

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
ATTENDEE ROSTER  
25 JULY 1990  
MARINE CORPS BASE  
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

1. SHELIA ASHTON	ATLANTIC DIV	(804)445-1814
2. STEPHANY DEL RE-JOHNSON	EMD, MCB, CLNC	(919)451-5093
3. CAPTAIN J. S. HINKLE	OSJA, MCB, CLNC	(919)451-5177
4. RAY HUMPHRIES	JACKSONVILLE	(919)353-4120
5. ROBERT G. GREGORY	ESE, INC.	(215)941-9700
6. MINDY SAYRES	ESE, INC.	(201)896-0363
7. JOHN F. MADER	JACKSONVILLE	(919)455-7542
8. TOM DICKEY	NC DEM (WILM)	(919)256-4161
9. DON HERMAN	EMGY MGT ONS CO	(919)347-4270
10. CAMERON LANIER	ONS CO HEALTH DPT	(919)347-2154
11. VICTOR L. WEEKS	EPA/RCRA/FED FAC	(404)347-3016
12. CARL R. FROEDE, JR.	EPA/RCRA/FED FAC	(404)347-3016
13. KEN WHITE	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	(919)451-5655
14. CAPTAIN SCOTT CAMPBELL	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	(919)451-5655
15. WAYNE R. MATHIS	USEPA REG IV, OPMFABFFC	(404)347-3776
16. JERRY A. BITTNER	CITY HALL, JAX	(919)455-2600
17. LAURIE BOUCHER	LANTDIV	(804)445-6783
18. JULIAN WOOTEN	EMD, MCB, CLNC	(919)451-5003
19. ANDREW R. KISSELL	ATLANTIC DIV	(804)445-2931
20. JOHN E. PETERS	LANTDIV, PAO	(804)444-9525
21. MARY WHEAT	MCAS, NEW RIVER	(919)451-6143
22. AL AUSTIN	FAC, MCB, CLNC	(919)451-3034
23. LESLIE HASTE, R.S.	ONS CO HEALTH DPT	(919)347-2154
24. DANNY SHARPE	EMD, MCB, CLNC	(919)451-5003
25. CHARLOTTE JESNECK	NC DIV OF SOLID WASTE MGT	(919)733-2801

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
JULY 25TH, 1990  
MCB, CAMP LEJEUNE  
AGENCY

- 9:00 - WELCOME Julian Wooten, Assistant Chief of Staff,  
9:15 Environmental Management Department,  
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
- 9:15 - INSTALLATION  
9:30 RESTORATION PROGRAM STATUS <sup>9:15-9:25</sup> Sheila Ashton, Project Manager,  
Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities  
Engineering Command
- 9:30 - SITE SUMMARY  
10:15 REPORT REVIEW <sup>9:30-9:45</sup> Stephany Del Re' Johnson, Installation  
Restoration Program Manager,  
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
- 10:15- BREAK <sup>9:45-10:00</sup>  
10:30
- 10:30 - WORK PLAN REVIEW <sup>10:10-10:15</sup> Stephany Del Re' Johnson, and  
11:45 Hunter/Environmental Science and  
Engineering, Inc.
- 11:45 - LUNCH (PARADISE  
1:00 POINT OFFICER'S  
CLUB
- 1:00 - SAMPLING PLAN <sup>10:45</sup> Hunter/Environmental Science and  
2:30 REVIEW Engineering, Inc.
- 2:30 - BREAK  
2:45
- 2:45 - HEALTH AND SAFETY <sup>10:45-</sup> Hunter/Environmental Science and  
3:30 Engineering, Inc.
- 3:30 - DISTRIBUTION OF  
4:00 COMMUNITY RELATIONS  
PLAN, COMMENTS AND  
WRAP-UP

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

held at

Building #1  
Marine Corps Base  
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542-5000

25 July 1990

PERSONS PRESENT: Wooten, Julian, AC/S, EnvMgtDept, MCB, CLNC  
Ashton, Sheila, Atlantic Div, NFEC  
Austin, Al, Facilities Dept, MCB, CLNC  
Bittner, Jerry, City Manager, Jacksonville  
Boucher, Raune, LantDiv  
Campbell, Scott (Capt), PAO, MCB, CLNC  
DelRe-Johnson, Stephany, Program Mgr  
Dickey, Tom, NC DEM (Wilmington)  
Froede, Carl R., EPA/RCRA & FedFacBr  
Gregory, Robert G., ESE, Inc.  
Haste, Leslie, Onslow Co. Health Dept  
Herman, Don, EmergMgt Onslow Co.  
Hinkle, J.S. (Capt), OSJA  
Humphries, Ray, Jacksonville  
Jesneck, Charlotte, NC DEM (Raleigh)  
Kissell, Andrew R., Atlantic Div, NFEC  
Lanier, Cameron, Onslow Co Health Dept  
Mader, John F. (Col USMC Retired) Jacksonville  
Mathis, Wayne R., USEPA Reg IV, OPM-FABFFC  
Peters, John E., LantDiv PAO  
Sayres, Mindy, ESE, Inc.  
Sharpe, Danny, EnvMgtDept, MCB, CLNC  
Weeks, Victor L., EPA/RCRA & FedFacBr  
Wheat, Mary, MCAS, New River  
White, Ken (Capt), PAO, MCB, CLNC

07/25/90

Wooten: I think most of the people are here, with the exception of the State Rep from Raleigh, but we'll go ahead and get started. I'm Julian Wooten, the Assistant Chief of Staff, Environmental Management here at the Base. I'd like to welcome all of you here this morning. We've got a full day planned I think, looking at the agenda. I certainly want to thank each of you for your willingness to come down and participate in our meeting and our discussions today.

I've got a couple of admin type things that I'd like to pass along, and then, of course, I'm going to turn the program over to our LantDiv Rep and she will give you more information. First, let me say that if you desire to make some comments, if you will speak into the microphone, give your name and organization, because we are recording this as required. It will be a part of the record--the permanent record here.

Before we go any further, I think probably if we could just go around the room and just let you introduce yourself and tell us what organization you're with.

(Introductions were made as requested. Those names are listed on the cover sheet of this transcript.)

Wooten: Again, I welcome you. A couple of admin comments. There are head facilities at each end of the hall--male and female--on the first floor. We will be taking some breaks here, as the agenda indicates. If any of you need to make a telephone call or establish a point to be reached here, we can do that on the second floor in my office, Room 260. I'd be happy if you want to write that down and get that up there to the secretary. I think all of them know--my people know that you're down here--the different individuals--most of you anyway.

We have a no-host lunch planned today at noontime if you desire to go with us out at the Officers' Club. There are some other eating places here on the Base--the Steak House down here, the Burger King, but we would certainly--we've got a table set up there that we can all sit and maybe have some exchange during the noontime meal. So we're going to have a bus come in here about 1145 in front of the building, that will transport all of those who want to go out, and then of course return and continue our work this afternoon.

I think we've probably got a full day here. Of course, the purpose of the meeting here is to get the Technical Review Committee together again. There was a meeting sometime last year that took some of the members--some of the members are new--out and showed you some of the sites that we're working with. But documents have been sent to you that outlined what we're planning to do. So today we want to discuss those documents, receive comments from you, maybe answer some questions you might have.

07/25/90

With us, as I indicated, we have our LantDiv Rep--the program manager at that level--Sheila Ashton, and at this point I'll turn the program over to her. And, of course, following her will be some comments from Stephany DelRe-Johnson who is our Base IR Manager and is, of course, my technical rep. And then we have the contractor rep that Sheila will introduce. So at this point I'll turn it over to Sheila and we'll get right into the business.

Ashton: Okay, what I want to do is take about 15 minutes to get everybody up to speed on the program in general, where we've been, and where we are today. We started the program here back in the early 80's under the old NACIP, the Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants. Under that program we developed what was called the Initial Assessment Study which is equivalent to the preliminary assessment under EPA's program. The IAS which was issued back in 1984 identified 76 sites here on the Base with the potential for contamination. Of those, 22 sites were recommended for further study, and those have moved on into what was known as the "confirmation study". Under the confirmation study, we performed two rounds of samplings at each of those 22 sites, which we'll be going into a little bit later when we get into the reports, but during that time, we identified some major contamination in the supply wells in the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. At that particular point in time, we made the decision to go ahead and move the Hadnot Point area onto a fast track and focus most of our efforts in that area, leaving the other 21 sites--I don't want to say "in the dust"--but behind in the scheduling.

In 1986, Congress passed SARA or the reauthorization bill of the original Super Fund Law. Under SARA, the Navy made a decision to move from the old NACIP program into what is now known as the Installation Restoration Program, and we have changed all of our terminology to match EPA's Super Fund phases. So when we run two rounds of sampling under the confirmation study, that throws us either into the late site inspection portion of EPA's program or into the early remedial investigation phase of EPA's program.

So what we're doing today is we're going to be reviewing the site summary report which details those two rounds of sampling, and also getting into the details of the remedial investigation that we're doing at Hadnot Point Industrial Area. Back in June of '88 we held the first TRC meeting where the initial remedial investigation feasibility study for Hadnot Point was presented, and we collected agency comments from that meeting. As a result of those comments, we have developed a work plan to finish up the remedial investigation at Hadnot Point. And at the same time, some funding came down to allow us to look at some other sites here on the base which we felt were a priority, and those are Sites 6, which is Lots 201 and 203; Site 48, which is the mercury site out at the Air Station; and Site 69, which is the Rifle Range Chemical Dump. And so that's why those three particular sites have been added into the work plans that we were sending to you.

07/25/90

In 1989, on a related topic, the Base started negotiations with EPA's Region Four and the state of North Carolina for a Federal Facility Agreement. These agreements are required under SARA, under Section 120 of CERCLA, and what we've done is developed a final draft agreement that is now--we're waiting for final signature on the letter of intent from the Navy but hope that within the next few weeks, we will be forwarding that package to EPA, and they will be responsible for putting the package out for public comment. I want to bring that up because the Federal Facility Agreement sets out the procedural mechanism that Navy and Marine Corps and EPA and the State will be following during the formal agency review of some of the documents we're developing under the program. This meeting we're here today for is to gather technical comments on the specific plans that have been sent to you. So we would like to keep those two separate today.

In 1989, the Navy set up some salary and support money under the Installation Restoration Program, and Camp Lejeune received some of that money, and that is how Stephany's position is funded on the Base. She works specifically for all of the DERA funded or Defense Environmental Restoration account funded projects. The IR program is one of those and we also do some underground storage tank under that project. So I want you to know that she is dedicated to this program here on the Base, and she is the major point of contact.

Our contractors on this particular project are Environmental Science and Engineering. Bob and Mendy are here with us today to answer any questions or comments that you may have on the report. We will be sitting down with them after today to go over those comments and to refine the work plans and put out the final plans before we actually start our field work.

The schedule that we have set up for this would get us to a final Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study by June of next year, and I want to stress that it's important we keep to this schedule so that we can get a record of decision this physical year and move on to start cleaning up the site. And the "site" I mean is Hadnot Point Industrial Area. It's a very tight schedule. It's aggressive. I think if we stick to it and at future meetings are able to bring our comments to the meetings, having reviewed the reports, we'll be able to meet that.

Does anybody have any questions on the program in general on how we at LantDiv work with the Navy or Marine Corps and how we're handling the program?

Weeks: I was just curious as to where the schedule is in the documentation.

Ashton: It's not in the documentation. That's a schedule we've worked out with our contractor.

07/25/90

DelRe-Johnson: Victor, we'll be glad to make a copy of the schedule and discuss it with you later if you're going to be around tomorrow morning.

Weeks: I'm sure that would be appropriate.

DelRe-Johnson: It's just been developed.

Weeks: Normally, that's part of the work plan.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, it is, Victor. Because this was a draft work plan, we did not work out the details of the schedule due to the fact that we knew there would be comments and having to prepare the report again. So we just tentatively put a schedule together and we will be glad to sit down with you. After the TRC meeting we'll have a better feel as to where we're going with this.

Ashton: Anything else?

(Negative response.)

Ashton: Great. What I'll do then is turn it over to Stephany DelRe-Johnson who will help us to go through each of the individual plans. Again, we want to keep this as informal as possible, but when you do speak, give your name and who you're with so that we can keep track of who the comments are coming from.

DelRe-Johnson: Well, you all know that I'm Stephany DelRe-Johnson, and yes, I use my maiden and married name together. That's not one full last name. The first report we're going to cover is the Site Summary Report which came in one of the big binders--if you all have brought that with you. We can go through it together if you'd like. I can just hit on a few of the major sites that we're going to be working on this year, and we can discuss those sites.

Maybe we should start with the Hadnot Point site, Page 3-55. Actually it's 3-53 and it's entitled "The Industrial Area Tank Farm". Even though the tank farm itself, as you notice from the work plan, is not a site included in that work plan, it is included as far as the overall study of ground water in the Hadnot Point area. The area tank farm that you see here in the Site Summary Report is part of the Underground Storage Tank Program. That is represented by another group in LantDiv and they are actually not part of the Federal Facility Agreement. However, this Site Summary Report does cover the first 22 sites that were considered to be "hot spot" sites, as Sheila has mentioned earlier. In this particular area tank farm, we have been working on a study, going through design, and will going out to bid for construction on a recovery system to recover fuel that has spilled out and is sitting on top of the water table. We hope to have award within a couple of months and initiate work within three months after the award of the contract.

07/25/90

Weeks: I'm Victor Weeks with EPA. Will we have an opportunity to see the proposed design and have an opportunity to comment?

DelRe-Johnson: The state covers our Underground Storage Tank Program, and the site was not included as part of the Federal Facility Agreement; however, we would be glad to share with you the hundred percent design that the state has commented twice on.

Weeks: Well, unfortunately it's true that initially your point--your source points are kind of defined on how you're going to move throughout the program, but once you characterize your contamination--when we have mixing of plumes in that area from different sources--some solvent base source that is not associated with the tank farm, and we feel that it's going to be part of the Hadnot Point Industrial Area overall remediation, and--you know--we should have a proposed plan dealing with that specific operable unit--is what we would term it--and have that go out for public comment and issue a ROD on that action. And EPA should have an opportunity to comment on the design and the proposed plan as well.

DelRe-Johnson: I understand your feelings and I do understand EPA's regulations under Super Fund for operable units. I understand the importance of the recovery of the fuel as well. What we have done with the State, since the Federal Facility Agreement has not been commented on by the public, nor have all three parties concurred on the Federal Facility Agreement, it's perceived with the Super Fund and Underground Storage Tank RECRA type work on the base, the State has taken the lead due to the fact this Federal Facility Agreement was not signed, and we felt that it was a top priority to recover as much fuel from the water table before we initiated full ground water cleanup. And I agree with you, ground water cleanup in Hadnot Point is all interconnected, and as you can tell from the work plan that you reviewed, we are certainly looking at three to four sites within the Hadnot Point area as contributors to that ground water contamination.

Weeks: Well, EPA is very concerned that we are allowed an opportunity to comment before any kind of design is implemented on the fuel recovery, because it's got to be consistent with the overall remediation of that area. We're dealing with a contaminated area now, not trying to deal with specific sources. Just because it's an underground tank at this point doesn't matter to us because we have a combined plume there with other source areas involved including solvent base.

DelRe-Johnson: Well, again we are not, Victor, going to be doing ground water recovery at this point in time. It's strictly recovery of the fuel. At that point in time, in the same conjunction with it, after we have completed the work that's estimated in the work plan, we would like to look at the plumes that are coming from ground water contamination. Again, this is strictly just recovering fuel on top of the water table. We are not at the point--



Weeks: Well, let me just say that we'll have specific comments--official comments--and we will expect a full response to those comments. So maybe this is not the appropriate area to discuss these issues here.

Mader: John Mader, Jacksonville. You folks then are treating this just like a fuel tanker spilled it in a ditch. Is that the theory that you have as far as the leaks from this tank are concerned--to recover the fuel that's laying on top of the water table? Is it a similar thing to fuel that's spilled in a ditch?

DelRe-Johnson: The--well a small quantity of fuel spilled in a ditch is very different from the situation we have at the Hadnot Point Fuel Farm.

Mader: Would you work the same way with the State on that though?

DelRe-Johnson: Yes--yes, sir, we do.

Mader: So theoretically then, this is treating it similar to a major spill outside on the surface of the ground, except this just happens to be under the surface?

DelRe-Johnson: It falls underneath the same regulation--the Underground Storage Tank regulation--I guess would be the appropriate way to respond to that, and yes, the State--the Wilmington Office does monitor our Underground Storage Tank Program, and yes, we have received information from the State concerning studies, schedule for design and construction, and we have been meeting with them on a regular basis and complying with their schedule for recovery of the fuel at Hadnot Point Fuel Farm. And again, this is work that's going on prior to the Federal Facility Agreement being negotiated and also prior to it actually being signed.

Weeks: Well, it's not the Federal Facility Agreement. EPA has the opportunity to comment by statute.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir. We will be glad to provide you any of the information on the fuel recovery system, and I believe we could even arrange a meeting with the State. Rick Shiver was not able to attend today. Tom Dickey sitting across from you at the table is our state representative from Wilmington. He's new, unfortunately. As in any Federal agency, there seems to be a lot of turnover. Tom has been out to visit the Hadnot Point Fuel Farm and looked at the recovery wells that we have placed already, and I'm sure we can arrange some type of meeting to get you the information that the State and Camp Lejeune have worked out.

Weeks: I guess the biggest difference right here though is administrative difference. It's not the technical issue. We're very pro-action oriented, but there should be a proposed plan developed for that action and a proper public comment period and a record of decision.

DelRe-Johnson: Under the underground storage tank regulations, Camp Lejeune supplies the state with information. Once that information is supplied, the state goes out with their own public notice of the work that's going to be conducted.

Weeks: If this was an isolated area separated from Hadnot Point, you know, we could agree with that, but as a strictly underground storage tank program, we feel like it's part of the CERCLA program as well and it should meet all the technical and administrative requirements.

DelRe-Johnson: For the Super Fund program.

Weeks: That's right.

DelRe-Johnson: Unfortunately we do not have a signed Federal Facility Agreement at the moment and we are operating underneath RECRA authority. Again, we would be glad to supply you, Victor. We certainly did not mean to slight EPA.

Weeks: I guess what I'm trying to say then is, if we're going to act as if the Federal Facility Agreement is in some vacuum somewhere and we're not going to try to at least follow along some of the requirements of that Federal Facility Agreement, then what we can do is at the time that it is signed, at that point we'll be coming back and we'll have to readdress these issues. I'm saying it would be better to address them now. The Navy is doing work at their own risk, in our opinion, without a proposed plan and a public comment period on that action that you're doing now.

DelRe-Johnson: Why don't we get together and discuss this a little bit later. I think the important point here that we would like to bring up as far as the site summary report is that we have studied the site, we are taking action to remove the fuel, we were able to obtain close to over half a million dollars from LantDiv this year to do studies, to do design, and they've guaranteed us another \$400,000 for construction of the recovery system. So we were very happy that this project had moved along, because overall, we do have to look at removal of fuel from the water table in order to really get good ground water cleanup in the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. Why don't we move on. We could talk about Site 69 and Site 48, and since most people don't have their books here, I guess I don't really have to give page numbers at this point.

Site 48 is a site out at the Air Station. Mary Wheat sitting over there is our Environmental Safety Manager for the Air Station. It is a site that through two different rounds of data, we found mercury in every sample. It does sit on the river. There is a potential for release of mercury into New River. Based upon that information, we have moved up the priority on that particular site and we're going to be going out and doing further site assessment work, including sediment and fish tissue analysis. Based upon that analysis, we would like to hope to get maybe emergency funds or other funding to move out into a full either an

emergency type of removal, which then would be considered an operable unit as Victor has suggested as an appropriate way to conduct business and get actions done, or either if we cannot do an operable unit, move into a full remedial investigation.

Our other hot site, Site 69--we call them our "hot sites" because of the data that we have in hand--is the Rifle Range chemical dump. For people that have been on this Base--retired colonels--I'm sure you're familiar with that area out there.

Mader: Somewhat.

DelRe-Johnson: It does sit up-gradient from the Sneads Ferry area. There is also the potential for release of contamination into the New River from the Rifle Range chemical dump. We have various chemicals in the chemical dump, and there have been fires there in the past years. It is abandoned, it's closed, it's been covered over. If you go out and look at the site now, what you'll find is a cleared area with a six-acre fence encircling it to make sure that we would have nobody that would wander out on the site that could possibly be harmed from the surface release. That we also considered as an operable unit which we would like to have underneath the Federal Facility Agreement when it is signed.

Our other site of particular concern--there are actually two sites combined into one site number--and that's Site 6, which is Lot 201 and Lot 203, which is described fully in the Site Summary Report. These sites can be seen driving along Holcomb Boulevard. They have signs out there posted on the road. What they were were disposal facilities for DRMO type activities. They had trash items, some waste, old paint cans--various items over the years that have been stored there. Unfortunately, as on all bases and probably every establishment across the United States, back in the 1940's and 50's, hazardous waste disposal practices were not what they are today. We do know that we have TCE, PCB's and other organics on both of those sites. We have deep water supply wells located behind these sites that are also contaminated. In the work plan, as we will be discussing, we are planning to resample all of those wells and do further work to characterize that particular site.

There are other sites in this book as you know, and I guess what I'll do is just open it up for any kind of comment that you might have or any questions on what I've said. Victor?

Weeks: We'll bide our time and give you official written comment and expect a response to those specific comments.

Mader: John Mader, Jacksonville, again. I couldn't determine in this report whether or not Wallace Creek was involved in the investigation. And the reason I ask that question, if we're concerned about whatever was leaking out at 201 and 203, did it get into Wallace Creek, and if so, I see a lot of guys fishing down there. Is that going to be of concern to those people?

DelRe-Johnson: The particular fishing area that you're referring to up by Wallace Creek fortunately is up-gradient from Lots 201 and 203; however, there is a potential that Lot 203 in particular could have a release into Wallace Creek.

Mathis: Is there any documentation, Stephany, of such a release?

DelRe-Johnson: No. That's why this particular work plan that we've developed--

Mathis: But it is a potential release--very real potential?

DelRe-Johnson: There is a very real potential--that's right. And again, that is one of the reasons why we've identified Site 6, Lots 201 and 203, as two of our--some of our top priority sites. However, the particular fishing area that Colonel Mader is speaking of, we have two big fishing areas that the Environmental Management Department actually dredged and opened up, and we do have quite a few people going back there and fishing, and that is up-gradient from those sites.

Mader: I was referring to that area by the Holcomb Boulevard bridge.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir. I'm familiar with those fishing areas back off in the woods. They're very nice, but they are up-gradient. As a matter of fact, we drove the LantDiv contacts out in that area to show them the locations of those fishing spots in relation to Sites 201 and 206. Any other questions?

Humphries: Yes, Ray Humphries, Jacksonville. Am I to understand that Site 48--I believe that's the Air Station.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir.

Humphries: All of the soil samples contained mercury?

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir.

Humphries: All of them?

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir. We are very concerned with that site for what it might be putting into the New River and the effect that it might have on fish, and we realize that there are a lot of people within the community that fish in that area.

I believe our other Raleigh state representative has just come in. Charlotte, would you like to introduce yourself.

Jesneck: I'm Charlotte Jesneck. I'm with the North Carolina Division of Solid Waste Management.

DelRe-Johnson: We are now discussing the Site Summary Report and taking any questions and answers--any questions, excuse me. Wayne, you look like you might have a question.

Mathis: Wayne Mathis, EPA, Region IV. Listening to Colonel Mader's comments and listening to your comments also on potential for release to New River, it causes me a lot of concern about the use of these areas for fishing--and I haven't had a chance to go over the report in any detail because our regular Facilities Branch has focused on that--but I certainly think that fish are not perhaps as concerned with the up-gradient/down gradient specific locations of these potential release areas, and biological samples probably ought to be included in whatever you do there.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, that is included in the work plan. We have not done any fish analysis in the past, and if you look closely at the work plan, we've planned a fish analysis on these sites. I think it's very much needed to determine what we are doing in the EACO system.

If we don't have any other questions on the Site Summary Report, we can either offer taking a quick break or we can move into the Work Plan, but I think maybe if we had a five minute break, because people have walked in a little bit late--use the bathroom facilities, get a little bit of coffee, and then we'll be back in about ten or fifteen minutes.

Wooten: If I could--I mentioned the little refreshments over here. I'd like to thank the staff that's done that. You are welcome to it, so if you will, make those doughnuts disappear.

(Break.)

Wooten: Okay, it's been suggested that maybe after the meeting today, that some of my staff and maybe LantDiv people with the EPA, get together and talk an issue that's obviously surfaced and there's some disagreement about. So, if we can, we'll go ahead and hold it to the original intent here and, Vic, maybe you and Mr. Mathis, we'll get together this afternoon and continue to talk. Okay? All right, with that, Stephany, are you ready?

DelRe-Johnson: I'll go ahead and move into the work plan that was prepared by ESE. I thought maybe I would open it back up for questions again quickly on the Site Summary Report since we've had a break. If there are no questions since the break, then I will move into the work plan. Anybody?

(Negative response.)

DelRe-Johnson: The work plan was developed recently by ESE based upon sampling results that were done in the past--since 1973--all the data that was collected, collated to form the Site Summary Report. Based upon the Site Summary Report, again we picked sites that we felt were "hot point" sites and developed a work plan. This right now constitutes a final draft work plan which will be released for public review--excuse me--TRC review, as it is here. And again what we're focusing on is the Hadnot Point Industrial

Area as well as Site 6, Site 49 and Site 69. I don't know how many people here have had a chance to review the work plan. Maybe a show of hands who've had--to take a quick look at it?

(Show of hands.)

DelRe-Johnson: Okay. Instead of going maybe into some of the details, I can give you just a general overview of the work plan, and I can let Mendy Sayres, who was the author of this work plan, describe any further actions that will be taken through the work plan.

The Hadnot Point Industrial Area, again, we are going to be looking at surface soils, the deep aquifer, and combining our information from the upper aquifer to perform a risk assessment and feasibility study. Based upon that risk assessment feasibility study and updated remedial investigation report, we would like to be able to move into a record of decision and develop a cleanup alternative for the aquifer. The immediate goal of the scope of work in this work plan for Hadnot Point Industrial Area is ground water cleanup. Would you like to open up for any comments on the Hadnot Point Industrial Area as far as the work plan and our approach in what we're doing as far as the deep aquifer or surface soils.

Weeks: EPA is just going to respond and give a written response and allow you all to respond officially to those comments.

DelRe-Johnson: Okay.

Mader: John Mader, Jacksonville. The work plan, as I read it, described what you did before and then describes what you're going to do later in order--because they all indicate that it needs more investigation, and this work plan is the more investigation plan.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir. For the Hadnot Point Industrial Area, it is the RIFS portion, Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study portion. A site assessment was performed on individual sites in the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. We're combining all those results. All those results have been combined and were presented in the Site Summary Report that we discussed a little bit earlier. Based upon that, the work plan was developed. It does cover some of the history prior and looks at what we have to do in the future to get to a record of decision. A record of decision is what is distributed to the public for review, and it will describe cleanup alternatives. In this particular case, it will describe cleanup alternatives for ground water.

Mader: When you take the record of decision and distribute it to the public, who is the public?

DelRe-Johnson: The public--we have our community relations people sitting here for the base--but the public is anybody in the Jacksonville/surrounding area. It will be advertised through the newspaper and the radio stations. We do have handouts in the Globe whenever there's an event that occurs. They could probably describe our community relations program more fully. Also, it is given through EPA, and EPA underneath the Federal Facility Agreement--which has not taken place yet but will--they will actually be taking comments for Camp Lejeune and LantDiv. And I guess--correct me if I'm not right--I believe EPA will do the advertisement of the public meeting?

Mathis: Probably unless the FFA designates another spokesman. Usually it's the designated spokesman in the FFA. There would also be copies in libraries and other repositories.

DelRe-Johnson: Right. Either way, all three parties I guess will be involved in making sure that all the proper parties are notified of a public meeting and the review of it.

Weeks: We will public notice the release of the document and you all will public notice the meeting of the FFA.

DelRe-Johnson: Obviously we have a lot to work out with the FFA, but either way, all three parties will be involved in it. I do know that Region IV will be the one accepting the comments, so--from the public meeting.

Site 6--again Lots 201 and 302--as you see again, they have a history here. It talks about the fact that we have PCB's out at those sites. It also includes in the work plan a map, a figure, which shows where some of the deep water supply wells are that have been contaminated and hence closed. We will be resampling those wells. We're going to be doing some more soil sampling out in that area. I guess I'm kind of fumbling for what I can really derive out of this work plan, if not a lot of people have had the opportunity to look at it. Maybe, Mendy, you can chirp in with some additional details made on Site 6 because our looking at the deep aquifer.

Sayres: At Site 6?

DelRe-Johnson: With looking at the deep supply wells, resampling those at Site 6, which will help us on the deep aquifer study.

Sayres: Right. At Site 6 we're just essentially going to sample the wells that are already in place there, and then we're going to look at Wallace Creek and take some surface water and sediment samples. There's already some data collected on that and we're just going to take some additional data, because it's been some time since we've--

Gregory: The previous data is dated 1986, so it would be appropriate just to resample the same locations to see what the current status is.

DelRe-Johnson: I think due to some of the comments that we've received here, that we will probably look at maybe doing some fish tissue analysis in Wallace Creek as well.

Sayres: At the moment that's not planned, but this work plan for those two sites was not intended to be a complete RIF test effort, that we view this coming later.

Gregory: The comment was made earlier that at Site 6, 48 and 69, we're really in a status where we're either in the late site investigation phase of EPA language or we're in the very early RI stage. We have been tasked with just taking an additional set of data because of what I said earlier--the last set is from 1986. That's four years. We need to see what's there. Has it changed anything? But it is not the intent that this work at those three sites outside of Hadnot Point stand alone and we're going to make decisions based on that. That is not at all the intention. It's just to get up to date. And that is all that we as the contractor here are tasked with doing right now at those sites. Now, again let me make it clear that it does not mean that in the future something else won't be done there. It's obvious that it will be, but I'm currently tasked with that.

Mader: John Mader again. If I understood correctly, it was indicated that June next year is when we hope to get going on the work of this thing--in other words, the actual cleanup?

DelRe-Johnson: June of next year, we should have the work within the work plan completed if we hold to the schedule. And what Bob Gregory is stating there is very true. The Hadnot Point Area is where we'll be conducting the full RIFS. Sites 6, 48, and 69 are site assessments. Based upon those site assessments, we will probably go into a full remedial investigation on those particular three sites, or we will probably divide them up into some type of operable unit, if we can get some type of emergency removal at those sites. That still has to be determined based on the sampling we're going to be doing on those three sites underneath this work plan.

Mader: But what the idea is, the deadline in June then is a paperwork deadline, not a cleanup begin deadline?

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir.

Mader: Okay.

DelRe-Johnson: Sites 48 and Site 69 are similar in the type of work that we're going to be conducting. We're going to be doing sediment analysis, fish tissue analysis, and resampling wells out in that area. Again, this is similar to Site 6 in the fact that we are doing site assessments that will lead into future remedial investigations or operable unit removals. As you can probably see from Site 69, if you're looking inside your work plan, we have various chemicals located there. We are going to do a full scan on looking for different contaminants at Site 69. At present, the



base feels that Site 69 is probably one of our most important sites due to the amount that was deposited there and the various types of chemicals that are present and have been detected in past sampling efforts.

The work plan also goes into different requirements by different environmental laws, chemical specific--ARAR's, they are called--ARAR's in general, and they have various different indicators. We have to abide by wetlands, clean air, RECRA, clean water. Clean air, as you know, is being amended. And in the back we have a full detail of what the different tasks within the work plan will include.

Humphries: I've got a question.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir.

Humphries: Ray Humphries, Jacksonville. On your ARAR's there, page 25, you've got something mentioned about state standards. What are the state standards? It says, "In addition, any promulgated state standards requirement," on page 25.

DelRe-Johnson: Well, the state has particular standards sometimes for releases, especially into wetland areas for erosion control on projects. They could come up with stricter standards than what CERCLA provides underneath the Federal Facility Agreement as far as the amount of release.

Ashton: If I may interrupt. My name is Sheila Ashton. Part of the feasibility study in developing the remedial investigation for the site is the determination of ARAR's, and it's a process that we're going to be going through not only with the Federal EPA Agency but also with the state agency and some of the local offices, to make sure that when we do clean up, we're meeting the most stringent standard. So that's all part of the process--determining what those levels are.

Humphries: One other question--are you in contact with CAMA?

Ashton: I'm not familiar with CAMA.

Humphries: Coastal Area Management Act.

Ashton: Yes.

DelRe-Johnson: I should probably state also that we have been working at this point in time closely with the state on our sites, and they've been involved on some of our sites as far as erosion control and wetlands, and we have a full environmental department here actually that looks at a lot of the different environmental requirements proposed by the state and EPA, in addition to the Installation Restoration Program Julian heads up.

We can go into specifics of how many samples we're going to take at each site, or I can open it up for questions and discussion again. Why don't we open it up for questions and discussions. Anybody have any questions on maybe the Super Fund process of the remedial investigation feasibility study. I know I kind of glossed over that?

Mader: John Mader again. This thing is funded actually by Norfolk--

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, sir.

Mader: And then when you get all of these studies finished, is it the EPA's Super Funds that pays to do the cleanup?

Ashton: No, sir. The way we're funded--Congress sets up a special account, the Defense Environmental Restoration Account similar to EPA Super Fund, where DOD taps into DERA to pay for all of the studies and cleanup. As a Federal Facility, we're not entitled to any of the Super Funds that have been set up for private sites. So we'll be paying for everything, the cleanup and two years of the monitoring will come out of DERA, and then after the cleanup is in place and we've determined that our action is over, the base will pick up any future monitoring of the site after the first two years.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, Wayne.

Mathis: Wayne Mathis, EPA, Region IV. I might also comment by way of clarification. EPA's role is one of oversight of the process and approval of selected remedial alternatives at the listed and PL site. That stems from the statute. The vehicles which they use to do this are principally here, the Federal Facilities Agreement which is negotiated between the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and EPA Region who is overseeing this, and that will specify specific deliverables or milestones in the process of studying and designing and selecting among the remedial alternatives, and there will be review and comments and interchange both ways under that document. That also sets forth requirements for community relations programs and various other oversight functions that EPA has to ensure that the Corps is doing. But basically, the Department of the Navy has both the authority and the responsibility to accomplish this cleanup, subject to EPA's concurrence under the statutes. Vic, do you want to add anything about how the oversight process works?

Weeks: That was perfect.

DelRe-Johnson: Any other questions on the work plan or on the overall process of what Camp Lejeune and the Navy are entering into with EPA and the state?

(Negative response.)

07/25/90

DelRe-Johnson: In addition to the work that's being presented here, I think I should let you know that we are beginning to address other sites that were listed in the initial assessment. We've gone out and done other site visits in addition to the 22 to start initiating site inspections. We do know that the 22 sites that are listed in your site summary report are not the only sites that we have to deal with. There are further sites that we have to do further study to determine the potential for contamination into the environment. Wayne?

Mathis: That's correct and, Stephany, you mentioned earlier that there are various RECRA authorities which the state is implementing and EPA, Region IV, is implementing as far as the corrective actions programs, and these must all be considered as applicable, relevant and appropriate regulations under the CERCLA overview of what's being done. That is, the remedy that is selected for each of these sites must meet the requirements not only of CERCLA, as spelled out in the National Contingency Plan, but must satisfy any other applicable, relevant and appropriate requirements, be they the local community's requirements, the county standards, the state standards, or the Federal RECRA requirements for corrective action. So all this has to be put together in one package. It is a complex process, and this issue of what are the cleanup standards to be met and what sites contribute to the problems that are included. It really is a very detailed process.

DelRe-Johnson: It's also fair to say that EPA is involved with Camp Lejeune on the ABC Cleaners' site as well where we have contamination onto the base from a private source. That work will be going on this year as well, and there will be a public meeting scheduled for that particular problem within the next 30 days. So there is going to be an awful lot going on this year, as far as looking at overall ground water contamination on the base from outside sectors as well as what the Marine Corps themselves have contributed to the problem. Yes, Mr. Bittner?

Bittner: I know you mentioned before that you're going to be meeting with the EPA officials after this to discuss your differences, but from a non-technical standpoint, what is the basis of the contention for the difference right now in terms of what they would like to see being done and in terms of what you're proposing?

DelRe-Johnson: As far as our plans for Site 6, Site 48 and Site 69, I don't think there is any difference, and I think we are trying to proceed to find out what the potential of release is to the New River. I think we're probably all in agreement that that needs to be done and try and find maybe an operable unit or move into a full RI on the sites. I think we have some discussion on the Hadnot Point Area, and it is a confusing area because we have a fuel problem as well as a ground water problem created by solvents, organics, pesticides, from other sources. And so it becomes a little bit complicated in how you separate the technical portion from the administrative portion of who governs what, and I think that can be something that can be resolved fairly easily. So really there's not a great deal of difference.

Anybody else with any questions on the work plan or what EPA is going to be doing?

Humphries: I have a couple of questions. Ray Humphries, Jacksonville. This ABC Cleaners, I think they're in litigation now for contaminants in the soil. Who is the monitoring source in that--EPA?

DelRe-Johnson: EPA has the funds from Super Fund to do the remedial investigation feasibility study, and ABC Cleaners did rank on the National Priorities List. They have developed a draft work plan and they're revising that draft work plan to go out for public comment. We have found that ABC Cleaners has contaminated ground water off the base and on the base. We have shut wells down on the base due to ABC Cleaners' problem. Basically we're talking about a TCE problem in the ground water, and three particular deep water wells were shut down at the Tarawa Terrace area.

Humphries: Who pays for the cleanup there?

DelRe-Johnson: The state and EPA will look into enforcement actions with the parties involved with ABC Cleaners. They will try and recoup any type of funds from the private party to pay for the remedial design construction as well as--and correct me, since I left EPA a year ago, it may have changed--but they will go after the RIFS cost as well.

Bittner: After the what, please?

DelRe-Johnson: Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study cost. EPA will try and recoup basically everything that they have spent on the site. And in this particular case, they may be able to obtain that from the owners of ABC Cleaners. The state has been involved also on ABC Cleaners from an enforcement standpoint of view and has done a very good job providing information to EPA. Now, that comes from a different office out of EPA. That's a Super Fund office that does the ABC Cleaners site. The people represented here from EPA Region IV Office are the Enforcement Federal Facility side of the house. Anybody else?

Kissell: I have a comment. Andrew Kissell from the Atlantic Division. I notice that the EPA is going to submit written comments later. If anyone else comes up with a question or comments subsequent to this meeting, when would you like to have those comments submitted--by when?

DelRe-Johnson: That's a good point. Based on the schedule that I worked out this morning, the--

Ashton: If we could have written comments to our office by the 3rd of August, that will give you ten days plus to pull them together. We've already provided 30 days or three weeks review time.

Humphries: Tell us your address.

Ashton: It's "Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Code 1822, Norfolk, Virginia 23511-6287."

Mader: 6 August?

Ashton: 3 August.

DelRe-Johnson: You're also welcome to provide any comments you might have to me, and I can forward those to LantDiv as well.

Weeks: Do you plan on reissuing another draft and response to the specific comments?

Ashton: It depends on the level of comments that we get. Today I'm not seeing a lot of real specific "let's change the way we're approaching the sites," but perhaps when the comments come in, they will be very detailed and we will have to put out another work plan for review.

Weeks: I would anticipate that occurring because we have specific detailed comments that will need to be addressed before we can approve the work plan.

Ashton: Okay, we can discuss that later.

DelRe-Johnson: We will anticipate getting those comments. So Sheila has given an August 3rd date for those comments to be received by LantDiv. LantDiv does run the Installation Restoration Program for the Marine Corps Base. Again I'm just here to facilitate their needs on the base and to do on site coordinating, but I will be glad to take any comments from anybody during the period of time before August 3rd and provide them to LantDiv.

Are there--I guess there are no other questions at this point in time on the work plan. We could move into the Sampling and Analysis Plan and the Health and Safety Plan and then go to lunch, and have comments and then be able to break early for today. Why don't we go ahead and do that, and I'll turn it over to Mindy Sayres from Hunter ESE, the Sampling and Analysis Plan.

Sayres: The Field Sampling Plan is the document that essentially describes in detail the field procedures that we will use during the site investigation. The work plan gives what we're going to do and the reasons why. The field plan gives the actual procedures--how we're going to drill a well and install it, how we're going to take a soil sample, how we'll take a water sample and fish sample. I really don't see a need for me to go into the details of how we're going to sample. My anticipation was that everybody would read this and have specific comments on "why we don't like this sampling procedure".

Gregory: If that's the case, we can certainly address those comments right now. We have no problem with that.

Sayres: For me to go word by word on how I'm going to drill a well--you know.

DelRe-Johnson: I have a question on the Sampling Analysis Plan.

Sayres: You have a question? You're not allowed.

DelRe-Johnson: I know, I'm not allowed. After reviewing the Sampling Analysis Plan, I'm a little concerned about the fact that we make sure that we do enough air sampling while we're doing some of our field work, and we're kind of vague on it and we don't really talk about it too much. In particular, in the Hadnot Point fuel area, if we're going to be doing any work within that area, it might be appropriate to have an OBA or something along that matter as part of the health and safety and the sampling plan.

Sayres: Well, I think the health and safety addresses that. We pretty much don't do any field work without having some kind of screening, either an A2, an OVM or an OVA.

DelRe-Johnson: I guess I was looking for some kind of statement in the sampling plan on the air monitoring as part of the health and safety.

Sayres: We can do that, certainly.

Bittner: Who inspects the drillers--observes them?

Sayres: That is provided by ESE--me.

Bittner: I don't know what the state of the art is, but I went through some monitoring in drilling some wells, and we found that some of these drillers were actually inducing contamination with the drills. Some housekeeping is important in getting the proper type of drillers.

Sayres: Well, we intend to contract environmental drillers.

Mathis: This area of field sampling operations is something that EPA Region IV is interested in, particularly an overview and actions carried out at PL sites, which Camp Lejeune is one at this point. I'd like to say that the region is taking a very strong position that field sampling should be consistent with EPA Region IV's Field Investigation SOP published by our Environmental Services Division. We've recently gone through considerable discussions with the Army about National Priorities List sites requiring the need to comply with the requirements of EPA's Field Sampling SOP. This was resolved by the Office of the Secretary of the Army who determined that it would, in fact, be followed, and that any deviation would be documented, and that exceptions would only be for documented cause. I strongly encourage NAVFAC to take a look at that document because EPA's comments are going to be--when they're transmitted formally in writing either in response to your request or as a part of the FFA process, they're going to very strongly request or even require that you follow Region IV's Field Sampling SOP. There's a lot of technical details about well

07/25/90

installation, well placement, about on site monitoring, cleaning of equipment, inspection of drilling equipment, and what not, that have been stumbling blocks elsewhere. EPA is inflexible on that position.

Weeks: And I've provided Ms. Johnson with a copy of that document.

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, Victor provided me a copy today. We'll certainly take a look at it. I think everybody in this business understands the importance of a sampling plan chain of custody.

Mathis: We're pushing for national consistency on field sampling. Right now we don't see it. We don't see it with Department of Defense, and we're going to drive in that way, and I think we're going to succeed in that.

DelRe-Johnson: We'll be very glad to look at this document, and I'll make sure that LantDiv is provided a copy of the document.

Ashton: I was going to request a copy. Our contractor doesn't have one, but if we can have one of Stephany's run off.

Sayres: Am I to assume that Region IV is different than Region II or other EPA Regions?

Weeks: Well, most other regions use our SOP's, so they may be real similar.

Mathis: Ours has evolved over the years. It's become a national standard. We've got a lot of precedent in our enforcement program that has driven us to produce this. It has been accepted and upheld in various enforcement cases. I do not foresee that we're ever going to get into that forum, but we make a very strong case. This is a very good SOP. Our procedurs are that we will allow exceptions, but they must be documented, and they're at the risk of your own agency. If later on you have a problem, you go back and repeat the data to these standards.

Sayres: But the approval of a field sampling plan by your agency will mean that you have approved any deviations.

Mathis: Yes, but what I'm telling you is that the comments are going to be based on a point by point comparison with our own field sampling SOP, and we'll point out deviations and expect them to be addressed, either by acquiescence with our plan or by citing of a justification why you are deviating and acceptance of responsibility for any unsuitable data.

Sayres: Well, that was my understanding of what should happen at this meeting.

DelRe-Johnson: We don't have any problem with that. As a matter of fact, we welcome having your guidance document because we certainly did not have that before.

Mathis: I believe you've already been provided a copy, Stephany?

DelRe-Johnson: Yes, this morning. I have been operating under the EPA Headquarters.

Mathis: I think LantDiv has a copy somewhere. They must have gotten a copy. If not, you should have and we should get you one.

DelRe-Johnson: Wayne, don't worry, we'll xerox a copy.

Weeks: We'll send another copy with our formal comments. In other words, the work plan or field sampling plan should reference our document versus the Navy QAQC.

Sayres: Okay, but have you made a comparison between our field sampling plan and your SOP as of yet?

Weeks: Well, we feel like the burden--since you all haven't even referenced the document--the burden will be on you to ensure that it satisfies our SOP requirements and have the redraft reference our document.

Sayres: Okay.

Mathis: It would really be faster in terms of producing a final acceptable field sampling if you all incorporated ours, rather than send us one that is deficient, have us comment on it back to you, and rather than kicking papers back and forth, we'll tell you up front what we need.

DelRe-Johnson: I don't think there will be an awful lot of differences because to be honest with you, going through this sampling plan--what I've always operated under again was EPA Headquarters' sampling plan guidance which, you know, I was closely involved with, so I don't think there will be a lot of differences, and I think we can probably go through and do a comparison for you and be able to make any-necessary changes.

Mathis: That would be the most efficient in terms of moving this thing along a time line. If you sent it to Art Linton, I turn around and give it to the program, the program shoots the sampling plan over to Athens to comment on, they sit down and compare it point by point, and then it comes back up. Stephany, it's faster. You all have got the document and you know what we're asking for.

DelRe-Johnson: The only difference I think that you'll see maybe in this document from EPA Region IV's guidance--maybe I might be wrong since I've just receive Region IV's specific guidance--is we don't cite a lot of the detail that's included in EPA's guidance document--Headquarters guidance document; however--

Mathis: I believe you can incorporate by reference.

DelRe-Johnson: It's referenced, right, and as long as we can incorporate by reference, I think that would be fair.



Mathis: The real test is what is the driller in the field going to be doing? What are the sample collectors in the field going to be doing? If they're following what our document says, we don't care how they're instructed to do it, we're going to measure the performance either through oversight, contractor oversight, or something else. That's the standard we're looking for. Data which is not collected to that standard is subject to rejection or refusal or question.

DelRe-Johnson: I think we can handle that and I think EPA will be happy with the sampling plan. Are there any other questions on the sampling plan?

Humphries: Ray Humphries, Jacksonville. On your Test 10, there's a mention of feasibility study upon completion of Tests 1 through 9. When?

DelRe-Johnson: You're back in the work plan, Ray. The feasibility study will be conducted during this effort and be completed by June.

Humphries: June of--

DelRe-Johnson: This coming year--next June, June of '91. That feasibility study hopefully will also identify operable units or other cleanup alternatives on different areas that we might be able to take quick order or maybe long term. That was one of the points that EPA has been picking up on, is the fact that we need to focus in the future on developing some quick operable units for cleanup, and hopefully that feasibility study will determine some different operable units that we can take and make some quick corrective action. Any other questions on the sampling plan or site summary report or the work plan?

(Negative response.)

DelRe-Johnson: Okay, why don't we move into the last and final--well, actually that's not true. We still have the Community Relations Plan to talk about. The Health and Safety Plan.

Gregory: I think the general perspective--this is Bob Gregory from ESE--general perspective on the Health and Safety Plan, we feel that the procedures in here are one hundred percent in line with OSHA requirements as far as training of field people. All of our staff are current with their certifications, training, medical monitoring. It will be their responsibility to keep other people away from the work sites, because those folks are not aware of the issues involved from health and safety perspectives. So there will be site monitors essentially. There will be decontamination areas. At the end of a period of work, personal protective clothing will be removed and things washed off. Again we feel our procedures are "up to snuff" with EPA protocol, OSHA protocol. Stephany mentioned air monitoring. During the field efforts, that is an assumption on our part. We do it all the time because our field people are the ones that are exposed to this because they work full time in this. So if there is a risk of exposure, our people have the highest risks because it's

potentially cumulative over their entire work careers. So we will have real time air monitors. Certain levels of protection are expected at the site because we've worked here for years, and we know what the air quality concerns will be; however, if there's any change, based on an unknown, unforeseen condition, we have the proper upgrades regarding respiratory protection, and we have all the emergency routes in case of some accidents, some exposure, using base facilities as much as possible and the Navy Hospital that's here. You've got a copy of the plan in front of you. As with the other plans, we are soliciting comments. If there are specific local or regional requirements that we have not included, please let us know and they will be included. Prior to working, we will inform everybody locally and on base about what we're doing and where we're doing it, so that the appropriate hazard emergency type situations are well coordinated. We don't just show up some place and go ahead--"We've had an emergency, help us." So everybody locally would be aware of when we're doing things and what we're doing, and we of course hope that no such incidents occur. So again, we're here today to--if you have specific questions, we don't have our industrial hygiene folks with us, but we're certainly knowledgeable in the topics. We'll either attempt to answer them today, or we will just note them and make appropriate changes in the plan at a future date.

Jesneck: I have a quick comment--Charlotte Jesneck with the State of North Carolina--the state will be submitting a few comments on the safety plan, but just as a quick comment, I noted that the telephone number for the Duke Poison Control Center is not correct. You may want to check on that.

DelRe-Johnson: Charlotte, would you happen to have that number?

Jesneck: I don't have it with me, but looking at the area code, it's not a North Carolina area code.

DelRe-Johnson: Okay.

Herman: Don Herman, Onslow County Emergency Management Coordinator. I have a question. On page 39 of the plan, it involves the environmental incident release or spread of contamination. It lists phone numbers for notification and it doesn't list the local county emergency management office, which is 347-4270, administrative number. Of course, it's 455-9119 for emergency.

Gregory: Would you repeat that please, both numbers?

Herman: 347-4270.

Gregory: And that is admin?

Herman: That is Onslow County Emergency Management Office, which is also the office for the local emergency planning committee which is required under SARA, Title III. And the emergency number is 455-9119 which is the Sheriff's Department that answers that number, and they would be able to notify us, and they're also the one who would dispatch the rescue.

07/25/98

Gregory: We certainly will include that.

Herman: Again, the problem with notification--that was a question--notifying the National Response Center would take several hours before it ever came back through the chain. They notify EPA, Atlanta; Atlanta calls the Emergency Management Office in Raleigh; they call Emergency Management in Wallace, who in turn calls me and says, "Do you know about this?" And my answer is, most of the time, "No." Again I think there needs to be more detailed work as far as, if you have an injury, then one place in the plan it says that there is no de-contamination requirement--you know--at the site from the normal work routine. I think it has to be addressed more so as far as, "Where is that patient going to go to? Has a liaison been made with the Naval Hospital to take people, say, that don't rate Naval Hospital facilities, but at least on this project, be able to take them there--the civilian work force?" There is a problem from contamination possibilities of ambulances, so anybody that sends an ambulance to the site should be made aware of the potential, because that ambulance would have to be set up to be able to--you know--the plastic and things of that sort. This isn't something that has been done. It's been discussed locally if we ever have incidents like that, but there is really no procedure in place in the county to go and pick up a contaminated person. And then the next step, of course, is the emergency room. Is the emergency room set to handle that? We don't want to be caught in a position of having contamination in the emergency room and the next thing you know, the emergency room has to be closed down because they weren't aware that they were going to get a patient who was contaminated. These are details, again, that weren't addressed. I think we can get more detail to you afterwards.

Gregory: Okay.

DelRe-Johnson: Appreciate that, Don. Any more questions on the Health and Safety Plan or maybe any general questions EPA might have? Mary, Air Station?

Wheat: No.

DelRe-Johnson: No? Why don't we move into the Community Relations Plan as our final point of discussion. This is a report that you have not received, so we do not expect any comments. It was prepared after the other reports, and what it looks like is how we're going to try to handle dealing with the general public and all the various parties involved in keeping them informed of what Camp Lejeune and Navy are going to be doing for the Installation Restoration Program. As you probably know--some of the people in the room--we have already proceeded with community relations activities. Captain Ken White, who is sitting there, and Captain Scott Campbell have been very instrumental in helping me. Actually they have really conducted the Community Relations Program.

(DelRe-Johnson passed copies of the plan to everyone present.)

Mader: Are you all going to give us a truck to help haul this stuff out of here?

9.04 - 07/25/90

DelRe-Johnson: If you would please review that and get your comments back to Sheila.

Ashton: By 31 August for these.

DelRe-Johnson: I want to let you know that we have been working on involving the community in the Installation Restoration Program. We've gone out and conducted several interviews with different citizens, private interest groups, local officials. We have published things in the Globe paper which is published on base, informing people of the potential of ground water contamination. We've notified them of our "hot sites", i.e. Sites 6, 48 and 69. There have been a lot of questions and a lot of answering to the public about what we're going to be doing on those sites and what we might potentially be contaminating the New River with. We've also talked to them somewhat about ABC Cleaners, and we have let them know that EPA will be coming back out to talk with them as well and receive comments on ground water contamination at Tarawa Terrace. We continue to publish different articles in the paper updating the community on the base and off the base as to any type of action that we've taken as far as the Installation Restoration Program. We are also putting together an administrative record which is a requirement of the Federal Facility Agreement. What it does is document all the different memos concerned with cleanup alternatives and how we derive at cleanup alternatives. It lists all of our sampling data, people that were involved and have commented on the different cleanups that we're proposing or on the studies, and that will be available for public comment as well. We have a location, one at Cameron Lanier's office--Cameron is sitting down at the end--if he'll still allow us to do that. We asked a while ago. We're still counting on your support.

Lanier: We would be glad to.

DelRe-Johnson: And I am going to maintain a copy here as well on the base for people within this area to review. LantDiv is the keeper of the original administrative record for Camp Lejeune; however, I know it's probably not convenient for the majority of the people in this room. So there will be two locations in Jacksonville for that review. That is the type of record that will be continually updated as different events occur. Are there any questions on community relations or maybe something else people feel that they would like to see as far as how we notify the public, what we're doing, or maybe how we can give input to the state or EPA as to how to keep everybody informed as to what we're doing?

(Negative response.)

DelRe-Johnson: If not, I think we can probably close at this point in time and maybe just have some general conversation. I don't think we'll need a recording of general conversation. You can leave or you can stay and wait for the bus that's scheduled to pick you up at quarter of twelve for lunch--whatever you would like to do--but at this point in time, I would like to conclude our first TRC Meeting and thank everybody for attending. We look forward to your comments by August 3d and your comments on the Community Relations Plan by August 31st. I'm going to close with that. Thank you, very much.