N60508.AR.002419
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING ON 13 NOVEMBER 1992 NAS WHITING FIELD
11/13/1992
NAS WHITING FIELD

MEETING MINUTES
PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING
NOVEMBER 13, 1992
NAVAL AIR STATION WHITING FIELD

On November 13, 1992, representatives of Southern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SDIV), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and ABB Environmental Services (ABB-ES) met at USEPA in Atlanta, Georgia to discuss the Navy responses to the Naval Air Station (NAS) Whiting Field Phase I Remedial Investigation (RI) Technical Memoranda comments. The following were in attendance.

Kim Queen	SDIV
Rob Pope	USEPA
Jim Barksdale	USEPA
Caron Falconer	USEPA
Jorge Caspary	FDER
Jim Crane	FDER
Eric Nuzie	FDER
Waynon Johnson	NOAA
Rao Angara	ABB-ES
Eric Blomberg	ABB-ES

The meeting began at 0950 with an introduction of all participants. The meeting agenda included review and discussion of the Navy responses to regulatory (USEPA and FDER) and Natural Resource Trustee comments on the six Technical Memoranda prepared at the completion of the Phase I RI at NAS Whiting Field.

Prior to review of the comments and responses, Mr. Angara handed out a draft schedule of the Phase II RI program at NAS Whiting Field and provided a brief update of the field activities completed since the beginning of the Phase II field program in May 1992.

Mr. Pope announced that NAS Whiting Field will be proposed for placement on the National Priority List (NPL) in the spring of 1993.

During general discussions, Mr. Barksdale asked why the NAS Whiting Field personnel were not present at this meeting. He indicated that it is important to have the base personnel involved in the RI/FS process. Ms. Queen stated that due to lack of travel funds, the NAS Whiting Field personnel were unable to attend this meeting. She informed Mr. Barksdale that the base personnel are being kept informed of all the RI/FS activities being conducted at NAS Whiting Field on a regular basis.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO USEPA COMMENTS

At 1015 Mr. Pope began the review of the Navy responses to USEPA comments. Mr. Pope only addressed the responses that remained unclear or the ones USEPA did not agree with. All other responses were found acceptable by USEPA. These minutes will be attached to the Response to Comments and the complete package will be resubmitted to the agencies.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment 4: Mr. Pope indicated that a ecological risk assessment workplan should be developed for regulatory review prior to conducting the ecological risk assessment. Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Pope and provided an overview of the Natural Resources Trustees role in the RI/FS process. Mr. Johnson also recommended that that the activity appoint an individual on-site as the facility's NRT representative. Ms. Queen indicated that NAS Whiting Field has appointed an individual to that role. The activity will contact Mr. Johnson regarding this issue in the near future.

Comment 6: Mr. Pope stated that USEPA would like a copy of the raw data of all future reports. Mr. Angara indicated that Form I laboratory data sheets (unvalidated data) will be included as an Attachment to all future reports. Mr. Pope also requested that all the data qualifiers be defined.

Mr. Pope and Mr. Barksdale indicated that the USEPA recommends that stainless steel monitoring wells be installed at hazardous waste sites. They also indicated that data from PVC monitoring wells may not be acceptable. Mr. Barksdale further stated that the burden of potentially having to replace the PVC wells with stainless steel wells is on the facility and the Navy.

He indicated that the PVC well may deteriorate and contaminants from the PVC well may be detected in the groundwater samples. Therefore, if a monitoring well is initially free of contamination and a few years later degradation compounds from the PVC are detected, then one can no longer say that the groundwater is free of contamination and the monitoring well will have to be replaced with a stainless steel well. Mr. Angara stated that these wells are being used for the characterization of the nature and extent of groundwater contamination and, therefore, are not projected for long-term monitoring purposes. Mr. Angara referenced the US Army Corps of Engineers' paper covering this issue that was attached to the response to comment handout. Dr. Crane stated that PVC monitoring wells is acceptable by the FDER.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Technical Memorandum No. 3: Soils Assessment

Comment 5: Mr. Pope indicated that it is difficult to determine the extent and size of the waste piles at Site 12 (Tetraethyl Lead Disposal Area). Mr. Blomberg provided a brief history of Site 12 and described the dimensions of the waste piles.

Comment 11: Mr. Pope stated that the subsurface soil and groundwater samples collected at Site 12 did not adequately characterize the contamination at this site and that a "No Further Action" document can not be prepared without additional soil and groundwater data. He stated that USEPA recommends collection of samples from the waste pile/ground surface interface which is approximately 3 to 4 feet below the waste pile surface. He said these samples coupled with the data from Phase I RI (samples collected at the 1 to 2 foot interval) would provide adequate characterization of the waste piles. He suggested that one sample be collected from each waste pile for Target Analyte List (TAL) metals analysis. In addition,

Mr. Pope also requested that a water table monitoring well be installed directly downgradient (south) of Site 12 and a groundwater sample be collected and analyzed for Target Compound List (TCL)/TAL full scan. Mr. Blomberg recommended that soil samples be collected from the monitoring well boring at depths of 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20 feet below land surface (bls) for TAL metals and TCL Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) analysis. All parties agreed that if these explorations were conducted and no contamination was detected, a "No Further Action" decision document could be prepared.

Technical Memorandum No. 5: Groundwater Assessment

Comment 1: Mr. Pope recommended that the drilling mud used during the Phase II monitoring well drilling program be sampled and analyzed for TAL metals to see if the mud is contributing to the contamination of the wells. All parties agreed that one sample of the drilling mud should be collected during the Phase II investigation for TAL metals analysis.

Comment 4: Mr. Pope reiterated that USEPA would like to see all the buildings on the figures identified. Mr. Blomberg indicated that the Navy has NAS Whiting Field as a CAD file; therefore, all future figures will be generated from the CAD files with all the buildings identified by numbers. Mr. Pope also requested that copies of NAS Whiting Field maps showing the industrial area (with building numbers) and the whole installation be sent to USEPA for reference purposes. Dr. Crane requested that a set of figures be submitted to FDER also.

Comment 7: Mr. Pope indicated that there are no upgradient monitoring wells at Site 12 and that upgradient groundwater quality data is necessary for comparison to downgradient groundwater data. Mr. Blomberg said that monitoring well WHF-9-2 which is upgradient of Sites 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 can be used for upgradient groundwater quality data. Mr. Blomberg also indicated that this well will be sampled during the Phase II program for TCL/TAL full scan. All parties agreed to use this well as an upgradient well.

Technical Memorandum No. 6: Phase I Summary and Phase II-A Workplan

Comment 7: Mr. Pope stated that the limited sampling at Site 2 does not support a "No Further Action" document since there is no guarantee that only construction debris and wood were dumped into the former borrow pit. Mr. Pope recommended that one downgradient monitoring well be installed and a groundwater sample be collected for TCL/TAL full scan analysis. In addition, he recommended that a soil boring be drilled to the water table in the center of Site 2 and subsurface soil samples be collected for analysis. Mr. Blomberg suggested that subsurface soil samples be collected from 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 50 feet below land surface and at the water table for TCL/TAL full scan analysis. All parties agreed that if these explorations were conducted and no contamination was detected, a "No Further Action" decision document could be prepared.

This concluded Mr. Pope's discussion of the Navy responses to the USEPA comments. The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1135.

The project managers meeting continued after lunch with discussion of the FDER comments.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO FDER COMMENTS

Mr. Caspary began the review of the responses to FDER comments. The responses that Mr. Caspary did

not address were acceptable by the FDER or were previously covered and agreed to in the discussion of the Navy response to USEPA comments.

Technical Memorandum No.6: Phase I Summary and Phase II Workplan

Comment 10: Mr. Caspary stated that FDER recommends that all data gaps be filled during the Phase II-A field program. Mr. Angara indicated that the Phase II-A explorations were proposed to identify data gaps existing from Phase I. Ms. Queen added that because no investigations were conducted previously at the newly added IR sites (sites 29 through 33), an additional round of explorations may be needed after Phase II-A to fill data gaps.

Comment 11: Mr. Caspary and Dr. Crane indicated that they had reservations about the placement of the proposed downgradient Phase II-A monitoring well at Site 1. Dr. Crane suggested installing piezometers at Site 1 or install the wells at Sites 2, 17, and 18 to get a better handle on the groundwater flow direction prior to the placement of the well at Site 1. Mr. Blomberg agreed with the suggestion of installing the monitoring wells at Sites 2, 17, and 18 prior to the Site 1 well installation. If the Site 1 groundwater samples and soil samples were free of contamination, then a "No Further Action" would be proposed for Site 1. Dr. Crane indicated that he is uncomfortable with the "one shot" RI approach at landfills such as Site 1. With potential releases in the future, he would like to see at least three monitoring wells installed and sampled and if no contaminants are present, then propose a "No Further Action" with long-term monitoring. All parties agreed that based on the Phase II-A results, long-term monitoring needs to be considered at this site when "No Further Action" is proposed.

Comment 17: Mr. Caspary stated that FDER recommends that the proposed Phase II-A monitoring well (WHF-11-3) be placed halfway between WHF-11-1 and WHF-13-1 due to the lack of groundwater investigations in that area. All parties agreed to move well WHF-11-3 to this location.

Comment 18: Mr. Caspary indicated that the deep groundwater sample collected from WHF-16-CPT-1 (100 feet below land surface) showed Benzene at 400 ug/l and thus wells downgradient to this well should be installed. Mr. Blomberg said that an existing well WHF-16-1 located downgradient of WHF-16-CPT-1 showed no presence of contamination at 42 feet bls. He also said that a monitoring well will be installed at location WHF-16-CPT-1 to first confirm the 400 ug/l of Benzene contamination, and, if it is present, downgradient wells will be installed deeper into the aquifer.

Upon completion of the response review, Mr. Blomberg suggested that the status of Site 5 be addressed. Site 5 was previously investigated under a FDER consent order and the contamination detected at this site was not related to contaminants associated with the Battery Acid Shop waste disposal activities. No work has been conducted since 1985 when Geraghty & Miller investigated Site 5. Dr. Crane felt that groundwater data from 1985 might not be acceptable to propose "No Further Action" for Site 5 and recommended resampling the Site 5 monitoring wells. Mr. Pope said he wasn't sure if data from 1985 would be acceptable but said he would check with some of his associates. All parties agreed to put Site 5 on hold until it can be determined if the 1985 data can be used.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO NOAA COMMENTS

At 1412 Mr. Johnson started the review of the responses to NOAA comments. Mr. Johnson did not cover

the responses to comments that he found acceptable.

Comment 2: Mr. Johnson stated that the detection limits for the inorganic analytical methods used for surface water analysis often exceeded the regulatory (i.e. AWQC) standards. He indicated that it is imperative that detection limits are below the regulatory standards for appropriate evaluation of risk to the resources and receptors. Mr. Johnson also indicated that these regulatory standards need to be followed when conducting an ecological risk assessment. Mr. Angara asked Mr. Johnson if he knew of analytical methods available whose detection limits would be below the AWQC and FSWQ standards. Mr. Johnson said there were methods available but wasn't sure of them and suggested we contact Dr. Forrester at the state lab.

He identified the NOAA requirements and stated that data providing information about receptors and effect of contamination on the receptors should be provided in all future reports. He also recommended that a basewide approach to ecological assessment should be taken rather than evaluating individual sites at the facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 1530 hours.

PRE-TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
March 2, 1993
2:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Captain Eckart	NASWF
CMDR John Ball	NASWF Public Affairs Office
Ron Steiner	NASWF Public Affairs Office
Rao Angara	ABB-ES
Eric Blomberg	ABB-ES
Gerry Walker	ABB-ES
Kathy Hodak	ABB-ES
Kim Queen	SDIV
Jim Holland	NASWF - Public Works Dept.
Pat Durbin	NASWF - Public Works Dept.

A synopsis of the discussions conducted at this meeting is given below.

- Rao Angara, ABB-ES, went over how the TRC meeting will be conducted in terms of the agenda: 1) Captain Eckart will do a basic introduction, 2) Ms. Kim Queen (SDIV) will briefly explain the Installation Restoration (IR) program, 3) Ensign Ron Steiner (NASWF PAO) will provide a brief discussion on community relations, and 4) Mr. Gerry Walker (ABB-ES) will give a slide presentation covering general and site-specific aspects of the Phase I Remedial Investigation.

- Captain Eckart asked if the cleanup program consisted of just "the basics" or a total package. Ms. Kim Queen explained that the program consisted of a Remedial Investigation (RI) followed by a Feasibility Study (FS). The RI may consist of, hopefully, a few "No Further Action" sites, which would remove them from the program. The remaining sites would be included in the FS which would consist of an identification of cleanup methods.

- Captain Eckart asked why we make this public disclosure. Ms. Kim Queen stated that public disclosure is required under CERCLA in order to keep the community involved. There has been contamination in public wells near the base and the Navy does not want the public to think the Navy is trying to hide anything.

- Captain Eckart expressed his desire to have the meeting shortened. The previous TRC meeting he attended was excessively long. He suggested that the meeting be broken into non-technical and technical segments with a break between the two segments. The intent was to provide non-technical people with an opportunity to leave if they wanted. All participants agreed.

- Captain Eckart asked if ABB-ES had a separate project field team for OLF Barin. Mr. Rao Angara responded that a separate team was being assembled and that work at NAS Whiting Field would not be interrupted.

- Mr. Jim Holland commented that Mr. Robert Pope of USEPA Region IV had said OLF Barin was not a high priority for EPA, but rather, that previously listed NPL sites were more important. Ms. Kim Queen said that work at OLF Barin will continue regardless of active USEPA involvement. She further noted that NAS Whiting Field will probably be proposed for NPL in June 1993.

- Mr. Jim Holland initiated a discussion of the investigation of Sandy Creek and the findings of Pesticides and VOCs in previously collected sediment samples. He speculated that it could be runoff from farms or possibly old, previous use/dumping of materials in that area.

- Ms. Queen stated that drilling activities at OLF Barin would start in Mid-April 1993 and that the private wells north of the base should be sampled because the area was previously owned Navy property. She also noted that Site 20B - The Abandoned Underground Storage Tank and Fuel Pit Areas, which received 6 Notices of Violation from ADEM, would likely remain under the IR program.

- The discussion then centered on the NAS Whiting Field floodplain investigation. The drum removal operations are scheduled for early April and preliminary investigations of the site will begin by mid-March.

Meeting was adjourned.