

Baker

08.09-07/28/93-00747

Baker Environmental, Inc.
Airport Office Park, Building 3
420 Rouser Road
Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108

(412) 269-6000
FAX (412) 269-2002

July 28, 1993

Commander
Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1510 Gilbert Street (Bldg. N-26)
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Attn: Mr. James J. Szykman
Engineer-in-Charge
Code 1823

Re: Contract N62470-89-D-4814
Navy CLEAN, District III
Contract Task Order (CTO) 0007 Modification 04
Minutes of Meeting with EPA
Regarding RCRA Corrective Action Permit
Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, Puerto Rico

Dear Mr. Szykman:

Transmitted under the cover of this letter are the minutes of the meeting held in EPA Region II Office on July 21, 1993, during which discussions pertaining to the RCRA Corrective Action Permit took place. As a result of these discussions, a number of action items were established. These are summarized at the conclusion of the minutes with responsible parties identified.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (412) 269-2065, if you have any questions or feel the minutes require clarification.

Sincerely,

BAKER ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.


Thomas C. Fuller
Activity Coordinator

TCF/rw
Enclosure

cc: Ms. Laurie Boucher, P.E. - LANTDIV (Code 1823)
Mr. Timothy Gordon - USEPA, Region II
Mr. Barry Tornick - USEPA, Region II
Mr. Richard Egan - TRC Environmental



A Total Quality Corporation

MEETING MINUTES

Date: June 21, 1993
Location: USEPA Region II, Federal Plaza, New York City
Purpose: Discuss RCRA Corrective Action Permit for Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, Puerto Rico

Attendees

T. Gordon - USEPA Region II
B. Tornick - USEPA Region II (Part Time Attendee)
R. Egan - TRC Environmental
L. Boucher - LANTDIV (Part Time Attendee)
J. Szykman - LANTDIV
S. Castillo - Roosevelt Roads Naval Station
T. Fuller - Baker Environmental, Inc.

1. The meeting was opened by EPA with a brief summary of where things stand at this point. It was pointed out that, given the schedule the EPA was under, comments from the Navy regarding the draft permit could only be received over the next month.
2. Ms. Boucher provided a brief presentation of the Navy's FY-94 DERA Funding. At this point, the funding available for Roosevelt Roads is \$650,000, excluding UST work. UST work is receiving a higher priority for the Navy during FY 94 with UST projects funded before IR, because they generally go to remediation sooner. It is projected that \$2.2M will be required, which represents a shortfall of \$1.55M. Ms. Boucher indicated that she felt some of this money could be made up, but that a 25% funding deficit was likely. It was pointed out that this was not a Roosevelt Roads problem, alone, but was indicative of the entire Navy Program. Ms. Boucher indicated that the Navy (CNO) and EPA Headquarters have "been talking" about the funding issue.

Mr. Tornick feels that the underfunding is a problem and that compliance with only 75% of the permit is unacceptable. He would like the names of EPA personnel at Headquarters that have been dealing with the Navy on this issue so he can contact them, determine their position, and express his opinion. Mr. Tornick indicated that the EPA will not cut back on the number of SWMUs or the level of effort required simply because the Navy has insufficient funds.

Mr. Szykman stated that the Navy is not refusing to comply, but is in need of schedule prioritization and attenuation. He expressed a desire to work together, which was echoed by Mr. Tornick. Ms. Boucher emphasized the need for meetings and up-front partnering, which received general agreement.

Mr. Tornick stated that the EPA has the ability and latitude within the permit to prioritize; however, this ability assumes that a baseline of knowledge is available for each SWMU. EPA's highest priority is stabilization according to Mr. Tornick,

who would like to see SWMUs addressed as soon as possible. Ms. Boucher agreed and indicated that rapid movement toward remediation was also the Navy's desire.

3. The Tow Way Fuel Farm was discussed.

Mr. Szykman explained that O'Brien and Gere performed a site characterization and produced a report. The report was deficient and another consultant is being contracted to complete work which would lead to free product recovery in a relatively short period of time. At this time, Mr. Szykman provided a summary schedule (included as Attachment A) for the remainder of planned work at Tow Way, which includes corrective action plans. Because of the relatively advanced stage of the program now in progress, the Navy wants to keep the Tow Way under the UST Regulations. Mr. Gordon indicated that the reports generated thus far have only been provided to the Puerto Rican EQB. Both Mr. Gordon and Mr. Tornick agreed that they do not really care if the site is a UST Program site, but that it definitely falls under RCRA and that the EPA has purview. Mr. Tornick stated that the EPA has jurisdiction and that the UST Program should defer to RCRA, since the EQB will be involved anyway.

Mr. Fuller accented the need for early action and jurisdictional determination due to scheduling and compliance needs with EQB.

Mr. Gordon requested that all the available Tow Way reports and work plans be provided to the EPA as soon as possible, if there is to be any hope of the information they contain being used in permit finalization.

Mr. Fuller asked how the possibility of trying to meet two different sets of requirements (i.e., UST and RCRA) for the Tow Way could be avoided.

Mr. Tornick indicated that the EPA and the EQB do not have a formal relationship/agreement. The EPA will review what has been done to date and hopefully will agree. He stressed the need for available information now.

In the future, according to Mr. Tornick, efforts will be made to coordinate responses from the EPA and EQB, but that the Tow Way will remain in the permit; the EPA will not defer to the EQB.

Ms. Boucher indicated that the Navy was on a compliance schedule with the EQB, and cannot legally abandon it for the EPA. Mr. Tornick stated that he would try to get this arranged before the permit was issued. The final summary is that both agencies will have review responsibility for Tow Way matters, and there is no way to avoid the possibility of the need to respond to two sets of requirements.

4. Mr. Tornick indicated that any information the Navy has related to the SWMUs must be provided now, if there is to be any hope of its being used in finalizing the permit. He stated that the Navy has promised this in the past, but has failed to appropriately follow up with information. EPA has already spent an inordinate amount of resources on this project in an effort to keep it moving. Decisions have been made regarding the SWMUs, which are unlikely to change as a result of new information, but they will consider any new data which may be available. A cut-off date for information to be considered in the permit is August 23, 1993. Mr. Tornick indicated that the EPA has been very conservative in their assessments of the risks potentially posed by the various SWMUs.

Mr. Tornick left the meeting at this point.

5. Mr. Szykman provided Mr. Gordon with Baker's report of the supplemental investigation. He explained that it has started as a Phase I RI, but changed to a more RCRA oriented investigation with the passage of time. Mr. Gordon turned his copy of the document over to Mr. Egan (the TRC representative). Mr. Gordon indicated that the EPA would like two copies of the final work plan for review.

Mr. Gordon stated that they could not remove SWMUs from the system at this point, since the process is so far along. He said he would not be able to use report to modify permit. Ms. Boucher questioned this position, as it appeared to be counter to that expressed by Mr. Tornick, who indicated his desire for information. Mr. Gordon looks to the RFI work plan as the real place for negotiations on investigatory scope. He stated that, to this point, the EPA has been "bending over backwards" to keep the Navy's data in the Program.

After extensive discussion, it was determined that Mr. Gordon will look at the report, focusing on SWMUs 1, 2 and 13, but will not review in detail since time is short. He indicated that the SWMUs addressed in the report are the most "significant" ones at the site and it is unlikely that any of them would have been removed from the permit even if he had received the report as early as March. He further indicated that when detailed review of the report was undertaken, they would require the full CLP package.

Ms. Boucher left the meeting at this point.

6. Mr. Szykman provided Mr. Gordon with a portion of an archeological report that discussed some sites of potentially significant archeological importance in the area of the Army Cremator.
7. Discussed SWMU 50 (area near corner of Building 3166).

Mr. Fuller explained that this was not a SWMU, since there was no waste stored or discovered in the area. The materials seen were raw materials.

Mr. Gordon asked if there were routine or systematic releases of materials containing hazardous constituents. Mr. Fuller and Mr. Egan agreed that there was no evidence of releases.

Mr. Gordon indicated that this was likely not an SWMU. He desires the Navy to send him a letter explaining site use, how long materials are stored, that no wastes are stored, and that there have been no systematic or routine releases from the area.

8. Discussed SWMU 41 (wash rack near Seabees pesticide area).

Mr. Fuller described the dye testing of this unit that was recently done. The results of this show that the wash rack sump is connected to the sanitary sewer, which is a permitted outfall. Mr. Gordon requested that the Navy send a letter to him describing the testing and results so he could remove the need for investigations from the permit. As an aside, Mr. Gordon indicated that the single drum containing a minor quantity of material (which Mr. Castillo indicated had been sent out for analysis) was not a problem.

Meeting Minutes (continued)
June 21, 1993

9. Discussed SWMU 52 (material storage yard in Seabee area).

Mr. Fuller explained use of area as raw material storage with no evidence of releases. Mr. Gordon requested the Navy to send a letter that indicates the lack of systematic or routine releases and that, based on this information, the area can probably be removed from the permit.

10. Discussed AOC B (site of demolished Bldg. 25) and SWMUs 31 and 32.

Mr. Fuller indicated that material was not discarded as described in the draft permit. Mr. Gordon would like the Navy to provide information to that effect.

Discussed IR 10 groundwater. Mr. Gordon said it was the Navy, not the EPA, who defined Site 10. Mr. Szykman indicated that groundwater problems, if any, appeared to be limited to the area around AOC B, not the area of SWMUs 31 and 32. It is okay to leave groundwater in as a matrix of concern at the AOC B, but should be removed from the RFI at 31 and 32. Mr. Gordon said he would review well specific groundwater data and see what could be done to address this in the permit.

11. Discussed SWMU 39 (old Battery Storage Building 3158). After discussion, it was agreed that the building (3158) was included in the SWMU along with the concrete pad.

12. Discussed SWMU 33 (former waste accumulation area on north side of Building 379 in AIMD).

This area has been covered with a new building, and no evidence of the site remains. Mr. Gordon decided that this area could be removed from corrective action requirements and that the permit will explain that it is covered by a new building.

13. Discussed SWMU 29 (Wastewater Treatment Plant drying beds).

Mr. Fuller explained that it is thought that these drying beds have a concrete floor and that to breach the integrity of the floor to obtain samples seemed counter-productive. Mr. Gordon will rethink approach at this SWMU should they be concrete lined. He will need a letter explaining when sludges were laboratory analyzed and evidence of concrete lining.

14. Discussed SWMUs 23 and 24 (Fuel Pier).

It was determined, after discussion, that these areas were appropriate for Phase I efforts.

15. Discussed SWMU 10 - IR Site 15.

Mr. Szykman requested that more specificity regarding "contingency" at the site be established in the permit. Mr. Gordon does not see need. He will review, but probably will not alter permit now.

16. Discussed AOC D (Facility outfalls).

Meeting Minutes (continued)
June 21, 1993

Mr. Gordon indicated that Waters and NPDES group never did sampling at the outfalls. Mr. Szykman and Mr. Fuller argued that no remediation of the site is possible since more environmental damage would occur through remediation than through release. Also, releases, if any, are old and outfalls are now monitored.

Mr. Gordon indicated that this was a separate issue and one with which he did not deal. He requested the Navy to send a letter stating their position that he could pass it on to the appropriate people.

17. Agreed to call Mr. Gordon regarding SWMUs 30, 11, 45 and 6, which were not discussed at the meeting due to time constraints.
18. Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Summary of Action Items

A. **Mr. Tornick**

1. Begin discussions with EQB to address Tow Way Fuel Farm.

B. **Ms. Boucher**

1. Inform Mr. Tornick when additional funds for NSRR become available.
2. Provide Mr. Tornick with names of people at EPA Headquarters who have been talking with the Navy regarding FY 94 funding.

C. **Sr. Castillo**

1. Provide Mr. Szykman with SWMU 41 dye test results.
2. Investigate liners in wastewater treatment plant drying beds.

D. **Mr. Gordon**

1. Review latest Baker report, focusing on SWMUs 1, 2 and 13.
2. Review IR 10 groundwater information as it pertains to SWMUs 31 and 32.

E. **Mr. Szykman**

1. Provide Tow Way Fuel Farm reports to the EPA.
2. Provide two copies of final work plan for supplemental investigation to EPA.
3. Provide letter describing required items regarding SWMUs 50, 52, 41, and 29 and AOC B.
4. Provide letter stating Navy's position regarding AOC D.

Meeting minutes prepared by Thomas C. Fuller of Baker Environmental, Inc.

ATTACHMENT A

U.S. NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS
TOW WAY FUEL FARM UST PROGRAM

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Scheduled Completion</u>
Site Characterization	January 10, 1994 ⁴
Corrective Action Plan (CAP)	March 10, 1994
Design of CAP	October 10, 1994

Note: Media to be covered under the program include soil, groundwater, and free product.