

NEIL ABERCROMBIE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



LINDA ROSEN, M.D., M.P.H.
DIRECTOR OF HEALTH

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

P. O. BOX 3378
HONOLULU, HI 96801-3378

In reply, please refer to
File:

September 11, 2014

U0915TP

Mr. Aaron Poentis
Program Director
Environmental Department
Navy Region Hawaii
850 Ticonderoga St., Suite 110
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860

Dear Mr. Poentis: ^{AARON}

SUBJECT: Questions for U.S. Navy from the September 3, 2014 Red Hill Task Force Meeting

As a follow-up to the September 3, 2014 Red Hill Task Force meeting, attached is a list of questions from the task force members.

Please submit your responses to these questions by September 30, 2014 in order to allow sufficient time for distribution to the task force members.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Thu Perry of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch at (808) 586-4226.

Sincerely,

STUART YAMADA, P.E., CHIEF
Environmental Management Division

Enclosure

Questions for U.S. Navy

From Sept 3rd Red Hill Task Force Meeting

(Respond by September 30, 2014)

1. When is the MILCON contract to install oil tight doors in lower tunnel to protect Navy's drinking water source scheduled?
2. Can you describe this 3-4 year maintenance cycle in more detail?
3. What are the details describing the modified API 653 method of tank repairs and how does something made for above ground tanks (ASTs) applicable to the Red Hill tanks?
 - a. How many tanks have gone through this modified API 653 process to date?
 - b. What were the findings of these investigations (visual/number of anomalies identified/ points that have been vacuum box tested/ repair work done) for tank 5 and other tanks tested? What are the locations of these 17 probable release points and how were they found? What were the results from the vacuum box tests?
 - c. What is the basis of the 20 year extension?
 - d. Describe all of the characteristics/qualities that would constitute a "visual anomaly" of the 47 found in tank 5?
 - e. What changes have been made to the modified API process over time?
 - f. What went wrong on tank 5 and why?
 - g. What corrective actions have been taken to remedy these problems and going forward?
 - h. What are the probable causes of these 17 "pinholes"? Can you elaborate on the idea that it was an issue of "workmanship"?
 - i. Can you provide us the reports that details how each of these pinholes were caused? Were they all improperly sanded welds?
 - j. How will the inspectors know from the inside of the tank, how much corrosion has gone happened on the outside of the tank? How are the thinning of these steel walls identified? What methods are experts using to gauge this?
 - k. Will the remainder of the 600 patches will be vacuum box tested in the future?
4. Is there a mandated/automatic stop when filling the tank at the 50 foot level in order to ensure that there hasn't been a release? If so, is it true that in this case, the protocol was not followed? What was the Navy's process in filling up Tank 5? Is there a standard process in which tanks are to be filled in increments?
5. Can we get the data from the soil/vapor monitoring (e.g. locations, fluctuations over time from all available reports since installation)? Was there an increase in soil/vapor after the tank 5 release? What soil/vapor levels would alert you to do anything additional action items? Besides increased monitoring, what other actions would be warranted? Is there a threshold where you would consider it a "suspected release"?

6. There is a monitoring well 2 in the vicinity of tank 5, were there elevated soil/vapor and/or water monitoring after the January release? What were those results for that period and historically?
7. What are the water testing results from monitoring wells (including Navy's drinking water source) that you have collected? Can you provide us the data of the testing from the time when they first started collecting data to now?
8. What other historical fuels have been stored at the facility specifically? What other constituents besides (i.e. knocking agents like EDB and other fuel additives) could be present from historic releases but may not have been added to the list of currently tested constituents?
9. Can you provide us past and present reports and studies on the fuel storage facility and the oily waste disposal facility? Can you give us all of the monitoring results from the continued monitoring activities done on the Oily Sludge pit well, as well as the deep water DLNR well? What petroleum contamination is present now, if any (even those under Environmental Action Levels)?
10. What types of feasibility studies have been performed regarding upgrades in release detection and secondary containment for the facility? Can we have access to these studies to see what options were examined and what considerations were identified?
11. Can you provide us with site characterization reports and findings including groundwater modeling studies and findings and groundwater monitor wells and soil vapor monitor points construction details (e.g. permit applications, as-built plans, driller logs)
12. Was there an increase in petroleum contaminant concentrations in monitoring well 2 (the closest monitoring well to tank 5) after the release in January? What levels are historical and what were the elevated levels?
13. Can the task force members be provided the latest site characterization work plan?