

N60200.AR.002907  
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL  
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 17 APRIL 2001 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NAS CECIL  
FIELD FL  
4/17/2001  
TETRA TECH NUS INC



# **Minutes**

## **Cecil Commerce Center and Cecil Field Airport Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes Tuesday, April 17, 2001**

The quarterly meeting of the Cecil Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) began at 7:00 PM on Tuesday, April 17, 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  
Diane Peterson, Alt. Community Co-Chair  
Margaret Day-Julian, 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

Lisa Chelf  
William Dike  
Iran Maisonet  
Edward Renckley  
David Scott

#### Navy, Regulators, and Officials

David Farrell, USFWS  
John Flowe, RESD  
Steve McDermaid  
Lewis Murray, USGS  
William C. Wilson

### **The following support personnel and guests were present:**

Ralph Hogan (J.A. Jones), Bob Simpson (JPA), Diana Stone (JPA), Rob Simcik (TtNUS), Mark Jonnet (TtNUS), Ralinda Miller (TtNUS), Stephen Stewart (JEDC), Alan Seeling, Darrell Heiden, and Joseph Aikon (Cherokee Environmental)

### **Administrative**

Richard Darby called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. The January RAB Meeting Minutes were approved without changes.

An announcement was made that Scott Glass and Richard Darby will attend a RAB Workshop next month in Denver, Colorado. The workshop will be an information exchange between RABs.

### **JEDC Development Plan Update**

Stephen Stewart of the Jacksonville Economic Development Commission (JEDC) stood in for Andy Eckerd to provide the presentation on development plans for Cecil Commerce Center. An organizational chart for the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) was presented. Two Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are “on the street” including one for Master Developer and one for Program Manager. Presentations from the Master Developer short list firms will be made at the end of April. The Program Manager will assist the City in managing over \$80 million in funds programmed for Cecil Commerce Center over the next 5 years. The decision on this contract is scheduled to be made next week.

Development is still following the Business/Operations Plan as detailed in the Cecil Field Final Base Reuse and Transition Plan. Long-term planning goals, on a 20-year horizon, include:

- Creation of jobs/asset value
- Attraction of “high-end” users

- Multi-modal development (runways, interstates, can reestablish rail lines)
- Balance growth with environmental conditions
- Compliance with Comprehensive Plan
- Quality development (landscaping, design guides)

Industry sectors to be targeted include:

- Aviation and aerospace
- Medical equipment and technologies
- Pharmaceuticals and biotechnology
- Office, customer support, and tech support
- Motor vehicle parts and accessories
- Electronics and semi-conductors
- Software and electronic commerce

Key elements of the development concept include:

- Direct access to Branan Field-Chaffee Expressway. The Cecil Commerce Center exchange under construction will be the first local access from the Expressway.
- Potential to extend a rail spur into the north parcel. Rail construction would depend on user need and would not be brought in unless requested by user. Construction would be conducted by CSX and would remain north of Normandy.
- Preservation of 5,330 acres within a Natural and Recreational Corridor. This would be a no-development zone that would include some wetlands created for mitigation purposes, a well field for JEA, and a buffer to the green belt.
- The area north of Normandy is planned for Raw Land Development with flexible planning for “Big Box” users
- The area south of Normandy is planned for aviation-related “in fill” development. Infrastructure in this area will be replaced to meet JEA standards. In addition, approximately 66% of buildings will be demolished.

The North Parcelization will include a 2,190-acre park including both active (832 acres) and passive recreation uses. Development plans include an equestrian center, a 50,000-square foot community center with pool, and soccer, baseball, tennis, and archery facilities. A Florida Community College of Jacksonville campus is also planned for the area north of Normandy.

Current facility usage includes 21 tenants leasing 24 buildings and employing over 1,000 people.

City Land Title Insurance is in place, and environmental insurance evaluations are in progress (Cherokee Environmental). The Master Conceptual Stormwater Permit application is pending, and general permits will be issued for individual projects. JEA has applied for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Other building and construction permits will be obtained as required.

Conditions for site development include:

- Statutory seven-year reinvestment in property by City
- Annual reporting to Navy
- Land Use Control and Implementation Plans (LUCIPs)
- Existing leases
- On-going environmental cleanup activities (NPL status)
- Small Business Enterprise Participation

Expenses include capital and operations and maintenance, and sources of revenue include land sales, leases, federal and state grants, Better Jacksonville Plan, JEA, and other sources.

Q: What is the current reuse plan for the Golf Course?

- A: The Business Plan identified the reuse as recreational in the short-term and mixed use in the long-term.
- Q: Would the City be able to accept a recreational cleanup if the golf course would be destroyed as a result, or is the continued use of the golf course an important factor? Minimal cleanup would be required if the site use remains a golf course. More extensive cleanup would be required to satisfy a general recreational use such as a camp or a playground.
- A: The current plan is for the area to continue to be used as a golf course. The 20-year plan is for mixed use – office, manufacturing, warehousing, etc.
- Q: What is the timeframe for conversion from recreational to mixed use? The BCT is in the process of making a decision on the cleanup to be performed.
- A: It is market-driven, to be determined by potential future tenants. If the golf course will be destroyed by the cleanup, the City needs to be consulted.
- Q: What is meant by the Wetlands Conservation Area designation for the area in Yellow Water northeast of the Building 635 former railroad bed site?
- A: The former railroad line will provide a utility right-of-way (ROW) including a 50-foot rail ROW (closest to wetland), a 200-foot utility ROW, and an 80-foot road ROW. The wetland is part of the stormwater retention system. Water will be directed through the wetland area to a system of ponds on the north side of the conservation area. The exact location of these ponds is not yet known. The area is currently classified as a wetland by the U.S. Corps of Engineers (COE).
- Q: The concern is that materials at the site currently being assessed as soils may need to be evaluated for ecological risks as sediment if the area is inundated. Is the area low enough to be inundated according to the current plan?
- A: It has the potential for that. The modeling has not been done yet. A possible solution might be to change the shape of the proposed Wetland Conservation Area to exclude the area of concern around Building 635. The wetlands lost as part of this change would have to be mitigated for elsewhere on the site. COE and the St. Johns River Water Management District will be concerned about this issue along with the BCT and the City.

### **Sites 21, 25, and 45 Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies**

Rob Simcik of TtNUS presented a summary of the Remedial Investigations (RIs) and Feasibility Studies (FSs) for Sites 21, 25, and 45. These three sites started out as Gray Sites, identified in the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS), or Areas of Interest (AOIs), as identified by John Dingwall. Upon further investigation, they were elevated to Potential Sources of Contamination (PSCs). PSC investigations identified soil and groundwater contamination at each site. Time-critical soil removals based on Action Memoranda were conducted at each site to address soil contamination. Groundwater contamination required that the sites enter the CERCLA process as Installation Restoration (IR) sites, including an RI/FS, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision (ROD).

Site 21, the Golf Course Maintenance Area, has been in operation since the 1950s for the storage and mixing of pesticides and herbicides and the storage and maintenance of golf course maintenance equipment. The site has been investigated from 1992 to 2000, and was designated an IR site in 2000. Contaminants of concern (COCs) in soil at Site 21 include total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons (TRPH), arsenic, chlordane, DDT, toxaphene, and dieldrin. Groundwater COCs include chlordane and DDT. For the time-critical soil removal, the BCT selected industrial land use as the basis for remediation. An Action Memo was approved for the soil excavation, and a public notice was placed in the Florida-Times Union, as required under CERCLA. Approximately 1,960 cubic yards of soil were identified for removal, which is scheduled for April 2001. Because of the cleanup to industrial criteria, the Proposed Plan and ROD will indicate that institutional controls (ICs) are required at the site. The RI investigation concluded that post-excavation human health risks were acceptable for industrial receptors, and that post-excavation ecological risks were negligible. Human

health risks from chlordane and 4,4-DDT were not acceptable, and an FS for groundwater remediation was required. The FS identified three alternatives for groundwater remediation at Site 21 including:

- (1) No action
- (2) Natural attenuation, ICs, and Monitoring
- (3) Extraction, onsite treatment, surface water discharge, ICs, and monitoring.

Natural attenuation would achieve groundwater cleanup in 4 years at a cost of \$98,000, and Extraction would achieve cleanup one year faster, in 3 years, but at a cost of \$784,000. A decision on the recommended remedial alternative is scheduled for the May 2001 BCT Meeting.

Q: Which land use scenario is more in line with the future use of the site?

A: It was decided that it was not an appropriate expenditure of funds to cleanup the site to allow residential land use based on the expected reuse as a recreational or industrial area. Industrial scenarios have been more restrictive than recreational, so an industrial cleanup was chosen. It was assumed that there would be perpetual land use control on the area associated with the golf course.

Site 25, the Former Transformer Storage Yard, was used for the storage of transformers on unpaved ground until the 1990s. Also, a pesticide storage building was used on the site from 1956 to 1975. Site 25 was investigated from 1997 to 2000, and was designated an IR site in 2000. COCs in soil include polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), TRPH, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Groundwater COCs include isomers of the pesticide BHC. For the time-critical soil removal, the BCT selected residential (unrestricted) land use as the basis for remediation. An Action Memo was approved for the soil excavation, and a public notice was placed in the Florida-Times Union, as required under CERCLA. Approximately 1,960 cubic yards of soil were identified for removal, which is scheduled for April 2001. At this site, as opposed to Site 21, the soil contamination was distributed such that a small additional investment could provide unrestricted land use, even though the site is in an area of industrial reuse. The RI investigation concluded that post-excavation human health risks were acceptable for residential receptors, and that post-excavation ecological risks were negligible. Human health risks from BHC isomers were not acceptable, and an FS for groundwater remediation was required. The FS identified four alternatives for groundwater remediation at Site 25 including:

- (1) No action
- (2) Natural attenuation, ICs, and Monitoring
- (3) In-situ enhanced biodegradation, ICs, and monitoring
- (4) Extraction, onsite treatment, surface water discharge, ICs, and monitoring.

A decision on the recommended remedial alternative is scheduled for the May 2001 BCT Meeting.

Site 45 includes a steam-generating plant, hazardous materials storage, and fuel storage tanks. The Steam Plant, Building 11, was built in 1941 and generated steam for the base. Building 7 was built in 1989 and used for hazardous materials storage. The site was investigated from 1995 to 2000, and was designated an IR site in 2000. Soil COCs include PAHs, TRPH, arsenic, mercury, and vanadium. The groundwater COC is vanadium. For the time-critical soil removal, the BCT selected industrial land use as the basis for remediation. An Action Memo was approved for the soil excavation, and a public notice was placed in the Florida-Times Union, as required under CERCLA. Approximately 325 cubic yards of soil were removed in August 2000. Because of the cleanup to industrial criteria, the Proposed Plan and ROD will indicate that ICs are required at the site. The RI investigation concluded that post-excavation human health risks were acceptable for industrial receptors, and that post-excavation ecological risks were negligible. Human health risks from vanadium were acceptable on a site-wide basis, but the FDEP groundwater cleanup target level (GCTL) was exceeded in five wells; therefore, an FS for groundwater remediation was required. The FS identified three alternatives for groundwater remediation at Site 45 including:

- (4) No action
- (5) Natural attenuation, ICs, and Monitoring
- (6) Extraction, onsite treatment, surface water discharge, ICs, and monitoring.

A decision on the recommended remedial alternative is scheduled for the May 2001 BCT Meeting, although evaluation of additional potential alternatives may delay this decision.

### **Potential Indoor Air Evaluation Locations**

Mark Jonnet of TiNUS gave a presentation on the evaluation of areas where underlying groundwater contamination might result in indoor air concerns. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine if current and future building occupants could be exposed to indoor air contamination at levels of concern resulting from groundwater contamination. Areas of potential concern were identified by applying the Connecticut Groundwater Standards for Protection of Indoor Air to the most recent groundwater data from wells at the facility. Exceedances of the standards were chosen as areas of potential concern if they occurred within 100 feet of a building. Based on this process, six areas of potential concern were identified including:

- Building 46
- North Fuel Farm
- Site 37/Buildings 20, 40, and 50
- Site 25/Building 81
- Day Tank 1/Building 846
- Site 16/Building 313

Groundwater contamination at Building 46 is being addressed by a nutrient-enhanced air sparging (AS) system, and cleanup goals are expected to be reached by 2002. Building 46 was demolished, and future building construction is not anticipated due to road expansion. Therefore, indoor air contamination is not of concern.

At the North Fuel Farm, contaminated soil and fuel tanks were removed, and all buildings were demolished during the removal action. Construction of any future buildings will require evaluation of underlying contamination. Planned reuse is for an aviation commercial/business park. Additional site assessment will be conducted to determine if any future groundwater remediation activities are required. Indoor air contamination is not of concern at this site.

At Site 37, Buildings 20, 40, and 50 were evaluated for potential indoor air issues. Building 50 has been removed, Building 40 will be removed during soil excavation scheduled for June 2001, and Building 20 is a skid-mounted storage building with no direct pathway for vapors from groundwater to the building interior. An AS system will be installed in the area to address the Sites 36/37 groundwater plume. Indoor air issues also are not of concern at this site.

At a location approximately 45 feet west of Building 81, one sample with a concentration of 1.1 ug/L of 1,1-dichloroethene (1,1-DCE) was detected. The criterion for 1,1-DCE is 1.0 ug/L. Building 81 is scheduled for demolition; therefore, there are no indoor air concerns for the building.

The area of concern at Day Tank 1 is Building 846, a garage with large bay doors that remain open, allowing air exchange from the interior of the building. Tanker trucks are parked in the garage, and people do not occupy the building for extended periods of time. A Biosparge/vapor collection system is in place in the area. Indoor air issues due to underlying groundwater contamination do not appear to be of concern due to the nature and use of the building.

At Site 16, Building 313 was evaluated for potential indoor air issues. Building 313, currently being used for the storage and repair of marine and power plant turbine engines, consists of open areas and high bays that do not favor accumulation of vapors. An AS/vapor extraction (VE) system in place at the site operated continuously from June 1999 to May 2000, and has been operating in pulse mode since that time. Air sample concentrations from nearby piezometers installed as part of AS/VE activities were less than published criteria for worker exposure. Based on these factors, indoor air is not of concern at this site.

Q: Will the areas with potential for air contamination due to underlying groundwater contamination be identified on any map?

A: A LUCIP will be required on these parcels of land that will contain information about the associated groundwater contamination. Future property owners will need to take into consideration the impacts from underlying plumes as part of the planning/design process. Subsurface ventilation systems put in with foundations are an inexpensive way to address these issues.

### **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 April RAB materials and the PSC and Grey Site Schedule/Status Table available today.

As detailed on the PSC/Grey Site Status Table, soil excavations completed since the January meeting include PSCs 39 and 42. Excavations scheduled for April 2001 include PSCs 21 and 25. Site 36/37 will be excavated in May, and the Former Fuel Depot (former railroad site) will be excavated in June. Buildings 98 and 535, also former railroad sites, had been delineated to industrial standards, but are now being delineated to residential (unrestricted) reuse. Based on sampling results, these sites may also be excavated in June. Open sites remaining at the next meeting will include Building 635, Building 610, PSC 49, and the active golf course. Soil excavation should take place at Building 610 within the next few months.

### **Conclusion**

Richard Darby adjourned the meeting at 8:50 P.M. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 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.