

N62604.AR.001632
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 5 DECEMBER 2011 NCBC
GULFPORT MS
12/5/2011
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD



Minutes
NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting
Naval Construction Battalion Center
Gulfport, Mississippi
December 5, 2011

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at the Good Deeds Community Center in Gulfport, Mississippi on September 12, 2011. RAB members present at the meeting included:

Charles Cook (Navy Co-Chair)	Ron Schmidting
Gordon Crane	Joyce Shaw
David Marshall (Alt. Community Co-Chair)	Phillip Shaw
Skip McDaniel	

Administrative and technical support were provided by:

Bill Olson, Tetra Tech
Jon Overholtzer, CH2M HILL
Greg Roof, Tetra Tech
Nancy Rouse, Tetra Tech

Guests in attendance:

Rufus Johnson
Mitch Young
Eddie Pruitt

Welcome and Introductions

Dave Marshall, Alternate Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:15 p.m. Meeting attendees were invited to introduce themselves.

Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) Update

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

Site 1: The Remedial Investigation will be issued as final and the Feasibility Study (FS) will be submitted as a draft final within the next month. The Proposed Plan will be available within the next three to six months.

Site 2: The Remedial Investigation field work has been completed. A presentation will be given later in the meeting to describe the preliminary results of the investigation.

Site 3: The Remedial Investigation was submitted as final. The FS and Decision Document are also being finalized.

Site 4: Cap installation at Site 4 is 100% complete. Groundwater monitoring wells will be reinstalled around the cap as part of the long term monitoring program. Field work should begin within the next three months.

Site 5: The landfill cap has been installed and groundwater monitoring is underway.

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

Site 7: The planning documents for the Remedial Investigation are being reviewed and will be presented to the RAB at later meetings.

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 8: The Site 8 cap was installed and land use controls and monitoring are ongoing.

Site 10: The Remedial Action (lining of the ditches) is completed. Land Use Controls and Monitoring are ongoing.

Land Use Controls: The Memorandum of Agreement is in negotiation. The facility is currently monitoring and controlling the sites.

Munitions Response Program (MRP) Site Status: The Preliminary Assessment for the MRP is being written. Ten MRP sites have been identified. Three of the sites have been identified on the northwest area of the base. No sites were identified on the southern end of the base. Two sites have been funded for further investigation (Site Investigation), which will begin after the Preliminary Assessment is completed.

Q: What kind of contamination are you looking for?

A: Usually metals (especially lead) and PAHs

Upcoming Public Meetings for Installation Restoration Program Sites:

- Site 1 within 6 months
- Site 2 and Site 7 in 12-18 months.

Community Involvement Plan Update

Gordon Crane of NCBC Gulfport presented an update on the Community Involvement Plan (CIP).

He presented the key issues identified in the CIP and the suggestions for addressing these issues as follows:

Issue #1. Lack of public knowledge/information regarding the NCBC environmental restoration program:

Suggestions:

- NCBC will maintain an accurate up-to-date mailing list for all interested stakeholders and community members.
- NCBC will investigate using other methods to distribute information as identified by community interviews. NCBC Will ensure information repositories are up-to-date and locations are known to community members and interested stakeholders.
- NCBC Will ensure information repositories are up-to-date and locations are known to community members and interested stakeholders.

Issue #2. Environmental concerns regarding water quality and coastal resources including: potential impacts to surface water quality in general; potential impacts to barrier island beaches; potential impacts to the seafood industry; historic impacts from the BP oil spill and creosote plant; potential impacts from storm water runoff and flooding; and potential impacts to wetlands.

Suggestion:

- NCBC will publicize all aspects of the environmental program, including existing compliance programs to ensure Clean Water Act (CWA) compliance.

Issue #3. Perceived health effects (Site 8/Agent Orange) including: perception that the community outside the base is not a good place to live due to historic Agent Orange contamination; perception that cancer and other health impacts are result of past exposures; belief that the Navy should pay for

additional sampling, blood work and ongoing health care costs; and frustration that off-site investigations may not have been adequately completed and that past exposures are unknown (and cannot be reconstructed).

Suggestion:

- NCBC will investigate holding a community workshop to publicize cleanup status of all IR sites on base, with particular emphasis on Site 8.

Issue #4. Lack of trust including: perception that information is not shared completely or in a timely fashion; belief that sampling by Navy contractors was not accurate or honest; uncertainty that NCBC has addressed all cleanup at Site 8; perception that NCBC only engages influential stakeholders and not the community right outside of the base; perception that senior military leadership has not taken more of a role; and belief that NCBC should do more on a day-to-day basis to engage the community.

Suggestion:

- NCBC will investigate opportunities for partnerships and identify additional ways to engage the community regarding the NCBC IRP.

#5 Environmental Justice concerns including belief that certain areas of the community have been impacted disproportionately by the NCBC environmental restoration program; perception that there were not many businesses outside of the base as the community is predominately minority; perception that off-site cleanup was not a priority as most of those affected were low income/minority; and perception that NCBC has a poor relationship with the Turkey Creek community.

Suggestion:

- Activity 5A: NCBC will continue to be sensitive to perceptions regarding environmental justice, and seek full and fair participation in the IRP by all stakeholders.

Issue #6. Perceived economic impacts including perceived lower property values in the community adjacent to NCBC; perceived difficulty in renting or selling homes in the neighborhood due to historic contamination from the base; and concern that the community has not reaped any tangible economic benefits from being located close to the base.

Suggestion:

- NCBC will investigate ways to summarize and publicize the positive economic impact the base has on the Gulfport Community.

Issue #7. General lack of interest including a perception that nothing a community member could say would actually make a difference; the perception that information presented at a RAB meeting is not helpful; and a general belief that the base is not listening to community concerns.

Suggestion:

- NCBC will solicit public comments regarding this CIP and consider all stakeholder inputs in developing a revised community involvement strategy.

Question: What is Environmental Justice?

Answer: Environmental Justice is an EPA program that was implemented to ensure that no group of people had to deal with an unequal share of the harmful environmental effects resulting from policies or operations run by businesses or government.

Mr. Crane offered to provide the draft CIP to RAB members for review. Skip McDaniel, David Marshall, and Joyce Shaw offered to review the CIP.

Site 2 Remedial Investigation

Bill Olson from Tetra Tech provided an overview of the Site 2 Remedial Investigation. Site 2 is approximately 10 acres, and operated as a landfill from 1943 to 1948. Refuse, solid waste, and liquid wastes were placed in trenches, burned, and buried during the operation of this landfill. After waste disposal ended, the landfill area was unused until 1998 when the golf course was expanded to include Site 2. The site is currently used as a training area.

Site 2 was identified in 1987. A confirmation study for the site was completed in 1987 and a Verification Action was completed in 1997. A surface water and sediment study was completed in 1995, a groundwater study was conducted in 1998, and the remedial investigation began in 2010.

The remedial investigation included a geophysical survey to identify the landfill boundaries, passive soil gas survey to screen for methane gas as well as volatile organic compounds and petroleum compounds; soil borings; and surface soil, subsurface soil, surface water, sediment, and groundwater sampling.

The passive soil gas sampling identified no methane (the typical landfill gas), and some "hotspots" of chloroform and chloroethane, BTEX, and total petroleum hydrocarbons.

Soil borings were collected in the landfill area to assess the depth to the landfill, thickness of the fill, and the nature of the fill. One soil boring was drilled through the landfill to a depth of approximately 20 feet.

Soil samples were collected at nine locations. Soil samples were collected within the area of the landfill to determine if the soil on the site could be used as part of the remedial construction.

Fifteen monitoring wells were installed. From the groundwater elevations measured in the wells it was determined that shallow groundwater flow is away from the pond. An additional round of groundwater elevation measurements are needed because these measurements are so critical in the design of the cap.

Contaminants of potential concern (COPC) identified during the Remedial Investigation are identified below and will be further evaluated in the Risk Assessment for Site 2:

Soil: arsenic, aluminum, chromium, iron, mercury, iron, cobalt, and vanadium (metals); dieldrin (pesticide); and methylene chloride (solvent). The arsenic found in the subsurface soil samples was discussed. Mr. Olson explained that the arsenic could be from (correctly applied) pesticides when this site was a golf course.

Groundwater: Groundwater samples were found to contain iron and one common herbicide. One of the wells contained the remaining contaminants identified as COPCs, but it is believed that the well may have been drilled too deep, it did not produce well, and the sample was very turbid (cloudy). From these samples, the herbicide 2-methyl-4-chlorophenoxyacetic acid (MCPA); aluminum, iron, lead, (metals); indeno (1,2,3-CD) pyrene (a polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon or PAH); and 1,4 dichlorobenzene (Volatile Organic Compound) were identified as COPCs.

Surface Water: 4 samples were collected from the pond and two were collected from the ditch on south side of the site. COPCs identified for the surface water included arsenic, aluminum, iron, mercury (metals); acetophenone (semivolatile organic compound); Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (PAH); and BHC, endosulfan, endrin ketone, (pesticides) PAH's and pesticides were found in the sample locations closest to the golf course.

Sediment: Arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, zinc (metals), benzo(a,h)pyrene (PAH); chlordane, DDT (pesticides)

Dioxin results: All media were sampled. No dioxin concentrations that were greater than the TRGs were found.

Site 2 RI Findings to Date: The following bullets summarize the findings of the Site 2 Remedial Investigation:

- The boundaries of the waste disposal area were identified.
- No plumes or areas of widespread contamination were identified
- Concentrations of contaminants greater than screening criteria (contaminants of potential concern or COPCs) were limited to the landfill material.
- Site conditions were determined to be suitable for a presumptive remedy (i.e., landfill cap).

What's next?

The next steps in the process are to complete a human health and ecological risk assessment for the site, present the results of the field investigation and risk assessment in a Remedial Investigation Report, evaluate remedial alternatives in the Feasibility Study, and prepare a Proposed Plan for public comments.

Conclusion

Meeting Announcements: Because of a complication in the NCBC Gulfport mail room, RAB members did not get their mailing until the last minute. Corrections will be made to avoid this problem for future meetings. A RAB member suggested that we consider looking at Facebook as a possible venue for announcing our meetings.

Meeting Location: Possible locations for future meetings included the West Side Community Center and the Public Library. The problem with the Public Library is that they close early on Monday evenings. Philip Shaw will talk to the library staff to see if it is possible for them to keep the library open later for our meetings.

Next Meeting Date: The next RAB meeting will tentatively be held on March 12, 2012, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting closed at 7:30 p.m.