

N60200.AR.003111
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 16 OCTOBER 2001 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NAS
CECIL FIELD FL
10/16/2001
TETRA TECH NUS INC



Minutes

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

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

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

Mark Davidson
Scott Glass, Navy Co-chair
David Grabka
John Flowe, RESD
Grazyna Pawlowycz, County Health Dept.

The following members were absent:

Community Members

Lisa Chelf
William Dike
Iran Maisonet
Edward Renckley

Navy, Regulators, and Officials

David Farrell, USFWS
Lewis Murray, USGS
William C. Wilson, SJRWMD
Debbie Vaughn-Wright, U.S. EPA

David Scott

The following support personnel and guests were present:

Andy Eckert (JEDC), Ralph Hogan (J.A. Jones), Diana Stone (JPA), Mark Speranza (TtNUS), Rob Simcik (TtNUS), Mark Jonnet (TtNUS).

Administrative

Richard Darby called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. The July RAB Meeting Minutes were approved without changes.

Review of ATSDR Issues

Scott Glass provided an overview of the findings of the ATSDR Public Health Assessment released for public comment in July 2001. ATSDR identified nine "situations" with potential for human exposure. One of these situations was categorized as "No Public Health Hazard," six were categorized as "Indeterminate Public Health Hazard," one was categorized as "No Public Health Hazard - Current and Indeterminate Public Health Hazard - Future", and one situation was categorized as a "Public Health Hazard."

Situation One: According to ATSDR, current and future building occupants could be exposed to indoor air contaminants from underlying groundwater plumes. ATSDR considers this an "Indeterminate Public Health Hazard." The BCT categorizes this situation as "No Apparent Public Health Hazard" based on its evaluation of potential indoor air hazards from groundwater plumes. This evaluation was conducted using standard practices and reference values. No unacceptable risks were identified.

Situation Two: A potential exposure pathway was identified as future building occupants exposed to contaminated drinking water. Both ATSDR and the BCT consider this “No Public Health Hazard” because known groundwater plumes are not expected to impact existing drinking water wells and future drinking water well prohibitions will be in place to prevent installation of wells in areas of contaminated groundwater.

Situation Three: ATSDR considers as an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard” the scenario of off-base leaks from the jet fuel pipeline polluting private wells. The BCT considers this “No Apparent Public Health Hazard” based on the following:

- Extensive investigations of the pipeline and potentially soil and groundwater has been conducted
- No additional areas of contaminated groundwater was identified other than existing plumes at A Avenue and Hawkins Property
- The A Avenue and Hawkins plumes are contained and being remediated
- Very limited soil contaminated has been detected

Q: Where is the Hawkins property?

A: It is located near I-295. The Navy purchased the property several years ago. The plume was limited to the immediate vicinity of the pipeline.

Q: Were nearby private monitoring wells impacted?

A: No. Mr. Hawkins’ well was not contaminated and has since been destroyed. The investigation identified only a limited groundwater plume. The only active groundwater remediation system associated with the pipeline is just outside the facility gate on 103rd Street. The Hawkins property groundwater plume is being addressed by monitored natural attenuation only. (Scott Glass will provide information of the Hawkins groundwater investigation to John Flowe.)

Situation Four: Current and future occupants living near the jet fuel pipeline could be exposed to indoor air contaminants from underlying groundwater contamination. ATSDR categorizes this as an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard,” and the BCT considers this “No Apparent Public Health Hazard.” Pipeline investigations have not identified any groundwater contamination that could adversely impact indoor air quality.

Q: When was the draft ATSDR report submitted?

A: Summer 2000.

Q: When was the assessment of the pipeline completed? Was all of the information provided to ATSDR?

A: November 2000. All data was provided to ATSDR.

Situation Five: Current trespassers and future recreational users could be exposed to harmful levels of lead from firing ranges in Yellow Water Weapons Area if remediation is not conducted. ATSDR considers this as “No Apparent Public Health Hazard” currently and “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard” in the future. The BCT agrees with ATSDR’s conclusion for the current condition but considers the future condition to be “No Apparent Public Health Hazard.” The remedial action plan being developed for Site 15 is protective of the passive recreational user, and this reuse is consistent with the City’s reuse plan. All other ranges in Yellow Water have been evaluated and found to have no unacceptable risks.

Q: Does the Site 15 deed restriction include prohibiting further development of the area?

A: Yes. The development of new trails will be prohibited.

Q: What if, 20 years from now, Parks and Recreation wants to further develop the area? Could hunting be allowed?

A: The requirements of the Conservation Corridor and the restrictive covenants will be very restrictive on future uses of the Site 15 area. Hunting will continue to be prohibited.

Q: Will warning signs be posted in the area?

A: Requirements for signing will be identified in the future. It is not likely that warning signs will be required.

Diane Peterson indicated that, in her opinion, signs would be appropriate for this area.

Situation Six: People could be eating potentially-contaminated fish and turtles from Yellow Water or Sal Taylor Creeks that receive drainage from Site 15. ATSDR considers this an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard.” The BCT considers this “No Apparent Public Health Hazard” because sediment and surface water samples from water bodies receiving runoff from Site 15 were not adversely impacted.

Situation Seven: Current and future building occupants could be exposed to lead-based paint, lead in tap water, and asbestos. ATSDR and the BCT agree that this is an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard.” However, the Navy feels that significant evaluations and abatement activities have been conducted. As required by law, facilities have been surveyed for lead-based paint, lead in drinking water, and asbestos. Lead-based paint may remain in industrial/commercial buildings and non-target housing, and non-damaged, friable, accessible asbestos may remain in some buildings, but these situations do not currently pose risks. During the Navy’s last routine sampling of drinking water, no lead above action levels was detected. The City has appropriate lead-based paint, asbestos, and drinking water management programs in place.

Situation Eight: People could eat potentially-contaminated fish and turtles from lakes and creeks on the base. ATSDR considers this an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard,” and the BCT considers this “No Apparent Public Health Hazard.” All potential sources of contamination to Lake Fretwell have been remediated or contained. A No Further Action determination has been approved for Lake Fretwell. No other sources that have not been addressed (evaluated/remediated/contained) have been identified that could impact other water bodies. The Fish and Game Commission evaluated Lake Fretwell and identified that there is no apparent risk in fishing.

Situation Nine: UXO could be a future explosion hazard for people digging near areas on the Main Base and Yellow Water. ATSDR considers this a “Public Health Hazard,” and the BCT considers this an “Indeterminate Public Health Hazard.” In areas where UXO would most likely be present, UXO surveys were conducted by both Navy experts and Southern Division contractors. All UXO identified, generally small caliber, was properly disposed. Historical activities at NAS Cecil Field do not support the possibility of significant risk of remaining UXO. The Navy does agree with ATSDR’s recommendation for public education in the form of Fact Sheets including information about what to do if UXO is found.

Q: How will the Fact Sheets be distributed?

A: They will be distributed by the City to those interested in developing the area.

Q: Was PSC 49 identified in this section of the ATSDR document?

A: No, it was not mentioned. Only ranges in Yellow Water were identified. PSC 49 has been extensively investigated.

Q: Were fish from Lake Fretwell sampled for mercury, PCBs, etc.?

A: Yes. There were barely enough fish to sample at the time. It was mentioned that Lake Fretwell will be tripled in size within the next 10 years.

Summary: ATSDR will address comments as they deem appropriate and issue the Public Health assessment as a final document.

Building 9 and 46 Update

Bill Canelos provided an update on the remedial activities at Buildings 9 and 46. Building 9: Two 1,250-gallon gas tanks present at Building 9 were removed in 1985, and an investigation was conducted to evaluate the extent of contamination. FOSTER nutrient injection, a proprietary remediation system, was used to remediate contamination at Building 9. The system involves injection of nutrients (oxygen, nitrogen, and phosphorus) to stimulate naturally-occurring microbes to degrade contaminants. Operation of the system at Building 9 began in January 2001. The system has been very effective, and the plume has decreased significantly. The system has been adjusted to provide more flow to the single remaining contaminated well. The last three rounds of soil sampling show that contaminants have decreased to less than action levels.

Building 46: A gas station with a gasoline underground storage tank (UST) was previously located in the Building 46 area (now the Bachelor's Quarters Area). An investigation was conducted in 1996. The FOSTER system was also used at this larger area of contamination. The two parts of the system include an eastern area with 19 injection wells and a western area with 11 injection wells. In both areas, wells were screened at 40 and 90 feet below ground surface. The system removed 80 percent of the contamination in the first 6 months of operation. Quarterly soil sampling has shown a decrease in contaminants to less than detection limits.

Q: It appears that the plume has moved beyond the treatment area. What will happen in this area?

A: The area is and will continue to be evaluated, and the system may be extended into this area if necessary.

Q: This area is scheduled for transfer next year. Will this still be possible?

A: Yes. The land can be transferred with land use restrictions, and the restrictions can be removed after the area is remediated.

Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) Update

Scott Glass of SOUTHDIV gave an update on the status of the FOSTs. 96 percent of the total acreage has been transferred to date. The template is now established for transferring property with land use controls (LUCs). Jacksonville Port Authority (JPA) is now Jacksonville Airport Authority (JAA).

Parcels for which transfer has been completed include:

- Clay County – 641 acres (June 1999)
- JAX Navy Federal Credit Union – 1.1 acres (July 1999)
- Jacksonville Port Authority (JPA) Phase I – 5,751 acres (September 1999)
- Parks & Recreation Phase I – 2,017 acres (December 1999)
- Jacksonville Economic Development Commission (EDC) Phase I – 7,891 acres (September 2000)
- JPA Phase II – 28 acres (September 2000)
- EDC Phase II – 29.2 acres (September 2001)

Remaining EDC Parcels to be transferred consist of carveouts from the Phase I parcel and include:

- EDC Phase III – 7 acres (scheduled for March 2002)
 - Includes Buildings 9, 46, 404, 271, and 428
- EDC Phase IV – 252 acres (Scheduled for March 2003)
 - Includes Golf Course (PSC 51), Site 11, PSC 49, Site 5, PSC 32, and PSC 44
- EDC Phase V – 42 acres (scheduled for March 2004)
 - Includes TFM/BFM, PSC 21, PSC 25, PSC 45, and former railroad bed sites Building 98, Former Fuel Depot, and Building 635

Transfer challenges for remaining EDC parcels include:

- PSC 51 – Active Golf Course. The reuse plan is unclear, and it has been difficult for the BCT to define cleanup requirements. In addition, the regulatory driver is uncertain and may affect the transfer schedule.
- Building 635 – Former Railroad Bed site. The extent contamination has been difficult to define, and this may affect the transfer schedule.

Remaining JPA Parcels to be transferred include:

- JPA Phase III – 47 acres (scheduled for December 2001)
 - Includes Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, and 17, Building 367, Fuel Pits, and PSCs 39 and 44
- JPA Phase IV – 9 acres (scheduled for June 2002)
 - Includes Jet Engine Test Cell, South Fuel Farm, and Buildings 82 and 860
- JPA Phase V – 90 acres (scheduled for June 2003)
 - Includes Sites 3 and 16
- JPA Phase VI – 157 acres (scheduled for June 2004)
 - Includes North Fuel Farm, Day Tank 1, Building 312, and Site 36/37/Day Tank 2

Transfer challenges for remaining JPA parcels include:

- Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, and 17. Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) determinations must be approved by EPA as a prerequisite to transfer. OPS approval by EPA is required for all Installation Restoration (IR) sites that are to be transferred.
- Sites 57 and 58 (Buildings 824A and 312). Investigation of these are newly identified solvent plumes on the flightline will effect scheduled transfer of the final JPA parcel.
- North Fuel Farm. The start of groundwater cleanup, and therefore property transfer, was delayed by Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 funding limitations.

Remaining Parks & Recreation (P&R) Parcels to be transferred include:

- P&R Phase II – 12 acres (scheduled for December 2001)
 - Includes Building 610 and PSCs 40 and 42
- P&R Phase III – 161 acres (scheduled for September 2004)
 - Includes Site 15

Transfer challenges for remaining P&R parcels include:

- Building 610. The City needs Phase II sites to support near-term P&R redevelopment plans.
- Site 15. Negotiations to determine alternate cleanup levels for polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and lead in soil are ongoing.

Sites Update

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

Q: What is the plan for PSC 49?

A: A dig is scheduled to be conducted in the next couple of months and is expected to last approximately 3 weeks.

Conclusion

Richard Darby adjourned the meeting at 9:30 P.M. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 15, 2002 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.