MINUTES OF 18 MAY 1990 TRC MEETING
NAS WILLOW GROVE, IRP STUDIES

Convened: 10:00 hrs, Building 78, NAS Willow Grove

LCDR Mike Zook opened the meeting and indicated Mr. Magee of Horsham Township and Ms. Faust-Beck with the Air Force Reserve would not be attending.

Jim Shafer requested comments on the 18 January meeting. None were offered. He indicated that the discussions of the 18 January meeting were based on the first 2 of three rounds of sampling. At that time there were some unanswered questions, some of which are still not resolved. There are two sites for which it is questionable as to whether an RI/FS is necessary. The Navy is considering additional investigations to determine the need for an RI. These could be considered an Extended Site Inspection (ESI). He asked EPA and PADER whether such an approach would be consistent with their requirements.

Both EPA and PADER indicated the approach may be appropriate but reserved formal comment until after they have reviewed the SI report.

Jim Shafer confirmed that the schedule for investigations at the Navy Fuel Farm would be accelerated with respect to the other SI sites. Contract negotiations for the next phase of work are scheduled for 25 May. This phase includes pump testing, both for aquifer characterization and pilot scale recovery testing. If pilot scale recovery is successful the Navy plans to initiate an interim recovery program while continuing to complete the RI/FS to develop the long-term solution for the site. He asked EPA and PADER what type of documents would be necessary to file to initiate an interim action--product recovery--prior to final clean up.

LCDR Zook indicated that the Request for Bid for construction of the new fuel farm and removal of the old will be published within the next few weeks. Contract award is anticipated by the end of the fourth quarter of this fiscal year. It is estimated the contract award will be for on the order of $2.4 - 2.6 million. He asked whether the state’s new tank regulations were in effect.

Richard Dudginski responded in the affirmative.

Jim Shafer indicated that a representative of PADER’s underground storage tank group had been invited to the meeting. The Navy was intending to discuss and get feedback on the following. It has been estimated that approximately 800 yd³ of contaminated soil will be removed during demolition of the old tank farm. Funds for the removal and handling of that quantity have been allocated as part of construction contract award. The Navy needs to have an idea of what else PADER may require at the time the old tanks are removed. The Navy’s intent is for the ultimate clean up to be performed under CERCLA.
CAPT. Shepard asked if it is possible that the final solution could be similar to that planned for the ARP Fuel Farm.

LCDR Zook responded in the affirmative.

Chuck Houlik distributed the SI report and indicated he would be summarizing the significant findings at each site in light of the third round of sampling. The intent is not to discuss detailed findings but to discuss those observations which are most significant to a decision as to whether or not further investigations are warranted at each site.

**NAS Site 1 -- Private Road Compound**

Samples of ground water obtained at the Privet Road Compound were found to contain trichloroethene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE) at levels above MCLs during one or more rounds of sampling. The VOC detected in the upgradient well sample were found at significantly lower levels than the levels in the downgradient samples. PCB, dieldrin, 1,1,1-trichlorethene (TCA), 1,1-dichloroethene, 1,2-dichloroethene, and lead are also of potential concern with regard to ground-water quality.

Soil samples from test borings at the Privet Road Compound contained the PCB Aroclor 1260 (2.7-7.5 mg/kg), dieldrin, and DDT which supports the interpretation that the site is a source for these components in ground water. Sediment samples taken from ditches bordering the site contain PCB and dieldrin which is consistent with ground water and subsurface soil data for the site. These sediment concentrations indicate the potential for migration of these hazardous constituents offsite. The PCB level in the upstream sample also suggests the possibility of an offsite source of this contaminant.

An RI/FS will be recommended.

**NAS Site 2 -- Antenna Field Landfill**

Dieldrin was detected in the stream adjacent to the site at levels several orders of magnitude above the chronic toxicity level for fresh water aquatic organisms and the suggested carcinogenicity protection level in ambient water.

Dieldrin was detected at levels ranging from 7.8 to 510 µg/kg in sediment samples from all sampling locations at the site. The highest surface water and sediment levels of dieldrin were consistently detected at station AL/SWS/3. This station was located along a ditch which bisects the landfill and discharges to the unnamed stream bordering the landfill. DDT and its breakdown products were also detected in sediment at two stations.

An RI/FS will be recommended.
NAS Site 3 -- 9th Street Landfill

Ground water in the water-table and semi-confined aquifers upgradient of the 9th Street Landfill was found to contain chlorinated hydrocarbons. It was concluded that the 9th Street Landfill is also a source of chlorinated hydrocarbons in ground water. Additional concerns at this site include pesticides in surface water and sediment, and pesticides and cyanide in surficial soil. An RI/FS will be recommended at the 9th Street Landfill.

NAS Site 4 -- North End Landfill

Dieldrin was detected at similar levels in surface water samples and the sample from well NELW-3, which is in the flood-prone area. Since dieldrin was not detected in either the upgradient or downgradient well outside the flood-prone area, it can be inferred that surface water infiltration near the well during a flood event is a source of dieldrin.

The surficial soil samples taken in the observed black tarry mass confirmed the presence of a degraded hydrocarbon source, but the concentrations of VOC and SVOC in the deeper sample indicate that little downward movement of contaminants has occurred. Healthy-looking grasses were observed to be growing directly out of the black tarry area.

The SI studies revealed no contaminants of concern which originate from the landfill. Therefore, an RI/FS is not warranted at the North End Landfill.

NAS Site 5 -- Fire Training Area

Successive sampling events were consistent in showing the presence of several chlorinated and non-chlorinated hydrocarbons in samples of ground water from well FTAW-1. Trace levels of chlorinated hydrocarbons were detected in the other well samples.

Soil sample results agreed closely with ground-water data with the exception that no traces of TCE were found in the soil. From these data it can be concluded that significant residue from fire training activities exists in and around FTAW-1 and to a lesser extent FTAW-2. The site will be recommended for an RI/FS study.

NAS Site 6 -- Abandoned Rifle Range No. 1

Based on the IAS findings and the EA site visit, no significant waste sources are located at this site. No further investigation of this site is warranted.
NAS Site 7 -- Abandoned Rifle Range No. 2

With the exception of methylene chloride -- a common laboratory contaminant -- no TCL organic compounds were detected in samples of ground water. Dissolved metals concentrations were below MCLs. There was no pattern to upgradient-downgradient comparisons. However, methylene chloride was detected during the SVCA at the site. Further investigations may be warranted. An ESI is recommended.

NAS Site 8 -- Building No. 118 Abandoned Fuel Tank

An SVCA was conducted to assess the potential for residual soil contamination. Nothing was detected. No further investigations are warranted.

NAS Site 9 -- Steam Plant Building No. 6 Tank Overfill

An SVCA was conducted to assess the potential for residual soil contamination. Nothing was detected. No further investigations are warranted.

ARF Site 4 Washrack Area

TCE has been detected at levels above potential ARARs in wells WRW-1 and WRW-2. Ground-water flow directions have been found to fluctuate at this site. It is not known whether this is seasonal and/or related to pumping of the ARF well. Well WR-1 (the well with the highest concentrations) is at times upgradient and at other times downgradient of the site. Traces of TCE and TCA have also been detected in the upgradient well WRW-3. Further evaluation to confirm the Washrack Area as a source of ground-water contamination appears warranted. An ESI is recommended. An evaluation of conditions upgradient of the site appears warranted. This evaluation may be applicable to the scope of the Privet Road Compound RI/FS.

ARF Site 5 -- Building No. 330 Waste Oil Storage Area

No significant contamination appears to exist at the site of the boring adjacent to Building 330. The analytical data indicate that hydrocarbon contamination is present at the boring located at the JP-4 spill site. The proximity of this boring to the drainage ditch which drains the Navy Fuel Farm area raises the question of whether this contamination resulted from the JP-4 spill which was cleaned up or from seepage out of the drainage ditch.

Further evaluation of the JP-4 spill site is warranted. Consideration should be given to including this work in the scope of the Navy Fuel Farm RI/FS.
ARF Site 6 -- Heating Plant

An SVCA was conducted to assess the potential for residual soil contamination. Nothing was detected. No further investigations are warranted.

ARF Site 7 -- Old Well House

Since preparation of the POA which planned for sampling of the well, the ARF has provided additional information to the Navy concerning the abandonment of the well. The pump was removed and the well capped in 1962. Materials storage by Base Civil Engineering was not initiated until about 1972. No further investigation of this site is warranted.

Jim Shafer requested that written comments on the SI report be provided by 22 June.

CAPT Shapard asked the TRC to comment on prioritizing the sites, e.g., if some should get more rapid attention than others.

The next meeting is schedule for 16 August 1990 at 10:00 hrs in Building No. 78.
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