

N62604.AR.001628
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 15 JANUARY 2013 NCBC
GULFPORT MS
1/15/2013
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD



Gulfport, Mississippi

Minutes
NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting
Naval Construction Battalion Center
Gulfport, Mississippi
January 15, 2013

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at the Isiah Fredericks Community Center in Gulfport, Mississippi on January 15, 2013. RAB members present at the meeting included:

Gordon Crane (NCBC Gulfport)	Ron Schmidting
David Marshall (Alt. Community Co-Chair)	Joyce Shaw
Skip McDaniel (Community Co-Chair)	Philip Shaw
Bob Merrill, MDEQ	

Administrative and technical support were provided by:

Bob Fisher, NAVFAC
Bill Olson, Tetra Tech
Lisa Noble, NCBC Gulfport
CDR Brian Nottingham, NCBC Gulfport Public Works
Greg Roof, Tetra Tech
Nancy Rouse, Tetra Tech

Guests in attendance:

Dickey Arndt
Sherry Arndt
Debbie Bennett
Fred Boykin, Jr.
Councilman Kenneth "Truck" Casey, Gulfport Councilman
Kathy Davis
M.C. Bennett Drake
Marie Hansen
Joan Head
Howard Page, Steps Coalition

Welcome and Introductions

Skip McDaniel, Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Meeting attendees were invited to introduce themselves.

Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Update

Greg Roof of Tetra Tech provided a site-by-site status of the NCBC Gulfport Installation Restoration Program as follows:

Site 1: The Remedial Investigation (RI) for Site 1 has been finalized. The Feasibility Study (FS) draft-final is being finalized and will be submitted to the MDEQ in next 30 days. The Proposed Plan/Decision Document/Remedial Design will be completed following MDEQ approval of FS.

Site 2: The Remedial Investigation draft-final has been submitted to the MDEQ.

Disclaimer: All comments, questions, statements, and responses, with the exception of the formal statements shown in italics, are paraphrased to the best of the recorder's ability. Questions and/or responses may have been missed. This is not a verbatim transcript.

Site 3: The Decision Document for Site 3 is under legal review by the Navy. The Navy is currently collecting some cover soil samples to ensure the site has two feet of clean cover in support of the Remedial Design for Site 3.

Site 4: The groundwater monitoring well network has been completed and groundwater monitoring will continue.

Site 5: The Remedial Action for Site 5 has been completed (i.e., a landfill cap has been installed).

Site 6: The Remedial Action for Site 6 is ongoing (i.e., long term monitoring).

Site 7: The Remedial Investigation for Site 7 is underway, the landfill area is has been defined and multi-media sampling has been completed.

Site 8: The Remedial Action has been completed and long term monitoring is in progress.

Site 10: The Remedial Action has been completed (i.e., the ditch has been lined) and long term monitoring is in progress.

Land Use Controls: A Memorandum of Agreement is in negotiation between the Navy and MDEQ. NCBC Gulfport is monitoring and controlling the sites.

Munitions Response Program (MRP) Site Status: The Preliminary Assessment (PA) is in preparation. Ten possible sites were investigated. We are currently waiting for the PA report to be issued.

Question: Are you sampling for dioxin at all of these sites?

Response: Yes.

Question: What sample method are you using for dioxin at Site 7?

Response: EPA Method 8290.

Question: What does that mean, Method 8290?

Response: EPA Method 8290 is a type of laboratory analysis that refers to the type of laboratory equipment used, detection limits that are achievable by that equipment, etc. Specific information regarding the method is available on the internet.

Question: My concern is about off-base sites. What is the Navy doing to address dioxin contamination in the areas outside of the base?

Response: The Navy has completed their investigations and off-site remedial actions. The investigation included extensive sampling of the affected areas to determine the extent of the dioxin-contaminated soils. The remedial actions included removing soil in the wetland areas just northeast of the intersection of Canal Road and 28th Street and later along the west side of Canal Road north of the base. After the remedial actions, the areas of excavation were sampled to make sure that the contaminated soil (soil with dioxin concentrations higher than 15 ppt) had been removed. The dioxin-containing soil was moved onto Site 8 on the base and the excavated areas were sampled to ensure that the dioxin contamination had been removed. To begin the process of closing the site, the Navy has drafted a letter requesting no further monitoring at Site 8 and in the off-base areas of concern.

Question: There are continuing concerns about concentrations north of the base. Is there any plan to further investigate these concerns?

Response: The agency responsible for investigating these concerns is the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Control (ATSDR). ATSDR completed a Public Health Assessment of these concerns. Their conclusion was that no further investigation was warranted based on an action level of 1 part per billion for dioxins. The USEPA action level has since changed to a lower number. Perhaps it is time to revisit your concerns with the ATSDR considering this new action level.

Comment [RG1]: At the very least we should add that we reported the Navy has completed "their investigation and off site remedial actions"... also I am not sure who answered this but I believe that the Navy explained the sampling was completed and the dioxin soil was moved onto the station. Post excavation sampling was performed and the Navy believes that adequate soil & groundwater sampling has been performed.

Question: You told us that you were going to continue monitoring the off-base areas indefinitely, now you are saying that you are not going to monitor anymore?

Response: A letter is being prepared to take us out of Brownfields. We feel that we have cleaned up the site and there is no further risk for the intended use (light commercial).

Comment: You [the Navy] drilled wells, cored, and found no more dioxin in the groundwater. You said that we could do anything we want on the land. I do not think the land can ever be used for anything. I believe that no matter what you do, the property is devalued because of perception and history. Why doesn't the Navy just buy the property?

Response: The Navy typically is not able to purchase contaminated property unless it is required by the mission. However, we were able to rent the property from you while we cleaned up the contamination.

Comment: I am concerned about liability issues because of the road that was left in place after the off-base cleanup. It acts as an attractive nuisance for kids.

Response: It sounds as if, for you to be made whole, the road needs to be removed.

Comment: Yes.

Comment: I'm also concerned that water travels, and that even if you think you have cleaned up all of the dioxin, water may have carried it to parts of the property that have not been sampled and that there is a possibility of contaminating the water table.

Response: We followed the surface water pathways with our sampling approach. We followed those pathways collecting samples until we found no more detections of dioxins. We believe that we have found all dioxins carried by water away from the base and have removed those contaminated sediments as part of our remedial action.

Question: What happens if they lower the regulatory level? It has happened in the past.

Response: The Navy will never lose the liability for the property. Should the regulatory levels change we would take the appropriate steps to address those changes.

Comment: We should have stayed in Brownfields, that's why I signed the contract. I plan to send a letter to MDEQ.

Response: We believe that property owners will get as much protection under CERCLA as they would have received under Brownfield's. We believe that it is actually to your [the property owner's] advantage to close the sites under CERCLA. Brownfields was not designed for military bases.

Question: Where is this property [the off base area where dioxin-containing soil and sediment was removed] located?

Response: North of the western side of the base near 28th Street and Canal Road and along Canal Road

Comment: What would prevent well installation or construction of a building foundation from contaminating the groundwater?

Response: The contaminated sample collected from the off-base site was the result of a screening type of sampling device that pushes into the ground to collect a sample. This sample type is used for sampling multiple points in an area where there is no known groundwater contamination as a "screening" technique. It is often done prior to installing the more costly monitoring wells so that the location of the wells can be appropriately selected. We believe that the screening probe pushed a small amount of dioxin from the overlying soil into the water sample. Subsequent sampling of the groundwater near this location was done via a properly installed monitoring well. The reason the first sample contained elevated dioxin concentrations and the second did not is due to the amount of sediment (soil particles) in the sample. Monitoring wells are designed to reduce the amount of sediment in the water and provide a truer indication of dissolved phase contamination, which is what the regulatory levels are intended to address. Additionally, dioxin levels are extremely low, 15 parts per trillion (ppt) or lower, and are unlikely to contaminate the groundwater.

Comment [r2]: I remember this being a verbatim comment. I can soften it, but I feel that we need to keep it in the sunlight...

Comment [RG3]: I do not remember what was said, but at the very least we need to change the language here. This sounds very flippant.

Comment [RG4]: Can we add more information to this? It is very unclear what they were asking about

Question: What is the condition of the off-base properties?

Response: The off-base property soils have been tested and all samples were at or below 15 ppt. Further, the site was covered with 1-3 feet of clean soil. The property is zoned for light commercial.

Comment: I believe this issue is going to go on and on and on unless the Navy buys our property.

Comment: I think it would helpful to get a good Chronological history of the offsite dioxin cleanup. Coming to these meeting rarely, I don't have a good sense of how all of this information fits together.

Response: We have a lot of good material that we can put together for future meetings.

Comment: I think the poster sessions were very helpful in discussing the technical topics. Could we bring them back?

Response: That is a good idea.

Question: There is an area north of the base that I'm concerned about. Will the Navy sample it?

Response: To sample an area the Navy needs to identify a pathway back to the base.

Comment: The pathway is the landfill where allegedly drums were dumped.

Response: We checked out many of these off base concerns, and yes, this is one we have not checked out. Another question is "is it a Navy issue or an Air Force issue?"

Question: I thought you bought the Air Force out?

Response: We bought out the known contamination; unknown issues can be reopened with the Air Force.

Comment: If we don't get some satisfaction we're going to use political influence.

Question: Did you ever find drums at any of the off base areas?

Response: No.

Summary by Navy: The letter that we have prepared to send to MDEQ is a letter of intention. It includes our cleanup goal and what we've done to date. The letter is a request from MDEQ to recognize that we have met our goals.

A summary of the key points and concerns I heard this evening:

1. Our biggest concern is sediment, not groundwater. On- and off-base ditches need to remain clean and monitored.
2. Did surface contamination get into groundwater?
3. Before road was built, we sampled groundwater using direct push which caused a small amount of contamination to get into the groundwater. How can we prevent this in the future?
4. Contaminated surface soils were excavated and the monitoring wells were removed. We fully expect that a groundwater sample collected from the area of concern would not contain dioxin. Does it make sense in light of other environmental concerns to invest in further groundwater sampling in this area? The Navy does not believe that they are providing any additional protection by further sampling.
5. There are some ongoing legal issues and the Navy needed to hear your concerns. The Navy will take your concerns to Navy legal and get back to you [the property owners].
6. The Navy needs to address your perceived lack of communication.

Conclusion

Next Meeting Date: The next meeting will tentatively be held on Tuesday, April 16, 2013, at 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Close: The meeting closed at 8:15 p.m.

Comment [RG5]: Is this really the comment? Seems incomplete.