

N00204.AR.002631
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 29 JUNE 2010 NAS PENSACOLA
FL
6/29/2010
NAS PENSACOLA

Minutes
NAS Pensacola RAB Meeting
Naval Air Station Pensacola
Pensacola, Florida
June 29, 2010

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at Building 624 on NAS Pensacola on June 29, 2010:

Greg Campbell (Navy Co-Chair)
Jesse Rigby
Lisa Minchew
Greg Fraley (USEPA)

Patty Marajh-Whittemore (Navy
NAVFAC SE)
Patrick Nichols (NASP PAO)
David Grabka (FDEP)

Administrative and technical support for the meeting was provided by:

Gerry Walker, Tetra Tech
Ron Kotun, Tetra Tech

Melissa Brock, Tetra Tech
Sam Naik (CH2M Hill)

Other attendees included:

Helen Lockard (Tier II, Navy)

Welcome:

Greg Campbell, the Navy RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:00 pm. Mr. Campbell welcomed everyone and began the initial discussions with the current “hot topic” of the British Petroleum Deep Water Oil Spill and effect of the oil spill on NAS Pensacola. Some oil has washed up on NAS Pensacola and has been cleaned up. The facility is currently being used for staging operations in support of the spill cleanup. The group discussed the presence of vice president Joe Biden at the NAS Pensacola facility to see cleanup operations. Greg Campbell then introduced RAB meeting topic to be discussed: Proposed Plan for Operable Unit (OU) 19, Site 44 Former Underground Storage Tank (UST) Site 3221 SW.

Technical Presentations:

Greg Campbell introduced Gerry Walker from Tetra Tech who presented a power point slide show discussing the Proposed Plan for OU 19, Site 44 Former UST Site 3221 SW. Site background and history was explained along with past investigations and report documentation. The current use of Site is a wash rack for cleaning aircraft and air craft parts. It is used by Naval Air Museum personnel in the refurbishing of aircraft for museum display. Chemicals of Concern (COC) for the site include carcinogenic Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (cPAH) in soil and Trichloroethene (TCE) in groundwater. Remedial Action Objectives were determined to prevent exposure and Human Health Risk Assessments (HHRA) were conducted using both USEPA and FDEP regulations/criteria.

The results of the HHRA were discussed in that for soils receptors with risks greater than FDEP target risk levels were identified (FDEP levels are lower and more protective than the USEPA target risk range) and for groundwater receptors with risks greater than FDEP and USEPA target risk levels were identified. Based on the receptors and chemicals of concern Cleanup levels for the site were determined and presented.

The Feasibility Study identified remedial alternatives for Site 43 including:

- Soil Alternative S-0 (no action) was not protective
- Soil Alternative S-1 Land Use Controls (LUCs) will cost \$86,000 over a 30 year period
- Groundwater Alternative G-0 (no action) not protective
- Groundwater Alternative G-1 (Natural Attenuation, LUCs and Monitoring) will cost \$271,000 for an approximate 10 year period
- Groundwater Alternative G-2 (in-situ groundwater treatment, LUCs and monitoring) \$913,000 over 5 year period

A comparative analysis of the soil and groundwater remedies was explained and the “Preferred Alternatives” of Soil Alternative S-2 LUCs and Groundwater Alternative G-2 Natural Attenuation, LUCs and Monitoring was presented as detailed in the Proposed Plan.

Then the next steps in the remedial process of the site were explained including the Proposed Plan Public Comment period and the publication of the Record of Decision.

RAB member questions included:

QUESTION: *How many sites are left? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: Just a few are left. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *Have any problems come up? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: Nothing has changed significantly. At the 5-year review they will evaluate if any issues occurred. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *How is the MRP sampling? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: Good. Funding is being looked at and paths forward are being explored as sample data comes back from the lab. Another public meeting may need to be held. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *What is the plan if remediation is required (at the MRP Sites)? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: We are looking at the data more closely in order to evaluate how to proceed if data comes back exceeding criteria. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *Did all the contamination at Site 44 come from the UST? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: We don't know. It seems very likely much comes from the wash rack not just the old UST. (Gerry W.)

QUESTION: *How long has the area been used as a wash area? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: Since at least the 80's, but probably the late 70's. (Gerry and Greg)

QUESTION: *How many monitoring wells are permanent? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: All of them. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: TCE is breaking down though, over time, right? (Jesse)

ANSWER: Yes, but we have not seen any daughter products/ constituents. More will be known as the project moves forward.

QUESTION: *Is G-2 more protective than G-1? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: No. You end with the same result with G-2, but it takes more money. With G-1 you get the same result for less money it just takes a little more time. (Gerry W.)

QUESTION: *Does that monitoring include wells outside of the plume? (Lisa)*

ANSWER: Yes. Wells would include source area and "compliance point" or downgradient locations. (Gerry W.)

QUESTION: What is the nature of the Site with regard to groundwater depth? (Jesse)

ANSWER: About 13 feet for the shallow aquifer. We will have shallow, intermediate, and deep wells to monitor all possible contamination. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: Does the flow rate have an influence? (Lisa)

ANSWER: We have downgradient wells showing that the plume is not migrating, even with flow. (Gerry W.)

QUESTION: *Is Site 45 near 44? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: It is by building 603. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *So we are not looking to have any new sites? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: We are not anticipating any new sites. (Gerry W.)

QUESTION: Is the staging system for the oil spill under control? (Lisa and Jesse)

ANSWER: BP has promised they are decontaminating everything and if anything happens they will clean it up. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: Has oil come on the base shore? (Jesse)

ANSWER: Yes and it is being disposed of properly by BP workers. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: Will we have RODs on all these sites by next year? (Jesse and Lisa)

ANSWER: That is the plan and what is slated on our schedule. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: *Can you send me a copy of the public notice direct? (Jesse)*

ANSWER: Yes. (Greg C.)

QUESTION: Has there ever been a TCE and PCE site actually cleaned up to criteria levels? (Jesse)

ANSWER: Yes at low level and mid range level sites. (David G.)

QUESTION: Can a list of current RAB Team members be sent out? (Jesse and Lisa)

ANSWER: Certainly. (Greg C.) [attached]

The next meeting was scheduled for Fall/Winter 2010.

The RAB Meeting was concluded at approximately 6:58 pm

Restoration Advisory Board Members

Note: This list is current as of the publication date (November 2009). Membership in the RAB may change. An up-to-date list of RAB members and their contact information is maintained by the NAS Pensacola Public Affairs Office (see previous page).

Navy Co-Chair

Greg Campbell
Naval Air Station Pensacola
Building 3560
310 John Tower Road
Pensacola, FL 32508-5200
(850) 452-3131 ext. 3007
gregory.campbell@navy.mil

Community Co-Chair

John Early
4 Waycross Avenue
Pensacola, FL 32507
(850) 456-4111

Members

Gregory Fraley
US Environmental Protection Agency
Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303-8960
(404) 562-8544
fraley.gregory@epa.gov

Jesse W. Rigby
125 West Romana Street, Suite 800
Pensacola, FL 32501
(850) 434-9200

David Grabka
Division of Waste Management
Federal Programs Section
Florida Department of Environmental
Protection
Bob Martinez Center
MS 4535
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400
(850) 245-8997
David.Grabka@dep.state.fl.us

Patty Marajh-Whittemore
NAVFAC SE
IPT, Gulf Coast
Building 903
NAS Jacksonville
Jacksonville, FL 32212-0300
(904) 542-6964
Patty.Whittemore@navy.mil

Lisa S. Minshew
600 South Barracks Street, Suite 201
Pensacola, FL 32501
(850) 434-6859