

N60508.AR.000932
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA AND SUMMARY 19 NOVEMBER
1998 NAS WHITING FIELD FL
11/19/1998
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

Agenda

NAS Whiting Field Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Pensacola Junior College, Milton Campus
Highway 90, Milton
November 19, 1998, 6:00 P.M.

- *Welcome* Pat Durbin
Navy RAB Co-Chair

- *Installation Restoration: A Navy Pledge to the Future* Video

- *Latest Perimeter Road Site Remedial Investigations* Jim Williams
Harding Lawson Associates

- *Break*

- *Interim Remedial Action Update* Tom Conrad
Bechtel Environmental, Inc.

- *RAB Business* RAB Members
 - RAB evaluation and recommendations
 - next meeting time and location
 - suggested agenda items

Naval Air Station Whiting Field
November 19, 1998 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary

RAB members attending:

Craig Benedikt	Pat Durbin, Navy Co-Chair
Anita Breeding	Logan Fink, Community Co-Chair
Garnett Breeding	Jimmie Jarratt
Jim Cason	Linda Martin

NAS Whiting Field and other Navy representatives:

Jim Holland, NAS Whiting Field Public Works
Ensign Jennifer Whitmore, NAS Whiting Field

Contractor support personnel:

Bill Kollar, Rao Angara: Harding Lawson Associates (HLA)
Tom Conrad: Bechtel Environmental

Logan Fink opened the meeting at 5:35 p.m. He welcomed the RAB members and the approximately 20 students from the Pensacola Junior College environmental department also in attendance. Mr. Fink explained that the RAB is made up jointly of community and government members, and that it is co-chaired by a community and Navy member. He then summarized the Board's advisory responsibilities, and encouraged the students to become involved in RAB activities.

Pat Durbin introduced the RAB members for the benefit of the students at the meeting, and also encouraged them to join the board or attend meetings. She next reviewed the meeting agenda, and introduced a short video on the Navy's Installation Restoration (IR) program.

Video Presentation: Installation Restoration, A Navy Pledge to the Future

Presentation: Status of Perimeter Road Sites

Rao Angara, HLA project manager at NAS Whiting Field, briefed the RAB on the status of the Perimeter Road sites. Mr. Angara began by providing some personal background, including his earlier IR work at NAS Whiting Field, and emphasized his positive experience working with the NAS Cecil Field RAB.

Mr. Angara then discussed the Perimeter Road sites individually. In addition to their current investigative status, he provided some background on each, including their operational and waste

disposal history. For context, Mr. Angara also reviewed the process for addressing former hazardous waste disposal sites under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), noting that cleanup decisions are largely driven by human health risk evaluation findings.

Questions and Comments

What are land use controls (LUCs) as they apply to the IR program? LUCs refer to legal mechanisms, such as deed restrictions, that prohibit specific land uses and are implemented as part of cleanup remedies. For example, a LUC could prohibit residential development at a site if risk evaluations found that site conditions would pose unacceptable health risks to residents living in that area.

Presentation: Interim Remedial Actions at Sites 9, 10, 17, 18, and 31C

Tom Conrad, Bechtel Environmental project manager at NAS Whiting Field, discussed ongoing interim cleanups at five sites. He first explained Bechtel's role as the remedial action contractor responsible for performing site cleanups such as contaminated soil removal, installation of treatment systems, and other methods. Mr. Conrad also noted that cleanup alternatives are selected by the NAS Whiting Field Partnering Team, made up of Navy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and contractor representatives. This coordinated approach leads to faster and more efficient site study and cleanup. Mr. Conrad also stressed the role of the community and the RAB in commenting on proposed cleanup alternatives.

Mr. Conrad then described the interim actions at each site. They are as follows:

- **Sites 9 and 10:** install clean soil cover over waste disposal area; plant vegetation on cover; spread out construction rubble piles currently at the site
- **Site 17:** install clean soil cover and sod over waste disposal area; allow petroleum products to degrade naturally
- **Site 18:** perform leachate testing for water infiltration to select appropriate type of soil cover; install clean soil cover over waste disposal area
- **Site 31C:** remove contaminated sludge to meet residential land use standards; install clean soil cover and sod over removal area

Mr. Conrad concluded by noting that, under CERCLA, interim actions address site contamination requiring early action while detailed investigations proceed. However, they are often found to be the final action needed to protect human health.

Questions and Comments

Are there risks to ecological resources (wildlife and plants) at the five sites discussed? There are minimal risks to plants and wildlife at some of the sites. However, the main objective of the interim remedial actions is to protect human health.

When was hazardous waste disposed of at these sites? Waste disposal histories vary for each site. Taken together, the disposal periods were from the mid 1940s to the early 1980s.

Where is waste removed from these sites disposed of? The contaminated sludge from Site 31C will be disposed of at a regulated landfill permitted to accept that particular waste. The ultimate disposal method depends largely on the type of waste and the type and amount of contaminant.

How is soil used to cover waste disposal areas verified as clean? Samples of the soil are analyzed at a laboratory to ensure that the soil is suitable for use as clean cover.

Discussion: RAB Self-Evaluation and Effectiveness

Pat Durbin and Bill Kollar, HLA community relations specialist for NAS Whiting Field, moderated the discussion among the community RAB members. Members were asked to comment on several items regarding RAB activities, and offer recommendations on improving each. The RAB feedback on each item is summarized below:

RAB Meeting Content

- **Continue site status reports:** yes; members recognize that these reports, while oftentimes repetitive, reflect the progress and objective of the IR program.
- **Continue site visits:** generally yes; recommended presentations and/or video on field investigations and cleanup in lieu of site visits.
- **Provide hands-on equipment and technology demonstrations:** generally yes; one member felt demonstrations were not necessary if presentations on site status and field activities are suitably non-technical.
- **Use video presentations:** yes: videos especially useful to members unable to participate in site visits due to time constraints; recommended videos on individual sites.
- **Review RAB membership and attendance policy:** generally no; community RAB members serve voluntarily and schedule conflicts invariably arise that preclude meeting attendance; attendance policy should be flexible to accommodate this and not so rigid as to remove members who have shown a genuine interest in serving; recommended continuing meeting notifications by mail and day of meeting telephone notifications.
- **Participation in on-base activities:** feedback was mixed; consensus was to keep members informed of events that may be appropriate for RAB participation.
- **Present guest speakers:** yes; recommended limiting speaker presentations to relevant topics, 15 to 20 minutes in length.

- **Other items:** recommended presentations on potential health risks by site, refresher on basic IR program concepts; also recommended contacts with other area RABs and consideration of a joint RAB meeting.

RAB Meeting Logistics

- **Preferred meeting locations:** Pensacola Junior College (Milton campus) preferred, followed by NAS Whiting Field; Santa Rosa Board of Education complex was least preferred.
- **Meeting day and time:** Tuesday or Thursday preferred; recommended establishing consistent meeting day (i.e., third Tuesday in month); 6:00 was preferred time.
- **Meeting frequency:** generally every other month preferred; support for scheduling RAB meetings in conjunction with other public meetings as a cost efficiency.
- **Room set-up:** current set-up (theater style) acceptable; some preference for horseshoe if appropriate for meeting agenda.

Pat Durbin closed the discussion by noting that an evaluation summary would be provided in the November meeting minutes, and that she would work to implement the preferences and recommendations as practical.

RAB Administration

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for 6:00 PM, January 5, 1999 at Pensacola Junior College, Milton Campus. Ms. Durbin asked the members to contact her with agenda item suggestions. The RAB meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.