

N60508.AR.001072  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

MINUTES REGARDING RAB MEETING FOR PROPOSED PLAN SITE 12 NAS WHITING  
FIELD FL  
11/9/1999  
NAS WHITING FIELD

**Naval Air Station Whiting Field  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary  
November 9, 1999**

RAB members attending:

Pat Durbin, Navy Co-Chair  
Jim Cason, FDEP  
Craig Benedikt, USEPA  
Ken Brooks

NAS Whiting Field Representatives:

Lori Aprilliano, Public Affairs Officer  
Jim Holland, Environmental Engineer  
Lt. Paul Odenthal, Public Works Officer  
Capt. Wayne Nelms, Commanding Officer

Support personnel and others:

Rao Angapa, HLA  
Eric Blomberg, HLA  
Terry Hansen, TtNUS  
Linda Martin, SOUTHDIV  
Phillip Ottinger, TtNUS  
Vickie Stitt, TtNUS  
Gerry Walker, TtNUS

Pat Durbin, Navy Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed the RAB members and others in attendance. Everyone present introduced themselves and stated their role with NAS Whiting Field and the RAB. Mr. Eric Blomberg, HLA, was then introduced for his presentation.

**Presentation: Proposed Plan for Site 12**

Eric Blomberg, HLA, reported on the size and location of Site 12 and its use as a disposal area in 1968. Eric narrated slides showing the six earth-covered piles at Site 12, which reportedly contained from 200 to 400 gallons of sludge each. The site was sampled to assess the nature and extent of contamination which identified:

- aluminum, arsenic, iron and vanadium in the surface soil exceeding Florida and USEPA residential cleanup levels
- arsenic in surface soil exceeding industrial cleanup levels
- arsenic and vanadium in subsurface soil exceeding Florida residential cleanup levels
- all subsurface soil detections were below industrial cleanup levels.

Eric explained that human exposure to surface soil, subsurface soil and groundwater at the site do not pose unacceptable cancer or noncancer risks using USEPA guidelines and are below the Florida target risk level for noncancer risks. However, arsenic in surface soil poses an increased cancer risk when compared to Florida's target risk level.

Three possible response actions were identified and evaluated in the Feasibility Study for Site 12. Those were:

- no action
- land-use controls (LUCs)
- sludge pile removal and disposal, with land-use controls

Land-use controls was selected in the proposed plan as the response action to be implemented at Site 12. This would permit commercial, industrial and limited recreational and agricultural use of the site, but prohibit residential use. Also required would be quarterly site inspections, an annual report by the NAS Whiting Field Commanding Officer and a five-year review. This plan was chosen because it offered the most cost effective human health protection by preventing full-time exposure to soil contaminants, and would also have less impact on the environmental than removing the sludge piles.

#### **RAB Questions on the Proposed Plan for Site 12**

*Would there be a buffer zone around the site?* Yes, there would be a perimeter around the site and fencing is possible.

A discussion followed concerning the arsenic contamination in and around the mounds. Arsenic levels around the mounds were not much higher than the apparent background level of arsenic in similar soil at other locations on base. The Navy is currently evaluating "background" levels of selected inorganics, including arsenic, at NAS Whiting Field to determine if the apparent "background" concentrations are due to natural occurring inorganics in the soil. The results of this study, if approved by USEPA and Florida, would most likely be higher background concentrations for naturally occurring inorganics like arsenic.

#### **Presentation: Remedial Investigation(RI)/Feasibility Study (FS) Update on Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33, Surface and Subsurface Soil**

Phillip Ottinger, TtNUS, reported on the recent Final RI and Draft FS completed for surface and subsurface soil at Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33. Each site was identified as to its location, potential sources of contamination and chemicals of potential concern. The chemicals of potential concern identified in the surface or subsurface soil at each site are as follows:

- Site 3 – arsenic and dieldrin
- Site 4 – arsenic, benzo(a)pyrene and dieldrin
- Site 6 – benzo(a)pyrene, PCBs, arsenic, TPH
- Site 30 – arsenic and TPH
- Site 32 – arsenic and TPH
- Site 33 – arsenic and TPH

A draft feasibility study was prepared which identified and evaluated response actions to remedy contamination present at concentrations above cleanup criteria at each site. Response actions for each site were evaluated using the nine USEPA Criteria, which are:

- Protection of human health & the environment
- Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements

- Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants
- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost
- State acceptance
- Community acceptance

The response actions evaluated, using the above criteria, for each site are as follows:

**Site 3 – Underground Waste Solvent Storage Area**

- no action
- removal of surface soils (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

**Site 4 – North AVGAS Tank Sludge Disposal Area**

- no action
- removal of surface soils (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- removal of surface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria), soil venting, and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

**Site 6 – South Transformer Oil Disposal Area**

- no action
- removal of surface soils (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- soil venting and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

**Site 30 – South Field Maintenance Hanger**

- no action
- removal of surface soils (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- removal of surface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria), soil venting, and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

**Site 32 – North Field Maintenance Hanger**

- no action
- removal of surface soils (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- soil venting and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

**Site 33 – Mid Field Maintenance Hanger**

- no action
- LUCs
- soil venting and LUCs
- removal of surface and subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs
- removal of subsurface soil (exceeding cleanup criteria) and LUCs

The preferred response action for each site will be identified in the Proposed Plan scheduled to be issued in the late spring or early summer of 2000.

## **RAB Questions on RI/FL Update on Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33, Surface and Subsurface Soil**

*Is the Navy or an outside contractor to be used for remediation?* The cost of each response action is based on using an outside contractor with off-site disposal costs.

*Would the concrete pads be removed if the soil at a site was replaced?* The concrete pad immediately over and around the soil to be replaced would be removed but not necessarily the entire concrete pad at a site.

*Would it be possible to dig down to a tank at a site, vent the tank and leave the tank with the concrete as a cap?* No, the tank could still leak and be a continual source of contamination.

*Could removal of tanks be coordinated with renovation of current hangers and wash racks?* That possibility is being investigated. However, remediation on these sites is not scheduled for some time yet and current renovations may finished by the time remediation is begun. If, at the time of remediation, renovation is being done at a site, the two could possibly be coordinated.

*Can removal of tanks be accomplished without disrupting normal activity at each site?* Tank removal should be able to be done without disturbing normal activity.

*How deep are the tanks?* Typically, five feet to the bottom of the tank.

*How long will it take to remove them?* A couple of days.

A question was raised concerning groundwater contamination. Groundwater contamination is currently being addressed as part of Site 40, Basewide Groundwater and was not addressed in this study. However, the source removal expected to be done at these sites will help in the later remediation of any groundwater contamination.

## **RAB Administration**

Ms. Durbin announced that the meetings for next year are scheduled for February 15, June 1, and October 3. Schedule is subject to change.

The discussion concerning issuing a Notice of Intent instead of automatically having a public meeting was continued from the last RAB meeting. Ms. Durbin explained that a Notice of Intent would be run in a local newspaper and the public would have 30 days to request a formal, public meeting. If no public interest was expressed, all the detailed site information would still be presented to the RAB in a public RAB meeting. Mailings would still go out to those on the mailing list.

A lengthy discussion was initiated by Captain Nelms about his concerns in a couple of areas. Those concerns were that remediation was being done at Whiting Field only because contamination had been identified; surrounding areas (farming areas were specifically discussed) were very possibly more contaminated than Whiting Field but since contamination had not been identified, nothing was being done. These concerns were shared and discussed by others attending the meeting. Another concern of Captain Nelms was that soils at Whiting Field, identified as having contaminates which were higher than acceptable standards, were actually very slightly, if at all, higher than normal background levels. There have been no studies done in the county to identify the normal level of chemicals in the soil and therefore there is no real standard to identify levels of contaminates.

The meeting was adjourned by Pat Durbin at 7:30 p.m.