

N61165.AR.002953
CNC CHARLESTON
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROJECT TEAM MEETING DATED 10
AUGUST 1998 CNC CHARLESTON SC
8/10/1998

**Naval Base Charleston
Environmental Cleanup Project Team
Meeting Minutes**

Date: 8/10/98

Place: NH-C/Project Team Room

Time 0800 - 1530

Attendees: Tony Hunt, Paul Bergstrand, Johnny Tapia, Dann Spariosu, Larry Bowers, Joe Land

Invited Guests: Tom Fressilli (CSO), Jeri Johnson (RDA), Bobby Dearhart, Kevin Tunstall, Jed Heames (DET), Gabe Magewood, Hayes Patterson (SDIV), Sandy Reagan, Craig Smith, Charlie Vernoy, Todd Kafka (EnSafe)

Leader: Dann Spariosu

Scribe: Larry Bowers

Discussions/Decisions

9808- M324	Paul Johnny	<p>DHEC Site Visit Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMU 39, 2 damaged wells (likely from existing tenant operations, fork lift use). • DHEC would like to see specific details regarding an Action Plan that addresses well management and maintenance in order to decrease future damage to existing wells. • Tony said that a "spread-sheet" Action Plan already exists, he will forward a copy of this information to DHEC by 17 Aug. <p>Sand Blasting Grit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHEC concerned about "apparent" grit material located at SWMU 39 near wells 4 and 5. • Tony stated that Navy has tested "apparent" grit and has determined it consists primarily of aluminum oxide (which is sand blasting grit). • DHEC concerned about the potential for asbestos in grit. • Tony stated no asbestos has been found in grit analysis.
------------	----------------	--

9808-M324	Paul/ Johnny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony described grit usage process. Grit blasting was used to remove existing paint from surfaces (primarily metal surfaces) prior to re-painting. Mostly used in the dry dock area of the CIA (Zone E). It was NOT used in DRMO (Zone A, SWMU 39 area). Spent grit was placed into roll-aways and then transported off-site for proper disposal. Unspent (ie, virgin) grit was sent to DRMO where it was either sold for use elsewhere (not at Charleston) or disposed of via an off-site landfill. Therefore, any grit that DHEC may have seen at SWMU 39 was likely “unspent” grit. Virgin grit that becomes wet and for some reason cannot be dried out would be considered as unusable blasting grit and thus it would be disposed of via DRMO channels. Thus SWMU 39 (DRMO) would have been used only as a staging area for unspent grit. The Navy will provide previous analysis of grit (spent and unspent) for anyone who would like such information. SWMU 54 contains spent grit and SWMU 109 contains unspent grit. • DHEC accepts fact that grit located in SWMU 39 is most likely “unspent” grit. The acceptance of this fact is based on the Navy SOP for grit blasting operations as previously outlined by Tony. <p>Site Visit Report Continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMU 2, DHEC expressed concern about well 2. This well appears to be located in a high elevation with no nearby down gradient wells. Therefore, DHEC would like to see other wells (one maybe two) placed down gradient of this well. The PT agreed to add extra wells as part of the CMS (one well to replace damaged well 5 and the second well to be located south of well 3 and south of former well 5 yet north of Building 1640. • SWMU 39, suspected oil/water separators were determined to be electrical vaults. NFA. • SWMU 1, tank-like debris was noted. During site visit, Billy Drawdy (SDIV escort) said debris was remains of former water storage tanks (bladders). No chemicals or petroleum stored. • SWMU 25, options for worker protection, water disposal, and vault abandonment were discussed. Went to parking lot for future discussion/decision by PT. • SWMU 3, well damaged via DET. DHEC not satisfied with DET response to well abandonment procedure. Well was abandoned prior to area excavation. DHEC would like to see a continuation of grouting for shallow wells (don't over drill). Plus DHEC would like to see wells "pulled" that are located in planned excavations. • SWMU 8 update via Jed Heames (DET). Approx 30 gal/min recovery occurring 24 hr/day. POTW will likely accept trench water after the oil is skimmed off. Approx 30K gal skimmed from SWMU 8 since start of operation. • SWMU 65, has a well cover in need of repair. Fuel oil UST recently removed yet UST report stated leakage concern. DHEC will discuss with Gabe Magwood (SDIV) on 11 Aug.
-----------	-----------------	---

9808-M324	Paul/ Johnny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOC 607, two wells had locks cut off. A void was noted in the concrete pad surrounding well 1. CPW folks were observed digging in surface soil near site. What is Navy procedure for dealing with these type of issues? Tony response: CPW must first contact CSO who then looks at Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) Map. If potential dig area is located in a red colored area on ECP Map, Tony is contacted and questioned on the significance of the area and potential risks to workers. The requesting party is then re-contacted and briefed by the CSO or Tony as necessary. Tony will mark-up this map to indicate known hot spots ... thus, an update of the ECP Map will be provided to the CSO for future use. • SWMU 3 again, map and well location correction requested by DHEC. <p>DHEC requests additional info (ie, list) of all O/W separators and associated USTs. Info coming via Gabe Magewood (SDIV). Paul will discuss with Gabe on 11 Aug.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of monitoring wells. These wells need to be addressed (ie, inspected) per the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inspect all wells and develop data baseline of well condition. 2) Navy would then review list of wells and determine those suitable for abandonment. The DET would be tasked with abandonment. 3) Continue to maintain and manage long-term wells. 4) Note that DHEC prefers up-right wells.
9808-M325	Tony	<p>AOC 680</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/W separator removed and area is now asphalt (ie, a parking lot). • Previous agreement was to install an additional well down gradient of suspect source area. Continue to investigate per RCRA. • PT favors one additional well immediately down gradient of UST (w/in 50 ft) opposite side of sanitary sewer line. • PT favors re-sampling of well 2 for VOCs.
9808-M326	Larry	<p>SWMU 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposal was made regarding remediation waste consolidation at SWMU 9 (the landfill in Zone H). As a big picture CMS issue it is obvious that many Navy base sites will likely require small-scale treatment of impacted surface soils. Likely treatment would consist of excavation and off-site disposal. These soils have been impacted by similar COCs such as arsenic and beryllium (inorganics) and BEQs (SVOCs/PAHs). Waste consolidation and subsequent treatment at SWMU 9 may be the better alternative when compared to soil excavation and off-site disposal. In addition, economies-of-scale may justify a central consolidation and treatment of waste material at SWMU 9 versus base-wide spot-excavations and off-site disposal. • Johnny and Dann will research CAMU, TU and waste consolidation/treatment information from a regulatory agency perspective. Information as to whether this is a viable option from the regulatory perspective is to be provided by the Oct PT meeting.

9808-M327	Tony	<p>Zone J Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of sampling strategy for Cooper River: dense pattern near shoreline, less dense pattern further out, check for contaminant gradient decreasing from base shoreline to mid-river point. • Statistical evaluation did not yield evidence of any significant concentration gradient representative of a Navy shore activity likely to have contributed to river organic contamination. • Based on data it appears that the source(s) of organic contamination in the river is from an entity other than the Navy. • The Navy will go back and look at previous river studies to determine appropriate inorganic background. Thus, a conclusion regarding Navy involvement with inorganics is inappropriate at this time. • A meeting will be set up with Priscilla Weiss to discuss these issues further.
9808-M328	Charlie	<p>Zone L RFI Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to handout. • Primary soil COCs are BEQs. • Primary GW COCs are solvents in Zones E and F (AOC 607). • Have not located any "new" hot spots. Contamination located throughout the Zone L process has been previously identified in other RFIs. No surprises. Yet some eco risk (as expected) was identified at some outfalls in Zones E and F. • It is important to review and approve other RFI reports BEFORE reviewing the Zone L RFI. This would allow all issues (ie, cross-zone issues) to be addressed at the same time and eliminate redundant reviews. • DET is identifying, via dye studies, illicit sewer cross connections and the information will be included as an appendix in the Zone L RFI report. Approx 10 illicit cross connects identified so far. • Question from Tony: Is there any additional sampling required based on current review of data? Charlie response: Probably not, but we can not be sure until a final review of all data (all RFI Zones) has been completed. • DPT samples not filtered, therefore metals data biased toward the high end because of the addition of absorbed metals on particulate matter in the water column. Thus, we will be relying on surrounding well data. Plus, a comparison was made between DPT turbidity and inorganics, and well turbidity and inorganics – it was found that if the turbidity increased then metals increased as would be expected. • Paul question: Any “new” GW problems identified? Charlie response: At the moment, no. • Tony request: Can Charlie provide a transparency that shows subzones as a base figure and Zone L as an overlay? Charlie response: Yes. • Charlie question: Re: Section 6, Fate and Transport, and Section 7, HHRA. Zone L data is basically Level II DQO (DPT from along sewer and rail lines). If needed for the HHRA, can we use nearby sample points that are level III data? If no nearby level III data is available, then we will obtain some additional data (at level III) and complete the HHRA. Todd Haverkost feels that nearby data ought to be sufficient for task. Team response: Wait until Todd is back from vacation. Consult with Todd first before a final decision is made (i.e., to take additional samples at level III or use existing nearby level III data). Tony, Todd, and Charlie will determine need for additional samples. • ARC View is being used to map all chemicals exceeding RBC, SSL, UTL or MCL. • The use and need of GIS was questioned by Johnny.

9808-M329	Craig	<p>SWMU 166 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craig provided a briefing on upgradient impacts to GW. Basically, wells 23D and 22D contain solvents (TCE) at less than 5 ppb. The wells are considered marginally impacted and no upgradient sources of TCE contamination have been identified. • Paul expressed concern about upgradient sources and the need for additional wells. Craig proposed that wells 23D and 22D be sampled as part of the second round of MNA sampling to occur in late September. If it is determined that the concentration of solvents "greatly" increase during the sampling event, the PT should at that time discuss the need for any additional upgradient wells. If the concentrations don't "greatly" increase, then we should close out the issue of an upgradient source and proceed with the CMS based on existing RFI and MNA data. • Tony question to PT: Can we progress with the RFI Report based on existing data and assume that field work is complete? This is based on the condition that additional field work would "likely" be required if the results of the MNA second round data for these two wells indicate a potential upgradient source. PT consensus passed.
9808-M330	Paul	<p>MNA/Sewer Line Repairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul feels that the first round MNA report lacked a lot of critical information and analysis. He feels it needs much more analysis to be of value. Based on the past telecon, Paul also believes the Navy is reluctant to use/demonstrate MNA as a viable remedial alternative. Also concerned about sampling events going from a quarterly to bi-annual activity. And he is aware that MNA is very costly. • Tony response to Paul: The Navy is following USEPA guidance and developing a MNA suitability score ranking based on some fairly straight forward parameters. Many people have been consulted regarding this process. • Charlie response to Paul: The April MNA presentation was based on first round MNA data only. An in depth analysis is premature at this point, however we intend to produce more information and applicable analysis as more MNA (ie, second round) data becomes available. A more comprehensive report that will be more valuable to the PT will be made available after we have had a chance to obtain, review and analyze the second round MNA data (Fall 98). • Paul's request for a more detailed analysis is based on his concern regarding data gaps due to a lack of wells. Also, well 4 in SWMU 39 is an odd well based on the data reviewed. Plus, Paul does not want to unnecessarily eliminate data points from subsequent sampling. • Tony response to Paul: We will not eliminate wells that produce "odd" data results (example, well 4 at SWMU 39). Yet, say for SWMU 166, some shallow wells can be dropped due to our knowledge that deep GW impacts is the area/zone of concern. • Paul: we should take more, not less samples, at this point in time. • Discussion to be continued later with Todd and Tony. Plus Paul wants to talk to Todd Kafka and Charlie Vernoy about MNA. To be discussed 12 Aug post PT meeting.
9808-M331	Jeri	<p>Land Reuse for Zones A and B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interest in using Zone A and Zone B for "residential" purposes has been shown by the City of North Charleston. • Is there anything "environmentally" in these two zones (primarily Zone A) that would keep the Navy and the RDA from developing these zones based on "residential" reuse? • The PT responded "no." However, this response does not consider the cost/benefit factor of redeveloping an existing industrial site adjacent a major operational fuel farm (Hess Oil Co.) into aesthetically acceptable and marketable residential property.

9808-M332	Gabe	<p>UST Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference handout for details regarding tank removals, NFA designations, and assessments. • Only 20 USTs remain to be removed. • 89 UST sites are NFA as of 11 Aug 98. • Additional work is required for UST near Buildings 56 and 221 in Zone E. Paul wants to discuss this site in more detail with Paul Bristol, DHEC, and will copy Gabe on results of discussion to be held by 31 Aug. • Chicora Update: The DET is 30% complete on first test tank demo. If successful, additional tanks will be demo'd by same means. Some asbestos was located in tank pump room yet it was not expected to cause any problems/delays in the overall operation.
9808-M333	Jed	<p>DET ISM Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference handout. • Jed briefed the PT regarding the status of AOCs 500, 501, 502 and 699, SWMUs 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 25, 38, 166, Zone G grid location PCBs, dye testing for cross connects, and Zone E electrical vault investigation. • Johnny made a general comment, regarding SWMU 8 in particular, that he would like to see “more” information and “specifics” in the DET’s Site Completion Reports.
9808-M334	Larry	<p>Treatability Study Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry briefed the PT on the current status of the AOC 607 and SWMU 166 Treatability Study (TS) portion of the CMS. • Currently, contractual paperwork (ie, vendor solicitations, cost estimates, purchase agreements) is being completed by EnSafe for submittal to the Navy for review, comment and approval. The development and internal review of this paperwork is to be completed by EnSafe this month (Aug 98). Submittal to the Navy is expected by the end of Aug 98. Upon approval and subsequent funding from the Navy, TS work can proceed for these two sites. • A graphic flow chart was presented to the PT. The chart described the envisioned TS process for the CMS. Basically, a TS will be conducted only for CMS sites which require additional evaluation beyond a “desk top” study. In a general sense, TSs typically come in two scales, small-scale (bench or laboratory studies) and full-scale (field studies). Bench and field studies will only be conducted on alternatives which look promising during the “desk top” study and that require additional technical evaluation by completion of a TS.
9808-M335	Tony	<p>Pre-RAB Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAB will be provided a general overview of the RCRA CAP for the Charleston Naval Complex. The typical meeting agenda format will be followed: introductions, administrative remarks, questions/comments, subcommittee reports, environmental cleanup progress report, DET status, reuse update, remaining questions, and agenda for next meeting. • Highlights of recent developments since the last RAB meeting (Jun 98) will be presented. • Daryl Fontenot will be present as a guest attendee and will be honored for his involvement and support of the RAB. Refreshments provided after the program.

9808-M336	Joe	<p>Post-RAB Debrief</p> <p>±</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lou did a good job at leading meeting as community co-lead • DET presentation very informative • fact sheet on RAB is good • very good RAB meeting altogether • community participation • recognition for Daryl • CTF update via DET provided photos • positive comments were stated regarding interaction between DET and PT <p>-/Δ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DET presentation to long • Hess presentation and response to community questions was to technical and confusing to common citizen • RDA presentation to long • acronyms, again • DET presentation should have focused on Charleston Naval Complex work only
9808-M337	Joe	<p>PT Training - Dealing with Difficult Customers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference handout. • Joe presented an interactive training module for the PT that dealt with: internal and external customers, perception versus expectations, behaviors of difficult external customers, related customer feelings and beliefs, triggers, a model to deal with difficult customers, interacting with a customer, and development of good customer relations. • An exercise was provided for PT members: role playing difficult customers and the people that are trying to serve them.
9808-M338	Tony	<p>PT Meeting Schedule for Balance of Year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sep 98 - no RAB or PT meeting, thus open. However, a video conference call may take place or a one day face-to-face meeting in Charleston may occur in September (approx 9 Sep 98). • Oct 98 - RAB on 13 Oct, PT meeting on 13 (start at 0800) and 14 Oct 98. Federal holiday on 12 Oct. • Nov 98 - currently no RAB or PT meeting, thus open. Yet, the need for a PT meeting has yet TBD. Note Federal holiday on Wednesday, 11 Nov 98. • Dec 98 - RAB on 8 Dec, PT meeting on 7 (start at 1100), 8, and 9 Dec.

9808-M338	Tony	<p>Loose Ends</p> <p><u>Risk Management Document</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been slowed down until we have some application for it. • However, Zone I RFI Section 11 basically consists of the Risk Management Decision Document (RMDD). This section provides a format for future RMDDs. • Dann comment: USEPA would like to see a list of risk management parameters that can be referenced during a risk management decision. This list is to be “general” and not site-specific. It is not necessary or appropriate to provide site-specific parameters. Professional judgment expected and required. • Tony response: We currently have that type of list. It was generated several months ago. Section 11 of the RFI essentially summarizes this list. It is expected that the RMDD in Section 11 will expand/grow over time. Upon approval of the RFI we should know which sites are NFA, pending further action, or are CMS bound. In addition, its important to note that risk management decisions will be made throughout the RCRA CAP from the RFI and well into the CMS. <p><u>SOP Team Improvement Model</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the next PT meeting (Oct 98), we will discuss another segment of the Team Improvement Model. Approximately 4 segments are present on the model. Segments can be considered as “areas for improvement.” <p><u>LUR Model</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony will distribute recent LUR Model information to PT prior to next PT meeting. • In addition, all PT members are invited to share information they have regarding the LUR Model prior to the next meeting. <p><u>DET Responsiveness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul expressed concern that DET is sometimes unresponsive to DHEC. • Through Paul and Tony, a recommendation was made that DHEC discuss issues direct with DET and if the issue is not fully resolved to DHEC’s satisfaction, then DHEC should go to SDIV to obtain support from Tony.
9808-M339	Tony	<p><u>Lead Model for Shipyard</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony discussed demographics that have been released from the base’s former employment office. • The statistics and demographic information provided by Tony dealt with the number of former base employees who were female of a child-bearing age (the most susceptible human receptor to lead exposure at the former base). This sensitive receptor population also applies to current workers. • Results indicated that Ted Simon’s (USEPA IV toxicologist) estimate of 1,325 ppm total lead as a soil cleanup objective was reasonable and conservative based on demographic data. • Johnny is to review data and provide DHEC position on lead cleanup for surface soils next week (21 Aug 98).

9808-M340	Joe	<p>Post PT Meeting Debrief</p> <p>±</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size of group (small, easy to work with) • Ports Authority/City issue • loose ends effective • data presentation • communicated well, no posturing <p>-/Δ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agenda planning late • time keeping of schedule lax • clarifying and designating action items lax • rambling discussions (lack of beginning or end points) • rushed on Tues night to prepare for RAB presentation • PT needs to help with RAB presentation preparations • full closure with Daryl seemed lacking
-----------	-----	---

Action Items

9808-A190	Tony	Provide copy of well management and maintenance action plan (ie, spread sheet) to Johnny and Paul. By 17 Aug.
9808-A191	Larry/ Ted	Add two wells at SWMU 2 as part of the CMS. One well will be installed in vicinity of former well 5. Second well will be installed south of former well 5 and well 3 yet north of Building 1640. Ensure that Paul reviews/approves well placement diagram prior to well installation. By 30 Nov.
9808-A192	Tony	Mark-up Environmental Condition of Property Map and provide new (marked-up) copy to CSO. By 21 Aug.
9808-A193	EnSafe	Re-sample well 2 at AOC 680 for VOCs. By 30 Sep.
9808-A194	Dann/ Johnny	Review CAMU and TU requirements for applicability at CNC. State agency position. Report results by next PT meeting in Oct. By Oct 98 PT meeting.
9808-A195	Tony	Set up meeting with Priscilla Weiss. Zone J discussions. By 21 Aug.
9808-A196	Tony, Todd, Charlie	Discuss Zone L data for relevance to DQO Level II and Level III use. Can we use nearby Level III data in lieu of DPT Level II data? By 28 Aug.
9808-A197	Paul	Discuss UST near Buildings 56 and 221 with Paul Bristol of DHEC. Copy Gabe Magewood (SDIV) with results of discussion and UST concerns, if any. By 31 Aug.
9808-A198	Tony	Provide LUR Model information and results to PT members. By 15 Sep.
9808-A199	Johnny	Review LUR Model information and provide DHEC position on cleanup level. By 30 Sep.
9808-A200	Larry	Provide list of EnSafe CMS and RFI Zone Managers to Johnny. By 21 Aug.