

M00263.AR.000357
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 17 MAY 2005 TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MCRD PARRIS
ISLAND SC
5/17/2005
TETRA TECH NUS

**MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) MEETING
MAY 17, 2005
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA**

ATTENDEES

Tim Harrington (MCRD PI)
Lila Llamas (US EPA)
Leon Fulmer (SCDHEC)
Art Sanford (NAVFAC)
Mac McRae (Parallax)
Debra Kramer (ICLD)
Mark Sladic (Tetra Tech)
Reed Armstrong (community member)
Dennis Forsyth (community member)
John Holloway (Community member)

At 5:40 PM, Tim Harrington welcomed all attendees. The agenda for the TRC meeting include discussions of SWMU 12 Jericho Island Proposed Plan, Site 45 Former Dry Cleaner, and the 5-Year Review.

SITE 12/SWMU 10 Jericho Island:

Tim hands out copies of the SITE 12/SWMU 10 Jericho Island Proposed Plan to the TRC members. Tim points to the site location map in the Proposed Plan and recounts that Mr. Wright previously owned the property before MCRD took it over in the 1960's. The plan is to dig and haul away the waste and contamination identified at Jericho Island. Also removed will be the causeway leading to Jericho Island. Tim asks the TRC community members to review the Proposed Plan. Art has awarded the contract and a Public Meeting is planned. Reed Armstrong asked what a public meeting meant. The Public Meeting will provide the opportunity for the Navy to discuss the site cleanup plan with the Shell Island community. Tim said it would be like the Site 3 Causeway Landfill Public Meeting. Dennis Forsyth asked if the community TRC members needed to attend the Public Meeting. Tim said that generally we would hope that the community TRC members would be there to give their perspective, thoughts and concerns regarding the cleanup. John Holloway asked what was the planned starting date. Tim replied August 17th. Tim noted that there would be some administrative changes incorporated into the final Proposed Plan. The summary of remedy alternatives will be in the final version.

Tim stated that during the last TRC meeting, John Holloway asked if there had been a rare, threatened and/or endangered species survey conducted at Jericho Island. A survey was completed at the end of last week and none were present at the site. John asked if only the Federal species were of interest. Tim said he was not sure, the species list that Priscilla sent out did not specify State or Federal species. Tim hands a copy of the species list to John and said

that the Navy completed the survey last week. John said the list appears to include State species as well as Federal species.

Reed asked if an archeological survey was completed. Tim said yes and that no resources were identified. John asked if a shovel test was performed. Tim was not sure. Reed asked if there is a letter certifying that an archeological survey was performed. Tim said yes, they should get something.

Reed references Figure 3 of the proposed plan and asked what the difference was between soil and sediment samples. Tim said that the soil samples were collected from the upland and sediment samples were collected from the tidal marsh. John asked where the PAHs came from. Tim said possibly from rubber material. Mark said that no visual sources of PAHs were identified, it just showed up in the results. Reed asked if benzene was detected. Mark said no. Tim said that the major debris was located on the surface at the southern tip of the island and includes a lot of broken and melted glass.

Reed asked about the debris in the causeway leading to Jericho Island. Art said that to keep the public off the island the causeway would also be removed by excavation. The road may need to be widened to provide vehicle and equipment access to the island. The causeway would be removed after the cleanup on Jericho Island is complete. A cofferdam, silt fencing and possibly one ton sand bags will be used during excavation.

Reed references the COPC Tables in the Proposed Plan and asked what does retained as COPCs mean. Mark said that the contaminant is of potential concern and is retained and carried through to the risk assessment. The table shows that results need to be further evaluated in an ecological and/or human health risk assessment. Reed referenced Table 5 and asked if anything was of great concern. Mark said to evaluate the maximum concentration detected against the remaining columns in the table. Sometimes the EPA Region IX PRGs are the risk drivers and sometimes the ESVs are the risk drivers. Maximum concentrations are screened against ecological and human health threshold values as shown in the tables.

Reed asked what the difference was between Tables 4 and 5. Tim said Table 4 showed soil results and Table 5 showed sediment results. Reed asked if the tables show anything alarming. Mark said that you hate to see large pesticides and PAH numbers. Reed asked if the background concentrations are typical of the facility. Mark said that the background data is still being wrestled with.

Reed asked under the comparison of cost table, which alternative was chosen. Both Mark and Tim said that alternative 4 was the preferred alternative. Reed asked what the 30-year present worth meant. Mark said that it is an EPA requirement if the remedy requires O&M.

Reed asked how long the would cleanup take. Art said is will take a couple of months. Reed asked what the restoration would include. Art explained that the relative depth of the debris is shallow and will be removed through visual examination to predetermined grades. The causeway will be removed by excavation and backfilled even with the marsh. The marsh will be re-vegetated. John said there might be the need to clear for large machinery. Tim said that a

standard backhoe may be used but we will have to see what the contractor proposes. Vehicular traffic will be a primary concern.

John asked if the excavated material would be disposed of at Hickory Hill landfill. Tim said maybe, but the contractor has the right to take the debris to another CERCLA waste disposal facility. Art said that the trucks would be cleaned before they leave the site. Keeping the neighborhood clean is a major concern.

Dennis asked if he could email had any comments he had on the Proposed Plan. Mark said that the TRC looks at the Proposed Plan first, before it goes to the public. Tim said that is still could be revised if necessary before it goes out.

SITE/SWMU 45 Former Dry Cleaner:

Mark explained that an AST released PCE to groundwater. The initial investigation was conducted 3-4 years ago and a pump and treat system was installed. Through groundwater monitoring, the Navy determined that the groundwater plume had migrated. MIPs data was collected. Temporary groundwater wells were installed to verify the MIPs data. Permanent wells were sited based on the temporary well data. Mark said that the permanent well data is not available yet, the wells were just sampled a couple weeks ago. The data will be shared with the TRC when it becomes available. Reed asked why not use just the MIPs data. Mark said that the probe would not read slight concentrations or discriminate between contaminants. MIPs will not differentiate between benzene and PCE, but it is still a good screening tool. The probe has three different detectors.

Reed asked if dry cleaning agents break down to something more harmful. Mark said it can breakdown to vinyl chloride, which is more toxic. Reed asked if it was persistent. Mark said that in aerobic environments vinyl chloride does not exist, but in anaerobic environments vinyl chloride can persist relatively longer. Reed asked if the groundwater flow direction was known. Mark said yes, shallow flow is generally to the southeast and varies about 15 degrees.

5-Year Review:

Mark explained that a 5-Year Review is required if contamination remains on-site. The suitability and protectiveness of the remedy should be evaluated after 5-years. It has been 5-years after construction completion and the Site 3 Causeway Landfill 5-Year clock is up this year. The Navy needs to evaluate if the remedy is still protective. The Navy plans to report all the MCRD sites at once. The Navy will need to advise the community that a 5-Year Review is taking place and the community has the opportunity of participate. Mark hands out the Notice of the 5-Year Review.

The next TRC meeting is scheduled for August 17, 2005 at 1730. It is anticipated that the TRC meeting will be held concurrently with the Proposed Plan public meeting for Site 12/SWMU 10.

END