N00204.AR.002621
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 2 DECEMBER 2008 NAS PENSACOLA FL

12/2/2008

NAS PENSACOLA

Minutes

NAS Pensacola RAB Meeting

Naval Air Station Pensacola
Pensacola, Florida
December 2, 2008

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at Building 624 on NAS Pensacola on December 2, 2008:

Greg Campbell (Navy Co-Chair)
Lisa Minchew
Jesse Rigby
Greg Fraley (EPA)
John Early (Community Co-Chair)

Administrative and technical support for the meeting was provided by:

Gerry Walker, Tetra Tech NUS
Ron Kotun, Tetra Tech NUS
Yarissa Martínez, Tetra Tech NUS

Other attendees included:

Patty Whittmore (Navy RPM)
Mike Weithler
Todd (Navy ex-employee)
Pat Nichols (Navy)
Greg Wilfley (CH2M Hill)
Allison Harris (EnSafe)
Travis Griggs (Press – Pensacola News Journal)
Nancy Rouse

Welcome: Greg Campbell, the Navy RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:00 pm. Mr. Campbell introduced the people present from the different agencies and excused Mrs. Tracie Bolaños (FDEP) a RAB member who was not present.

Technical Presentation: Tetra Tech NUS, Inc. will provide summaries of current reports and significant information on the environmental investigations in the naval base related to the Installation Remediation Program.

1. Five Year Review: Gerry Walker of Tetra Tech NUS provided an overview of the Five Year Review Report that was finalized August, 2008. The Five Year Review included an assessment of the remediation and protectiveness of the following sites; OU 1, OU 4, OU 11 and OU 13. Background information was presented for each site, as well as the issues and recommendations for all the sites assessed.

OU 1 - Currently the site is being assessed because of the iron concentrations that are being reported in the groundwater. Part of the proposed remedy that included a trench and limestone to treat and collect groundwater with elevated iron concentrations will be removed because the results were not as expected. Additional investigations are being conducted at the site to better characterize the specific situation on wetlands 3 and 4.

Question: What does the assessment mean?

Answer*:* Basically we are studying the hydrogeological features and natural environment of the wetlands in order to keep contamination away.

Question: *What is the process to protect to protect the wetlands?*
Answer*:* It is a continuous process; we will be evaluating the concentrations detected, trends and patterns, to determine if the iron is related to background and natural concentrations.

Question: *Is there a timeframe?*
Answer*:* A modification to the existing Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued in the next month to address moving the point of compliance. Therefore, by next June we should have something in place.

Question: Has anyone looked at the issue of landfills and how capping would prevent storm-water infiltration and therefore preventing dilution of what is currently carried in the groundwater?
Answer*:* Not that we are aware of.

Question: Can the lead from the landfill be differentiated from the lead attributed to background conditions?
Answer*:* Lead is a metal and it cannot be differentiated because of the source.

OU 4 and OU 11 – The Five Year Review assessment determined that the remedy in place is protective.

OU 13 - The area has had significant changes because of the reconstruction from Hurricane Ivan, therefore additional sampling will be conducted by early 2009 in order to verify the protectiveness of the selected remedy at this site.

2. OU 2 ROD: Gerry Walker of Tetra Tech NUS provided an overview of the OU 2 ROD that was finalized September, 2008. The ROD is a decision document that records the selected remedy, in this case for OU 2, which is comprised of the following sites; Site 11, 12, 25, 26, 27 and 30. A summary of the selected remedy, which includes removal of selected areas (soil) and land use controls, was presented to the RAB.

Question: *Are the areas that will be removed blocked?*
Answer: Most of the areas to be removed are paved; therefore blocking access due to exposure is not needed.

Question: *The base doesn't have irrigation wells nearby?*
Answer: Not currently, the base used to have irrigation wells, but the amount of lead present in groundwater stained the buildings.

Question: *What is the frequency of groundwater monitoring?*
Answer: The frequency is different depending on the site. Additionally depending on the results, the frequency of groundwater monitoring would be decreased until the concentrations reported are above the regulatory criteria.

Question: *Is there a point at where improvement needs to be shown?*
Answer: Typically for FDEP improvement should be shown within 5 years, with the exceptions of landfills.

Question: *Are they* [the groundwater monitoring wells] *generally showing reduction?*
Answer: Yes. All, but OU 1, have shown a significant reduction in the levels of contaminants detected.

Question: *Are all the OU's with RODs or is there any left?*
Answer: Approximately there are five OUs left without a decision document (ROD). The sites are in different stages of the environmental investigation.

Question: *What is the schedule?*
Answer: As of now, we have estimated that by 2011 all of the OUs should have RODs and/or a remedy in place.

Comment: *When this process started, the RAB was told that it would be at least 20 years. This is better.*

Question: *Do we have an estimate of how much money the Navy is spending per year?*
Answer: Approximately 3 million per year. However, additional details regarding the funds assigned for the remediation can be provided.

Question: *How much has the Navy spent?*
Answer: That information can be provided later, because we don't have the details available.

It was briefly discussed how Hurricane Ivan funds were used for the reconstruction, fill and changes around the base.

Question: *Were you guys supervising the demolitions?*
Answer: Greg Campbell has been participating in all the planning and construction activities at the base.

Question: *What are the health effects from the iron on wetlands and on the bayou?*
Answer: Human health risk is not significant for iron exposure, additionally it seemed to be localized and not spread.

Membership: The RAB agreed on the necessity of the yearly meetings, therefore we will have a meeting around fall/winter next year. It is understood that the environmental investigation activity in the base has decreased significantly compared to 1997 when the RAB started.

Additionally, Mr. Rugsby has requested that the RODs be sent to the RAB members for review before being finalized.

Conclusion

The next meeting was scheduled for Fall/Winter 2009.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.
(see news article attached)

Pensacola NAS environmental cleanup efforts discussed

Travis Griggs
tgriggs@pnj.com

Members of the Resident Advisory Board met with officials at Pensacola Naval Air Station Tuesday to discuss the cleanup and containment of pollutants in the soil and groundwater of the more than 170-year-old base.

In the late 1980s, several areas at the base were identified as environmental hazards due to past industrial activities, such as pesticide mixing and hazardous waste storage.

In the years since, the Department of Defense has spent millions of dollars to clean up the sites and prevent the spread of pollutants into surrounding areas. The Resident Advisory Board is a group of community members invited by Pensacola NAS to provide input and participate in the planning and execution of cleanup projects.

Tuesday night, Resident Advisory Board co-chariman Greg Campbell said all but one of the contaminated sites on Pensacola NAS have been effectively treated and contained.

The remaining "nagging problem," Campbell said, is an 85-acre landfill located on the north side of the base.

Iron from the landfill has seeped into the groundwater and is not being effectively contained by current measures, he said.

The iron does not pose an immediate health risk because groundwater in the area is not used for human consumption —Pensacola NAS gets its water from Corry Station three miles away —but community members are worried that it may eventually run off into nearby Bayou Grande.

"We keep looking at different options, but so far none of them seem to be working," Campbell said.

Currently, the base has installed an "interceptor trench" to separate iron from groundwater and pump it from the ground to be disposed of. But so far, the trench has been ineffective.

"The interceptor trench doesn't seem to be working," Campbell said. "(The area) continues to be a problem and we have to come up with a cost-effective way to limit exposure."

Pensacola NAS currently spends about $3 million a year on environmental cleanup, and Campbell said they are exploring new methods of containing the iron pollution.

RAB board member Jesse Rigby, an attorney who lives near Perdido Bay, said that despite the lingering problems at the landfill, he was happy with the cleanup effort's success in other, more toxic, locations.

"I think the troublesome stuff that is out there was found early on and dealt with early on," Rigby said.
