

N60200.AR.002721
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 24 OCTOBER 2000 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NAS
CECIL FIELD FL
10/24/2000
TETRA TECH NUS INC



Minutes

Cecil Commerce Center and Cecil Field Airport Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 24, 2000

The quarterly meeting of the Cecil Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) began at 7:00 PM on Tuesday, October 24, 2000. The meeting was held in the Conference Room of Building 82 at the Cecil Field Airport.

The following RAB members were present:

Community Members

Richard Darby, Community Co-Chair
Diane Peterson, Alternate Community Co-Chair
William Dike
Margaret Day-Julian

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

Mark Davidson
Scott Glass, Navy Co-chair
David Grabka
Debbie Vaughn-Wright
John Flowe

The following members were absent:

Community Members

Lisa Chelf
Iran Maisonet
Skip Renckley
David Scott

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

David Farrell
Keith Halford
Steve McDermaid
William C. Wilson

The following support personnel and guests were present:

Andy Eckert (JEDC), Charles Grosse (ATSDR), Rob Harrell (SOUTHDIIV), Ralph Hogan (J.A. Jones), Diane Jackson (ATSDR), William Luttrell (NEHC), David McConaughy (NEHC), Steve McDermaid (Cecil BJC), Steve Patterson (Florida Times-Union), Sam Ross (J.A. Jones), Bob Simpson (JPA), Mark Speranza (TtNUS), Rob Simcik (TtNUS), Ron Kotun (TtNUS), Mark Jonnet (TtNUS), Ralinda Miller (TtNUS).

Administrative

Richard Darby called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. The October RAB Meeting Minutes were approved with no changes. Dave Grabka was introduced as the new FDEP representative for Cecil Field. Diane Peterson announced that she had been invited to represent the RAB at the Department of Defense (DoD) Environmental Cleanup Stakeholders Forum in November. The theme of the conference is "smart cleanup."

North Fuel Farm (NFF) Update

Sam Ross of J.A. Jones provided information about the progress of remediation activities at the NFF. All of the tanks have been removed, and the mound is gone. The site is now flat. The truck fueling area has been demolished, and a large pile of clean soil from the mound is being stored there. Approximately 70,000 tons of soil from the site were excavated and disposed of offsite as contaminated. As a reference, one dump truck can transport approximately 24 tons of soil. These soils were taken to a landfill in Jessup, GA, determined to be the most cost effective disposal method.

Approximately 216 tons of asbestos-coated pipe also were removed from the site. The six 60,000-gallon tanks were cut up, and the steel was recycled. A 12-inch concrete layer above the tanks also was removed and recycled.

An issue arose during work as to what to do with rainwater that had accumulated in depressions at the site. A permit was granted to discharge this water to the site wastewater treatment plant. The water was passed through an oil-water separator prior to discharge to be sure it was clean. The site has dried out now with the end of hurricane season.

A major management challenge associated with the NFF remediation was the separation of clean soil (that could be reused as fill) from dirty soil that had to be disposed of offsite. Approximately \$2.5 million, one-third of the original estimated total cost of the project, was saved by segregating clean soils using field screening techniques. Sam mentioned the success of working with the State to come up with the methodology for this process that has been successful in the field.

Q: What happens next?

A: Now that the mound and tanks are gone, the subsurface soils must be removed to the water table. Contaminated soils are present beneath the former tank locations and free product is present at the water table. After soil removal is complete, a remedial action plan for dissolved groundwater contamination will be developed. The plan will probably involve an air sparging system for the dissolved plume.

Q: Will there be a Record of Decision (ROD) for this site?

A: This site is under a different program and will have a Remedial Action Plan.

Site 16 and Site 3 Updates

Site 16

Rob Simcik of TtNUS discussed the air sparging systems at Sites 3 and 16. Contamination at Site 16 resulted from operation of a seepage pit for disposal of liquid wastes from 1959 to 1980. In 1994, a source removal was conducted to remove the pit, associated hardware, and approximately 1,500 cubic yards of contaminated soil. Also in 1994, 42 temporary groundwater sampling locations were installed using direct push technology (DPT). Six groundwater samples from various depths were collected from each location. Based on these data points, 30 permanent wells were installed.

The Site 16 ROD for groundwater, approved in 1996, called for pump and treat in the source area with discharge to the federally-owned treatment works (FOTW - on-site wastewater treatment plant) and enhanced bioremediation for the downgradient plume. However, because of scheduled site closure, it was uncertain that the FOTW would be available to handle extracted groundwater from the site. In 1999, an amended ROD for Site 16 was approved with air sparging/soil vapor extraction (AS/SVE) in the source area and monitored natural attenuation of the plume. In addition, storm sewer repair was included to prevent infiltration of contaminated groundwater.

A pilot-scale test was conducted in 1998 at the site to establish the physical parameters for the full-scale design including the radius of influence for injection and extraction wells and requirements for offgas treatment. Based on data obtained from this test, the full-scale system included three pairs of injection wells screened at 58 to 60 feet below ground surface (bgs) and 95 to 100 feet bgs, nineteen extraction wells screened from 3 to 7 feet bgs, and dual vessel granulated activated carbon (GAC) units for offgas treatment.

Startup of the full-scale AS/SVE system was in June 1999. While the system was in operation, air samples were collected before extracted air entered the GAC units and after air passed through the units. Results showed that approximately 1,220 pounds of total VOCs were removed from the aquifer and that the GAC units had an average VOC removal rate greater than 99%. The system was shut off in May 2000 when two consecutive rounds of groundwater data showed TCE concentrations below the remediation system goal of 1,000 ug/L. Prior to start up, the maximum TCE concentration in the source area was nearly 1,000,000 ug/L. All source area wells now have TCE concentrations at or below 1,000 ug/L. Wells at the perimeter of the system's zone of influence continued to show low concentrations of contaminants (contamination was not being pushed downgradient).

Groundwater sampling at Site 16 will continue to assess any rebound affects as a result of system shutdown. The AS/SVE system will be restarted if substantial rebound is detected, and if it is determined that effective removal of VOCs can be achieved.

Q: Is this success a reason to delist the site?

A: The time to assess that would be when the FDEP groundwater target cleanup goal of 3 ug/L of TCE has been reached, not the remediation objective of 1,000 ug/L.

Q: When will the system be removed?

A: We need to leave the system in place until natural attenuation has been proven conclusively and rebound effects are assessed. It cost approximately \$500,000 to install the system, and it is more cost effective to maintain it for now rather than remove it and then possibly have to reinstall it later.

Site 3

Site 3 was a liquid waste disposal area from the mid-1950s to 1975, at which time it was closed and filled with clean soil. The ROD specified air sparging of the source area, monitored natural attenuation of the downgradient plume, institutional controls, and five-year reviews. The air sparging system design was based on the pilot study at Site 5. Groundwater modeling identified a remediation objective of 1,225 ug/L TCE and a cleanup time of 0.5 to 2.5 years. The AS system included 15 injection wells screened at 45 to 50 feet bgs and five vapor monitoring points. Offgas treatment was not required at this site because only approximately 75 pounds of total VOCs were estimated to be present in the source area.

The AS system began operation in May 1999. Quarterly groundwater monitoring of source area and downgradient wells was conducted for contaminants of concern and natural attenuation parameters. Concentrations of TCE decreased to below the remediation goal of 1,225 ug/L for two consecutive sampling events, and the system was shut off in May 2000. Wells at the perimeter of the system's zone of influence continued to show low concentrations of contaminants (contamination was not being pushed downgradient).

From the site figure, it appears that the plume discharges directly to the creek. However, our data and previous research indicate that the creek sediments degrade the contaminants before they can impact the surface water. Monitoring will continue to make sure this process continues effectively.

Groundwater sampling at Site 3 will continue to assess any rebound affects as a result of system shutdown. The AS system will be restarted if substantial rebound is detected, and if it is determined that effective removal of VOCs can be achieved.

Q: Have concentrations of TCE at both sites begun creeping back up since the systems were shut down?

A: Just at Site 16. At Site 3, the concentrations have remained fairly consistent. For both sites, the option of turning the system back on remains open.

Five-Year Review

Debbie Vaughn-Wright of U.S. EPA discussed the results of the Five-Year Review. The purpose of a five-year review is to look at the remedial actions in place and see if they are functioning effectively. Five-year reviews are required under Superfund. For each operable unit, the following is included in the five-year review:

- Site inspection
- Review remedial action objectives (RAOs)
- Review site cleanup levels
- Review data and documents
- Review projected and actual costs
- Note any deficiencies in actions to date
- Provide recommendations.

Installation Restoration (IR) sites with RODs require five-year reviews. The clock starts on the five-year review process when the first remedial action takes place at a site. At Cecil Field, the trigger was the early soil removal actions in 1994 and 1995 at Site 5, 11, 16, and 17. Five-year reviews will continue until cleanup goals have been met. Evaluations in this five-year review document are based on data as of June 1999.

At OU 1, Sites 1 and 2, short-term actions have been completed and long-term monitoring indicates that impacts are limited to upstream portions of the Site 2 tributary.

At OU 2, Sites 5 and 17, soil remedial actions began in 1995, have been completed for both sites, and met the goal of removing source soils affecting groundwater. Both sites are now in the groundwater long-term monitoring/monitored natural attenuation phase.

At OU 3, Sites 7 and 8, soil excavations are complete and both sites are now in the groundwater long-term monitoring/monitored natural attenuation phase.

At OU 4, Site 10, a ROD recommending no further action was issued in 1997. However, reevaluation of soil data identified arsenic in soil at levels greater than the FDEP soil cleanup target level (SCTL). Soils were excavated based on a 1999 amended ROD, and no further action is required.

OU 5 sites were not evaluated because Site 14 had a no further action ROD and the Feasibility Study (FS) is still underway at Site 15.

At OU 6, Site 11, soil excavations are complete and long-term groundwater monitoring is in progress.

Detailed information about OU 7, Site 16 and OU 8, Site 3 was provided during Rob Simcik's earlier presentations. At both sites, soil removal actions were effective and air sparging appeared effective at the time at the review. Evaluation of groundwater data continues at both sites.

OU 9, Site 36 and 37 was not evaluated because the FS was still being reviewed at the time.

Institutional controls must be implemented at all sites where contamination will remain in place, and Land Use Implementation Control Plans (LUCIPs) will be required that outline the purpose, location, and exact nature of these controls. Groundwater monitoring will continue until cleanup goals have been met at all sites. The next five-year review is scheduled for 2005. This document will probably be more detailed with respect to groundwater remediation because most systems were in their early stages at the time of this review.

Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) Update

Scott Glass of SOUTHDIV gave an update on the status of the FOSTs. The Clay County Parcel was conveyed through the public benefit conveyance mechanism. This FOST was completed in June 1999, and the transfer was completed in July 1999. There were no environmental issues affecting this transfer.

The Jacksonville Port Authority (JPA) Phase I Parcel also was conveyed through the public benefit conveyance mechanism. The FOST was completed in August 1999, and the transfer was completed in September 1999. Several carveouts, areas that require additional cleanup, were included in this parcel. Approximately 95% of the property has been transferred. JPA Phase II through Phase V Parcels were established based on grouping of the sites based on expected cleanup times to accommodate property transfer.

Transfer of the JPA Phase II parcel is scheduled for September 2000. No further action has been approved for all sites within this parcel, and no land use controls (LUCs) or additional funding will be required. Transfer of the JPA Phase III Parcel is scheduled for April 2001. Four of the eight sites in this parcel will require soil and/or groundwater land use controls, and some sites will have industrial limitations. Transfer of the Phase IV Parcel is scheduled for April 2002, and soil and/or groundwater LUCs will be required at all five of the sites in this parcel. The Phase V Parcel is scheduled for transfer in June 2003. LUCs for soil and/or

groundwater will be required at all four sites within this parcel. FY00 funding was mainly for NFF cleanup, and FY01 funding will be required NFF and Site 36/37 cleanup activities.

Q: How much funding is included in FY01 for the Site 36/37 cleanup?

A: Enough to get the air sparging system up and running and for 1 year of system operation.

The Jacksonville Parks and Recreation (P & R) Phase I Parcel was transferred through the public benefit conveyance mechanism in March 2000. Approximately 92% of P & R property has been transferred, with several sites requiring cleanup being carved out. Transfer of the P & R Phase II Parcel is scheduled for December 2001. LUCs will be required for Site 15. FY00 funding was mainly for Site 15 investigation and "Grey Site" cleanup. FY01 funding is required for Site 15 remediation and completion of "Grey Site" cleanup.

The Jacksonville Economic Development Commission (JEDC) Phase I Parcel was scheduled for transfer under the economic development conveyance mechanism in September 2000. Approximately 96% of JEDC property will be transferred, with several sites being carved out. The JEDC Phase II Parcel is scheduled for transfer in January 2001. Groundwater LUCs will be required at Facility 199 only. This will be the first transfer including LUCs and deed restrictions, and will be a test of the national issue of establishing and maintaining LUCs. Dialogue continues of this issue with the Navy, State, U.S. EPA, and the City of Jacksonville. Transfer of the JEDC Phase II Parcel is scheduled for September 2001 and will require soil and/or groundwater LUCs at all seven sites. Sites that require additional funding include the existing golf course, former railroad bed sites, and the skeet range. The JEDC Phase IV Parcel is scheduled for transfer in December 2002, and will require soil and/or groundwater LUCs at all six sites.

Successes include:

- Transfer of approximately 16,418 acres, over 95% of the facility
- "Hot turnover" of the flightline at JPA on schedule (no downtime)
- Successful completion of the closure of the Hazardous Waste Storage Facility, eliminating RCRA post-closure requirements.

Q: Will this site still have a HSWA permit?

A: Yes. The closure was on the Part B Storage Facility (regulated unit). The Navy will still hold the permit.

The major challenges remaining include:

- Operating properly and successfully (OPS) determinations. U.S. EPA must concur that site remedies are operating properly before transfer can occur.
- Reaching agreement on LUC language to facilitate transfer of carve-out parcels.
- Investigation and potential cleanup at the active golf course to support future "recreational" reuse.
- Investigation and potential cleanup at former railroad bed sites.
- Reaching agreement on cleanup levels and method of defining extent of required remediation at Site 15.

Site 15 Update

Ron Kotun of TtNUS discussed the latest information on Site 15. One of the biggest challenges to date has been reaching agreement on cleanup levels. Major contaminants of concern (COCs) are lead and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Lead and PAHs are present in different areas based on the past uses of the sites. From its use as a skeet range, lead is present from lead shot in shotgun shells and PAHs are present from clay pigeons. PAHs are also present as a result of the burning of old ordnance on site. Approximately 800 soil samples have been collected to define the area of extent of lead and PAH contamination. The BCT, in consultation with others from the Navy, State, and U.S. EPA, is trying to decide on cleanup levels.

Proposed future use of the site is as a natural resources conservation center, which means that cleanup does not need to be as protective as would be required for a residential area. Recreational cleanup levels for human health protection are calculated based on site data using FDEP general recreational assumptions. Ecological

receptors identified for Site 15 include the robin, woodcock, and shrew, and established models are available for these receptors. The human health exposure area is the entire 85 acres of the site because it is unlikely that people would spend all of their time in only one area of the site. Based on this exposure area and the general recreational assumptions, a preliminary cleanup value of approximately 3,000 ppm lead has been calculated. The ranges of the robin and the woodcock are larger than the site area, but the shrew has a home range of approximately 2.4 acres, making it the most sensitive receptor at the site. A preliminary cleanup value of 1,400 ppm has been calculated as being protective of the shrew.

The average lead concentration across the site is approximately 1,100 ppm, so the site is currently safe for humans, but we need to ensure that the average concentration within each 2.4 acre unit is less than 1,400ppm. This will involve removing some contaminated soil and replacing it with clean soil. This will also be more protective of human health by lowering the overall average concentration across the site. The key issue is that we are looking at average concentrations – some areas of soil with concentrations greater than 1,400 ppm can be left at the sites as long as the average concentration is less than that. Calculated cleanup values are all currently preliminary – there are outstanding issues that still need to be resolved regarding ecological receptors to arrive at final cleanup levels.

Geostatistics are being used at the site to predict roughly where areas that require remediation for lead and PAHs area located. For PAHs, concentrations of benzo(a)pyrene (BaP) equivalents, a value that represents the total of concentration of carcinogenic PAHs, is being used as opposed to concentrations of specific PAHs to evaluate remediation areas.

The cost of a standard cleanup to the industrial SCTL is approximately \$30 million. For a cleanup to recreational use for humans and protection of the shrew with remediation areas defined by simply “connecting the dots” would cost approximately \$7.4 million for removal of approximately 46,000 cubic yards of soil. Using geostatistics, which may provide a more accurate delineation of areas to be remediated, the cost would be approximately \$1.5 million to remove approximately 10,000 cubic yards of soil.

A major outstanding issue is what ecological receptor to use. The experts called upon to help reach a decision have conflicting opinions.

Q: Will the City be involved in determining the cleanup level?

A: The City’s reuse plan is what is driving it by requiring a recreational cleanup, but the City will not be involved at the level of detailed discussions.

Q: Can the City say that the site is not cleaned up enough?

A: Yes.

John Flowe, City of Jacksonville, initiated a discussion of planned LUCs for Site 15. Currently, plans for the site include passive recreation with no fixed structures and with organized activity restricted to the existing roads. It is possible that people may walk in other areas, but there will be no recreational development at the site. There has been no big push for off-road uses at the site. An equestrian area is being planned just east of Site 15 at which trail use can occur, but trails will follow existing roads (for reasons of convenience and cost). It is possible for users to venture off of existing trails/roads, but the human health risk assessment says that would be safe.

Charles Grosse, of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) made some comments of Site 15. He said that he had not been successful in getting all of the data together. He feels that there is a need to have data in a readily usable form so that people can make informed decisions. He was given new Site 15 data today, but does not believe that sampling has been adequate to assess risks to public health. If the site is to be used by humans, he would recommend exposure-based sampling and bioavailability testing, and if children use the site regularly, he would recommend blood lead level testing.

Mr. Flowe reiterated that, as for City-owned recreational facilities, it is not foreseen that there would be regular daily use of these areas, but only occasional passive use as part of a larger recreational corridor. No development is planned for the corridor.

Mr. Grosse said that he was very concerned about LUCs and about having a caretaker to track issues and make sure that “nothing falls through the cracks.” He is hoping that the City will take a big lead in tracking and monitoring LUCs so that they are not lost for future generations.

Scott Glass mentioned that the EPA and the State have been working very closely with the Navy in developing plans on how to handle LUCs. They are trying to be as detailed as possible and include a means for tracking the controls in the future. Dave Grabka, FDEP, stated that the State is more focused on having enforceability, not just tracking, but being able to halt land use restriction violations.

Mr. Grosse stated that he recommends an educational program about potential hazards at the site and asked who would be responsible for implementing such a program. Mr. Flowe stated that the City’s Recreational Department manages recreational facilities, so it would likely be done by that department. Mr. Grosse further stated that his opinion that a deed may not be the best enforcement mechanism for LUCs. One reason is that a deed is not required to obtain building permits. Also, the property could be sold and the actions of future tenants could not be controlled.

Q: Is it possible for the City to have language that the property cannot be sold?

A: These decisions are based on economic development – if the end is best served by selling the property, the City would want to be able to do that.

Diane Peterson stated that she does not feel comfortable with what was presented today about lead at Site 15, especially with respect to children, and that she does not want the City to sell the property. It was restated that the City did not have any plans to sell the property and that risk assessment calculations indicated that a child would have no increased risk even if he/she spent 250 days a year at the site. It was observed that there is not really anything of particular interest in this area to encourage children to spend a lot of time there, and that they would most likely just be passing through the area. Of most concern would be children from NAS Jacksonville Navy housing, which is located in the area, spending time at the site. However, it was noted that families can spend only 3 years in that housing, and again, calculations have shown that even spending 250 days per year there would be safe.

Q: Are there Boy Scout camps there?

A: No. The City does not know of any camps at Cecil Field.

Q: What if the fair is moved there?

A: The fair would encompass more area than just this corridor, and although activities take place at the fair grounds year-round, it is not expected that the same people would be there for more than 250 days per year.

Mr. Grosse mentioned his desire for a comprehensive data management plan to allow presentation of all data available for Cecil Field. He feels that all of the data – CERCLA, asbestos, lead-based paint, petroleum, etc. needs to be brought together in one place in electronic format. He also would like to see some kind of screening of indoor air in areas with groundwater contaminated with chlorinated solvents and petroleum products. His plan is to go back and incorporate the data he received today and make recommendations.

Sites Update and PSC Update

Mark Davidson of SOUTHDIV briefly reviewed the status of sites at Cecil Field, referencing the Sites Update document that was distributed with the October monthly materials and the PSC and Grey Site Schedule/Status Table available today. Most sites were discussed in earlier presentations.

At OU 9, Site 36 and 37, the Feasibility Study (FS) and Proposed Plan (PP) have been issued.

A quarterly groundwater monitoring event was conducted in July.

At Buildings 9 and 46, the air sparging systems are to be installed November 6, 2000.

Looking at the PSC/Grey Site Status Table, 6 sites have had soil excavations completed since the last meeting, and 4 additional sites have proposed excavations in the approval process.

Future activities at PSC 49 will be determined based on the outcome of Site 15 discussions based on their similar history and COCs (both were skeet ranges and have lead and PAH contamination).

At the active Golf Course, PSC 51, soil sampling has been conducted and monitoring well installation is planned. The next step is to begin “crunching numbers” for the human health and ecological risk assessments to see what has to be remediated. It is expected that most excavation will be limited to tees and greens. There is no current human health risk to play golf.

At former railroad beds at Building 635 and the Former Fuel Depot, soil sampling is continuing to determine the extent of contamination. At Buildings 535 and 98, delineation is complete, dig and haul packages have been submitted, and soil excavations are pending. We are almost at the point at which these 4 sites can be carved out. This process can be fast-tracked if it appears that it will impact the City’s plans.

The RCRA closure was completed at Building 610. This building had previously been a PWC maintenance area, but in 1985, it was converted to a RCRA-permitted Part B facility. Soil sampling is now being conducted to investigate low levels of contamination previously detected in soil samples at the site.

We started with 250 sites in the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS), and we are now down to these few at which investigation activities are still ongoing.

Q: JEDC has plans to demolish Building 11. Soil excavation is complete at this site. What happens if wells are destroyed?

A: Any wells destroyed during demolition activities must be replaced.

Mr. Grosse stated that he would like to locate the 3 other fishable lakes (aside from Fretwell and Newman) mentioned in the Environmental Assessment. John Flowe said they were located north of Normandy Boulevard, and subsequently showed Mr. Grosse the locations on a site map on the wall of the meeting room.

Conclusion

Richard Darby concluded the meeting at 9:15 P.M. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 16, 2001 at the same location. If the location changes, a public notice will be placed in the Florida Times-Union announcing the new location.