

N62604.AR.001696
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 9 AUGUST 2010 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NCBC
GULFPORT MS
8/9/2010
NAVFAC SOUTHEAST



Minutes
NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting
Naval Construction Battalion Center
Gulfport, Mississippi
August 9, 2010

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met in the Harrison County Public Health Department Meeting Room in Gulfport, Mississippi on August 9, 2010:

Gordon Crane
Bob Fisher (Navy Co-Chair)
David Marshall

Skip McDaniel (RAB Community Co-Chair)
Joyce Shaw

Administrative and technical support were provided by:

Bonnie McGerr, NCBC Gulfport
Nancy Rouse, Tetra Tech Technical Services
William Olson, Tetra Tech NUS
Jon Overholtzer, CH2M Hill
Greg Roof, Tetra Tech NUS

Guest:

Lettie Caldwell

Welcome

Skip McDaniel, the Community Co-Chair opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Proposed Plan for Site 3, Northwest Landfill

The Site 3 Proposed Plan is currently in a Public Comment Period. The plan was presented at a Public Meeting held on July 15, 2010. Greg Roof provided a presentation on Site 3 that included facts, remedial investigation groundwater and soil findings, ecological risk assessment results, the presumptive remedy, feasibility study alternatives, maps, and the proposed alternative information.

Site 3 is the former Northwest Landfill that operated from 1948 until the mid-1960s. Nearly all of the solid waste (about 30,000 tons) and some of the liquid/chemical waste generated at NCBC Gulfport during that time were disposed in the landfill. Contamination was first reported at Site 3 during the basewide groundwater study completed in 1995. At that time, metals were found in groundwater at the site. Site 3 was fully evaluated during the Remedial Investigation (RI) during the summer of 2006 and the fall of 2007.

Chlorinated solvents were found in the groundwater beneath Site 3. The solvents are likely associated with former NCBC Gulfport practices that included the use of solvents in degreasing. Chlorinated solvents appear to be breaking down naturally in a process called natural attenuation. Elevated concentrations of arsenic, iron, and benzene were also found in the groundwater. Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), chemicals formed during the incomplete burning of organic substances such as coal, oil, gas, and wood, were found in the surface soil at Site 3. Arsenic, a naturally and commonly occurring element and a known human carcinogen, was found in the surface soil at Site 3.

Exposure to groundwater at Site 3 would pose an unacceptable risk to humans only if housing is developed on the site. PAHs and arsenic found in the surface soil could pose an unacceptable human health risk for a hypothetical resident or a lifelong trespasser or industrial worker at the site.

The ecological risk assessment showed a minimal risk to ecological receptors (plants and animals) at the site. Food chain modeling was used as part of the ecological risk assessment to evaluate more thoroughly site-specific conditions. Effects on food chains were considered minimal.

Because conditions at Site 3 are similar to a typical municipal landfill, the federal United States Environmental Protection Agency's "Presumptive Remedy" approach was used to streamline the site restoration process. Using the streamlined process, only two alternatives were evaluated in the Feasibility Study.

Alternative 1 assumes that no changes would be made to the conditions at the site. Alternative 1 provides a baseline for comparison of other alternatives. Alternative 2 (the Presumptive Remedy) includes capping, natural attenuation of chlorinated solvents in groundwater, land use controls (LUCs), and monitoring. The proposed alternative is Alternative 2.

The site would be capped using a surface cover consistent with Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality regulations. Landfill gas would be monitored by checking for methane at landfill vents and from probes installed during the remedial action. The final cover would be planted with grass and would be suitable for use as a recreational area.

LUCs prevent residential development and groundwater ruse at the site. Periodic inspections and annual monitoring would be required to check the integrity of the cap, and repairs to the cap would be made if needed. Periodic groundwater monitoring would ensure the existing contamination is degrading and not migrating away from the site and that contaminants were not leaching into the groundwater.

Natural attenuation is the process by which naturally occurring microorganisms, such as bacteria, break down target chemicals into less toxic or nontoxic substances. At Site 3, natural attenuation is breaking down chlorinated solvents. The progress of the natural attenuation would be tracked as part of the groundwater monitoring program. A five-year review would be conducted to verify the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.

Mr. Roof noted that all formal public comments must be either submitted in writing during the comment period. The schedule for completion of the work is to complete the decision document by the end of 2010 and to construct the landfill cover sometime next summer.

Question: Will you be adding organisms for the natural attenuation like you did at other sites?

Answer: Not at this site because the concentrations were low.

Site 4 Remediation Update

Jon Overholtzer of CH2M Hill presented an update on the Site 4 remediation. The project involves excavating sediment from 700 feet of Canal No. 1 and placing geotextile and rip rap along the bottom and side slopes of the canal, grading 3 to 4 acres of the site for the cap, installing a geosynthetic gas collection system and collection trench, installing 18 inches of low permeability soil, installing topsoil, and establishing vegetation.

Bob Fisher added that because waste is being left in place, rip rap is being placed to keep the sides of the bank from eroding. The landfill cap is being constructed to keep water from leaching through the landfill and causing contaminants in the landfill to migrate away from the site.

Question: Is natural attenuation working here as well?

Answer: Not completely. It got us so far, then, we hit a "stall". We injected food for the microbes to help break down the contaminants about three years ago and we will resample sometime in the first part of next year to see how the natural attenuation is working.

Installation Restoration Program Update

Bob Fisher, the Navy Co-Chair of the RAB, provided an overview of the IR sites.

Site 1: The Disaster Recovery Disposal Landfill is an inactive landfill where a mock disaster recovery training area was located used from 1942 to 1948. The RI report has been completed and is under review for this site. The Feasibility Study is underway and funding is available for the Proposed Plan, Decision Document, and Remedial Design.

Site 2: The World War II Landfill is an inactive landfill where general refuse from the base was disposed between 1942 and 1948. The RI work plan is underway and fieldwork for this site is scheduled to begin in 2010.

Site 3: The Northwest Landfill and Burn Pit is an inactive landfill that was the primary disposal site for the base between 1948 and 1968. A burn pit on the site was used for fire-fighting training from the mid 1950's to 1966. The RI fieldwork has been completed and the report is in review. A Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, Decision Document, and Remedial Design are underway. We most likely construct a cover/barrier over the landfill.

Site 4: The Golf Course Landfill operated from 1966 to 1972. This site is a former landfill with a chlorinated solvent plume. The remedial action at Site 4 is underway and is scheduled for completion in October 2010. Long-term monitoring will begin at this site in 2010. An update on the project was provided earlier in the meeting.

Site 5: The Equipment Training Area Landfill operated from 1972 to 1976. The remediation work was completed on this site in July 2009 and the grass surface will receive fresh sod in August 2010. Long-term monitoring will also begin in 2010.

Site 6: The Fire Fighting Training Area operated from 1966 through 1975. The treatment system for the contaminated groundwater beneath this site discontinued operation about 6 years ago. We are currently in long-term monitoring to evaluate the progress of natural attenuation at the site. One year of monitoring has been completed and year two has been initiated. The last round of groundwater sampling was collected last week.

Question: Was there not a cap at this site?

Answer: No, we're looking at least 30 years of monitoring at this site.

Site 7: The Rubble Disposal Area is a three-acre site that reportedly received only construction rubble from 1978 to 1984. It was noted that there is more than construction rubble at this site. The RI for this site is funded and will begin in late 2010. The investigation work plan is currently being developed.

Site 8: The Former Herbicide Orange Storage Area is near completion. All off-base sampling has been completed. Land Use Control documents and long term sediment monitoring will begin in 2010. We want to make sure that what we did at 2005 and 2006 is still working.

Site 10: PCBs were found in ditches at the Parade Ground Ditch. Remedial actions were taken in 1999 to remove the source of the PCB contamination. The final remedial action, a concrete cover, was completed in May 2010. Long-term monitoring will begin in 2010.

NCBC Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP): The MMRP program began in early 2010. The Preliminary Assessment has been completed. Ten sites where small arms were potentially used were identified. The Site Inspection is scheduled for 2010-2011. Two sites are being investigated further in the Site Inspection.

Bob Fisher noted that the MMRP is organized the same as the Installation Restoration Program, beginning with a Preliminary Assessment, followed by a Site Investigation if warranted. The Preliminary

Assessment does not involve sample collection, but instead is a records search and visual site inspection to see if there is enough information to indicate the need for further studies.

Question: Do sites where blanks were used fit into this program?

Answer: Yes, at least they did at the Woolmarket site.

Question: Do the investigators know about the training activities on CCC Camp road?

Answer: I'm not sure, we to advise Malcolm Pirnie about that. Thank you.

Conclusion

The next meeting will tentatively be held on November 8 at 5:30 (poster session) and 6:00 meeting presentations. The MMRP program will be discussed at this meeting.

The meeting closed at 7:30 p.m.