



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVAL AIR STATION
MOFFETT FIELD, CA 94035-5000

IN REPLY REFER TO

5090
Ser 189/ 2045

29DEC 1992

From: Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station, Moffett Field
To: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering
Command

Subj: NAS MOFFETT FIELD INSTALLATION RESTORATION (IR) PROGRAM
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) MEETING

Encl: (1) TRC Meeting Minutes, 10 Sep 92
(2) TRC Meeting Agenda, 26 Jan 93

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are provided for your information.
2. The next TRC meeting is scheduled for 26 January 1993, from 0930 to 1100 in the Gold Room of the Eagles and Anchors Club, Building 243. Your attendance at this meeting is requested.
3. It is further requested that LT Susanne Openshaw (Code 189) be contacted at (415) 404-6540 or DSN 494-6540, not later than 19 January 1993, regarding your plans to attend the upcoming TRC meeting.


R. K. Gray

Copy to:
COMNAVAIRPAC (Code 515)
WESTNAVFACENGCOM (Attn: Steve Chao)

1854

CLEAN
Contract No. N62474-88-D-5086

Contract Task Order 0134

Navy Engineer-in-Charge: Stephen G. Chao, PE
PRC Project Manager: Joshua D. Marvil, CPG
JMM Project Manager: Joseph P. LeClaire, Ph.D

**NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA**

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
MEETING DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 1992**

Prepared By

PRC Environmental Management, Inc.
1099 18th Street, Suite 1960
Denver, Colorado 80202
303/295-1101

and

James M. Montgomery, Inc.
365 Lennon Lane
Walnut Creek, California 94598
510/975-3400

December 17, 1992

Encl (1)

**MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
FOR THE INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
AT NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA**

The meeting was called to order at 10:11 AM on September 10, 1992, at NAS Moffett Field. The minutes for the meeting were recorded by a stenographer service and are on permanent record as part of the public record at the Mountain View Library. The agenda for the meeting is included at the end of the notes.

Mr. Jim Haas, Base Environmental Coordinator, welcomed everyone to the meeting and requested that the panel participants introduce themselves.

Mr. Haas then introduced Mr. Keith Bradley of International Technologies Corp. (IT Corp.) as the first speaker for the day.

Mr. Bradley provided a brief description of the six operable units (OU) at NAS Moffett Field. OU 1 was described as containing the soils and landfill materials at Sites 1 and 2. The Draft RI report for OU 1 is scheduled to be delivered on November 2, 1992 to the regulatory agencies. The draft final version is scheduled for submittal on March 2, 1993.

Mr. Lenny Siegel from the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition asked if the golf course landfill would be included in OU 1.

Mr. Bradley replied that the golf course landfill is Site 2 and was included in OU 1. The report would address soil contamination in and around the landfills as well as the landfill solids, leachate, and emissions.

Mr. Bradley then provided a description of the status of OU 2. OU 2 is comprised of soils from all of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites except Sites 1, 2, 12, and 15. These four sites will be addressed in either OU 1 (Sites 1 and 2) or OU 3 (Sites 12 and 15).

OU 3 was described as containing Site 12 and Site 15. Site 15 is actually an assemblage of sumps and oil water separators located throughout the base. Mr. Bradley also described the schedule for providing the OU 3 Draft and Draft Final RI reports.

Mr. Bradley then provided descriptions and schedules for OUs 4, 5, and 6.

Dr. James McClure of Harding Lawson Associates asked if the Navy had the right to deny the regulatory agencies an extension for the review of documents.

Ms. Roberta Blank of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicated that the EPA has the right to unilaterally request an extension on draft reports; however, they must obtain the Navy's approval for extensions on draft final versions.

Dr. McClure then indicated that the Navy in principle could deny the EPA the right for an extension to completely review a draft final document.

Ms. Blank indicated that was correct, however, the Navy had not denied the agencies' request for additional time. Ms. Blank also indicated that if the Navy did deny any request, the EPA would submit their comments as is and then follow up with the additional comments. If the Navy disputed the validity of the additional comments, the Navy and the EPA would move into dispute resolution.

Mr. Haas then introduced Mr. Tim Mower of PRC Environmental Management Inc. as the next speaker.

Mr. Mower provided a description of the quarterly monitoring well sampling program for the Navy monitoring wells at NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Mower stated that each monitoring well would be sampled at least once and that many of the monitoring wells would be sampled semi-annually. Monitoring wells that are a distance from the contaminant plume source and historically show little variation or no contamination, would be sampled only once and then may not be sampled for several years. New monitoring wells will be sampled quarterly and then the data will be evaluated to determine the sampling frequency for the following years.

Mr. Mower said that the analytes at each well were dependent on the well location and the prior analytical detections. All monitoring wells will be sampled for VOCs and dissolved metals. Monitoring wells in the vicinity of underground storage tanks, or areas affected by fuels, will be sampled for purgeable and extractable hydrocarbons. Monitoring wells with previous detections of semivolatile compounds or pesticides and PCBs will also be sampled for those analytes.

Mr. Mower continued that the quarterly reports for the Navy monitoring wells would include tables of data that list all of the analyte concentrations detected at each well. Water level hydrographs for each well or representative clusters will be provided. Chemical concentration maps will be provided each quarter for the wells sampled that quarter.

Ms. Paula Pritz of Martin Marietta Energy Systems asked which field measurements were to be collected during the sampling.

Mr. Mower explained that pH, specific conductance, turbidity, Eh (oxidation reduction potential), and temperature would be measured during purging and sampling. Mr. Mower then described the general procedures that are used during monitoring well sampling.

Ms. Pritz then asked if the QA/QC frequencies that IT Corp. used would be continued through the sampling program.

Mr. Mower replied that the frequency for equipment rinsates and duplicates would be 10 percent and that the matrix spike/ matrix spike duplicates would be at 5 percent.

Ms. Pritz then asked if a sampling plan had been issued for the quarterly sampling, and if a laboratory had been designated for the analytical work.

Mr. Mower answered that the quarterly sampling was covered within the basewide Field Sampling Plan, and that the laboratory could change from quarter to quarter.

Ms. Pritz then asked if any quality assurance was being conducted to determine the effect of using different laboratories during each quarter.

Mr. Mower replied that no special quality assurance was being scheduled or planned and that the use of CLP methods and CLP laboratories was designed to eliminate that potential variability in the quarterly results.

Mr. Siegel then asked why it appears that no wells were going to be sampled in the runway area and what measures would be taken to ensure the rapid dissemination of data from new wells between the various parties.

Mr. Mower indicated that monitoring wells were present within the runway area and that each of those wells would be sampled at least once during the year and that any new wells would be

sampled quarterly. The data from each new investigation will be provided to the MEW Companies by the Navy at the same time that the data are provided to the regulatory agencies.

Dr. Joseph LeClaire of James M. Montgomery, Inc., also related that the Navy was allowing the MEW Companies to collect split samples along with the Navy quarterly sampling of the wells, and that the MEW Companies were required to sample the wells under the MEW Companies' Plume Definition Study.

Mr. Siegel asked about why there were no monitoring wells in the area of the HydroPunch sample west of Hangar 1.

Mr. Mower explained that no monitoring wells were installed at the time of that investigation because PCE was not a compound of concern during the investigation in which it was detected and, secondly, because there was no clear source for the detection other than the regional VOC plume. The Navy's position was that there were enough existing monitoring wells to define the nature and extent of 90 to 95 percent of the plume and that the remaining unknown sources would be identified and delineated in future investigations.

Mr. Haas then introduced Dr. LeClaire as the next speaker.

Dr. LeClaire began by providing a description of the Additional Sites Investigation that the Navy conducted earlier in the year. The Additional Sites Investigation was prompted by information collected by IT Corp. during the RI, that indicated three additional sites (Zook Road Site, Patrol Road Ditch, and the Golf Course Landfill) may be sources of contamination or may have been used for improper waste disposal.

Dr. LeClaire provided a background on the Zook Road Site and indicated that during the investigation additional contaminated soils were identified that will be treated at the bioremediation pad currently under construction.

Dr. LeClaire indicated that three soil borings were drilled at the Zook Road Site. Samples checked from soil borings SBZR-1 and SBZR-3 had only estimated concentrations. At SBZR-2, high TPH concentrations were detected from just below the ground surface throughout the total depth of the soil boring. As a result, some additional soil borings were drilled adjacent to SBZR-2 to attempt to roughly delineate the extent of the TPH contamination. Each of the additional soil borings was scanned with an OVM and the values recorded for each depth.

Dr. LeClaire indicated that the differences in the concentrations with depth suggest that the contamination may have migrated downward from a small source to the shallow water table then spread laterally.

Mr. Siegel asked what kerosene was used for.

Dr. LeClaire explained that in TPH-extractables analyses, the compounds are reported as ranges of materials, (i.e.,: kerosene, diesel, gasoline), and that the material had possibly weathered to a kerosene range.

Mr. Michael Howar of James M. Montgomery, Inc., indicated that the JP-5 commonly used by the military was similar to kerosene and would be reported as a light kerosene in the chromatograms.

Dr. LeClaire indicated that the Zook Road fuel spill site would probably be excavated in conjunction with the Site 12 remediation and that the soil would be treated on the Navy bioremediation pad. Dr. LeClaire also added that additional monitoring wells had been proposed to assess the impact of the fuels on the groundwater beneath the site.

Dr. LeClaire then presented a description of the Patrol Road Ditch Site. Dr. LeClaire said that Patrol Road Ditch was a drainage ditch for the east side of the base and that improper disposal of various waste fluids had reportedly taken place in the past. During the Patrol Road Ditch investigation, three soil borings were drilled to determine if soil contamination was present at the site. TPH contamination was detected in both the soil samples and in the method blanks at the lab on the day of the analysis so the contamination will have to be confirmed with additional soil samples in the future.

Mr. Siegel asked if the acetone reported earlier was a soil contaminant or if it was a laboratory contaminant.

Dr. LeClaire replied that additional soil sampling was going to be recommended as part of the OU 2 FS to confirm the presence or absence of the acetone and methylene chloride detected at the other sites.

Dr. McClure then asked why the distribution of the soil samples varied from the two previously described sites.

Dr. LeClaire answered that at the north end of Patrol Road Ditch, the depth to water was 1 foot below land surface, and at the southern end of the ditch the depth to water was 3 feet below land surface. At the Zook Road fuel spill site, the depth to water was 6 to 7 feet below land surface, thereby allowing the collection of samples at 1 foot, 3 feet, and 5 feet below land surface as scheduled.

Dr. LeClaire continued to provide a description of the history of the new Golf Course Landfill Site. The site appeared to contain landfill debris, construction debris, and soils from around the base. The location of the landfill cells was roughly determined using ground penetrating radar, and the soil borings were moved to allow the sampling of the contents of those cells. The soil samples were analysed for VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, metals, TPH, and semivolatiles.

Mr. Siegel asked if the site was elevated above the surrounding terrain.

Mr. Howar indicated that the north central portion of the site was slightly elevated, and that the southern portions of the site were at 4 to 5 feet above mean sea level.

Dr. LeClaire then presented information on the concentrations of various compounds detected in the soil samples at the site. Dr. LeClaire and Mr. Howar provided brief explanations for the various laboratory qualifiers.

Dr. LeClaire indicated that an ecological risk assessment would be conducted at the site because of the compounds detected, and that four to five monitoring wells may also be installed to characterize the groundwater at the site.

Ms. Pritz asked if a solid waste assessment test (SWAT) was going to be conducted at the site now that it is a confirmed landfill.

Dr. LeClaire indicated that a SWAT would be conducted at the site and that the site may be included in OU 1.

Mr. Bradley indicated that the new golf course landfill would not be included in the OU 1 RI due to the schedule for the RI.

Mr. McClure then asked about the distribution of contaminants in the new wells that PRC had recently installed. Mr. McClure was concerned because some of the wells have been reported to contain high concentrations.

Mr. Mower described the areas where the new PRC wells were installed and the relative concentrations that were detected in each area.

Mr. Siegel asked if any coordination was in place with NASA and whether they were listed as a PRP.

Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA replied that NASA was cooperating with both the Navy and the MEW Companies. Ms. Olliges also indicated that NASA had recently completed a Listing Site Inspection for the NASA facilities.

Mr. Siegel said that he would like to receive a copy of the NASA Listing Site Inspection Report.

Dr. McClure said that the MEW Companies appear to have missed some recent work plans, and reiterated that the MEW Companies would like to review all of the Navy documents to the extent feasible. Mr. Stephen Chao of Western Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command replied that copies of all of the Navy documents were provided to Canonie and that the documents may not have been forwarded on to Dr. McClure. Mr. Chao also explained that HLA had been informed sometime back of the presence of the work plan and the upcoming field activities.

Mr. Haas concluded the meeting by informing all of the attendees that he had accepted a position with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and that he would be replaced before the next meeting by Lt. Susanne Openshaw on a temporary basis. Mr. Haas thanked everyone for their assistance and cooperation and adjourned the meeting.

AGENDA
FOR
INSTALLATION RESTORATION (IR) PROGRAM
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) MEETING
NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD
26 January 1993

- I. WELCOME

- II. IR PROGRAM STATUS
 - A. Status of all Operable Units (OUs) Reorganization

 - B. Overview of Draft OU 1 Remedial Investigation Report

 - C. Startup of Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) Unit for Source Control Measure at Site 14 South

 - D. Construction of Concrete Pad for Bioremediation at Site 12

- III. AGENDA/SCHEDULE FOR NEXT TRC MEETING

- IV. CONCLUSION

Encl (2)