

N60508.AR.001144
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING REGARDING FEASIBILITY STUDIES HELD
ON 1 JUNE 2000 WITH AGENDA NAS WHITING FIELD FL
6/1/2000
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA

NAS Whiting Field Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Pensacola Junior College
Natural Resources Building 4900, Room 4902
5988 Highway 90, Milton, FL
1 June 2000, 5:00 P.M.

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

- ***Feasibility Studies for Sites 11,
13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18*** Eric Blomberg
HLA

- ***Update on Site 31 Remedial
Investigation*** Eric Blomberg
HLA

- ***Proposed Plans for Sites 3, 4, 6,
30, 32 and 33*** Phillip Ottinger
TtNUS

- ***Update on Basewide
Groundwater Investigation*** Terry Hansen
TtNUS

- ***RAB Business*** Pat Durbin
Navy Co-Chair

**Naval Air Station Whiting Field
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary
June 1, 2000**

RAB members attending:

Ken Brooks
Jim Cason
Pat Durbin, Navy Co-Chair
Logan Fink, Community Co-Chair
Sam Vickers

Support personnel and others:

Eric Blomberg, Harding Lawson Associates
Jerry Girardot, Harding Lawson Associates
Terry Hansen, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.
Linda Martin, Southern Division
Phillip Ottinger, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.
Vickie Stitt, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.
Amy Twitty, CH2M Hill

Logan Fink, Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m. and welcomed the RAB members and others in attendance. A motion to adopt the November 1999 meeting minutes was made and approved.

Presentation: Feasibility Studies for Sites 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18

Eric Blomberg, Harding Lawson Associates, presented the findings of the feasibility studies for Sites 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. Mr. Blomberg stated potential remedial action alternatives are identified and evaluated, utilizing USEPA criteria, in the feasibility studies. Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements are also discussed in the feasibility studies. A "No Action" alternative was evaluated in each feasibility study as a baseline comparison to the other remedial alternatives.

Mr. Blomberg presented the following information for each of the sites:

- Site description
- Chemicals exceeding residential USEPA risk based concentrations (RBCs) and Florida soil cleanup target levels (SCTLs).
- Results of the human health and ecological risk assessments.
- Remedial action alternatives evaluated and their associated costs.
- Preliminary suggested alternative.

A copy of the presentation is attached.

RAB Questions on the Feasibility Studies for Sites 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18

How is the public made aware that an area is under a Land Use Control (LUC) restriction? Signs are posted and the areas under LUCs are shown on Navy Planning Documents. In addition, the sites are inspected quarterly to be sure the LUCs are being observed. Once a year a report on the site is submitted to the State of Florida and USEPA.

The cost of the remedial action alternatives covers what period of time? Remedial action cost estimates are based on a 30-year time period.

Presentation: Remedial Investigation Update for Site 31

Jerry Girardot, Harding Lawson Associates, presented the Remedial Investigation Update for Site 31.

Site 31 contains former Waste Water Treatment Plant Sludge Drying Beds at Site 31A and five sludge disposal locations at Site 31B-F. The potential concerns for the site were aircraft cleaning compounds (methylene chloride) and photo processing chemicals (silver) which were discharged to the Waste Water Treatment Plant from the 1940s to 1984.

Surface and subsurface soil and groundwater were sampled and analyzed during the remedial investigation. The results of sampling activities and human health and ecological risk assessments are as follows:

Surface Soil

At Sites 31A, 31B, 31D, and 31F, no chemicals were detected at concentrations in excess of their respective background screening values and Florida Residential SCTLs.

At Site 31C, chromium, copper, lead, aroclor-1260 and dieldrin were identified at concentrations in excess of Florida Residential SCTLs.

At Site 31E, manganese exceeded background and SCTL at one surface soil sample location.

Groundwater

Hydrogeologic data collected at all sites included depth to water table, groundwater gradient, and seepage velocity. No chemicals were detected in groundwater at concentrations in excess of USEPA or Florida guidelines.

Human Health Risk Assessment

The excess lifetime cancer risk (ELCR) to human health from surface soil was determined to be unacceptable for the current trespasser and hypothetical future resident, trespasser, and site worker at Site 31C. No human health chemicals of potential concern were found in the surface soil at Sites 31A, 31B, 31D, 31E, or 31F or in subsurface soil or groundwater at any of the Site 31 areas.

Ecological Risk Assessment

Sites 31A, 31B, 31D, 31E, and 31F were found to pose no unacceptable risk to terrestrial wildlife and soil invertebrate. Higher concentrations of silver at Site 31B could have adverse effects on individuals but are unlikely to result in changes in community and populations.

Site 31C contained cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc, which could contribute to risk to wildlife receptors.

The human health and ecological risk assessment results above were based on data collected during the Remedial Investigation, prior to the removal of contaminated soil.

Interim Removal Action

An Interim Removal Action (IRA) was performed in 1999 to remove surface soil exceeding USEPA or Florida cleanup criteria. Twelve inches of surface soil was removed in areas exceeding SCTLs and 6 inches of soil was removed in areas of visually stressed vegetation. Excavation and offsite disposal of 1,635 cubic yards of contaminated surface soil was performed.

No Further Action is recommended for Site 31 based on removal of contaminated soil during the IRA.

A copy of the presentation is attached.

RAB Questions on the Remedial Investigation Update for Site 31

Was the contamination limited to the piles of sludge? Yes, it was confined to the sludge piles.

Presentation: Draft Proposed Plans for Surface and Subsurface Soils at Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33

Phillip Ottinger, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., presented the Draft Proposed Plans for Surface and Subsurface Soil at Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33. Groundwater is being addressed as part of Site 40, Basewide Groundwater and is not included in the Proposed Plans. Mr.

Ottinger stated the suggested remedial action alternative for soil at each site is presented in the draft proposed plans.

Mr. Ottinger presented the following information for each of the sites:

- Site description.
- Chemicals in surface and subsurface soil exceeding Florida or USEPA residential cleanup levels.
- Results of the human health and ecological risk assessments.
- Potential remedial action alternatives and their associated cost.
- Preliminary suggested alternative.

A copy of the presentation is attached.

Mr. Ottinger explained the next course of action is to finalize the Proposed Plans, which describe the suggested final response action for contamination at each site. A public comment period will follow, providing the community a chance to review the Proposed Plans and submit questions or comments. Next, a Record of Decision will be prepared, considering public comments and documenting the selected response action for the sites. Finally, implementation of the response action will follow.

RAB Questions on the Draft Proposed Plans for Surface and Subsurface Soils at Sites 3, 4, 6, 30, 32, and 33

Where did dieldrin come from? The most likely source would be fire ant control pesticides.

Presentation: Basewide Groundwater Investigation Update

Terry Hansen of Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., presented an update on the investigation of basewide groundwater, Site 40. Mr. Hansen stated the groundwater investigation was separated from the soil investigations at each site because plumes of contamination from different sites are co-mingled.

Wells are being installed to delineate the contaminated areas, which involves determining the depth and horizontal and vertical extent of the contamination. The investigation is not complete at this time so no conclusions have been reached.

Clear Creek is ecologically sensitive and is also being investigated.

The Remedial Investigation Report for groundwater is scheduled for completion in 2001.

RAB Administration

Pat Durbin thanked the presenters and asked if there was any new business. With no new business, Ms. Durbin announced the next RAB meeting is planned for Tuesday, October 3, 2000, at Pensacola Junior College.

The RAB meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.