

1D-00110

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION
MILLINGTON, TENNESSEE

IN RE: NAS MEMPHIS TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

APPEARANCES:

Harry A. Bryson	George Robertson
Cindy Lin	Sue Hosmer Millican
Charles Higgins	Norman LaChapelle
Captain Rick Grant	Mayor George Harvel
Commander Ron Carpenter	Jim Crow
Lt. Bennett Bogess	Gwynne A. Woodward
Chief Ken Iverson	Robert W. Moser
CWO3	

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the above-captioned
cause came on to be heard on this the 30th day of
June, 1989, beginning at approximately 2:00 p.m.
at the Memphis Naval Air Station, whereupon the following
proceedings were had, to wit:

ALPHA REPORTING CORPORATION
Suite 1104 - 100 North Main Building
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
(901) 523-8974

ALPHA REPORTING CORPORATION

P R O C E E D I N G S

(2 o'clock)

1

2

3 MR. MOSER: Before I get started on the

4 current status, I would just like to recap what we did

5 last time. The last time we met, we just basically

6 outlined the basis and the authority for this program.

7 This program is the naval installation/restoration

8 program, and it's been authorized vis-a-vis the two

9 laws, which is the Comprehensive Environmental Response

10 - Conservation and Liability Act of 1980 as well the

11 Superfund and Reauthorization Act of 1986, which

12 essentially says that for those sites which are

13 designated as past disposal sites that need some sort

14 of remediation or some sort of investigation, that we

15 will involve the public, the state, the county, and, of

16 course, EPA. That is the reason we are all here.

17 Last time, you all were given a copy of

18 the initial assessment study, and I assume you all have

19 been sent a copy of the verification study. You all

20 should have all the studies which we have conducted on

21 these sites to date.

22 I have put a package in front of you --

23 I being the navy. Basically, the package has several

24 items in those packages. One of the first items is a

1 projected schedule. It will look similar to this
2 (indicating). We have two schedules. We have one
3 projected schedule for TRC and one schedule for -- it
4 looks like this (indicating). I have a little more on
5 mine, being there's a little more to this contract, and
6 we're doing a little more work than just this. It will
7 basically be titled Memphis Status Report at the top.
8 That is our projected schedule for this piece of work.

9 The work entails work plans for
10 non-sites to conduct the remedial investigations and
11 feasibility study and to prepare EPA documents for
12 three sites for no further action. Some of the dates
13 that you need to keep in mind on that one is the draft
14 final. We anticipate to have the draft final ready by
15 the 17th of November. We plan to have it in your hands
16 no later than the 22nd of November.

17 The 90-percent draft is a draft in
18 which the navy will review internal to ensure that we
19 are not giving away any secrets as far as national
20 security goes and to ensure that we're going in the
21 right direction. When you all receive the draft final --
22 the charter that you will be signing later on says 45
23 days that we would like to have the review comments
24 back. This schedule shows 60 days. I've just thrown

1 in a factor of -- hopefully, we're not pushing anybody.
2 If we can, we would like to have it back in 45 days for
3 comment. The TRC meeting, in order to discuss those
4 plans, we anticipate somewhere around the 6th of
5 February, and upon the comments and satisfaction of
6 everybody that we have addressed everyone's comments,
7 we will then proceed to final.

8 The schedule attached to that sheet is
9 a future schedule, and this future schedule will be
10 dependent upon funding. We have a defense
11 prioritization model which ranks all DOD sites, and
12 based on the ranking in which this activity falls, it
13 will depend on whether or not we will have received
14 funds at that time. We have a tremendous amount of
15 work going on DOD-wise with very little dollars to work
16 with. We are having to rank the priorities - we're
17 having to prioritize these sites. Sites which need
18 work will get the funding.

19 The other schedule that I have in that
20 packet is a schedule of projected TRC meetings. What I
21 recommend is that we, as a group, review this, and you
22 can get back to us at a later date on your opinions on
23 whether or not you would like to see certain TRC
24 meetings met. This is just what we feel like is the

1 necessary amount of TRC meetings in order to accomplish
2 this program appropriately in order to keep everybody
3 informed.

4 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Can I ask one
5 question?

6 MR. MOSER: Yes, sir.

7 MR. LaCHAPELLE: What do you mean by
8 reviewing each site? Are you expecting each one of us
9 to review each site and make comments?

10 MR. MOSER: On this particular one, we
11 are going to get in the van, and we are going to ride
12 around and visually review these sites.

13 MR. LaCHAPELLE: And we're going to get
14 a description of what has to be done for remedial
15 action?

16 MR. MOSER: Yes, sir, that will come --
17 on the 22nd of November, you should receive that work
18 plan. Okay, today we are going to talk a little bit
19 about each site. I have my consultant here, and he
20 will briefly explain his approach - how he's going to
21 approach each site, but you will get a copy of the
22 draft work plan in writing so that you can make your
23 comments on that.

24 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Could we have a draft

1 plan of each site?

2 MR. MOSER: Yes, sir.

3 MR. LaCHAPELLE: By what date?

4 MR. MOSER: The 22nd of November.

5 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Thank you.

6 MR. MOSER: I have also included in
7 your packet the statement of work. This is by no means
8 the entire statement of work, but it is the statement
9 of work that basically covers the work we are going to
10 be doing at these 12 sites. It is titled Description
11 of Services for this Contract Action. We stated last
12 time, a little optimistic, that we were planning to
13 have the work plans to you before this meeting.
14 However, I was not able to negotiate until the first of
15 June, and on the 20th of June, we finally entered into
16 a contract with ERC, Environmental and Energy Service
17 Company.

18 I have Mr. Charles Higgins, Harry
19 Bryson and Cindy Lin. They are going to be our
20 consultants. Now, what I would like to do is talk a
21 little bit on each site. This blue packet here just
22 has a very minor blurb on each site. I prepared this
23 so that you would be able to take this out in the field
24 today. When we ride around, you can make notes. I

1 have left room down here so that you can make notes. I
 2 do not mean for this to take place - or replace the
 3 initial assessment study or the verification study.
 4 All I have prepared this for is basically to allow you
 5 to make notes as we ride around these sites so that
 6 when you get back to your office and we give you the
 7 work plans, you won't have to jog your memory, because
 8 it's going to be November before you receive those work
 9 plans.

10 Okay, Site No. 1, of course, is the old
 11 firefighting - or fire department drill area. That old
 12 fire department drill area was basically used, as the
 13 name states, for firefighting-type drill operations.
 14 Basically, JP-4 was used as the flammable liquid. They
 15 ignited it and basically had a containment area made of
 16 railroad rails. They had a mock plane in there, and
 17 they would do their exercise there. It operated up
 18 until 1981. It basically operated from 1960 to '81.
 19 Chuck?

20 MR. HIGGINS: Yeah, what we propose -
 21 overall, what we propose to do is -- when you look at
 22 the scope or work, you see there's lots and lots of
 23 plans, and what we proposed to do is to prepare what we
 24 call a generic plan, which touches all the bases - or

1 all the elements that are common to all nine sites, and
 2 then we would have an appendix specifically for each
 3 site to address the special considerations for each of
 4 the major plans. So that's the way we plan to put the
 5 whole thing together to try to keep you from -- from
 6 giving you a pile of documents this high (indicating),
 7 maybe we can keep it half that high to keep from
 8 breaking your book shelves down.

9 With respect to this first site, in
 10 looking at the four media of concern to us, which is
 11 air, ground water, soil or sediment, because they used
 12 volatile liquids, and that's the purpose, we don't
 13 believe that there's a great deal of concern about the
 14 remnant of some volatile material there. It appears to
 15 us that the primary pathways of concern would be
 16 contamination of the soil itself or -- and there's a
 17 little ditch that you will see at the end of the area
 18 that just provides surface drainage.

19 Our basic approach is just to take some
 20 soil borings in the immediate area of where the fuel
 21 was placed on the ground and see if we can detect
 22 contamination of ground surface, and if we do, how far
 23 down does it go. Also, in the tributary, a little
 24 drainage swall that drains this area, we propose to do

1 some sediment sampling, again on the theory that if
2 there was a leak - a release, it would have migrated
3 into the ditch, and it would have contaminated the
4 sediments in the ditch.

5 Conceptually -- we've been under
6 contract now for ten days, but conceptually, that's our
7 approach for investigating this first site.

8 MR. MOSER: We have not done any
9 investigation at all at this site other than visual
10 inspection of this site.

11 Site No. 2 is the south-side landfill.
12 There it received just about everything that the base
13 generated at one time. We have studied this site. We
14 have put monitoring wells in the -- we have put a deep
15 one and a shallow one and two more over here
16 (indicating). I think we've put a total of five
17 monitoring wells. That's covered in the verification
18 study. To date, we have found no volatiles and no
19 significant levels of metals. The metals we found were
20 below the drinking water standards.

21 MR. HIGGINS: Again, this is one of the
22 ones -- do you have a question?

23 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Chuck, how deep are
24 those wells - the monitoring wells?

1 MR. MOSER: I think they are around 15 --

2 -

3 MR. HIGGINS: We're not talking Jackson
4 Sands or anything. We're just talking shallow.

5 MR. MOSER: Fifty feet is Monitoring
6 Well 1. They're running about - around 50 feet to 22
7 feet.

8 MS. WOODWARD: Are those total or
9 dissolved?

10 MR. MOSER: Those were the total --
11 well, dissolved. It was actually water. It was full
12 of water.

13 MS. WOODWARD: So dissolved. Were they
14 filtered?

15 MR. MOSER: No, nonfiltered samples.

16 MR. LaCHAPELLE: So what you're saying
17 is no volatiles or heavy metals were found above the
18 standards?

19 MR. HIGGINS: That's correct.

20 MR. MOSER: There were no volatiles at
21 all detected. There were metals found, but they were
22 below the drinking water standards. They were in the
23 parts per billion. They were around 22 or so parts per
24 billion.

1 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Was there any mercury
2 and lead?

3 MR. MOSER: We did not test for
4 mercury. We did test for lead. Lead was detected, but
5 it was below the drinking water standards.

6 CAPTAIN GRANT: But you had no reason
7 to think that there was mercury there, did you?

8 MR. MOSER: We will probably go out and
9 test for it. I can't say that I -- knowing the
10 instruments that go in some of the planes, there could
11 be.

12 MR. LaCHAPELLE: I think it would be
13 wise to test for mercury, just to rule it out.

14 MR. HIGGINS: Again, at this site,
15 unlike the first one, there has been, as we've
16 discussed, extensive study here. But because of the
17 fact that it was a designated landfill and because of
18 the fact that there are a number of things that
19 potentially could be in there, we've got a little more
20 aggressive investigative effort. We do propose to put
21 in, again, at the perimeter of the landfill some more
22 supplemental borings looking for soil contamination.

23 All the work to this point has been
24 with ground water contamination. So we're going to

1 check out the soil media at the boundary of the unit to
2 determine if anything has migrated. We're also going
3 to resample the wells, presuming that the wells meet
4 the proper standards for a well of this type. They've
5 been in several years, and standards change, and
6 frankly, we're not exactly sure yet whether we can use
7 it. It is our hope to use them for sampling wells. In
8 any case, we will use them for determining where the
9 ground water table is.

10 Also, we propose to do some monitoring,
11 again, at the perimeter and possibly across the surface
12 of the facility looking for volatile emissions. We
13 would expect to find methane gas. At a decomposing
14 landfill, it will be there. But in any case, we do
15 expect to do some work looking at volatile emissions.

16 MR. MOSER: Site No. 3, up here on the
17 north complex, is in 121, the old plating shop. At
18 that building you will see this afternoon a sidewalk,
19 and in the middle of that sidewalk will be a manhole
20 cover, and there is simply a pit there. The pit is
21 about ten feet deep at that point, and you have about a
22 three to four foot concrete pipe going down, and then
23 it opens up to a ten-foot diameter pit filled with
24 gravel.

1 We tested the pit. The pit itself,
2 when the initial assessment was done, came up pretty
3 high in metals - in total metals. In the verification
4 study, we came in and we put in ground water monitoring
5 wells on the north and on the south side. We found no
6 detectable volatiles. We did find some metals, but
7 they were all below the drinking water standards.

8 MR. HIGGINS: Now, this site is one of
9 those situations where we know there's contamination at
10 the source because the original study found heavy
11 metals in the pit, but we also have done some
12 subsequent investigation around it and have not found
13 it to have migrated even across the street. So what we
14 propose to do in this particular case is sample the
15 soil that is immediately adjacent to the source by
16 moving - basically, exhuming the whole gravel bed and
17 then getting just beneath it and sampling the soil at
18 that point, our premise being that, (a), we don't need
19 to worry with the volatiles to the atmosphere, because
20 we're dealing essentially with heavy metals here, and
21 (b), if we're sampling the soil immediately in contact
22 with the source and if we find contamination in the
23 soil at that point, we will also - then we can chase
24 plume chasing looking for ground water later.

1 But given that we have already looked
2 in the near vicinity in the ground water and found
3 nothing, it's our belief that the prudent thing to do
4 is just simply check the soil in immediate contact with
5 the source.

6 MR. MOSER: Site No. 4 is a storm water
7 conduit that empties into an open ditch and runs on
8 out. We've done some studies here. Samples taken in
9 the initial assessment study found some metals here
10 that were total metals in the sediment. They were
11 relatively low numbers when you start looking at health
12 risks.

13 Chromium was one exception. We found a
14 little chromium here (indicating) that totals 157 parts
15 per million. That's getting up there a little bit. In
16 the verification study, we took some samples all along
17 here (indicating) as well. We continued to find
18 different metals as well, but all of them are
19 relatively low when you look at health risks - when you
20 start basing it on health risks.

21 Last year -- we have a project going in
22 right here (indicating), and the contractor wanted - we
23 wanted to ensure the contractor's safety, so we went in
24 and inspected -- this is a 60-inch RC pipe -- we went

1 in and inspected that all the way up to this point
2 (indicating). We came in where the joints were located
3 and put borings down along the side of this and checked
4 it for metals as well as cyanide, and we found nothing.
5 We found nothing. We took some samples here
6 (indicating). We took some samples back here as well
7 (indicating). They all came out clean.

8 Now, we checked these samples in '88
9 for EP toxicity. It's a slightly different test.
10 Basically, we are looking at whether or not it was
11 leachable and whether or not it would be considered as
12 a hazardous waste; whereas before, we ran total, which
13 gives us -- you know, it's slightly -- it's a different
14 test totally. I know you understand that. Hopefully,
15 whenever we do our risk assessment, we can show the
16 relationship between those two tests.

17 MR. LaCHAPELLE: You haven't tested any
18 samples near the Big Fork Creek, have you?

19 MR. MOSER: We have not tested out here
20 at all, yet. We plan to ---

21 MR. LaCHAPELLE: So we have no results
22 from the Big Fork?

23 MR. MOSER: I do not know what's coming
24 from the creek this way off the property, yet.

1 MR. LaCHAPELLE: No, I mean off the NAS
2 property.

3 MR. MOSER: Right. I have not tested
4 here (indicating). I have tested down to here
5 (indicating). Now, we have not tested coming on to
6 this property. We do not know what is coming on, but
7 we will come down to here (indicating) and test.

8 MR. HIGGINS: It's our view at this
9 time that what we need to do at this phase is to tie
10 all these various pieces together. We have one part of
11 the thing looked at at four years ago, another segment
12 looked at last year, some tests on total and some tests
13 on EP toxic.

14 What we propose to do now is to tie it
15 all together with an apples-to-apples comparison from
16 the upper end to the bottom end with basically a series
17 of sediment sampling - or soil sampling stations along
18 the ditch to give us the data that compares everything
19 together and can allow us to tie all the work together.

20 MR. MOSER: Site No. 5 is the
21 firefighting training area. It predominately consists
22 of two paths that are about 75 feet in diameter. When
23 you're approaching NAS some days, that's where you see
24 all this black smoke coming from.

1 MR. LaCHAPELLE: I know. We get phone
2 calls.

3 MR. MOSER: We have not done any
4 testing to date in this area. There is just a soil
5 water separator for when the fuel runs - collects on
6 this pad that's unburned, it will run into the soil
7 water separator that collects the foaming agent as well
8 as the fuel that is unburned. Also in this area there
9 were three little hand-held fire extinguisher practice
10 pads there.

11 MR. HIGGINS: In this particular area,
12 that whole surface is drained by four little drainage
13 ditches. What we propose to do to get a handle on any
14 off-site migration by spilled fuel or wash-off of ashes
15 or the product itself, whatever, is we propose to
16 sample the sediment at the outlet end of each of those
17 little ditches before it joins into the main drainage
18 ditch. We also propose to do some borings around the
19 two fire mats, and to - looking for contamination,
20 basically, immediately adjacent to the fire mats and
21 under the fire mats.

22 MR. LaCHAPELLE: What are you going to
23 be looking for, VOCs?

24 MR. HIGGINS: Yeah, we'll be looking

1 for -- I mean, there's obviously VOCs put there. But
2 frankly, because of the nature of the activity there, I
3 doubt that there are any. But given the high volume of
4 VOCs that went there, we'll look for VOCs and standard
5 petroleum products and those sorts of things.

6 MR. MOSER: One addition, there was a
7 pipe out here we found that was cracked and did have
8 some petroleum product out around it. We have removed
9 that, and we have put in a ground water monitoring
10 well.

11 ~~CWO3 IVERSON~~
~~COMMANDER CARPENTER~~: We have received
12 the results back, and the results show no significant
13 levels. The state has been involved with this.
14 Gwynne, in fact, was out here, and she directed us as
15 to where to put the monitoring well. The state has
16 been a great help as far as that.

17 MR. MOSER: Site No. 6 is a battery
18 shop up here (indicating). It is essentially - was a
19 floor drain emptying into the storm sewer system that
20 ran into a ditch that ran this way (indicating). It
21 basically received a hundred to two hundred gallons a
22 year of just where battery acid electrolytic basically
23 spilled on the floor and where they washed the floor
24 down. That's basically where that came from as well as

1 it just ran out and got into the storm drain. We plan
2 to come in with Chuck here ---

3 MR. HIGGINS: Yeah, basically, the same
4 approach that we talked about in the earlier ditch with
5 a series of sediment sampling locations along the
6 length of the ditch, and at this point, we will get
7 close enough that we're going to begin to tie in with
8 other drainage facilities upstream and downstream of
9 where we connected with the tribs.

10 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Chuck, are you going
11 to be looking for heavy metals, especially lead, where
12 batteries were broken down?

13 MR. HIGGINS: Yes, that's the
14 predominant one of interest.

15 MS. WOODWARD: That's the cracking
16 site?

17 MR. MOSER: No.

18 MR. LaCHAPELLE: They didn't break any
19 batteries at that site?

20 MR. MOSER: No, sir, it was just where
21 they had the batteries for the aircraft and where they
22 recharged them or filled the new batteries up or
23 whatever and they just had spillage due to operation.
24 When they washed the floor down to get that electrolyte

1 off the floor, it went into the storm drain.

2 MR. LaCHAPELLE: And the batteries went
3 into the landfill?

4 MR. MOSER: I don't know. I know they
5 do not now, but they have been -- yeah, they have at
6 that time. I don't know whether they were recycled at
7 that time or not.

8 Site No. 7 is N-126 plating shop, dry
9 well. It is a dry well of similar construction as the
10 one at N-121 for Site 3. We took some samples in the
11 dry well during the initial assessment study and found
12 total metals fairly high. We then went back in the
13 verification study.

14 We took the drill rig and put a boring
15 down through the center of it. We found metals in the
16 soil samples. We went from 14 feet to 24 feet pulling
17 samples, and the total metal content was fairly low in
18 the soil there. We also put in a monitoring well at
19 that point and tested the water, and the water - most
20 of the metals were below detection in the ground water
21 at that point.

22 MR. LaCHAPELLE: What did you find in
23 the air? You said you tested the air.

24 MR. MOSER: Basically, during any

1 drilling operation, we just use an HU meter or
2 something like that to test the air. I do not have the
3 results of that. They did not upgrade from level D.
4 Basically, they were looking for cyanide since it was a
5 cyanide-type plating operation.

6 MR. HIGGINS: We propose to deal with
7 this one exactly in the same fashion that we described
8 for the other one where we will exhume the source to
9 check the walls of the excavation in the immediate
10 vicinity of the source and then go from there.

11 MR. MOSER: Site No. 8 is what is
12 termed as cemetery disposal area, simply because of the
13 they tell me there's a Civil War cemetery out there.
14 This is the only site where we found any contamination
15 above any sort of standards as far as drinking water
16 standards. We found chromium 22 parts per billion
17 above the 50 part per billion standard for drinking
18 water. So we know we have something out there. We
19 found no volatile organics.

20 MR. HIGGINS: This is a situation where
21 statistically it's pretty -- I mean, we've got one
22 sample that shows some higher levels of chromium.
23 That's enough to certainly warrant continuing to
24 investigate. That's not enough, in my opinion, to say

1 the sky is falling, yet. But what we propose to do -
2 because this is a landfill, we would propose to
3 reexamine the ground water monitoring wells that are
4 there to make sure they comply with the present
5 standards and use them and resample the ground water
6 and replace and/or supplement as necessary, do some
7 additional soil borings, because all the work -- to
8 this point, we've only looked at the water, not drill
9 through the landfill but drill around the perimeter of
10 the landfill to see if there is anything we can detect
11 through migration, and then also, again, because of the
12 possibility of volatile organics, we'll do some gas
13 work around the perimeter.

14 MR. MOSER: On these eight sites, we're
15 proposing to prepare the work plans to look at these
16 eight sites. In our January meeting, we were only
17 proposing that we will work at Sites 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8,
18 I believe. We felt like, after reviewing the data, in
19 order to clear up anybody's concern about these other
20 sites that it would be to everybody's best interest
21 that we spend a few more dollars to ensure ourselves
22 that we covered these sites.

23 The next three sites that we're going
24 to look at, it is our opinion that these sites are not

1 a threat to human health or the environment. Excuse
2 me, Site No. 9, we'll still look at. We're going to
3 look at the plans.

4 Sites 10, 11 and 12, we're going to
5 propose no further action to the sites.

6 Site No. 9, we will look at doing
7 plans. Site No. 9 is our old sewage lagoon. In the
8 old sewage lagoon, we found some metals. We came in
9 here with a sled and pulled samples from the sludge
10 from the bottom and ran EP toxicity on that test. All
11 samples were below EP toxicity detection limit.

12 MR. HIGGINS: At this point, we have
13 tested the sludge, and the sludge in the bottom of the
14 lagoon was not found to be a problem. It is very
15 unlikely -- frankly, I would be willing to suggest, and
16 we have suggested once already, that this not be
17 investigated any further.

18 But to be prudent, what we are going to
19 propose to do is go down through the sludge to the
20 underlying soil of which the lagoon - unlined lagoon,
21 and then check to make sure that the -- since we don't
22 have complete documentation on exactly how the sludge
23 in the bottom of the lagoon was sampled, the prudent
24 thing to do is to go through the sludge to the soil

1 underlying it and then sample the soil at that point,
2 and then presuming that we find -- we will be able to
3 make a definitive statement one way or another about
4 whether there has been a release. If there has, then
5 there will be contamination to the soil which
6 constitutes the bottom of the lagoon and focus on the
7 lagoon itself instead of the sludge in it.

8 MS. WOODWARD: Are you going to close
9 that lagoon or what? You are not using it. Are you
10 going to establish clean closure on it?

11 MR. MOSER: That will be something that
12 we will have to decide on. That would be the most
13 prudent thing to do. If there's nothing there, if that
14 is the -- well, if it's perfect, we will go ahead and
15 close it out so that it will present no potential risks
16 in the future or -- anything that's going to raise
17 questions in the future, we want to go ahead and see if
18 we can alleviate that.

19 MR. LaCHAPELLE: But you have no use to
20 reactivate it?

21 MR. MOSER: No, sir, we are tied in
22 with the city.

23 Site No. 10 is titled the northside
24 landfill. It's really a bad title. This landfill is

1 really a demolition landfill. We have been working
2 with the state to basically come in and bulldoze it off
3 flat. It just basically has concrete rubble and this
4 nature in there. We're proposing no further action at
5 this time simply because all we believe that is there
6 and what we have ascertained is only construction
7 rubble. Another part is we'll be testing this ditch
8 that cuts through the site. We'll be testing the
9 ditches that run downstream of the site. If we find
10 something in the ditch, we're going to have to keep
11 backing up until we find the source. We do not believe
12 we have any sources in this area right here
13 (indicating) at all.

14 We've been working with the state. The
15 state has indicated that they have approved for us to
16 just go in here and level this off, and if we find
17 anything while we level that off that we do not know
18 today, then we will bring it back to you guys.

19 MR. LaCHAPELLE: You don't have any
20 past history of what kind of demolition material
21 was ---

22 ^{CW03}~~CHIEF~~ IVERSON: It's concrete -
23 it's asphalt - an asphalt debris and some other things
24 that we have found out there, some old steel pipes and

1 things, and what we have done is contacted Paul
2 Patterson from the state, and we are going to go in
3 there, and we're going to pull out the items that he
4 pointed out to me. I've walked him up and down through
5 there. We're going to level it all out and dump some
6 topsoil in there to help grass growth in there. As
7 soon as I get the CBs released from what they're doing,
8 they're going to come in there and level it all out.
9 They'll grate it to drain to the drain back there, and
10 we will make sure that the drain area does not collapse
11 or we don't get too close to it where we cause collapse
12 of the drain area. At that time, we will seed it and
13 grass it, and I will be taking pictures during the
14 entire operation, and I will be on the scene most of
15 the time to make sure that if we come across anything
16 we stop immediately.

17 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Did Mr. Patterson have
18 any problems with the asphalt at the site?

19 ^{CWO3}
~~CHIEF~~ IVERSON: I'm waiting on a
20 letter to come from Paul right now indicating exactly
21 what I just said.

22 MR. MOSER: Site No. 11 is entitled
23 oil/dirt road. They are essentially the dirt roads
24 that ran around the perimeter of the station. The

1 standard practice way back when, from the '40s to the
2 '60s, in order to reduce the dust, was to put your
3 heavier oils, such as your motor oils, down.

4 Due to the nature of the navy, we
5 thought maybe there might have been some PCBs mixed in
6 with that oil. We went out during the initial
7 assessment studies. We tested for PCBs, and we found
8 no PCBs. Based on that, and based on the fact that
9 asphalt roads are made up of oil and there is no
10 visible sign of any contamination of that past process
11 out there, we feel like no further action should be
12 warranted on that.

13 When you go to build a new road, you
14 simply pour fresh oil down for a tack coat, and then
15 you come back with the asphalt, which is made up of
16 oil.

17 Site No. 12 is located here in the
18 south complex. It was an area over in this area
19 (indicating) that was just a pile of what essentially
20 was sea rations. They were food products in tin cans,
21 and we feel like that does not pose an environmental
22 threat. We cannot see any evidence out there today,
23 because since this initial assessment study, they have
24 come in and put the levee.

1 We feel like that since it was
2 basically food products -- we saw no evidence of any
3 other item out there that should not have been out
4 there -- we do not feel like it is going to present an
5 environmental threat to human health or the
6 environment.

7 The first nine sites we are planning to
8 investigate, not the first eight. The last three, we
9 plan to prepare a preliminary assessment document with
10 an HRS, which is a hazard-ranking scoring system. That
11 will look at a lot of your health and migration
12 potentials, receptor potential, and prepare a report
13 for no further action. If in the course of preparation
14 of that, my consultant finds that there may be a risk
15 higher than what we're assuming at this point, we will
16 definitely bring it back to you, and we will pursue
17 those sites. That's all, sir.

18 CAPTAIN GRANT: Let's stay by the
19 agenda. We'll go do the tour. We'll come back here if
20 that's okay with everybody.

21 (Whereupon, a tour of the above-mentioned
22 sites was taken. An audio recording was made by
23 the court reporter, after which, the following
24 proceedings were transcribed:

CW03
~~CHIEF~~

1 CHIEF IVERSON: The first site we
2 will be visiting is the galley disposal area, if you
3 would like to turn to your blue book there to that page
4 and write some extra notes. Some place in the wooded
5 area here is a pile of tin cans. This is Site No. 12.

6 The next site we will be visiting is
7 the sewage -- all right, excuse me. We are not going
8 to go to the sewage lagoons. We are going to go over
9 near there. We can't off the road to get back into the
10 lagoon itself.

11 Behind this, you will see a little
12 whitish building over here. That is the old pump house
13 of the sewage lagoons. The sewage lagoons are directly
14 behind that. There's two of them. There's one small
15 one and one very large one. We'll have to go outside
16 the gate and go across to try and get in there. Like I
17 said, the roadway that goes in there is all dirt. I'm
18 afraid we'll get stuck.

19 What we are currently driving by - on
20 both sides of the road here is the landfill. The area
21 where you can see it best, we're coming up to. We're
22 at it right now.

23 What we are driving on now basically is
24 an example of the dirt roads that were oiled at one

1 time on the base. It's straight ahead that we are
2 driving on now.

3 There is a monitoring well that we are
4 coming up to here on the left-hand side. In fact, it's
5 right here on the left-hand side. This is for the
6 landfill area. This is the south side of the base,
7 now. We will be going over to the north side to Site
8 No. 3, which is the North 121 plating shop dry well.
9 You will see a dry piece of concrete here in the
10 ground. That is the old dry well. You can see it here
11 on your right. That's the dry well.

12 The ditch - this runs across the street
13 and follows down on the left-hand side of the road here
14 all the way down to the fire mats. What we're going to
15 do here is -- basically, what I'm saying is the drain
16 is going from here all the way down. We'll pick up on
17 that drain later on.

18 LT. BOGESS: There's two monitoring
19 wells on the left.

20 ^{CWO3 IVERSON}
~~COMMANDER CARPENTER~~: Yes, sir, there
21 are monitoring wells on the left. I believe -- is
22 there some on the right, too?

23 MR. MOSER: There's one on the north
24 side of that building there.

CWO3

1 ~~CHIEF~~ IVERSON: The next place
2 where we're going is Site No. 7 and No. 6, the North
3 126 plating shop and the battery shop. Right behind
4 this pickup truck right here you'll see what looks like
5 a gas cover where the valves are. That is the access
6 to the plating shop dry well. Robert, where's the
7 monitoring well at right here?

8 MR. MOSER: It's right down the center.
9 That new concrete that you see there is the concrete
10 holding the lid, and the pipe comes up right there, and
11 you can access that monitoring well right there with
12 that lid. We made sure that we did not carry any of
13 the potential contamination down with us when we
14 drilled through there.

CWO3

15 ~~CHIEF~~ IVERSON: Right up here on
16 your left, that's where the battery shop used to be.
17 There's a manhole cover off to the right about - in the
18 center of this conglomeration here that - it runs north
19 and south or east and west or whatever - north and
20 south, and that's where the drain is. It's a storm
21 sewer pipe which eventually empties into a ditch out
22 here. We'll go out and see the ditch.

23 What we're trying to get out to is the
24 Site No. 5, which is the firefighting training area.

1 This is out of sequence from our list that I gave out
2 to everyone. We can't get over there from the way we
3 originally planned on it.

4 Immediately here on your left -- I
5 shouldn't say immediately. It's kind of in back of us
6 now. Do you see that clump of dirt out in the middle
7 of the field? Just in forward - coming this way
8 towards us is where the firefighting area is. Needless
9 to say, I don't think we dare go out in the grass
10 there.

11 Site No. 10, the solid construction
12 landfill will be on your right-hand side. The drainage
13 ditch on your left-hand side is the continuation of
14 that North 121 storm sewer drain line. This on your
15 right-hand side here is the construction landfill -
16 demolition debris, I should say. You can see the piles
17 of fresh dirt back there that now have grass growing on
18 top of them.

19 The area that we are going into now is
20 the continuation of the North 121 ditch, which comes
21 right through here to the fire mats and goes straight
22 out to your right. That's Site No. 4, and also Site
23 No. 5, which is the firefighting training area, is what
24 you are looking at here off to your right. This is the

1 oil water separator. There is a monitoring well
2 sitting next to it. That's the white pipe that's
3 sticking up. The PVC piping that's sticking up -
4 that's the outer cover. We'll be crossing a bridge in
5 just a few hundred yards down the road here. This is
6 the continuation of the North 126 battery shop drainage
7 ditch. It is also the same ditch that follows along
8 the backside of the construction landfill - or
9 demolition construction landfill. The last site that
10 we are going to is the cemetery disposal area. The
11 cemetery is right here.

12 (Whereupon, the tour of the above-mentioned
13 sites was concluded and the meeting resumed in t
14 conference room.

15 CAPTAIN GRANT: Does anyone have
16 anything they would like to discuss after the tour?

17 Okay, we will plan on meeting again in
18 October, and we will follow up with mail. In the
19 meantime, if we can get this signed, and unless there's
20 anything else you would like to discuss, let's go home.

21 MR. MOSER: I just want to touch on one
22 thing. I provided the Mayor, Jim Crow, Norman and you
23 a copy of this (indicating) and a copy of the guidance
24 document. Our work plans will follow this guidance

1 document. This will enable you guys to review the
 2 guidance document easier, and we ask that, as part of
 3 this committee, it's your function to help us identify
 4 what would be applicable or relevant and/or appropriate
 5 to be considered for these sites as far as regulations.
 6 This copy here helps that rationale in how to come up
 7 with some of those. That's a little aid for you guys.
 8 The EPA and the state already has a copy.

9 MR. LaCHAPELLE: Captain, we received
 10 quite a few calls in the city and also in the county
 11 about what's being done as far as environmental
 12 control. Do you have a spokesperson or PAO that we can --

13 -

14 CAPTAIN GRANT: Sue Millican right
 15 there, and that's just her favorite thing. Thank you
 16 all for coming. Let's leave or we'll think of
 17 something else to talk about.

18 * * * * *

19 MEETING ADJOURNED

20 * * * * *

21
 22
 23
 24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF TENNESSEE:

COUNTY OF SHELBY:

I, T. BRYAN CAMPBELL, Court Reporter and
Notary Public, Shelby County, Tennessee, CERTIFY:

The foregoing proceedings were taken before
me at the time and place stated in the foregoing styled
cause with the appearances as noted.

Being a Court Reporter, I then reported the
proceedings in Stenotype, and the foregoing pages
contain a full, true and correct transcript of my said
Stenotype notes then and there taken.

I am not in the employ of and am not related
to any of the parties or their counsel, and I have no
interest in the matter involved.

WITNESS MY SIGNATURE, this, the 3rd day of
July, 1989.



T. BRYAN CAMPBELL,
Court Reporter
Notary Public at Large

My Commission Expires:
June 20, 1992