

N60200.AR.003462
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 15 OCTOBER 2002 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NAS
CECIL FIELD FL
10/15/2002
TETRA TECH NUS INC



Minutes

Cecil Commerce Center and Cecil Field Airport Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 15, 2002

The quarterly meeting of the Cecil Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was held on Tuesday, October 15, 2002 in the Conference Room of Building 82 at the Cecil Field Airport.

The following RAB members were present:

Community Members

Richard Darby, Community Co-Chair
Diane Peterson, Alt. Community Co-Chair
Iran Maisonet
David Scott

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

Mark Davidson, SOUTHDIV
Scott Glass, Navy Co-chair
David Grabka, FDEP
Debbie Vaughn-Wright, U.S. EPA

The following RAB members were absent:

Community Members

Lisa Chelf
Margaret Day Julian
Edward Renckley
William Dike

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

Lewis Murray, USGS
William C. Wilson, SJRWMD
John Flowe, RESD City of Jacksonville

The following support personnel and guests were present:

Andy Eckert (JEDC), Harold Bullington (J.A. Jones), Mark Jonnet (TtNUS), Ralinda Miller (TtNUS), Bob Simpson (JAA), Mark Speranza (TtNUS), Diana Stone (JAA).

Administrative

Scott Glass called the meeting to order at 7:08 PM. The July RAB Meeting Minutes were approved with no changes. Debbie Vaughn-Wright made a comment on the minutes, page 9, that Dawn Taylor was overly optimistic in stating that the partial deletion process would be completed by October 2002. It will probably be in the first quarter of next year.

Andy Eckert announced that the information on the Cecil Commerce Center web site was updated recently. The site can be accessed through the City of Jacksonville site (www.coj.net), following the links to JEDC, and then doing a search for "Cecil Commerce Center." Richard Darby announced that the Cecil Field RAB history that he wrote was forwarded to a local environmental award committee, and he has been told that it is in line to win.

Proposed Plan, Operable Unit 9, Sites 57 and 58

Mark Speranza of TtNUS discussed the proposed cleanup plan for Operable Unit (OU) 9, Sites 57 and 58, two groundwater contamination sites located along the flightline.

Site 57, located in the central portion of the Main Base just west of the north-south runways, is flat and consists of industrial buildings and paved areas. The site is used for aircraft storage and maintenance. Site 57 also includes the Day Tank 1 area, the former location of a 200,000-gallon aboveground storage tank.

Site 58, also located in the central portion of the Main Base, is between Site 57 and the east-west runway. Site 58 is also flat with industrial buildings and paved areas and includes a fenced drainage ditch. The site

includes Building 312, a corrosion control facility with an associated wash rack and underground storage tank, and Building 312LS, a sanitary wastewater lift station.

In 1996/1997, a contamination assessment documented soil and groundwater contamination at Site 57. In 1999/2000, Day Tank 1 and 24,000 tons of contaminated soil were removed from Site 57 and a biosparge groundwater treatment system was installed and started. From 1998 to 2002, several groundwater investigations were conducted to define the nature and extent of contamination at Sites 57 and 58. In 2001/2002, a Remedial Investigation (RI) was conducted at the sites that included:

- Horizontal and vertical delineation of groundwater contamination at each site
- Delineation of floating free product at Site 57
- A Preliminary Risk Evaluation (PRE) to assess potential human health risks at each site

In 2002, a Feasibility Study (FS) was conducted to determine potential alternatives for remediation at each of the sites.

Cleanup is needed at Site 57 because groundwater from the surficial aquifer is contaminated with chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOCs), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX), and total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons (TRPH) at concentrations in excess of FDEP Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels (GCTLs). Except for potential soil contamination associated with Day Tank 1 and being addressed under the Petroleum Program, there are no unacceptable risks associated with exposure to soil at Site 57.

Cleanup is needed at Site 58 because soil in the drainage ditch at Site 58 contains polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) [expressed as benzo(a)pyrene equivalents (BaPEqs)] at concentrations in excess of FDEP Soil Cleanup Target Levels (SCTLs) for residential exposure. In addition, groundwater from the surficial aquifer contains chlorinated VOCs, xylenes, naphthalene, and TRPH in excess of FDEP GCTLs.

Soil cleanup alternatives evaluated for Site 58 included Alternative 1: No Action, Alternative 2: Institutional Controls and Monitoring, and Alternative 3: Excavation and Off-Base Disposal. The No Action alternative is required as part of the analysis of alternatives for comparison purposes. This alternative does not protect human health or the environment or meet federal and state requirements. It also does not offer short- or long-term protection or permanence or reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminants through treatment. No mechanisms are in place to determine if cleanup goals would be reached, and no costs are associated with this alternative.

Alternative 2 would involve prohibiting residential development and performing annual site inspections and 5-year reviews at the site. This alternative would protect human health and the environment, meet federal and state requirements, and provide short- and long-term protection and permanence. Alternative 2 would not reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminants through treatment. Cleanup goals might eventually be met through natural attenuation, and monitoring would evaluate this process. The Net Present Worth (NPW) cost for this alternative is \$74,000. Alternative 3, the recommended alternative, is protective of human health and the environment, meets federal and state requirements, provides short- and long-term protection and permanence, and reduces the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminants through treatment. The NPW cost for this alternative is \$32,000, and cleanup goals would be reached within approximately 2 months. This is the preferred alternative for groundwater remediation at Sites 57 and 58.

Groundwater cleanup alternatives for Sites 57 and 58 include:

- Alternative 1: No Action
- Alternative 2: Natural Attenuation, Institutional Controls, and Monitoring
- Alternative 3: In-Situ Enhanced Biodegradation, Institutional Controls, and Monitoring
- Alternative 4: In-Situ Air Sparging (AS), Institutional Controls, and Monitoring
- Alternative 5: Extraction, On-Site Treatment, Surface Discharge, Institutional Controls, Monitoring

Alternative 2 would involve restricting groundwater use and conducting long-term monitoring. It has a NPW cost of \$524,000 and would achieve cleanup goals within 3 years for Site 58 and 18 years for Site 57. Alternative 3 involves the injection of oxygen-releasing compound (ORC[®]) into the Site 58 plume and injecting ORC[®] and hydrogen-releasing compound (HRC[®]) into the Site 57 plumes. Also, groundwater use would be restricted and long-term monitoring, annual site inspections, and 5-year reviews would be conducted. The NPW cost for this alternative is \$1,617,000, and cleanup goals would be reached within 2 years for Site 58 and 3 years at Site 57.

Alternative 3 would involve the installation, operation, and maintenance of two AS systems at Site 57 and one system at Site 58. As with Alternative 2, groundwater use would be restricted and long-term monitoring, annual site inspections, and 5-year reviews would be conducted. The NPW cost for this alternative is \$2,200,000, and cleanup goals would be reached within 2 years for Site 58 and 3 years at Site 57.

Alternative 4 involves installation, operation, and maintenance of a pump-and-treat system at Site 57 and a second system at Site 8. As with Alternatives 2 and 3, groundwater use would be restricted and long-term monitoring, annual site inspections, and 5-year reviews would be conducted. The NPW cost for this alternative is \$2,651,000, and cleanup goals would be reached within 2 years for Site 58 and 12 years at Site 57.

The next steps for Sites 57 and 58 include:

- Submission of a Proposed Plan
- Announcement of a 30-day public comment period in the Florida Times-Union
- Preparation and submittal of a Record of Decision (ROD)

Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) Update

Scott Glass of SOUTHDIV gave an update on the status of the FOSTs.

The first carveouts for City of Jacksonville Economic Development Commission (EDC), Jacksonville Port Authority (JPA), and Parks and Recreation (P&R) have been transferred.

EDC Parcels to be transferred and the latest scheduled transfer dates are as follows:

- EDC Phase III – 5.5 acres
 - Scheduled for November 2002
 - Includes Buildings 9, 46, 404, and 428 – all petroleum sites
 - Draft FOST/Environmental Baseline Survey for Transfer (EBST) being reviewed
- Golf Course Parcel – 224 acres
 - Scheduled for April 2003
- EDC Phase IV – 23 acres
 - Scheduled for May 2003
 - Includes Sites 5, 11, 32, 44, and 49
- EDC Phase V – 44 acres
 - Scheduled for March 2004
 - Includes TFM/BFM, Sites 21, 25, and 45, Building 271, the former railroad bed south of Normandy, and Building 635

Transfer challenges for remaining EDC parcels include:

- PSC 51 – Active Golf Course. Discussions are still ongoing about whether it should be classified as an operable unit and about the need for and application of future land use controls (LUCs). U.S. EPA is collecting additional data to validate the assumptions used in evaluating the original data set.

Q: Is the decision about whether the site should be an operable unit affected by the City's decision to close the course?

A: No.

- Sites 32, 21, 25, and 45. High level discussions about ROD requirements at sites with LUCs are ongoing. The discussions have national implications and affect sites other than at Cecil Field. The BCT has tried creative ways to resolve the issue, but it comes back to “policy needs” and high level negotiations, and the issue is currently out of the hands of the BCT.

Q: How long will it take to resolve?

A: We don’t know. Discussions are continuing at U.S. EPA Headquarters and Department of Defense (DoD).

- Sites 5 and 11 Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) demonstrations. The Navy is having difficulty incorporating LUC components to satisfy U.S. EPA’s needs to get approval of the OPS documents needed to transfer these sites. This issue is directly related to the unresolved ROD issue.

Remaining JPA (now JAA) parcels to be transferred include:

- JPA Phase III – 12 acres
 - Scheduled for November 2002
 - Includes Buildings 367 and 860, North-South High-Speed Refuelers, and PSCs 39 and 44
 - Has LUCs for petroleum sites only. The remaining phases have IR sites with LUCs.
- JPA Phase IV – 38 acres
 - Scheduled for June 2003
 - Includes Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, and 17
- JPA Phase V – 21 acres
 - Scheduled for September 2003
 - Includes South Fuel Farm (SFF), Site 3 and Building 82
- JPA Phase VI – 230 acres
 - Scheduled for June 2004
 - Includes North Fuel Farm (NFF), Jet Engine Test Cell (JETC), Site 16, Day Tank 1, Sites 57 and 58, and Sites 36 and 37/Day Tank 2

Transfer challenges for remaining JPA parcels include:

- Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 36, and 37. OPS determinations must be approved by U.S. EPA as a prerequisite to property transfer. The ROD/LUC issue is also affecting OPS approvals for these sites.
- Sites 57 and 58 (Buildings 824/824A and 312). The ROD/LUC dispute may also affect the schedule for these sites.
- North Fuel Farm. The extent of groundwater contamination was greater than expected and will require a more extensive cleanup. Cleanup funding was delayed until Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 because of funding control issues. Costs are projected to the out years to meet certain DoD budgetary controls. So far, Cecil has been able to get the needed funds, but Scott and Mark “raised the red flag” at NAVFAC about the implications of pushing the NFF cleanup funding to FY 2010.

Remaining P&R Parcel to be transferred include:

- P&R Phase III – 161 acres
 - Scheduled for September 2004
 - Site 15. Hopefully we are back on track to get a cleanup number for this site. Progress is being made with the people generating the acute toxicity number for lead. U.S. EPA and University of Florida experts appear to be coming to a consensus. The process has just taken much longer than expected.

Sites 36 and 37 Air Sparging System Update

Paul Malewicki of J.A. Jones provided an update on the operational status of the AS system at Sites 36 and 37. The Hot Spot #3 system began operating in late July 2002. The noise attenuation enclosure is working – it is a lot quieter in the area. A sparging well within one of the runway vaults is blowing sand out of the holes

in the seals onto the runway. This is a concern for aircrafts. Airflow to this well, which is located outside of the groundwater plume, has been shut down and bypassed.

Q: Is there any way to regulate the flow to prevent this?

A: Yes. The design called for the air flow rate to be 10 cubic feet per minute (cfm). It has been proposed that the flow rate be lowered at this well to get some air into the aquifer without blowing sand. The long-term effects of the holes are worrisome because, if air is getting out, water may be getting in that could affect the integrity of the concrete in the area of the vault.

The Hot Spot #2 system has been running since May 2002, and groundwater concentrations have been decreasing. One issue with this system is that water from the condensate tank has to be pumped out weekly, which is more than expected. They are considering adding another tank so that pumping has to occur only every 2 weeks.

Sites Update

Installation Restoration (IR) Sites

Groundwater samples were collected in July at Sites 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 21, 25, 45, 36/36, and Building 605. At Operable Unit (OU) 5 Site 49, soil excavation was postponed by wet conditions. The work remaining involves scraping the soil to remove lead pellets. The work may start again later this month, weather permitting.

OU 6 Site 11 has the pesticide 1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP) in one well. The July data indicated that the concentration had decreased to less than the FDEP GCTL. The well will be resampled this week, and if the concentration remains less than the GCTL, a no further action document will be prepared. At OU 8 Site 3, the AS system was turned back on in July because the maximum TCE concentration in the January sampling event exceeded the AS system remedial objective. July results indicated that the concentration had decreased to less than the system objective, and the system was turned back off.

For OU 9 Sites 57 and 58, the final RI Report was submitted in September 2002, and the final FS Report was submitted in October 2002. At Site 57, pigging of the pipeline running from Day Tank 1 to the North-South High-Speed Refuelers is scheduled for mid-November. The RODs for Sites 32, 42, 44, and the Old Golf Course in OU 12 were submitted on September 28th.

Petroleum Sites

At SFF, soil contamination is being rebaselined. System evaluation and permeability testing, on hold temporarily for repairs to the system, are expected to be completed this month. At the JETC site, a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) to address groundwater contamination was submitted in September 2002. The RAP calls for installation of an AS system. At Day Tank 1, Phase II soil sampling to delineate the area of soil exceedances began in October 2002.

At the 103rd Street Pipeline site, the Navy and the City previously had a “gentleman’s agreement” that the City would do the soil excavation and the Navy would haul the soil offsite. Now they have a written agreement with the City as the Navy’s “subcontractor” that is actually cheaper for the Navy and prevents the road having to be closed twice. Planned road widening is going to be combined with the soil removal effort.

At Building 46, two additional intermediate wells and one additional deep well were installed and sampled to investigate potential migration of the toe of the plume. A RAP recommending installation of an AS system was submitted in September 2002 for Tanks 271 SUL/R/UL/D at Building 271. At the BP Wells site, startup of the in-situ oxygen curtain (ISOC) treatment system is scheduled for October 2002, and hopefully, that site will be knocked out quickly.

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Sites

At Building 605, chloroethane concentrations were less than the FDEP GCTL in two consecutive events, and a Sampling and Analysis Report (SAR) is being prepared recommending no further action. Soil excavation at

Building 635, the former railroad bed site in Yellow Water, was completed in August 2002, and a groundwater sample collected at the most contaminated area came back clean.

Work still to be completed includes:

- Site 15
- Finishing the dig at Site 49
- Free product removal at Site 57
- Sediment excavation at Site 58
- AS systems at JETC and Building 271
- NFF remediation system – This is the last big ticket item that needs funding.

Conclusion

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 21, 2003 at the same location. Possible topics for the January meeting include an update on Sites 36 and 37, Site 15, supplemental soil sampling at Day Tank 1, and the active golf course. If anyone has any suggestions as to future RAB agenda items, contact one of the BCT members. If the location changes, a public notice will be placed in the Florida Times-Union announcing the new location.