

**Naval Air Station Pensacola  
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes  
May 28, 1996**

**1. Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Community Co-Chairperson John Early. An attached attendance roster reflects the RAB members who were present for this meeting. First order of business: Minutes from the 26 March 1996 meeting were reviewed and approved. Move to the order of business: Site 40 and 42 update.

**2 Site 40 and 42 (Bayou Grande and Pensacola Bay) Update and data presentation.** Dave Trimm, ENSAFE. Phase IIA sampling of sites 40 and 42 has been completed. A sediment assessment phase was conducted as a precursor to phase IIA which is a chemical analyses/sampling. All analytical data collected has not been validated at the time of this presentation.

**Phase IB: Toxicity diversity bioaccumulation**

- Constructed isoplets to separate silts from sands. Used to determine entrainment of contaminants

**Phase I: Sediment Assessment Phase**

- Habitat and biological survey/contaminant source survey

**Goal:** Gain familiarity with the environment, choose phase II sample locations, predict high probability areas, and develop a sample analysis plan (SAP).

Qualitative description of near **shore environment and receptors**

**Phase IIB: Chemical analysis sampling**

**Goal:** Characterize the nature and extent of contamination in bay and bayou near shore areas collect sediment samples

- Compare contaminant concentrations to sediment screening values using the Florida Sediment Quality Assessment Guidelines (SQAGS) and Sediment Screening Values (SSV).
- Determine which shoreline segments should be investigated during Phase IIB and quantify potential risk via screening assessment or modeling if applicable.

**Phase IIB: Toxicity diversity bioaccumulation**

**Goal:**

- Quantify impact with respect to measurement and assessment points.
- Perform bioassay in areas where concentrations suggest high risk

- Perform bioaccumulation studies
- Relate results to measurement and assessment endpoints
- Determine if more defined studies are necessary.  
(Note: No studies have yet gone to phase III)

#### Phase IIA: Summary

- 143 sediment samples collected from 4 near shore assessment zones in Bayou Grande
- 141 sediment samples collected from 5 near shore assessment zones in Pensacola Bay to determine what contaminant sources were prevalent in the area.
- During preliminary assessment, developed three levels of qualitative/quantitative assessment, using color codes to set criteria to determine status and used to qualify the areas.

##### **Blue zone**

Less than 25% or max concentration is less than 2 times the screening value, this is considered lower risk potential. No further study recommended in these areas.

##### **Orange zone**

25% - 50% stations exceed the screening level or compound concentration is greater than 2 times the screening value. Potential risk/continue to analyze information.

##### **Red zone**

50% stations exceed sl or compound concentrations were greater than 4 times the screening value. Higher risk potential/further study suggested.

#### Review of Assessment Zones:

a. Assessment Zone 1: Categorized as an "Orange Zone". Sampled random areas near shore, 100 feet off shore, 250 and 500 feet off shore to increase probability of finding contaminants. Approximately 40 samples were taken. For example, in a 500 by 500 foot area, 8 samples might be taken. These findings are based on ecological health rather than human health. There is no sediment quality criteria set for human health. Surface quality standards are set based on human and ecological health. Question as to toxicity of sediment on children playing in the mud. No health risk is present at this time. Cadmium, chromium, copper and lead were in the 25% to 50% range. There is a lot of subjectivity used in the testing process and this data has not been validated. Pesticides and PCB's are the most critical in the ecological sense and all screening levels recorded were within safe standards. This is the first stage of data review. Screening values are exceptionally low compared to human toxicity values. Sediments will hold contaminants more than soil. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set the criteria based on a nationwide database. Summary of Assessment Zone I shows that metals were the biggest issue, predominantly found in fine grain sediments. It was determined to be coming from an off site source and not associated with the Navy base.

- b. **Zone II - Reviewed independent of target areas. Again, metals were primary concern.**

**Zone IIA - DDE (degradation product of DDT) and metals are the primary concern. 7 - 15 year degradation level for DDT.**

**Zone IIB - Metals and PCB's (60 parts per billion) DDE and DDT based on drainage around the airfield. Catagorized as a "Red Zone".**

**Zone IIC - Small quantities of arsenic (could be naturally occurring). Some metals found in the sediment.**

**Zone IID - Primarily metals.**

**Zone IIE - Primarily metals, BEHP in the red zone.**

**Zone IIF - Blue zone - lot of tidal movement - no concentrations found.**

- c. **Zone III - Red zone. DDE & DDT possibly from golf course drainage. Cannot correlate where the contaminant source is coming from.**

**Zone IIIA - Primarily petroleum aerometric hydrocarbons (PAH) found. Orange zone.**

**Zone IIIB - No significant contaminants.**

**Zone IV - Orange zone based on metals and a few pesticides. Pesticides are extremely mobile in water and will travel. Intensive sampling was taken.**

**Zone V - Outside channel in Pensacola Bay, two target areas sampled. Nothing noted. set up two target areas OU-10 and Site 14, both sites were benign.**

**Zone V - Arsenic levels were enough to place it in the orange tone.**

**Zone VI - Small quantities of arsenic found, no other contaminants noted.**

**Zone VII - No contaminants noted.**

**Zone VIII - Found Polyaeromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) but were isolated.**

**Zone IX - Sherman Cove - No contaminants found.**

Ready to validate and recalculate data. Anticipate no change or minimum of 10% variance. Based on the findings, Pensacola Bay is not in any ecological danger at this point. Bayou has concentrations of pesticides but no danger to fish or fowl noted.

Discussion with Thomas McAlpin regarding results of assessment to ascertain results of survey. A request by the committee has been made to get a copy of the data once it has been validated. The current data gathered is preliminary. Criteria used was from the EPA, Florida and various other sources. Care must be taken in interpretation of this data.

Question arose regarding health of seafood obtained from bayou. Discussion revolved around using shellfish to determine toxicity levels for human consumption.

### 3. Site 41 Remedial Investigation (Phase IIA sample results) by Henry Beiro, ENSAVE:

#### A. Phase IIA: Sample results:

Three phases site 41 remedial investigation.

##### Phase I: Habitat and biota survey/contaminant source survey

- Looked at wetlands topography.

##### Phase IIA: Chemical analysis sampling

- Spent \$1000 per sample to measure toxicity accumulations

##### Phase IIB: Toxicity/diversity/bioaccumulation studies

##### Phase III: Refine studies (if necessary)

Samples were selected qualitatively based on point source discharges, pathway analysis through the wetland. Looking for areas that may have contamination. Used global positioning to assist in taking samples.

##### Goal:

- Gain familiarity, choose phase IIA sample locations and develop a sample analysis plan.
- Qualitative description of wetlands and receptors.
- Identify reference wetlands, endpoint determinations, and conceptual model.
- Choose "hot spot" sample locations based on site history and areas of likely contamination.
- Looked for point source discharges where deposits occur regularly (hot spots likely in these areas)

#### B. Phase IIB: Chemical analysis sampling

##### Goal:

- Characterize the nature and extent of contamination in those wetlands sampled and quantify impact.

- Collect sediment and surface water samples at Phase I "hot spots".
- Compare contaminant levels to two times mean reference concentrations, sediment screening values and water quality criteria.
- Determine which wetlands should be studied further based on the above review.

The contract for the labs were modified to detect low levels of contaminants.

#### C. Phase IIB: Toxicity/diversity/bioaccumulation studies:

Goal:

- Qualify impact with respect to measurement and assessment endpoints.
- Perform toxicity test.

#### D. Risk assessment

Goal:

- Measurement and estimate current and future effects.

122 sediment samples collected from 29 wetlands or wetland complexes

51 surface water samples collected from 27 wetland or wetland complexes.

General trends: Appears to be a relationship between metal contamination and toxicity; i.e. Highest metal contamination is located in areas with highest toxicity. This relationship did not appear present in reference wetland sediments.

Site groundwater contamination did not appear correlated with associated wetland sediment or surface water results.

Surface water results, particularly from saline wetlands, did not correlate with corresponding sediment data.

#### E. Wetlands ranking according to color

##### *Red*

Contamination appears to be related to an Installation Restoration site and consistently exceeds reference values and benchmarks.

Wetlands: 64, 5, 3, 4, 16, 18, 10, 12 and W1.

##### *Orange*

Contamination may be related to an Installation Restoration site. Limited contaminants are above reference values or benchmarks, or contaminants are above benchmarks but do not appear to be site related. Wetlands 1, 15, 6, 63a, 48 and 49.

##### *Blue*

None or isolated contaminants detected in most cases were below background and/or benchmarks and do not appear to be Installation Restoration site related. Wetlands: 10

(eastern portion) 13, 17, 19, 2, 56, 57 58, 63b, 72, 79 aad W2.

Screening values differ for wetlands from the sediment assessments.

5. OU-10 Update - Henry Beiro:

Restoration Advisory Board members should have received a responsiveness summary in the mail. (Summary of response from the public received during the public comment period), in draft form. Needs to be finalized. Delayed due to institutional control (i.e. Governmental control)

OU-10 handles all industrial wastes from NAS. The facility has been transferred over to a sanitary sewer. Awaiting the record of decision (public document) Issue: What method will levels be maintained since deed restrictions are not feasible.

6. Site 2 Update - David Trimm:

Site 2 is the Southeast waterfront area west of Allegheny Pier to building 76. Used to be a painting and stripping facility. Discharged raw solvent and stripping compound into the bay. Since 1993 a sediment assessment phase has been conducted, qualitative - up to 700 feet off shore. Designed a selective sampling plan primarily in high depositional areas to save time and money.

Phase IIA Analytical Chemistry Site 2 sediments:

- Arsenic, cadmium, chromium and copper were the primary metals found in minimal quantities. Representation was reasonably close to the phase IIA readings sampled in 1993.

Components of the hazard index (HI) used to correlate risk factor.

Types:

Metals

PAH

BEHP

Pest/PCB

Effects assessment: EPA screening values are considered to be conservative. Site 2 was found to be fairly benign based on samples taken.

7. The board has opened the floor for questions from community members.

- 1) Question: What is the status of grass beds that used to be in Bayou Grande, has any submerged vegetation been found?

Answer: Grass and rupia beds have been located just off of wetland 16 and in the bayou.

- 2) Question: Major hydraulic spills have occurred in the bayou. Are PCB's being found in the samples?

**Answer:** No PCB's have been detected during samples taken.

Next meeting is scheduled for 23 July 1996. A consensus of board members agreed to hold meetings bi-monthly rather than monthly at 5:30 p.m.

8. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by consent of the members at 8:25 p.m.

**Minutes approved by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
LCDR Joe Monachino  
Co-Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Early  
Co-Chairperson

**Attachments:**

(1) Attendance Roster

# Naval Air Station Pensacola RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD ROSTER

28 MAY 1996

**MEMBERS**

**SIGNATURE**

Jay Bassett

\_\_\_\_\_

John Early

*John A. Early*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Bill Hill

*Bill Hill*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Thomas McAlpin

*Tom McAlpin*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Lisa Minshew

*Notified unable to attend*  
\_\_\_\_\_

John Mitchell

*John Mitchell*  
\_\_\_\_\_

LCDR Joe Monachino

*Joe Monachino*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Jesse Rigby

*Jesse Rigby*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Jerry Westmoreland

*Jerry Westmoreland*  
\_\_\_\_\_

**ALTERNATE MEMBER**

Mary Radford

\_\_\_\_\_

**NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA  
INSTALLATION RESTORATION INVESTIGATION  
RAB PROGRESS REPORT FOR MAY 1996**

**INVESTIGATIVE SEQUENCE**

Sites identified in the original base site preliminary assessment phase were grouped into Categories as outlined below. Sites within each Category were grouped based upon location or possible common contamination. The assessment also listed suspected sites that were to be investigated as a Screening Site status. This means contaminants were suspected. In these cases additional screening sampling is required to substantiate a No Further Action decision or as a result of the findings the Site should be elevated to an Operable Unit (OU). Sites suspected to be a possible threat to human health or the environment were classified as an Operable Units and assigned numbers by USEPA. The Categories were prioritized based on an assumption they posed the worst threats to human health and the environment. Investigation of the Sites within each Category have been investigated in this order.

Category	Site	Operable Unit	Site Description
1	13	(screen)	Magazine Point Rubble Disposal
1	32	10	IWTP Sludge Drying Beds
1	33	10	WWTP Ponds
1	35	10	Miscellaneous IWTP SMMUs
2	1	1	Sanitary Landfill
2	2	3	Waterfront Sediments
2	38	11	Bldg 71 & Sewer Line Southwest End
2	39	12	Oak Grove Campground Site
3	11	2	North Chevalier Disposal Landfill
3	26	2	Supply Dept Outside Storage
3	27	2	Radium Dial Shop
3	30	2	Bldg 648, 649, 755, & the Sewer Line North
3	12	(screen)	Scrap Bins
3	25	(screen)	Radium Spill Site
4	40	15	Bayou Grand Area
4	41	16	NASP Wetlands
4	42	17	Pensacola Bay

5	9	6	Navy Yard Disposal
5	29	6	Soil South of Bldg 3460
5	10	(screen)	Commodores Pond
5	14	(screen)	Dredge Spoil Fill
5	34	(screen)	Solvent North of Bldg 3557
6	15	4	Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Area
6	37	14	Transformer Storage Area
6	18	(screen)	PCB Spill Area
6	24	(screen)	DDT Mixing Area
6	28	(screen)	Transformer Accident
7	22	13	Refueler Repair Shop
7	4	(screen)	Army Rubble Disposal
7	5	(screen)	Borrow Pit
7	6	(screen)	Fort Redoubt Rubble Disposal
7	7	(screen)	Firefighting School
7	8	(screen)	Rifle Range Disposal
7	16	(screen)	Brush Disposal Area
8	36	(screen)	IWTP Sewer Line
9	43	(screen)	Buried Drum Area
9	44	(screen)	Former UST 3221SW

**FUNDING STATUS**

Sites within categories 1 - 8 have been funded for all actions required through the Record Of Decision. Sites in Category 9 have not been funded for investigation or report writing to date due to Appropriation cuts in the 1996 budget.

**F THROUGH MAY 1996**

Final Comprehensive Sampling and Analysis Plan has been completed for NAS Pensacola.

Final Comprehensive Health and Safety Plan has been completed for NAS Pensacola.

Final Site Specific Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAP) have been completed for Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Final Site Specific Health and Safety Plans (HASP) have been completed for Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8.

**Final Remedial Investigation Report (RI) has been completed for Category 1 (OU 10 with screening Site 13) and Category 2 (OU12, Site 39).**

**Draft RI for category 2 (OU 1, she I; OU3, Site 2; OU 11, Site 38) have been submitted.**

**Site Characterization Report has been completed for Category 5 (screening Sites 10 & 14) and Category 7 (screening Site 5).**

**Final Feasibility Study(FS) has been completed for Category 1 (OU 10, Sites 32, 33, & 35).**

**Final Proposed Plan (PP) has been completed for Category 2 (OU 12, Site 39). Final PP has been completed for Category 1 (OU 10, Sites 32, 33, & 35).**

**Final Record of Decision has been completed for Category 2 (OU 12, Site 39).**

**Interim Removal Actions have been completed at Sites 9, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, and 39.**

**Final revised Community Relations Plan has been completed.**

**Draft Record of Decision has been submitted for Category 1 (OU 10, Sites 32, 33, & 35).**

**Field investigation is approximately 77% completed.**

**Final RI report for Category 5 (OU 6, Sites 9, 29, & screening site 34) has been completed.**

**Preliminary Site Characterization Report for Site 28 has been submitted.**

**Final Work Plan for Flushing and Grouting IWTP Sewer Lines has been completed.**

#### **ACTIVITY FOR JUNE**

**Continue Field Investigation on Categories 4, 6, and 7.**

**Feasibility Study Report for Category 2 (OU 1, Site 1) to be submitted May 31, 1996.**

**Draft Proposed Plan to be submitted June 21, 1996 for Category 5 (OU6, Sites 9, 29, & screening site 34).**

**NAS Pensacola Environmental Dept. to submit a request for No Further Action for Site 6 since it is still an active landfill to USEPA and FDEP.**

**Final Record of Decision for Category 1 (OU10, Sites 32, 33, & 35) to be submitted.**

**Final Close Out Report for Flushing and Grouting IWTP Sewer Lines to be submitted.**

**Draft Proposed Plan (PP) for Category 1 (OU 1; site 1) to be submitted.**

**Draft Record of Decision for Category 1 (OU 1; Site 1) to be submitted.**

**Draft Final RI Report for Category 2 (OU 11; Site 38) to be submitted.**

**Draft Final RI Report for Category 2 (OU 3; Site 2) to be submitted.**

**QUESTIONS GENERATED FROM OUR LAST MEETING 26 MARCH 1996**

**.NONE.**

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
 NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA  
 c/o Public Affairs Office  
 Building 191-Code 00B00  
 190 Radford Boulevard  
 Pensacola, Florida 32508-5217**

[redacted] date [redacted]

[redacted] name [redacted]  
 [redacted] organization [redacted]  
 [redacted] address [redacted]  
 [redacted] city [redacted] state [redacted] zip code [redacted]

RE: Naval Air Station Pensacola Environmental Installation Restoration Program

Dear [redacted] name [redacted],

As Community Co-chairmen of the NAS Pensacola Restoration Advisory Board, ("RAB"), we want to take this opportunity to inform you of Environmental Installation Restoration Program activities aboard NAS Pensacola that may be of interest to you and other members of [redacted] organization [redacted].

The enclosed document provides a description of the Navy's Environmental Installation Restoration Program and the Restoration Advisory Board that was formed to enhance community involvement in the Navy's environmental clean-up activities. Please feel free to reprint the enclosed document in any newsletter or other publication that you send to members of your organization.

The private citizen members of the RAB can serve as conduits of information between the Navy and the public with respect to the efforts to clean up hazardous substance contamination aboard the base. We invite your input. Feel free to encourage your members to call any member of the RAB if they have questions. Feel free to call on us to speak to your organization. We will do our best to facilitate the free flow of information about the Environmental Installation Restoration Program. We will assure you that any comments that your members might have will be passed on to the Navy personnel responsible for the success of this program.

Sincerely,

John Early  
 Co-Chairperson

Joe Monachino  
 Lieutenant Commander, USN  
 Co-Chairperson

Enclosure

July 16, 1996  
Page 2

## RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

### NAS PENSACOLA

The current mission of Naval Air Station Pensacola is to support Naval air training by providing facilities, services, and maintenance support for training squadrons and other tenant commands. During much of its almost 170 year history, the base conducted industrial related operations that required the use of a wide variety of materials that we now know to be hazardous. These included plating materials, metals, cleaning solvents and petroleum based compounds that have the potential to pollute the environment.

In December 1989, NAS Pensacola was placed on the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL) of sites that require environmental assessment and clean-up. Although these sites are commonly referred to as "Superfund" sites, NAS Pensacola will be cleaned up using funds from the DoD budget. The DoD program responsible for cleaning up contamination by hazardous substances is the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). NAS Pensacola is an active and energetic participant in the IRP. Through the fiscal year 1997 budget (ending September 30, 1996), \$22,000,000 had been set aside for the IRP assessment and clean-up activities aboard the base.

Assessment activities have been completed at many of the 44 separately identified sites, and cleanup work has been completed at some of these sites.

July 16,1996

Page 3

Assessment activities **to determine** the extent and nature of *the* contamination is on-going at the remainder of these sites. In fiscal year 1885 alone, approximately \$2,130,000 was *spent* on **assessment and clean-up activities** at NAS Pensacola under the IRP.

The IRP requires a cooperative effort **between the Navy (as lead agency)**, the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. This cooperative **effort** has worked exceptionally well at NAS Pensacola.

In order to enhance the cooperative approach, **representatives of each** of these agencies, along with representatives of the private **firms** contracted to perform assessment and clean-up **activities**, meet **monthly** as a joint **decision-making group** overseeing the IRP. Problems **are** identified **early** so that solutions can be found to save **time** and money.

NAS Pensacola recognizes that the public has an interest in ensuring that the Navy does a good job protecting the base environment and **remediating** past **problems**. NAS Pensacola is **almost** surrounded by **navigable waterways** used by the public. These water bodies could have been impacted by waste **disposal practices** considered acceptable years ago. **Therefore, as** part of the IRP, these adjacent water bodies **will** also be studied, **just as sites physically aboard** NAS Pensacola are studied during *the* assessment process.

July 16,1996

Page 4

NAS Pensacola desires input and suggestions from the public. Clean-up plans are presented to the public for review and comment before the plans are finalized. In addition, to enhance the public awareness of the IRP and to increase public involvement and access to information, NAS Pensacola has created a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) comprised of private citizens and Navy representatives. The mission of the RAB is to establish and facilitate a forum with the community, regulators, and NAS Pensacola for the exchange of information in an open and interactive dialogue concerning the base's environmental restoration program. The RAB is an adjunct to, but not a replacement for, the public input forums required by federal and state law.

The NAS Pensacola Restoration Advisory Board consists of between five and eight members. Members were initially selected by the Base from applications. The goal was to obtain broad based representation from the community. Future members will be selected by the RAB pursuant to the RAB's Charter, which was developed by the RAB.

NAS Pensacola encourages your participation and involvement in the process of improving the environmental status of the base. The RAB meets at least bi-monthly. Notice of the meeting is provided in the Pensacola News Journal. All meetings are open to the public. You can also become involved by calling any member of the RAB to ask questions or express concerns. Another option is to

**July 16,1996**

**Page 5**

contact **Keith Cornett** at the **NAS Pensacola Public Affairs Office (452-2311)**. **Keith** will ensure that your **comments** are forwarded to the **Board**.

**Current RAB members are:**

**John Early**  
**Board Co-Chairperson**  
**456-4111**

**Lisa S. Minshew**  
**034-6858**

**Thomas McAlpin**  
**432-4420**

**Jerry Westmoreland**  
**4-92-2820**

**Jesse W. Rigby**  
**434-9200**

Naval Air Station  
Public Affairs Office  
Pensacola, Florida

Ph: (904)452-2311  
Fax: (904)452-2760  
DSN: 922-2311



*News*

*Release*

Release Number: 040-96

May 23, 1996

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

## **NAS PENSACOLA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETING**

PENSACOLA, Fla. – Naval Air Station Pensacola will hold a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Tuesday, May 28, 5:30 p.m. The meeting will take place in the conference room (second floor) in building 624 on board the air station. Building 624 is located on Radford Boulevard across the seawall east of McDonald's. The public is encouraged to attend and participate in the meeting. Time is available during the meeting for questions and comments from attendees. The evening's presenters will also be available after the meeting to answer questions and listen to concerns.

Agenda items for this environmental meeting include data presentations on the Pensacola Bay, Bayou Grande and the NAS Pensacola Wetlands. Toxicity test data will be presented on the southeast waterfront bay area along the southeast portion of the base and an update on the Operable Unit-10 Record of Decision.

The RAB is an advisory board established by NAS Pensacola to increase public participation in its environmental cleanup program, called Installation Restoration, better known as Superfund. Technical experts involved in the environmental investigations and cleanup of the base are brought together in public meetings with state and federal regulatory officials and community members. This gives the community an opportunity to provide input directly to the decision-making body.

For additional information on the Restoration Advisory Board, its meetings or the Navy's Installation Restoration Program, contact Michele Harrison, NAS Pensacola Public Affairs Office,

(904) 452-2311.

-30-