

N60508.AR.000667  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 20 MAY 1993 TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING NAS WHITING  
FIELD FL  
6/4/1993  
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL



13.03.00.0024

00601

June 4, 1993

Commanding Officer  
ATTN: Kim Queen, Code 1859  
Southern Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
2155 Eagle Drive  
N. Charleston, SC 29419-9010

**SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes for the TRC Meeting - 20 May 1993 ✓**  
**Phase II-A RI NAS Whiting Field**  
**Milton, Florida**  
**Navy CLEAN District I**  
**Contract N62467-89-D-0317**

Dear Kim:

Enclosed are the minutes from the May 20, 1993, Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting, held at NAS Whiting Field, Milton, Florida. The meeting was held to inform the committee about the status of the Phase II-A RI being conducted at the NAS Whiting Field facility.

If you have any comments or questions regarding the minutes please call me at 904-656-1293.

Very truly yours,

ABB ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC.

  
Rao V.R. Angara  
Task Order Manager

cc: All TRC members  
File: 7560-XX [ ]

ABB Environmental Services, Inc.

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING**

**LIST OF ATTENDEES:**

Robert H. Pope	USEPA-Region IV
Kim Queen	SOUTHDIV-NAVFACENGCOM
James Holland	NASWF Public Works Office
Capt. Jim Eckart	Commanding Officer, NASWF
Jerrell Anderson	NASWF Public Works Office
Rao Angara	ABB-ES
Eric Blomberg	ABB-ES
Kathy Hodak	ABB-ES
Salvatore Consalvi	ABB-ES
David M. Clowes	FDER - Tallahassee
Jorge R. Caspary	FDER - Tallahassee
Mike Planert	U.S.G.S.
Jerry Giese	U.S.G.S
Ernie Padgett	Santa Rosa County
Susan Goggin	FDNR - Tallahassee
Lynn Griffin	FDNR - Tallahassee
Ludwig H. Opager	NASWF Public Works Office

**AGENDA**  
**PHASE II-A RI SUMMARY TRC MEETING**  
**NAS WHITING FIELD**  
**MILTON, FLORIDA**  
**MAY 20, 1993**

- 1000-1005 Introduction by NAS Whiting Field CO, Captain James Eckart
- 1005-1010 RI/FS Update by SDIV EIC, Ms. Kim Queen
- 1010-1045 Phase II-A RI Field Program Summary by ABB-ES FOL, Sal Consalvi
- Geophysical Survey
  - Soil Gas Survey
  - SW/SD Sampling and Technical Memorandum No.1
  - Test Pitting
  - Surface Soil Sampling
  - PCPT/BAT Explorations
  - Soil Borings and Subsurface Soil Sampling
  - Monitoring Well Installation
- 1045-1100 Phase II-A RI Field Changes by ABB-ES Technical Leader, Eric Blomberg
- 1100-1115 Technical Reports and Technical Memorandum No. 1 Discussion
- 1115-1130 Clear Creek Floodplain Investigation Summary
- 1130-1200 Questions and Discussion
- Site 5 No Further Action

**Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting Minutes**  
**Naval Air Station Whiting Field**  
**May 20, 1993**  
**10:00 a.m.**

**Introduction**

The meeting began with Captain Eckart, Commanding Officer (CO), Naval Air Station (NAS) Whiting Field, Milton, Florida, welcoming all participants. He noted the absence of Mr. Alton Harris and that he was happy to be attending his 3rd TRC meeting in his tenure at NASWF. He then turned over the meeting to Ms. Kimberly Queen, Engineer-in-Charge (EIC), Southern Division (SDIV) Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

**Phase II-A Remedial Investigation (RI) Update**

Ms. Queen began by stating her role as a representative of SDIV, which is the organization responsible for conducting the Installation Restoration (IR) program in the Southeastern United States. After stating the purpose and legislation which authorized the initiation of an IR program, Ms. Queen briefly explained the three components of the IR Program: 1) Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection, 2) Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, and 3) Remedial Design/Remedial Action and Long-term Monitoring. Ms. Queen asked that everyone in attendance introduce themselves and give their affiliation. She then introduced and presented an 8 minute video that summarized the Phase II-A RI field tasks that have been completed or are currently underway. The video was prepared by ABB Environmental Services to document the Phase II-A RI field program and also to be used as an informational source at future public meetings.

**Phase II-A Remedial Investigation Field Program Summary**

After presentation of the video, Ms. Queen introduced Mr. Rao Angara, Task Order Manager for NAS Whiting Field, ABB Environmental Services, Inc. Mr. Angara discussed the meeting agenda (attached). He gave a brief summary of the project to date, as requested by Captain Eckart.

Mr. Salvatore Consalvi, Phase II-A RI Field Operations Leader (FOL) was introduced and proceeded to explain the field program at NAS Whiting Field. Mr. Consalvi gave a slide presentation that described all field activities conducted to date, including: geophysical survey, soil gas survey, surface water and sediment sampling, test pitting, surface soil sampling, soil borings and monitoring well installation. The presentation covered specific details concerning sampling locations, number of samples collected, types of analysis, etc.

The Piezocone Penetrometer and Bengt-Arne-Torstensson (PCPT/BAT) exploration task was explained by Mr. Eric Blomberg, Technical Leader on the project. The slide presentation continued with Mr. Blomberg explaining the procedures and identifying specific sampling locations on the base map.

After a short break, the meeting resumed with Mr. Blomberg discussing the objectives, scope and results of the Geophysical Survey Technical Report. He pointed out that Navy responses to comments received from the USEPA and FDER had been provided in the handout. Specifically, he commented on the USEPA's concern that the landfill may extend beyond the fence boundary by explaining that no physical evidence of this extension was found and that a monitoring well has been drilled which met with no landfill refuse.

### **Phase II-A RI Field Changes**

Mr. Blomberg also noted that during a field program changes to the proposed scope may be required. Field changes for the Phase II-A RI field program were documented as they occurred and are summarized in the handout provided. He briefly discussed each field modification and presented the rationale behind each decision.

### **Technical Reports and Technical Memorandum 1 Discussion**

Continuing with the slide presentation, Mr. Blomberg gave an overview of the objectives, scope and results of both the Soil Gas Technical Report and Technical Memorandum No. 1 (Surface Water and Sediment Assessment). Recommendations for no further exploration of the surface water and sediments of Clear Creek and further exploration of the Clear Creek Floodplain sediments were given. He identified the information provided in the handout.

### **Clear Creek Floodplain Investigation Summary**

Mr. Blomberg discussed the objectives and scope of the Clear Creek Investigation. He informed the TRC that a 55 gallon drum was discovered in this area during an ecological survey conducted in December 1992. In March 1993, at the request of FDER, the drum was removed as shown in the slides. Mr. Blomberg explained that a geophysical survey conducted in this area identified an anomaly in the bog of the Clear Creek Floodplain. He specifically identified each area and level of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) contamination as depicted in a slide, and reproduced in the handout.

### **Questions and Comments**

Mr. Angara in his introductory discussion, indicated that any questions, comments or suggestions, even at a later date, would be most welcome. Several questions were asked both during and following the conclusion of both Mr. Salvatore Consalvi and Mr. Eric Blomberg's presentation. The individual questions, in the order they were asked, and the technical responses to the questions are detailed below:

- Mr. Jerry Giese, U.S.G.S., asked if surface water samples had been taken from anywhere in the floodplain?

Mr. Eric Blomberg, ABB-ES, responded, yes - sample stations 4, 7, and 9, and pointed to their approximate locations on the map.

- Ms. Lynn Griffin, F.D.N.R., asked if the next step in the process would be an ecological survey?

Mr. Eric Blomberg responded that a Baseline Risk Assessment had been planned. Mr. Rao Angara further stated a Workplan for the Ecological and Public Health Assessment would be produced first.

- Mr. Jim Holland, NASWF-Public Works, asked how much longer it would take to complete the program?

Mr. Eric Blomberg responded that at this time the field program is scheduled to be complete in 4 to 6 months. Mr. Rao Angara agreed, but noted that if data gaps were identified, the program may continue for 6 to 8 months.

- Ms. Lynn Griffin also asked whether ABB-ES felt that they had adequately discovered the extent of the contamination in the floodplain and that there was no need to continue North or further out?

Mr. Blomberg responded that an extensive investigation of the area had been conducted and ABB-ES was confident about the results. Captain Eckart further commented that NAS Whiting Field was very concerned about the contamination at Clear Creek.

- Mr. David Clowes, FDER, asked why a sample was not collected from the Big Coldwater Creek floodplain?

Mr. Blomberg responded by saying that contaminants would have to be transported over a mile through unlined ditches. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the floodplain of Big Coldwater Creek would exhibit any significant levels of contamination.

### Adjourn

Captain Eckart closed the meeting.

### Site Visit

Immediately following the TRC meeting an unscheduled project manager's meeting was held at FDER's request, after which a site visit was conducted of the NAS Whiting Field RI/FS sites. A tour of all the sites was given by ABB-ES Field Operations Leader, Salvatore Consalvi for USEPA representative Mr. Robert Pope. Mr. Jim Holland also gave a tour of the sites to FDER representatives, Mr. David Clowes and Mr. Jorge Caspary.

## **AGENDA**

**Phase II-A RI Summary  
Technical Review Committee Meeting  
NAS Whiting Field  
Milton, Florida  
May 20, 1993 at 10:00 am**

- o Introduction - Capt. Jim Eckart, NASWF CO**
  
- o RI/FS Update by SDIV EIC, Ms. Kim Queen**
  
- o Phase II-A RI Field Program Summary, ABB-ES**
  - Geophysical Survey
  - Soil Gas Survey
  - SW/SD Sampling and Technical Memorandum No. 1
  - Test Pitting
  - Surface Soil Sampling
  - PCPT/BAT Explorations
  - Soil Borings and Subsurface Soil Sampling
  - Monitoring Well Installation
  
- o Phase II-A RI Field Changes, ABB-ES**
  
- o Technical Reports and Technical Memorandum No. 1 Discussion**
  
- o Clear Creek Floodplain Investigation Summary**
  
- o Questions and Discussion**
  - Site 5 No Further Action
  
- o Adjourn**

## PROJECT MANAGER'S MEETING

May 20, 1993

11:35 a.m.

### Attendees:

Rao Angara	ABB-ES
Eric Blomberg	ABB-ES
Kathy Hodak	ABB-ES
Kim Queen	SDIV
Jim Holland	NASWF - Public Works Dept.
Jorge R. Caspary	FDER - Tallahassee
David M. Clowes	FDER - Tallahassee
Robert H. Pope	USEPA - Region IV

A synopsis of the discussions conducted at this project manager's meeting is given below.

### **GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY TECHNICAL REPORT**

- Mr. Robert Pope, USEPA, asked if ABB-ES did soil borings down to the water table at Sites 3 and 6, and if not, could we have been boring through clean fill put there after the tanks were removed? Ms. Kim Queen responded that only the top 10 feet may have been clean fill, but that soil borings went down to 30-40 feet. She continued by saying that because no contaminants were found, it was decided that the wells planned for these areas would be used elsewhere. Mr. Pope agreed that this was a good idea.
- Mr. Pope specifically pointed out to ABB-ES that new objectives should not be written in this report. A re-statement of the Geophysical Survey objectives should be submitted to the regulatory agencies.
- Mr. Pope made reference to the western boundary of the landfill at Site 16. He would like aerial photographs of the area and references to historical data, possibly obtained from interviews of base personnel, submitted to verify the location of the landfill and its perimeter. Both Eric Blomberg and Kim Queen, EIC, agreed that although recent interviews had not been conducted, the requested information could be obtained and photographs would be distributed as soon as copies could be made.
- Mr. Pope commented that after reading the report, he was still not sure what was going to be done in light of the data obtained. Mr. Rao Angara responded that the premise behind submitting the technical reports at the end of each field event was to just present the data obtained - in essence, an attempt to give the regulatory agencies the information as soon as possible. Mr. Angara clarified recommendations and conclusions would be made in the Technical Memorandums.

- Mr. David Clowes, FDER, asked if ABB-ES would be extending the Geophysical Survey out further at the landfill. Mr. Blomberg responded no, and that at this time the area of concern has been covered. Mr. Pope noted that review of the aerial photographs may help confirm this.
- It was agreed by all that a letter memorandum may be used to resubmit corrected pages to the Geophysical report.

## **SOIL GAS SURVEY TECHNICAL REPORT**

- Mr. Clowes asked why the soil gas survey was not done during Phase I. Mr. Clowes was informed that some sites were added to the IR program after completion of the Phase I RI. Therefore, it was essential that a site screening be completed prior to the installation of monitoring wells, collection of samples, etc.
- Mr. Clowes noted that the ion count numbers were not related to one another, which needs to be explained and that he is not clear about the difference between the 85,000 and 100,000 threshold values. Mr. Angara responded that ABB-ES will add more information, in future reports, to better explain all field screening procedures.
- Mr. Clowes requested that a composite map be prepared for all contaminants for each site. Mr. Angara responded that a composite map can not be prepared for this methodology because the data is presented as relative ion counts for each contaminant of concern.
- Mr. Jorge Caspary, FDER, asked if ABB-ES was relying on a statistical analysis. He wanted to know what was used for the background sample and if 9 samples exceeded 100,000, what would happen if only 7 exceeded 50,000? Would further investigations be conducted? Mr. Caspary explained his concern that the soil gas survey was being used to delineate the plume. He wanted confirmatory samples taken before relying on just soil gas analysis. Mr. Blomberg replied that the threshold values were selected based on histograms and frequency distributions. Mr. Blomberg informed Mr. Caspary that soil gas survey results were not being used to delineate plumes but, it was being used as screening tool to select locations for sampling, well installation, and soil borings.
- Mr. Robert Pope, EPA, noted that he had specific comments on figures which may be referenced in his memo. In particular he is concerned about the inconsistencies and presentation format of the figures. He had the same concerns about ion counts as Mr. Clowes and, although Technical Memorandum No. 6 was referenced, he still did not understand the procedure.

## **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 1 SURFACE WATER AND SEDIMENT ASSESSMENT**

- Mr. Clowes asked why the floodplain at Big Cold Water Creek was not sampled. Ms. Kim Queen responded that nothing was found in Phase I, so efforts were concentrated on Clear Creek. Mr. Rao

Angara further stated that efforts were concentrated on Clear Creek because of the results of a site reconnaissance and the close proximity of Sites 15 and 16. Mr. Clowes responded that ABB-ES should include a statement explaining this.

- Mr. Pope asked if the drainage ditch to Big Coldwater Creek was an intermittent or free flowing water body. Mr. Blomberg said it was intermittent.
- Mr. Clowes asked why most of the data was reported as "J"s. Mr. Angara responded that all data between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and Contract Required Detection Limits (CRDL) is reported as "J". Mr. Pope responded that there needs to be a clear explanation of why there are so many "J"s so that EPA and FDER reviewers do not think it is all due to laboratory contamination. Mr. Blomberg noted that an appendix including the validators explanation had been included for that reason. Both Mr. Angara and Mr. Pope agreed that there may be a need to create a new code to deal with this situation (USEPA needs to advise the Navy).
- Mr. Clowes noted that Mr. John Mitchell, FDER, had commented that he thought that some samples were above the Florida Water Quality Standards even though ABB-ES said they were not. Mr. Blomberg responded that ABB-ES had used Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC) for Class III waters. Ms. Kim Queen noted that maybe the Florida Surface Water Quality Classifications (FSWQC) are more stringent and need to be addressed. Mr. Pope added that a distinction needs to be made that Class III Freshwater Marine Standards were used.
- Mr. Clowes asked what the next stage would be in the Clear Creek Floodplain investigation. Ms. Kim Queen responded that investigations would continue farther up into the northwest part of the study area, then an ecological risk assessment would be done. Based on that information a determination would be made concerning remediation. She noted that some white top pitcher plants (an endangered species) had been identified in the area which may have to be left alone. Mr. Pope responded that a decision concerning the pitcher plants would be made at another time.
- Mr. Clowes asked if ABB-ES had any idea where the source of the contamination was. Mr. Blomberg responded that several possibilities are being considered.
- Mr. Pope asked if the Geophysical Survey was going to be continued farther up (North). Mr. Angara responded no, because of the water. Mr. Blomberg further explained that the bog is very deep and not conducive to survey by geophysical means.
- Mr. Angara stated that the next step was to prepare a generic ecological assessment workplan for the NAS Whiting Field facility including the Clear Creek Floodplain. Ms. Kim Queen further stated that a basewide ecological assessment will be conducted so that just one workplan document is prepared. However, she stated as soon as the base goes NPL there is a possibility that the sites will be separated into operable units (OU) with an ecological assessment per OU.

- Mr. Pope, USEPA, asked ABB-ES to use facility or site specific background samples. He further stated that all reports should include tables comparing Phase I data with Phase II data, with relevant comparisons and correlations noted in the text in an effort to show possible migration of contamination. He also asked that, in the future, the Navy should provide a figure with the exact extent of wetlands and exact locations of white top pitcher plants.
- Mr. Pope asked if groundwater at Sites 4 and 7, (currently being investigated under the UST program) had been sampled yet to see if TCE was a contaminant of concern. Ms. Queen responded that the UST program had not sampled these sites due to funding constraints. Mr. Blomberg further noted that the UST team had just finished their Sampling and Analysis Plan. Mr. Pope stated that he wanted this information included in the Technical Memorandum.
- Ms. Queen moved discussions onto the subject of Site 5 - Battery Acid Shop and the 1986 Consent Order. Mr. Blomberg stated that benzene was found at the site, but that it was concluded that it was not a result of onsite activities. He asked the agencies about the possibility of proposing this site for "no further action (NFA)" based on the 1986 groundwater data. Mr. Jorge Caspary responded that there was no chance of using the 1986 data and that re-sampling will have to be conducted. Mr. Pope asked if the wells at the site still existed and were usable. Mr. Blomberg responded yes, however, they may have to be re-developed.
- Mr. Caspary stated that once a facility is placed on the National Priority List (NPL), even if a site previously went NFA, it will be identified in the Federal Facilities Agreement as an active site. Therefore, a NFA document may have to be prepared again. He recommended that any attempt to have Site 5 be proposed for NFA should be done after the NPL announcement. Mr. Angara asked if sites that went NFA years ago will be put back on the list and need to be re-sampled and given the NFA designation again. Mr. Caspary responded yes.
- Mr. Pope asked what Technical Memorandum will be delivered next and when. Mr. Angara responded that the Soils Assessment Technical Memorandum is due in 1994. Mr. Pope requested that another TRC meeting be scheduled after receipt of all the Technical Memoranda. Mr. Clowes agreed. Mr. Clowes further stated that waiting until all the Technical Memorandums were done would allow him to relate them all together. Ms. Queen noted that there would be one Technical Memorandum which will summarize the findings of all the Memoranda.
- Mr. Rao Angara, ABB-ES, requested a shorter review time on the Technical Memorandums, followed by a Project Manager's Meeting/teleconference, to speed up the review process. Mr. Pope replied that USEPA was really busy and that the possibility of such a meeting was unlikely. Mr. Clowes and Mr. Caspary, replied that their review was dependent on their workload at the time. Ms. Queen stated that she will request 45 days review period for the Technical Memoranda.

The meeting was adjourned.