

3/28/95-00704

**Minutes**  
**NAS Oceana Restoration Advisory Board**  
**March 28, 1995 Meeting**

**1900-2130 hours**

**Introduction and Opening Remarks**

The meeting began with brief introductory comments from the NAS Oceana Executive Officer, Captain Santapaolo, followed by self-introductions from each RAB member. Mr. Will Bullard, the RAB Navy co-chair, reaffirmed that the purpose for holding the meeting was to discuss the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) at NAS Oceana. Mr. Bullard then continued with a discussion of several questions raised at the last RAB meeting concerning location of the former Fifth Green Landfill, if additional monitoring at the former landfill would be useful, if past waste disposal sites existed near Wherry Housing, and if radioactive waste had been disposed at NAS Oceana.

A records review and employee interviews (informal) were conducted to verify the location of the landfill as accurately shown in previous reports. The records review also included the area of Wherry Housing. No past disposal sites were documented near the housing complex.

There did not appear to be a need for any additional monitoring at the site of the former Fifth Green Landfill. Due to the age of the landfill, groundwater contamination (if present) would have been detected in previous monitoring. In addition, no odors had been reported on the golf course in the area near the former landfill to justify air monitoring.

Mr. Bullard explained that he and Jim Harris (LANTDIV) had met with Ms. Rider at Wherry Housing to discuss some of her concerns. An odor was observed coming from a small natural gas leak at some outside piping valves. Virginia Natural Gas who owned the piping was called and the leak repaired.

In regards to the use and disposal of radioactive material, Mr. Bullard explained that only two small radioactive sources had been used at the station. These were a radiation detection meter used in non-destructive materials testing and a radar unit on the A-6 aircraft. Any disposal was and is off station.

**Petroleum/Oil/Lubricant (POL) Site Discussion - SWMUs 11, 18, 19, 20, and 24**

Mr. Jim Harris continued the meeting by reviewing the status of the five POL SWMUs. Soil removal actions had been completed at these SWMUs. The Navy was awaiting the

final close-out report from the excavation contractor. The excavated areas were returned to their original condition using clean fill material. Soil management quantities from each site were reported and converted to cubic yards for the RAB.

Mr. Harris explained that during excavations, the subcontractor encountered greater lateral and vertical extents of contamination than originally estimated for SWMUs 18 and 24. At SWMU 24, the digging extended to the water table and produced an excavated soil volume 20% larger than forecast. Although the soil contamination at SWMU 24 had been addressed, the groundwater must still undergo remediation. Mr. Bullard added that at SWMUs 11 and 20, the excavation depths extended to one to two feet below ground surface (BGS). At SWMU 19, the soil excavation was deeper and extended to 4 feet BGS.

The following items were discussed after the presentation in response to questions posed by RAB members:

- \* Geoprobe samples at SWMUs 18, 19 and 20 confirmed the absence of groundwater contamination. Monitoring well data at SWMU 11 documented a very low concentration of benzene in one well.
- \* The recent Excavation Close-out Report and previous POL Report contain the analytical results of groundwater sampling at these sites. The Close-out Report was under review and available to the public at NAS Oceana Base Civil Engineering or the LANTDIV administrative offices in Norfolk.
- \* Confirmatory soil samples were taken from the excavation floor and walls to determine the extent of excavation necessary. The goal of the remedial action, as stated in the workplan, was to utilize 100 mg/kg as an action level. However, in some areas the Navy exercised best professional judgement and elected not to continue excavation to the action level if the source had been removed and the remaining soils posed no risk to human health or the environment. [Note: The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are expected to concur with this decision.]
- \* The excavated soil was taken to a disposal facility in Chesapeake, VA and thermally treated.

#### **RFI Phase II Discussion - SWMUs 2D, 2E, 15, 24, and 25**

Mr. Steve Brown of CH2M HILL presented an overview of the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Phase II Report which discussed five other SWMUs where additional investigation had been recently completed. These were SWMUs 2D, 2E, 15, 24, and 25.

## SWMU 2D

This SWMU was a location where aircraft were cleaned and maintained. From the 1960s to the early 1980s, waste chemicals from these activities were disposed on the ground. Low-levels of chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOC) had been detected with only one well having a single compound slightly above federal drinking water standards. Because of the low contaminant concentrations and very limited affected area, active remediation was not proposed for this site. In response to a question from the audience, Mr. Brown added several comments regarding well sampling procedures and purge water handling.

## SWMU 2E

Mr. Brown briefly reviewed the site history and dates of release, followed by a detailed discussion explaining the nature and extent of contamination and free-product distribution. The groundwater contamination is mainly VOC and fuel-related. Five to six feet of fuel had been measured in a monitoring well in the area. Mr. Bullard added that the thickness of measureable free-product in a monitoring well is not always a good indication of the thickness in the aquifer because the product tends to accumulate in the wells. The CMS Report estimated that there may be 2,000-3,000 gallons of product in the ground.

Mr. Brown discussed that the actual source of the fuel was unknown even though a records search and employee interviews were conducted. However, the source was considered to be from a past event possibly due to spills from wing tanks formerly located in this area or from improper fuel/oil disposal into a nearby manhole. NAS Oceana had begun regular (2/month) free product removal from a monitoring well in the area. Mr. Bullard stated that so little fuel was removed from a two inch monitoring well that a greater removal frequency by manual methods was not warranted.

After the discussion on SWMU 2E the following items were discussed in response to questions from the audience:

- \* The groundwater flow rate at SWMU 2E is 40 feet/year compared to 240 feet/year at SWMU 2D.
- \* A fuel recovery pilot-test will be conducted to determine the volume of fuel that can feasibly be recovered. The pilot-test is tentatively scheduled to occur in the next several months. The results will most likely be available for discussion at the next RAB meeting
- \* CH2M HILL is not treating the chlorinated volatile contamination at SWMU 2E as a dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) or sinking contaminant problem primarily because the chlorinated VOC concentrations are relatively low.

### SWMU 15

Consistent with the discussion format for the previous SWMUs, Mr. Brown reviewed the site history, dates of release, extent of fuel contamination at this former fuel tank farm. The test-pit program and observations recorded during the Fall 1994 field investigation were then discussed. No free product was observed on the water-table. There was a significant area of groundwater contamination with dissolved fuel compounds, primarily benzene. Additional insitu samples or wells were needed to further define contamination on the south side of the dissolved plume. There was a significant area of soil contamination.

In response to a RAB member's inquiry, Mr. Brown explained the difference between total and dissolved metals analysis. Because metals adsorbed to fine silt in a groundwater sample can increase the total metals concentrations determined in a water sample containing the silt, filtered samples are also collected. This approach allows comparison to a hypothetical household well providing filtered drinking water.

### SWMU 24

Mr. Brown reaffirmed that the soil contamination at the Construction Battalion (CB) Compound had undergone remedial action, however groundwater contamination with chlorinated VOC must still be addressed. The only known source for any of the contamination in this area was reported as spills/leaks from a waste bowser. Apparently cleaning compounds were disposed in the bowser along with POL.

Mr. Brown indicated that the final approach to this site will most likely correspond to the remedial actions being implemented at SWMUs 2B and 2C. Upon receipt of the sampling results from the latest field investigation in March 1995, characterization of this site is expected to be complete.

### SWMU 25

This former borrow pit was purchased by NAS Oceana in 1979. Reportedly, local dumping resulted in the site being studied as a SWMU. Sampling demonstrated that water in the borrow pit was not contaminated. The sediments contained low levels of metals and several pesticide compounds, but not enough to pose a risk to public health or the environment. Cleanup was not proposed.

Discussion of the contaminant concentrations lead to an explanation by Mr. Brown of the slow breakdown and decomposition of DDT, which is a characteristic that led to its ban. DDT's persistent nature suggests that the detection of DDT at this site, approximately 25 years after its ban, is most likely due to the result of the adjacent land-use practices which were mainly agricultural activities. At the conclusion of this discussion, a RAB member suggested tightening security at the site as past experience indicates that the site is not always secure.

The following items were discussed at the conclusion of Mr. Brown's presentation:

\* The RAB members wanted to know the amount of money that had been spent to date on the IRP at NAS Oceana. LANTDIV and CH2MHILL estimated that the figure was approximately \$2 million (later confirmed at closer to \$2.5 million). This was primarily for site characterization, with the exception of the remedial design portion of the Sites 1, 2B, and 2C CMS. Several RAB members expressed this was an impressive expenditure and thought the general public should know the financial commitment the NAVY was making.

\* In response to a question as to why the Navy applies stricter clean-up levels than those adopted by some industries, Mr. Bullard responded that the Navy chooses to adopt a conservative approach to ensure compliance and risk reduction.

\* In response to a question from the audience, Mr. Bullard reviewed his earlier comments on the former Fifth Green Landfill. Mr. Brown then explained that the landfill monitoring points had not been sampled since the Interim RFI investigation in 1989, and that at that time the EPA was in concurrence with the Navy's position that the analytical results did not indicate any releases from the landfill. When further questioned about the EPA decision, Mr. Brown corrected his statement and clarified that in response to the EPA's Interim RFI comments, the 5th Green Landfill was sampled during the RFI Phase I. Steve clarified that it was actually after Phase I that the EPA concurred with the Navy's position.

## CLOSING DISCUSSION/REMARKS

Mr. Bullard directed the remaining discussion and focused upon administrative issues, such as the next meeting date, and the need for RAB members to review the stations IRP community relations (COMREL) plan and the RAB Mission/Procedures statement. Reviewing previous discussion on the COMREL plan, RAB members concurred that they would like to see more newsletters, presentations to community groups, and articles in newspapers. The RAB also liked the idea of listing future meeting dates on the Virginia Beach cable news channel devoted to community events. }

It was agreed that the RAB members would complete review of the COMREL plan and Mission/Procedures statement in the next two to three weeks. Mr. Bullard would contact members for comments. If there were comments and a need for discussion, a meeting would be held at the NAS Oceana Officers Club on May 27, 1995. (No significant comment was received and May 27 meeting was not necessary).

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for July 27, 1995 at 7PM at the Virginia Beach Radisson Hotel. Topics for discussion proposed at the meeting and refined since include:

- \* EPA comments received on the CMS for SWMU 1, 2B and 2C
- \* New data, pump test and bench scale treatability results on RFI Phase II SWMUs
- \* Risk ranking
- \* Updated funding status
- \* RFI Phase II CMS (possibly)