

N60508.AR.000743
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER WITH ATTACHED MINUTES FROM REMEDIAL PROGRAM MANAGERS MEETING
24 MAY 1994 NAS WHITING FIELD FL
6/22/1994
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL



03.01.00.0061

1D-00087

June 22, 1994

Commanding Officer
ATTN: Jeff Adams, Code 1859
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
P.O. Box 190010
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

**SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes
Remedial Program Managers Meeting
May 24, 1994 - Tallahassee, Florida
Naval Air Station Whiting Field, Milton, Florida
Contract Task Order 050**

Dear Jeff:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Meeting Minutes from the Remedial Program Managers meeting held in Tallahassee, Florida on May 24, 1994.

If you have any questions about these minutes, please call me at 904-656-1293 (ext. 114).

Sincerely yours,
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC.

Robin S. Futch
Task Order Manager

cc: File: 7560-- (11.2.1)
Gerry Walker, ABB-ES
Jim Holland, NASWF
Robert Pope/EPA
Bruce Arnett/FDEP
John Mitchell/FDEP

ABB Environmental Services Inc.

2590 Executive Center Circle East
Berkeley Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Telephone (904) 656-1293
Fax (904) 877-0742

**MEETING MINUTES FOR THE
NAS WHITING FIELD
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING
May 24, 1994**

Attendees: Jeff Adams - SouthDiv
Ray Butka - SouthDiv
Robert Pope - USEPA, Region IV
Bruce Arnett - FDEP
John Mitchell - FDEP
Jim Holland - NAS Whiting Field, PWD
Robin Futch - ABB-ES
Gerry Walker - ABB-ES
Sal Consalvi - ABB-ES
Gopi Kanchibhatla - ABB-ES

Afternoon Session only
John Kalsner - ABB-ES
Jim Williams - ABB-ES

Meeting Called to Order: 10:00 a.m.

Gerry Walker (ABB-ES) gave a brief introduction and reviewed the meeting agenda (attached). All attendees were introduced prior to the meeting. Mr. Walker then initiated discussion on the first agenda item "proposed operable unit (OU) breakdown and state of the Site Management Plan"(SMP). A memorandum was distributed that listed the preliminary OUs proposed for the facility. Following a group discussion with primary input from Robert Pope (USEPA), a total of six OUs were defined. The attached memorandum provides a description of the OUs and explains the rationale for the site groupings.

Mr. Pope then led the discussion on the SMP. He provided two separate examples of SMPs. One that he preferred (Defense Distribution Depot - Memphis, Tennessee) and a second SMP (Revised 1994 Site Management Plan of the Installation Restoration Program for the Naval Air Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida, April 27, 1994) that was cited as a lengthy document that he would prefer to avoid. Mr. Pope indicated that the SMP establishes milestones and schedules for the RI process and would be updated annually. In addition, Robert is planning that the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) deliverable schedule to be tied to the SMP, therefore both schedules would be updated annually and allow greater flexibility in the RI/FS program. Robert also indicated that he is continuing to work on the FFA for NAS Whiting Field.

Mr. Walker provided a facility-wide groundwater flow map and indicated that groundwater is generally flowing in a south to southeasterly direction.

Mr. Walker then outlined the plans for the remainder of the meeting. Two Whiting Field team members Sal Consalvi and Gopi Kanchibhatla were scheduled to summarize the recently compiled draft Phase II-A data, Mr. Walker would then summarize identified data gaps and solicit a group discussion on the identified data gaps. Complete summary tables of the data were supplied to the RPMs at the beginning of the meeting.

A summary overview of the discussions conducted at this meeting is presented below.

Background Sample Discussion

Surface Soil Samples - Overall it was concluded that sufficient background surface soil samples were collected. At present no data gaps were identified.

Surface Water/Sediment Samples - It was agreed that one additional upgradient sample will be collected northwest of the facility, at the confluence of Clear Creek and an unnamed tributary. This concurs with background surface water and sediment sampling discussions at the previous RPM meeting (November 10, 1994).

Groundwater Samples - An adequate number of samples and locations have been completed, however, elevated inorganic concentrations have been detected in background and site-specific samples. To further clarify these results it was proposed that additional sampling be completed with analysis for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters. This data will be used in the risk assessment and will provide additional uncertainty data for inorganic contaminants exceeding risk-based concentrations. As a cost saving measure, only a representative portion of the monitoring wells at the facility will be re-sampled. However, the sampling results will be extrapolated throughout the facility and to all previous sampling results.

Subsurface Soil Samples - No background subsurface soil samples have been collected at the facility. It was generally agreed that given the depth to groundwater and variability of subsurface soils, no subsurface sampling for background characterization is warranted.

Proposed No Further Action (NFA) Site Discussion - Sites 1, 2, 9, 12, and 31

The sample results were summarized for each of the sites. A summary of the site-specific data gap discussions is as follows:

- Site 1 - Additional surface soil samples are required to support the risk assessment. The ABB-ES risk assessor will obtain input from risk assessment reviewers prior to determination of the exact number of samples.
- Site 2 - One additional downgradient monitoring well is required to support a NFA decision. The groundwater sample will be analyzed for total and dissolved inorganic parameters in addition to the Target Compound List (TCL) and Target Analyte List (TAL) parameters.
- Site 9 - No data gaps were identified and consequently no additional investigation is planned. It is possible that the exact site location has not have been accurately determined, however additional aerial photo searches and file searches are not warranted.
- Site 12 - One additional downgradient monitoring well is required to support an NFA decision. The groundwater sample will be analyzed for total and dissolved inorganic parameters.
- Site 31 - Robert Pope requested that the individual Site 31 disposal areas be redesignated to distinguish between the different areas. ABB-ES concurred with the recommendation and will define specific designations in the upcoming Technical Memoranda.

Additional surface soil samples may be required from each of the six disposal areas to support the risk assessment. The ABB-ES risk assessor will obtain input from risk assessment reviewers prior to determination of the exact number of samples.

Additional soil or sediment samples may be required from the drainage swale located down-gradient of the disposal area containing soil samples WHF-31-SL-12 through 15. In addition, upgradient and downgradient monitoring wells are needed at this disposal area due to the elevated inorganic concentrations detected. Groundwater samples collected in association with the site will be analyzed for both filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters in addition to the TAL and TCL analysis.

The meeting was stopped for a lunch break.

Operable Unit "Landfills" Discussion - Sites 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16

The sample results were summarized for each of the individual sites. A summary of the site-specific data gap discussions is as follows:

Site 10 - Additional surface soil samples may be required to support the risk assessment.

Additional groundwater samples will be collected and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Site 11 - Additional surface soil samples may be required to support the risk assessment.

Additional groundwater samples will be collected and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Site 13 - One additional downgradient monitoring well, located south-southeast of the site, will be installed and sampled to further define the extent of contamination.

Additional surface soil samples may be required to support the risk assessment.

Additional groundwater samples will be collected and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Site 14 - Additional surface soil samples may be required to support the risk assessment.

Additional groundwater samples will be collected and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Site 15 - Additional surface soil samples may be required to support the risk assessment.

Additional groundwater samples will be collected and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Site 16 - Additional upgradient monitoring wells will be installed to further define the source of organic contamination detected in the present upgradient monitoring wells. In addition, downgradient monitoring wells will also be installed to determine if contaminants are migrating off facility.

Additional surface soil samples may be collected to support the risk assessment evaluation.

A representative number of the monitoring wells will be sampled and analyzed for filtered and unfiltered inorganic parameters.

Operable Unit "Crash Crew Training Area" Discussion - Sites 17 and 18

The sample results were summarized for each of the sites. A summary of the site specific data gap discussions is as follows:

Site 17 - Vertical extent of soil contamination has been determined and sample results have characterized contaminants within the individual pits. The current data appears to be sufficient to initiate the Feasibility Study (FS).

Site 18 - Vertical extent of contamination has been determined and sample results have characterized contaminants within the individual pits. Current data appears to be sufficient for the FS. No data gaps have been identified.

Bruce Arnett (FDEP) suggested that additional source area monitoring wells may be required in the immediate test pit area for both sites 17 and 18. ABB-ES and SouthDiv took the suggestion under advisement.

Industrial Area Discussion

Although the discussion proceeded through the three separate areas of the industrial area (North Field Area - Sites 3, 4, and 32; Midfield Area - Sites 5, 6, and 33; and South Field Area - Sites 7, 8, 29, and 30) the identified data gaps for each of the three areas were the same and are presented as such below.

- Groundwater contamination has not been adequately characterized. Data gaps include defining the lateral and vertical extent of organic contamination in groundwater. Additional investigation will focus on the use of a groundwater screening methodology to collect in-situ groundwater samples to be analyzed for organic compounds on a field portable Gas Chromatograph (GC). The field screening data will be used to strategically locate monitoring wells.

The vertical and lateral extent of subsurface soil contamination has not been adequately defined. Additional sample collection and field portable GC screening for organic contamination is proposed to be conducted in conjunction with soil borings required for the groundwater investigation.

Another potential data gap is the lack of characterization and definition of specific source area(s).

Mr. Pope inquired about the Underground Storage Tank (UST) removal that was conducted at the South Field Fuel Farm. He was particularly interested in the depth of the excavation and the amount of soil that was removed. Mr. Jim Holland (NAS Whiting Field - PWD) indicated that the soil removed during the tank excavation was backfilled into the excavation and topped off with clean soil to bring the soil up to grade.

The group also discussed Site 8, and it was determined that because the UST program has determined that the site is a NFA site, no additional work will be conducted at the site.

Future Program Support Decision for Sites 4 and 7 (UST Sites 1467 and 1466 respectively)

Previous discussions between ABB-ES and SouthDiv had indicated that based on TCE contamination in groundwater samples, the investigation and remediation of groundwater for Sites 4 and 7 should be transferred to the IR program. However, a final decision concerning the investigation and remediation of the surface and subsurface soil had not been made.

Mr. John Kaiser (ABB-ES) and Mr. Jim Williams (ABB-ES) presented soil gas headspace data collected during the UST program investigations at the sites. ABB-ES and SOUTHDIV were of the opinion that the soil investigation at Site 7 (UST Site 1466) should remain in the UST program because of the large separation distance between identified contamination in the shallow subsurface soils and deeper soils immediately above the water table. However at Site 4 (UST Site 1467), because elevated OVA readings were reported continuously from the land surface to the water table, the investigation and remediation of contaminated soils at this site should be transferred to the IR program.

USEPA and FDEP representatives indicated they would prefer that the soils investigation along with the groundwater investigation for both sites should be transferred to the IR program due to the potential for mixed wastes. John Kaiser indicated that he would contact Luis Vazquez, SOUTHDIV's UST EIC, to convey the RPM's comments and to facilitate transfer of the site to the IR program.

The meeting was concluded at approximately 4:30 pm.

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 6, 1994
To: Robin Futch
From: G. Walker
Subject: Revised List of Proposed Operable Units (OUs) for NAS Whiting Field Milton, Florida

Based on the group discussion during the Remedial Project Managers (RPM) meeting on May 24, 1994, I have revised the previous memorandum (dated May 9, 1994) detailing proposed Operable Units (OUs) at NAS Whiting Field. The following summary reflects my recollection of the group consensus.

Potential OU Groupings - Outlying Perimeter Road Sites

Potential OU - Northwest Perimeter Road Sites

Site 1, Northwest Disposal Area
Site 2, Northwest Open Disposal Area
Site 17, Crash Crew Training Area
Site 18, Crash Crew Training Area

All sites represent good selections for grouping as a single OU given their close geographic proximity. Sites 17 and 18 are anticipated to be completed at an accelerated pace using the available data. Sites 1 and 2 may require additional limited investigation, however, both appear to represent potential No Further Action sites.

Potential OU - Southwest Perimeter Road Sites

Site 15, Southwest Landfill
Site 16, Open Disposal and Burning Area

These sites are grouped under a single OU based on geographic proximity, similarity of aquifer contamination zones, potential scope and complexity of investigation, and similarity of potential investigation methods and remedial actions.

Potential OU - Southeast Perimeter Road Sites

Site 9, Waste Fuel Disposal Area
Site 10, Southeast Open Disposal Area A
Site 11, Southeast Open Disposal Area B
Site 12, Tetraethyl Lead Disposal Area
Site 13, Sanitary Landfill
Site 14, Short-term Sanitary Landfill

These sites are grouped under a single OU based on geographic proximity, potential scope and complexity of investigation.

Potential OU - Perimeter Road Sludge Drying Beds

Site 31, Sludge Drying Beds and Disposal Areas

This site will be investigated as a single OU because it is unique in disposal method and because of the potential scope and complexity of investigation.

Potential OU Groupings - Industrial Area Sites

Potential OU - North Field Industrial Area

- Site 3, Underground Waste Solvent Storage Tank
- Site 4, North AVGAS Tank Sludge Disposal Area
- Site 32, North Field Maintenance Hanger

These sites are grouped into a single OU based on geographic proximity of sites, similarity of type of aquifer contamination, potential scope and complexity of investigation, and similarity of potential investigation methods and remedial actions.

Potential OU - Midfield and South Field Industrial Areas

- Site 5, Battery Acid Seepage Pit
- Site 6, South Transformer Oil Disposal Area
- Site 7, South AVGAS Tank Sludge Disposal Area
- Site 8, AVGAS Fuel Spill Area
- Site 29, Auto Hobby Shop
- Site 30, South Field Maintenance Hanger
- Site 33, Midfield Maintenance Hanger

These sites are grouped into a single OU based on similarity of aquifer contamination zones, similarity of potential investigation methods, potential scope and complexity of investigations, and similarity of potential remedial actions.

Although six OUs have currently been identified, it is possible that additional investigation at the facility may indicate the need to further subdivide the units to facilitate the RI\FS process. For example, an additional OU including the groundwater portion of the Industrial areas only may be broken out in the future.