N60200.AR.002805
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 16 JANUARY 2001 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NAS CECIL FIELD FL

1/16/2001

TETRA TECH NUS INC

Minutes

Cecil Commerce Center and Cecil Field Airport
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 16, 2001

The quarterly meeting of the Cecil Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) began at 7:00 PM on Tuesday, January 16, 2001. 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
David Scott, RAB Member

Navy, Regulators, and Officials
Mark Davidson
Scott Glass, Navy Co-chair
David Grabka
Debbie Vaughn-Wright

The following members were absent:

Community Members
Diane Peterson, Alt. Community Co-Chair
Lisa Chelf
William Dike
Margaret Day-Julian
Iran Maisonet
Skip Renckley

Navy, Regulators, and Officials
David Farrell
Steve McDermaid
William C. Wilson

The following support personnel and guests were present:
Andy Eckert (JEDC), Ralph Hogan (J.A. Jones), Sam Ross (J.A. Jones), Bob Simpson (JPA), Diana Stone (JPA), Mark Speranza (TtNUS), Rob Simcik (TtNUS), Mark Jonnet (TtNUS), Ralinda Miller (TtNUS).

Administrative

Richard Darby called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM. The October RAB Meeting Minutes were approved with the following change: Page 2, last paragraph, fourth line – May 2000 instead of May 1999.

John Flowe asked about the status of the activities of Charles Grosse (ATSDR), as discussed during the last RAB Meeting. The discussion on the pre-draft human health assessment continues between the Navy and ATSDR. The Navy has sent information requested by ATSDR and has provided their comments on the pre-draft document.

Q: What if Mr. Grosse/ATSDR does not agree with the Navy's conclusions.
A: ATSDR is not a regulatory body, but can provide comments and recommendations for education programs and more sampling as part of their evaluation, which is mandated by Superfund.

Q: Could his recommendations hold up the development process?
A: Yes, depending on the planned development. No development is planned at Site 15, so there is probably nothing to stop or delay. However, delays are possible in other areas. Mr. Flowe is specifically concerned about the Skeet Range, PSC 49, where development resulting in use/exposure is expected. Decisions about PSC 49 will be made based on the resolution of issues at Site 15. Different exposure assumptions may be used, but the approach will be the same. Issues raised by the ATSDR will need to be discussed with the community.

The ATSDR process now involves incorporating the information recently provided and getting a draft document out for public review. At that point, Mr. Grosse will probably want to come back to the RAB for another presentation. However, the time frame for that is not known based on the amount of new data he has received.

Buildings 9 and 46 Update

Sam Ross of J.A. Jones provided information about the progress of remediation activities at Building 9 and 46. Building 9 is the Former Fire Station on Skillside Ave. An underground storage tank (UST) was located at this site, and some spills occurred that triggered the cleanup now underway. Building 46 is the Former Gas Station where approximately eight diesel and gas USTs were present, but were removed in the 1980s. A relatively large groundwater plume was discovered at this site, with the contamination area covering approximately 165,000 square feet. The area of contamination at Building 9 covers approximately 6,000 square feet.

The Remedial Action Plan (RAP) initially developed for the sites estimated a cost of approximately $900,000 to clean up both sites. Subsequent to the submission of the RAP, Nick Ugolini, the Navy's Petroleum Program Coordinator for Cecil Field, learned of a new technology developed by the Department of Energy (DOE) and recently made available to the public. Proposed use of this technology resulted in a revised cost estimate of $500,000 for both sites and a faster cleanup time, so it was decided that it would be used at Buildings 9 and 46.

This nutrient-enhanced biosparging technology is a patented process installed by a specialist that involves injecting air mixed with triethylphosphate and nitrous oxide into the groundwater. Phosphate and nitrogen provide nutrients for microorganisms and stimulate biological growth in the groundwater. Biodegradation of the contaminants by these microorganisms is thereby enhanced.

J.A. Jones prepared the site for the pre-fabricated system, which the Navy is leasing, by installing 30 injection wells at Building 46 at depths of 40 and 90 feet below ground surface (bgs) and 4 wells at Building 9 at 40 feet bgs. The contractor then brought the systems to each site and connected them to the lines to complete installation. The system at Building 9 began operation on January 9, 2001, and the two systems at Building 46 are expected to start on January 17, 2001. Cleanup at both sites is expected in less than 1 year. The contractor operating the system has agreed to stay on until the groundwater cleanup target levels (GCTLs) are reached. There are performance incentives for the system operation contractor in the contract, with payments docked if the system shuts down.

Q: Are the wells far enough back from the road along New World Avenue to allow utilities to be installed?
A: They are expecting the remediation to be completed by the time the utilities will be installed. There are five wells right along New World Avenue because this is the most contaminated area of the site. To meet their schedule, they were willing to run the risk of having to replace the wells if they are disturbed as a result of utility activities.

Q: What is the status of the illicit discharge connections from buildings to sewers?
A: According to Scott Glass, Dave Kruzicki had identified all of the problem areas, and he was not aware of any remaining problems. Andy Eckert recently came across an e-mail chain indicating that all cross-connection and related problems were resolved. In addition, the City is planning to abandon all old utilities in place and install new lines.

Q: When will Building 9 be remediated?
A: Less than 1 year, possibly 3 to 6 months. They expect similar results as at Sites 3 and 16 and expect that the small source at the site should respond well to treatment.

Update on Former Railroad Track Sites

Mark Speranza of TtNUS provided an update on the status of the four former railroad bed sites. Potential past environmental releases along the former railroad beds were investigated to determine the conditions for

property transfer and reuse. A document search and interviews were conducted in April 2000 to identify areas potentially impacted by past railroad activities. Information was gathered about pesticide applications to the tracks, spills of fuels, pesticides, hydraulic fluids, etc., locomotive fueling, maintenance, and parking areas, and on- and off-loading areas. Based on the results of the record search, four areas of high potential concern were identified as requiring investigation, including:

- Building 98, a maintenance and fueling area
- Former Fuel Depot, near South Fuel Farm (SFF) and Day Tank 2
- Building 535, the former Aviation Ordnance (AVORD) off-loading area
- Building 635, the loading dock in Yellow Water.

At Building 98, PAH contamination in excess of the FDEP industrial soil cleanup target levels (SCTLs) was identified and delineated. The area to be excavated is small, approximately 5 cubic yards, and is located on a separate track spur to the east of the PSC 50 excavation area. A dig and haul package detailing the excavation to be conducted was finalized this month, and removal activities are expected to start in early March. PAH contamination in excess of FDEP industrial SCTLs was also identified and delineated at the Former Fuel Depot site. A draft dig and haul package was submitted on January 10, 2001, and approval is expected at the current BCT Meeting. The excavation is scheduled for mid-March. PAH contamination was identified and delineated along the former AVORD loading dock area. The dig and haul package was finalized this month, and the excavation is scheduled for March. Sampling to delineate PAH contamination continues at Building 635, the former Yellow Water loading dock. The area of contamination is currently approximately 100 feet long. Once the area is delineated, a dig and haul package for excavation will be prepared.

All railroad sites will eventually be remediated to industrial standards and will require land use controls (LUCs) for property transfer.

Q: What is the proposed future use of the Building 635 area based on the business plan?
A: It is in a wetlands area that will not be developed. We may have to reevaluate the Building 635 data based on its use as a wetlands set aside and as part of the water management plan. There may be associated ecological issues.

Site 36 and 37 Remedial Design

Mark Jonnet, of TtNUS gave an update on the design of the Site 36 and 37 groundwater remediation system. Similar to Sites 3 and 16 and other sites at Cecil Field, air sparging will be used for groundwater remediation at Site 36 and 37. Air sparging will be conducted in three hot spot areas and then natural attenuation will be allowed to address the remainder of the plume. The hot spots make up approximately 5 acres of the approximately 25-acre site. Air sparging involves the injection of compressed air below the zone of contamination to enhance volatilization and aerobic degradation of dissolved groundwater contaminants.

Hot Spot 1 is a small area of contamination in a grassy field west of Buildings 177 and 302 and southeast of Building 72. Approximately 24 pounds of petroleum-related contaminants (benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, and xylenes – BTEX) are present in this area. One or two compressors will supply eight sparge wells in this area. Hot Spot 2 is south of Hot Spot 1 in a grassy area between two taxiways. Groundwater contamination consisting of approximately 7 pounds of TCE extends to 42 and 88 feet bgs, with some clean areas between. Hot Spot 3 is a relatively large area of contamination located southeast of Hangar 14. Contamination is at 15 and 39 feet bgs, extending deeper to the west. This hot spot contains approximately 804 pounds of BTEX and DCE, with BTEX making up about 99% of the contaminants. A concrete apron consisting of 10-inch thick, 12-foot by 15-foot pads makes up 85% of the area, and the remainder, to the east, is in a grassy area. An outstanding issue of the design is how to install the air conveyance lines without removing the concrete pads. The cost to remove the pads and install all of the system underground is estimated at $1.5 million. The concrete will have to be removed to install the sparge points, but we are trying to come up with a way to run the conveyance lines with minimal disturbance to the concrete and to air traffic. The current idea involves cutting small trenches in the concrete and installing the lines within these trenches.

The Hot Spot 1 air sparging system will consist of eight sparge wells installed to a depth of 50 feet bgs. Based on the results of groundwater modeling, it is estimated that BTEX remediation will continue for approximately 4 months to 1 year and 4 months. After this time, the system may be operated in pulse mode for an additional year based on quarterly sampling data. In pulse mode, the system will be turned off for 3 months, during which time contaminant concentrations may rebound. If this happens, the system will be restarted and operated for 3 months, and this process will be repeated until significant rebound is not observed. Data collected from system pulsing operations at Sites 3 and 16 will be used to refine modeling estimates for Site 36 and 37. Hot Spot 2 will consist of a total of 28 sparge wells with three at 45 feet bgs, eight at 65 feet bgs, and 17 at 90 feet bgs. It is estimated that TCE cleanup in this area will continue for approximately 2 to 6 months. This system also may run in the "3 month on/3 months off" pulse mode for an additional year. Hot Spot 3 will include a total of 46 sparge wells with 38 at 15 feet bgs to address BTEX contamination and eight at 45 feet bgs to address DCE contamination. The cleanup time for DCE is estimated to be from 1 to 4 years, and the cleanup time for BTEX is estimated at from 9 months to 2 years and 8 months. The difference in cleanup time is due to the fact that the DCE contamination is deeper and less sparge wells are proposed. Based on quarterly sampling data, this system may be operated in pulse mode for an additional year.

The shallow BTEX plume in Hot Spot 3 extends to the area where Bob Simpson would like to build a hangar (near existing Hangar 14). Although it has not yet been discussed with the BCT, it may be possible to shut off the eastern leg of the system in this area and let hangar construction proceed before the hot spot is entirely cleaned up. Bob stated that he does not plan to build the hangar for 3 years, and the air sparging may be completed by then, with contaminant concentrations reduced to system remediation goals, but not GCTLs. Construction before the completion of hot spot remedial activities would require design coordination between hangar construction and RAB/BCT representatives.

The estimated cost for the air sparging systems at Hot Spots 1 and 2 is $323,000. The estimated costs for Hot Spot 3 depend on whether the system is installed above or below ground. The cost to install the Hot Spot 3 system completely aboveground (no concrete pad removal for conveyance piping) is estimated at $475,000, the cost for a 50% above/50% below ground installation is $1,185,000, and the cost to install the system completely beneath the concrete is $1,580,000. The cost associated with the current idea of surface trenches is approximately $800,000 to $900,000.

The completion of the design is expected in approximately one month and then construction will begin a few months after that. Only the Hot Spot 3 system will affect runway traffic, and construction of this system will probably be conducted in phases to allow for continued air traffic.

Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Presentation

Mark Davidson, SOUTHDIV, provided an overview of what has been done at Cecil Field with respect to UXO. In 1994, a company named EOD-T was contracted to do geophysical surveys for UXO at various sites. EOD-Mayport was hired to excavate any anomalies found by EOD-T during their surveys. Geophysical surveys were conducted at Area of Interest (AOI) 34 (Rowell Creek Ordnance Disposal Area) Potential Source of Contamination (PSC) 18 (Ammunition Disposal Area) and at 11 sites in the Yellow Water Weapons Area (YWWA). These areas were chosen as having a high probability to contain UXO based on a record search, aerial photography review, and interviews with Navy personnel.

AOI 34 is located just south of Sites 1 and 2 near the southwestern perimeter of the main base. Geophysical surveys were performed on both sides of Rowell Creek in this area by EOD-T in two 100-ft by 200-foot survey grids. The only UXO found during excavation at the site was one MK 24 flare. Because of the limited UXO found, no environmental sampling for explosives/explosives waste was conducted at AOI 34. The site has been approved for no further action (NFA), and there are no plans for further investigative activities at the site.

PSC 18 is located near the southeastern corner of the main base in the AVORD area, off of Perimeter Road. EOD-T performed a geophysical survey on an approximately 100-foot by 200-foot area on the high ground

on both sides of the bridge at the site. Ordnance disposal had been reported at this site, and a truck accident on the bridge was reported, resulting in UXO in the water below. A total of 231 ordnance items were found and removed from PSC 18 including:

- 150 20-millimeter rockets
- seventy-six 2.75 rocket warheads
- two unknown cartridges
- one flare
- one MK 4 cartridge
- one 50-caliber round

The survey of the creek itself could not be completed at the same time as the ground survey because the water was too high. A survey of the creek was performed during a drier period and will be discussed later. After removal of the items listed above, environmental sampling was conducted at PSC 18 including the collection of surface water, sediment, and groundwater samples. No contamination was identified, and the recommendation for NFA approved for the site.

For the UXO investigation in YWWA, EOD experts looked at drawings and photos, and conducted interviews resulting in the identification of 11 suspect areas totaling 333 acres to be investigated. Only 18 live items were found in four grid areas over the 333 acres surveyed including sixteen 7.62-millimeter rounds and two 50-caliber rounds. Most of the anomalies detected in YWWA were ordnance exploded waste (OEW) or the actual spent metal slugs from bullets. Based on this data, the BCT decided that no further investigation of YWAA with respect to UXO was warranted. The Naval Ordnance Center and the Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board both approved the removal of the blast arcs, concurred that the YWWA investigation was adequate, and approved the YWWA for unrestricted reuse. No further UXO investigations have been conducted or are planned in Yellow Water.

In 1997, EOD-Mayport returned to PSC 18 to conduct a magnetometer survey and removal action under the wooden bridge at the site (some items were visible in the water beneath the bridge). To perform this investigation, the creek was dammed and a fire truck was used to pump remaining water out of the area to be surveyed. Based on visual observations and survey results, EOD-Mayport personnel went into the area and removed a total of 450 items from the creek bed at PSC 18 including:

- one 5-inch rocket warhead (inert)
- one MK 76 practice bomb (inert)
- sixty-three 2.75-inch rocket warheads (inert)
- 175 20-millimeter APT cartridges (live or treated as live)
- 150 MK 2 Mod 1 impulse cartridges (live or treated as live)
- thirty-nine 2.75-inch rockets (live or treated as live)
- four MK 8 impulse cartridges (live or treated as live)
- three 50-caliber cartridges (live or treated as live)
- one 2.25-inch rocket warhead (live or treated as live)
- thirteen MK 4 signal cartridges (live or treated as live).

Inert items were turned over to the Weapons Department, and items that were live or treated as live were disposed of by detonation at PSC 14. No further UXO investigations are currently planned for PSC 18.

Also as part of the 1997 UXO work, investigations were conducted at Sites 1, 2, 10, and 15. At Sites 1 and 2, each proposed soil gas sample point was cleared with a magnetometer, and ingress/egress routes to sampling locations were visually surveyed. Six inert UXO items were found and removed from Sites 1 and 2 including:

- three 2.75-inch rocket pods
- one MK 76 practice bomb
- one old style GP bomb
- one metal nose cone

At Site 10, a visual UXO survey was conducted along the creek channel and Rowell Creek floodplain area between Sites 1 and 2 and Site 10. UXO material found and disposed of was limited to one 2.75-inch rocket

motor. A visual survey/walkover of Site 15 was conducted to determine if magnetometer surveying was required at the site. No magnetometer surveying was recommended based on the findings of the walkover, which included only one UXO item, an inert MK 82 GP bomb. An MK 82 was identified as a 500-pound bomb, and a GP bomb is a general purpose bomb, also known as a "dumb bomb" that is just dropped, as opposed to a smart bomb that seeks out a target. There is no information as to why it was at Site 15, but because of its size, it was probably taken there for a specific purpose. It would not be expected at Site 15 based on past use of the site.

A comment was made that the reuse plan for Site CE-2, identified as the "malfunction range," is for construction of a Jacksonville Community College campus.

Sites Update and PSC Update

Mark Davidson of SOUTHDIV briefly reviewed the status of sites at Cecil Field, referencing the Sites Update document distributed with the January RAB materials and the PSC and Grey Site Schedule/Status Table available today.

The Site 15 ecological conceptual model is being reviewed. At Site 16, the air sparging system was restarted in December because concentrations of TCE in one well in the source area had rebounded to approximately 3,100 ppb, in excess of the system goal of 1,000 ppb. This well originally had a TCE concentration of about 1,000,000 ppb. The air sparging system was also restarted at Site 3 due to rebounding of TCE concentrations above the system goal of 1,255 ppb. The Site 45 Remedial Investigation (RI) and Feasibility Study (FS) were submitted in draft form, and the RI and FS reports for Sites 21 and 25 are being completed. It appears that monitoring only will be required at Sites 21 and 25, and Site 45 may require some type of engineered system. Soil excavation activities are nearly complete at the North Fuel Farm (NFF), and quarterly monitoring continues at the Jet Engine Test Cell (JETC) site. At 103rd Street, soil sampling was performed to investigate odors reported by the City during construction activities at 103rd Street and Wesconnett Boulevard.

Looking at the PSC/Grey Site Status Table, no soil excavations have been conducted since October. Excavations are scheduled for PSCs 21, 25, 39, and 42, Site 36/37 (a small area of contamination and the only soil excavation at this site), and former railroad bed sites 535, 98, and Former Fuel Depot. If the contaminated area at Building 635, the fourth railroad bed site, can be delineated in the next sampling phase, excavation can be scheduled in the next 2 to 3 months. Other remaining open sites include Building 610, PSC 49, and the active golf course.

Q: Has it been determined whether the contamination at 103rd Street and Wesconnett is jet fuel or gasoline? There was a gas station in that area.

A: This issue was brought up, but the data is not yet available. It should be obvious by looking at the data whether the contamination is from jet fuel or gasoline.

Conclusion

Richard Darby adjourned the meeting at 9:15 P.M. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 17, 2001 at the same location. If anyone has any suggestions as to future RAB agenda items, contact one of the BCT members. If the location changes, a public notice will be placed in the Florida Times-Union announcing the new location.