

N60508.AR.000830
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA 2 MAY 1996 NAS WHITING FIELD
FL
5/2/1996
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA

NAS WHITING FIELD RAB MEETING PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE, MILTON CAMPUS May 2, 1996, 5:30 P.M.

- **Welcome** Pat Durbin
Navy Co-Chair

 - **Presentation** Nancy Goddard
Ecological Risk Assessment
(15 - 20 minutes) ABB Environmental

 - **Presentation** Jeff Adams
Relative Risk Ranking
(15 - 20 minutes) Navy Southern Division

 - **Break**

 - **Follow-Up Discussion** Gerry Walker
Monitoring Well Installation ABB Environmental

 - **General Discussion** RAB Members
- Upcoming Agenda Topics/Speakers
 - Other topics

**NAS Whiting Field
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, 2 May 1996
MEETING SUMMARY**

RAB Members Attending:

Jeff Adams
Garrett Breeding
Jim Cason

Pat Durbin, Navy Co-Chair
Logan Fink, Community Co-Chair
Robert Fowlkes

NAS Whiting Field Representatives:

Commander Brian Harris, NAS Whiting Field Public Works Department
Jim Holland, NAS Whiting Field Public Works Department

Others:

Tom Conrad, Bechtel Environmental, Inc.
Charlie Donahue, ABB Environmental Services (ABB-ES)
Terry Hansen, ABB-ES
Bill Kollar, ABB-ES
Phil Ottinger, Brown & Root Environmental
Gerry Walker, ABB-ES

Pat Durbin opened the meeting at 5:37 p.m. by welcoming the RAB members and others in attendance. She then reviewed the meeting agenda and introduced the presenters. RAB members were then asked for comments on the March 7 RAB meeting minutes. The minutes were subsequently approved without comment, and Durbin noted that all RAB meeting minutes are available in the Information Repository at the Milton Public Library. Jeff Adams then introduced Phil Ottinger of Brown & Root Environmental. The technical contract for the Installation Restoration program at NAS Whiting Field will be transferring from ABB-ES to Brown & Root shortly.

Ecological Risk Assessment for Operable Units 3, 4, 5, and 6:

Charlie Donahue of ABB-ES presented an overview of the ecological field investigation conducted at Operable Units (OU) 3, 4, 5, and 6 in October 1995. The data gathered during the field studies is being used in the risk assessment which is part of Remedial Investigations at these sites. The key topics of Mr. Donahue's presentation included:

- Overall objectives of the ecological field investigation
- Review of background information, including major information sources:
 - NAS Whiting Field Biologist and Forester
 - Florida Natural Areas Inventory
 - Records on protected species
- Objectives of the site inspection:
 - determine overall field conditions
 - identify major plant cover types
 - evaluate health of plant communities
 - identify any unusual physical characteristics at the sites
 - note signs of wildlife use at the sites

■ How this information is used:

- basis for estimating level of risk
- helps define and focus ecological risk assessment
- ensures development of sensitive sampling plan

■ Preliminary conclusions:

- contamination at perimeter sites unlikely to have serious impact on plants and animals
- soil erosion could be a greater concern to species habitats, but protective measures are in place

Jim Holland asked if there had been a site inspection at Site 39 (the Clear Creek floodplain). Mr. Donahue responded that Site 39 is part of OU 7 and will be inspected at a later time. Garrett Breeding asked how a risk assessment measures human health risks. Donahue summarized the risk assessment process by explaining that potential health risks posed by maximum contaminant concentrations are identified for the exposure pathways and receptors that exist at a given site. If those risks are unacceptable based on regulatory standards, then the pathways are severed through cleanup and/or source control.

Relative Risk Ranking Site Evaluation

Jeff Adams, the Navy Southern Division representative on the RAB, made a presentation on the relative risk ranking process for site evaluation. He explained that relative risk ranking is primarily a budgeting tool which allows Navy decisionmakers to prioritize sites for funding. He added that use of the relative risk ranking is consistent with the overall mission of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP). Relative risk ranking has been an important DERP element since 1994, when it was developed through coordination among the various military services.

Adams described the principles behind relative risk ranking as follows: to provide a general assessment of site contamination; to assign rankings based on that assessment; and to prioritize funding based on the site rankings. He added that relative risk input reflects a conservative approach to site assessment. The benefits of relative risk ranking are: uniform assessment criteria are applied to all sites; sites requiring immediate attention are identified; other sites are prioritized as warranted by actual environmental conditions; and dialogue among the agencies with DERP responsibilities is promoted. Adams stressed that relative risk ranking is not a substitute for comprehensive human health and ecological risk assessments, and therefore is not a characterization of a site's risk.

The relative risk ranking site evaluation model was then presented. Mr. Adams explained that sites are grouped into high, medium, and low risk groupings using the model. Sites are grouped based on several site-specific factors, including: contaminant hazards; migration pathways; and potential receptors. Hydrological, chemical, geological, and other site characteristics are considered under the site evaluation model. Mr. Adams concluded by noting that DERP goals are to budget 90% of program funds on high risk sites, with 60% of that funding spent on cleanup and 40% on investigation.

Mr. Adams fielded questions following his presentation. Jim Holland asked if National Priorities List (NPL) status is considered in relative risk ranking. Adams replied that requirements for NPL sites and other applicable federal and state regulatory requirements are considered in the relative risk ranking process. Julie Catone, NAS Whiting Field Natural Resource Trustee, asked where the base's sites were ranked. Mr. Adams stated that some of the sites were in the high grouping, and offered to provide more detailed information to Ms. Catone. Terry Hansen, ABB-ES Project Manager, noted that sites ranked in the high-risk group do not necessarily pose imminent danger to human health or the environment, and again emphasized that relative risk ranking is a budgeting tool and not a comprehensive technical analysis. Adams added that relative risk ranking is increasingly valuable as federal decisionmakers are balancing environmental concerns against military needs in the current period of budget reduction.

Monitoring Well Installation Field Visit: Follow-up Discussion

Garrett Breeding asked if restrictions were placed on flight line monitoring well installations based on flight schedules. Pat Durbin replied that such restrictions were in place. Durbin then noted that the recent item in *The Whiting Tower* base newspaper regarding the field visit was somewhat misleading, in that it could give the impression that the wells visited were the first such installations. Durbin explained that monitoring wells had previously been installed at other sites at NAS Whiting Field.

Closing Comments

Jesse Wilcox, a member of the public in attendance, asked if minutes from past RAB meetings were available for review. Pat Durbin replied that minutes of all the RAB meetings are at the Information Repository at the Milton Public Library.

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for August 15 under the RAB's new quarterly meeting schedule. The meeting will begin at 5:30 at Pensacola Junior College. Potential topics for the next RAB meeting were then discussed. Pat Durbin mentioned that a presentation on health risk assessment by Dr. Marland Dulaney of ABB-ES was planned. Other potential topics were presentations on environmental justice (by US Environmental Protection Agency staff or by NAS Pensacola staff familiar with the issue) and on groundwater flow modeling. Durbin asked the RAB members to think about other presentation topics for the next meeting and provide suggestions to her. The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.