

## **RAB Minutes**

# *NAS North Island Restoration Advisory Board*

### ***Introduction***

The sixtieth Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island/Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Coronado was held on Thursday, October 21, 1999, at the Coronado Public Library from 6:30 p.m. to 8:20 p.m. Ms. Fargo called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m., and welcomed RAB members and the public.

### ***RAB Attendance***

Bill Collins, Carla Fargo, Bob Geilenfeldt, John Locke, Richard Mach, Foster Marshall

### ***Public/Navy Attendance***

Alan Clark, Wayne Crawford, Nancy Lee, Bob Logan, Larry McCauley, Rick Phillips, Michael Pound, Vicki Raun, Lee Saunders, Art Van Rooy, Debbie Wankier

### ***Approval of September 16, 1999 Meeting Minutes***

The September 16, 1999 meeting minutes were approved.

### ***Meeting Topics***

The October 21, 1999 meeting topics were Relative Risk and Training, Cleanup Budget for Fiscal Year 2000, Site 9 Remediation Update.

### ***Presentations***

#### ***Relative Risk and Training—Michael Pound, SWDIV***

The first presentation was given by Mr. Pound, on the Department of Defense's (DOD's) Relative Risk Site Evaluation Model, which is one of the elements used to prioritize spending for cleanup of sites. His presentation covered three topics: the purpose, how it works, and examples for some of the sites at North Island.

In the early 1990s, the DOD put out some directions for the Environmental Restoration, Navy; that's the funding account for cleanup on the sites at North Island. A group forum came up with the framework on how to do this, and this framework is used by the DOD and helps the public and the community understand what is being done.

What the framework does, is take data from the sites, and provide a relative assessment at that point in time of the relationship between the contaminants present at the sites, their ability to migrate, and the potential receptors for that site.

As that relationship develops, it is assigned a high, medium or low priority, and it's modeled using the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Risk Assessment Guidance.

The Navy looks at the relationships for the different environmental media at the site—groundwater, surface water, sediment, and surface soil. All these media are evaluated at all the sites.

In the model, three different factors were evaluated. The first factor was the *Contaminant Hazard*

*Factor.* That's how much contamination is present at the site. The second factor was the *Migration Pathway Factor*, and that is a judgmental evaluation based on the data about the ability of contamination to migrate or whether contamination has actually migrated from the site. The third factor was the *Receptor Factor*, and that's looking at whether humans or sensitive ecological environments are present or nearby the contamination. This model is intended to be an evaluation of the site conditions at a particular point in time. It is only to be used for sequencing sites for funding. That's the only thing it's to be used for. It's not to be used in place of a baseline risk assessment and it can't be used to close a site for no further action. There are a couple of different sites that it can't be used for. It can't be used for sites with unexploded ordnance, demolition of buildings, and potential responsible party sites. These are sites where the Navy has shipped waste or contamination off-site to a landfill, and that landfill has had environmental problems.

A calculation is then done, if the sum is over 100, it's considered significant. If it's between 2 and 100, it's considered moderate; and if it's less than 2, it's minimal.

For a Contaminant Hazard Factor, the most representative chemical data is plugged in. The Migration Pathway Factor is looked at to see the area where contaminants have been released. Has it hit the groundwater and migrated off? The Receptor Factor is used to determine beneficial use.

Ms. Fargo asked, *"Is it just the high sites then whether they have a CHF of 100 or 2 to 100 or less than 2? But it's just the high in these two categories that are vying for funding; is that correct?"*

Mr. Pound replied, *"We have what's called defense priority goals, and they want us to spend I think it's 70 percent of our money on high sites. Then there's other factors that come into play."*

Ms. Fargo then asked, *"How often are these ranked? How often do you do your ranking scheme? Annually?"*

Mr. Collins answered, *"They get evaluated twice a year."*

Mr. Mach added, *"All of the Navy sites should be closed by 2015." That means closed through the Comprehensive Environmental response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process to the Record of Decision (ROD)."*

The examples Mr. Pound gave were, first the cleanup at Site 9. The Contaminant Hazard Factor for site 9 was very high. The Migration Pathway Factor was marked evident, which means contamination is moving away from the source. The Receptor Factor was marked potential as being possible to flow to a beneficial use source. This site fell in the high priority site.

The second example was UST3, the underground storage tanks.

Ms. Fargo interjected, *"Do you at least take the worst case scenario for your tanks?"*

Mr. Mach answered, *"Right."*

Site 7 got a low overall rank. Site 4 is a site where a removal action was conducted throughout the site for closure. In the beginning it was the highest rank you can get for a site. A removal action was done and PCBs were cleaned up at the site. The relative risk site evaluation model for Site 4 was reran and changed the PCB concentration, which led to an overall low rating at the site.

**Cleanup Budget for Fiscal Year 2000 — Mr. Bill Collins, SWDIV**

The next presentation given by Mr. Collins was on the Cleanup Budget for Fiscal year 2000. Mr. Collins stated that the general rule is to first pay for overhead, next year's salaries, and administrative records.

The next item taken care of is any long-term monitoring or long-term operation costs. Next are the projects from the previous year that didn't get funded. Those are moved to the front and then funded.

The next category is where sites have legal agreements involved. At North Island the Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement, (FFSRA), is used to bolster requests for site cleanup investigation.

After all of the above is completed, then it reverts to risk, high-risk being funded first.

Next year's budget is \$8,450,000 for North Island. Most of it will be used towards cleanup. That's well within the Navy's goal of spending most of the budget on cleanup and the remainder on studies.

At Site 1 there will be a remedial investigation. Other projects include the landfill maintenance and the groundwater monitoring at Sites 2 and 5. There will be a removal action for Site 5, and additional money will be assigned to Site 9, where groundwater monitoring will be performed. The Navy will be working on the feasibility study. The Navy is working with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and an organization that's composed mostly of state environmental agencies from California and all around the country to develop ways that are uniform so if it's approved in one state, another state can accept it without having to test it. This progressive thinking will save a lot of money in the future for North Island.

#### **Site 9 Remediation Update — Richard Mach, SWDIV RPM**

Mr. Mach has been presenting monthly updates on the pilot tests, the removal action at Site 9. He explained there are two steam injection wells, seven free product recovery wells and the soil vapor extraction wells, and many temperature and vapor probes (TVP). About five weeks ago steam injection into SIW2 was started. About a week-and-a-half ago steam was injected into SIW1. With the increase in temperature, it has made the floating product more mobile, and in the last month approximately 500 gallons have been removed. It's anticipated that the pilot test should be completed by the end of November.

Mr. McCauley asked, *"The steam is heating the product that is captured in the soil? It comes out as well?"*

Mr. Mach answered, *"Right. It's heating up the product. It's essentially fuel, and it's got these chlorinated volatile organic compounds intermingled in with the fuel. So it helps to volatilize those out of the fuel, and you can suck those off in the soil vapor extraction (SVE) system pretty easily. And then the fuel is more mobile and it goes to the wells and we can suck it out with a regular pump. We're sucking fuel out just like you would suck water out of a groundwater well."*

#### **RAB Membership Drive and Resignation**

##### **RAB Membership Drive**

Ms. Fargo introduced Ms. Raun who represented the "Coronado Eagle Journal." Ms. Raun attended the meeting to gather information for writing and publishing an article on the RAB meeting, which might encourage new members to join. It's hopeful that this article would assist in

the process of starting the membership campaign.

### **Resignation**

Wayne Crawford, after serving the RAB for five years, resigned. He came primarily to resign but emphasized that he thought the RAB system was helping to correct the errors of the past, and complimented the RAB for doing a tremendous job. He further stated that he would try to get representation from Navy League for future RAB meetings.

### ***Public Questions and Comments***

#### **Site-Walk**

At the last RAB meeting, Mr. Geilenfeldt requested the Navy give a tour of the North Island sites and the NAB sites, for the benefit of the RAB attendees and its members. It was determined that it could be used as a method to encourage interested individuals to join the RAB. A suggestion was made that a member solicitation could be sent out stating, *"We're going to have a tour of the sites."* This would be in preparation for getting people to join the RAB.

The proposed date is the third week of January. Ms. Fargo suggested that it be held on a Saturday. Mr. Collins noted that the duration of time for the tour would be three-to-four hours.

#### **Questions**

Mr. Geilenfeldt asked, *"So you had closure of [NAB] Site 6. Is that done?"*

Mr. Mach answered, *"The Site 6 closure report was submitted. That was submitted to Douglas Bautista at the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on about the 30th or so of September for a 60-day public and regulatory review but a recommended no further action."*

#### **Evaluation Form**

As discussed at the last RAB meeting, a form was developed to rate guest speakers and presenters at RAB meetings. Mr. Mach prepared and presented the form to be used for evaluating presenters at future RAB meetings. The rating information would be reviewed at the end of a RAB meeting to provide verbal feedback to the guest speaker or presenter. The purpose of the form is to provide feedback to the presenters, thus improving future presentations.

Ms. Fargo asked, *"Are the presentations too technical? Do we need more of a bottom line approach?"*

The response and consensus from the group, was that most people are satisfied with the current level in which the presentations are given.

Mr. Mach handed out the presentation forms, and reviewed the rating process.

#### **Dr. Marshall's Survey**

Dr. Marshall asked about an ad that he would like to put in "The Eagle Journal", a cancer survey for Coronado—one that he made up.

Ms. Raun replied that she would check with the publisher, and consider putting it in as an insert.

Ms. Fargo asked for clarification of Dr. Marshall's intent, and she also asked him if he planned on publishing a professional article.

Dr. Marshall stated that he was interested in gathering data on cancer, and wasn't sure yet how the data would be used.

Ms. Fargo cautioned the group, and felt the survey was useful, but didn't know if it was within the purview of the RAB.

Mr. Mach suggested for everyone to provide their comments to Dr. Foster, and to put it on the agenda for next month, and Dr. Marshall could update everyone with the responses he received and go from there. Dr. Marshall provided his home telephone number, 437-6880.

***Upcoming Agenda Items***

Draft Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment for Shoreline Sediments at NAB Coronado – Mark Bonsavage

Site 5 Time Critical Removal Action /Chemical Oxidation Technology Presentation – Rich Mach

Site 9 Non-time Critical Removal Action Update -Rich Mach

Site Tour (NASNI and NAB) – Bill Collins

Coronado Health Survey – Foster Marshall

***RAB Upcoming Meetings, Year 1999***

Wednesday, December 1, 1999

***RAB Upcoming Meetings, Year 2000***

January 20<sup>th</sup>; February 17<sup>th</sup>; March 16<sup>th</sup>; April 20<sup>th</sup>; May 18<sup>th</sup>, June 15<sup>th</sup>; No meeting in July; August 17<sup>th</sup>; September 21<sup>st</sup>; October 19<sup>th</sup>; November 16<sup>th</sup>; and, No meeting in December.

***Meeting Adjourned***

Ms. Fargo concluded the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.