

N62604.AR.000510  
NCBC GULFPORT  
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 6 MARCH 2001 NCBC GULFPORT  
MS  
3/6/2001  
NCBC GULFPORT

39501 - GENERAL  
13.03.00.0047



**NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting**  
**Naval Construction Battalion Center**  
**Gulfport, Mississippi**  
**March 6, 2001**  
**6:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.**

*Gulfport, Mississippi*

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board met in the Building 1 Conference Room at the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi on March 6, 2001:

CDR Mark Ashley,  
Gordon Crane  
Joe Halasz  
David Marshall  
Skip McDaniel

Joyce Shaw  
Philip Shaw  
Jeff Stawowy  
Earl Whittemore

Support personnel attending the meeting included:

Art Conrad, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SouthDiv)  
Bob Fisher, TetraTech  
Nancy Rouse, TetraTech Subcontractor

Other parties attending included: Mike Hawkins (AFCEE) and Bill Kilpatrick (SouthDiv)

Cherie Schulz attended as an interested community member.

**Welcome:** Skip McDaniel opened the meeting by expressing his appreciation for the hard work of the RAB members and the open lines of communication with the Navy.

**Agreed Order and Installation Restoration Program (AO/IR) Update:** Art Conrad presented the following information as part of the AO/IR Update.

Groundwater Investigation: The investigation at Site 7 has been moved from Agreed Order in to the Installation Restoration Program because the contaminants that are now being studied are not tied to the dioxin contamination originating from storage of Herbicide Orange.

Off-Site Brownfields Program: A Brownfields Program is being initiated for two off-site properties where dioxin was found. More details were provided later in the presentation.

Biological Monitoring: The biological monitoring program at Site 8 will be completed with the finalization of the risk assessment report. Since the last RAB meeting the MSDEQ provided comments on the draft report and those comments have been addressed in a final report.

*Q: What kind of questions were asked by the MSDEQ?*

*A: Most of the questions were clarifications. One of the most significant was, "Can the dioxin results be repeated at levels below 15 parts per trillion?"*

Q: *Will the final report be placed in the public library?*

A: Yes it will. In addition, Mr. Crane suggested that we bring a copy of the executive summary to the next RAB meeting.

It was noted that additional risk assessment work will be completed as part of the Brownfields program.

Remediation of Site 8: The Focused Feasibility Study for Site 8 is being completed in "piecemeal" fashion as funding becomes available. The Treatability Study is currently underway.

Q: *Would the contamination be encapsulated by the cap?*

A: Yes. Mr. Crane suggested that copies the executive summaries for both the bench-scale and pilot-scale studies be provided to the RAB at the next meeting.

Q: *Have there been any studies done on the effect of the intimate contact of kiln dust with chlorinated compounds. Kiln dust is very basic and could possibly de-chlorinate dioxin and change it into something else.*

A: No. The studies have been focused on the structural stability of the material.

Q: *What prevents the release of contaminated sediment off base when the ditches are being mucked out?*

A: We've been able to confirm that the sediment recovery traps are working well. These traps will be used during the excavation of the ditches. In addition, the sediments will be transported in a box that will not allow the release of contaminated water. The box will be in a "contaminated" truck when it is being loaded with sediment. The box will be moved to a clean truck before it goes outside of the contaminated area during transportation to Site 8.

Gordon Crane suggested that the work be recorded on video to be played at the RAB meetings.

Q: *Who will be excavating the ditches?*

A: TetraTech will be doing the excavation under the pilot scale study.

Mr. Conrad stated that the schedule for completion of the FFS is dependent upon the treatability study, but that it would probably be completed in October 2001.

Site 7: An Expanded Site Investigation (ESI) will be performed to study the earlier dichloromethane and dioxin findings. As stated earlier, dioxin is not expected to be found in future studies, therefore the studies are being moved from the Agreed Order work (which is focused on contaminated related to the storage of Herbicide Orange) to the Installation Restoration Program where the dichloromethane findings will be further investigated.

Q: *What is dichloromethane?*

A: It is a common solvent. Dichloromethane is heavier than water and can therefore percolate down into the aquifer.

Dichloromethane was not found in earlier studies because only shallower samples had been collected.

Q: *Are the dichloromethane findings significant?*

A: In some samples the levels were 1000 times higher than acceptable concentrations.

Site 6: A bioslurper is being considered for use at Site 6 to improve the efficiency of product removal.

Q: *What is a bioslurper?*

A: A bioslurper is an updated version of pump-and-treat (our current system). Instead of drawing product into a single well, the bioslurper uses a number of pumps installed in a series of wells. The pumps work until the product ceases to flow then stops pumping to allow the well to recharge. The system also brings oxygen into contact with the product the speeds up the bio-degradation of the product.

The bioslurper will be free of cost to the Seabee Center, except for the costs of installation and operation.

Q: *How would we remove the oil from the water?*

A: With an oil/water separator.

Q: *Did it work well in Jacksonville?*

A: Yes, they have completed their cleanup there.

Mike Hawkins offered to provide some copies of the bioslurper fact sheet prepared by the Air Force.

Sites 5: Investigations at this site will include the use of ground penetrating radar (GPR) to look for buried drums.

Q: *Didn't we already use GPR? Isn't it just a big metal detector?*

A: We did a magnetic survey earlier, which is quite similar to a metal detector. The GPR is much more sophisticated.

Field work on this site begins this summer.

### **Brownfields Program**

Bob Fisher of Tetra Tech presented an overview of the Brownfields Program. He stated that the Brownfield's program is confined to "any property where use is limited by actual or potential environmental contamination, or the perception of environmental contamination, and that is or may be subject to remediation under state law or CERCLA." He stated that Brownfields actions may not be conducted on sites where there is no contamination, where no cleanup is required, at federal facilities, where a corrective action is already taking place, or if the site is included on the National Priorities List of extremely contaminated sites. He stated that the perception of contamination, as well as real contamination, is a problem with respect to future use of the site.

Mr. Fisher reviewed the map of the contaminated area and pointed out areas where contamination still exists. He stated that the process was developed around risk-based site evaluation and remediation. He described five steps in the process:

Step 1: Identification of hazard(s). This step includes determining if a risk exists that will require remediation. The key study used to determine the presence of a hazard is called a Baseline Site Conceptual and Exposure Model (Baseline SCEM). Mr. Fisher summarized by saying the highest concentrations of dioxin in the swamp were approximately 400 parts per trillion. The MSDEQ requires action about the unrestricted Tier 1 Target Risk Goal (TRG). The TRGs is like the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) in that it is a trigger for action. The numbers are based on risk levels. Action may be as simple as changing the zoning for the given piece of property.

Step 2: Site characterization: This step involves completing an investigation that defines the source of contamination, means of moving the contamination (called transport mechanisms), and the ways in which the people, animals, or plants could come into contact with contamination (called exposure pathways). These findings are summarized in the final SCEM report.

Mr. Fisher described how sediment slows down and settles out in areas where the swamp is not channelized. In the southern area of the swamp the water moves in more defined channels. The area of contamination is limited and less concentrated than in the northern area of the swamp where the channels are not defined.

Q: *What will happen to the trees in the swamp?*

A: The trees will be removed, chipped, and transported to Site 8.

Q: *Will the organic matter in the trees impact the integrity of the cap?*

A: No, the organic content of the sediment was factored into the bench-scale calculations.

Q: *Will you be restoring the site when the removal is completed?*

A: Yes, trees will be planted on the site and it will be restored upon completion of the cleanup.

Step 3: Ecological risk and toxicity assessment. This step involves evaluating risks to human health and the environment, determining cleanup goals, and developing options to eliminate exposure to risk associated with the identified contamination.

Step 4: Development of a Corrective Action Plan. This step involves evaluation of remedial options and identifying appropriate land use controls and restrictions.

Q: *Is the property wetlands and can it be developed?*

A: Yes, the property is a wetland and a permit is required to conduct the work. However, there is currently a nationwide permit that allows the remediation to take place. The wetlands will NOT be restored as wetlands. The rationale is that a cleaned up piece of property is more important than maintaining a contaminated wetland.

Q: *How will you keep the zoning from changing on the properties that undergoing the Brownfield's action?*

A: Deed restrictions will be incorporated in the agreement.

### What Makes the Brownfield Process Better?

The Brownfield's Program is considered to be an improvement over the more conventional programs (governed by the RCRA and CERCLA regulations).

- Brownfields is a more streamlined approach that allows the cleanup to start earlier. This translates into being more protective of human health and the environment because the risk is removed more quickly.
- Land that might otherwise remain dormant is placed back in to productive use.
- Liability protection is provided for current and future owners, developers, future occupants, and lenders.

Mr. Fisher then opened the floor to any questions from the RAB.

Q: What are "cells?"

A: Cells are the building blocks of cap. Think of a brick wall lying on its side. The individual "bricks" of the cap are made up of these concrete "cells." The cap is much too large to build in one continuous layer, so we will construct it using this piece-by-piece method.

Q: *How big will the cells be?*

A: We don't know yet. We will be trying out different size cells during the pilot scale study.

Q: *What about continued flow into the ditches?*

A: Currently there is no "flow" through the area. The 28<sup>th</sup> street removal action included diverting the flow from the base that previously ran through that area. The new flow goes along canal road then into the canal north of the contaminated area.

### **Conclusion**

The RAB voted to change the meetings back to the first Thursdays of the month.

Ways of involving the RAB more in the day-to-day activities of the cleanup action were discussed. It was decided that the RAB would be invited to see the activities as they happen on base. One point of interest might be the set up of the cells and the start of the pilot scale study.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20.