

N60200.AR.007131
NAS CECIL FIELD
5090.3a

PUBLIC MEETING PROCEEDINGS REGARDING SITES 5 AND 17 NAS CECIL FIELD FL
8/25/1994
NAS CECIL FIELD



NAS CECIL FIELD PUBLIC MEETING

A public meeting to discuss the U.S. Navy's proposed plans to clean up contaminated soils at two locations on Cecil Field will be held at:

7 p.m.
Thursday, August 25
at the
National Guard Armory
9900 Normandy Boulevard
Jacksonville

Based on the results of ongoing investigations at the two sites, Sites 5 and 17, the Navy has prepared interim plans to reduce the sources of contamination. Cleanups at both sites are interim actions designed to limit movement of contaminants while final cleanup plans are being developed.

Copies of the proposed plans for interim cleanup of these sites are available for review at the Charles D. Webb Wesconnett Branch of the Jacksonville Public Library, 6887 103rd Street. Public comments on the plan can be made from August 12 through September 12 to Commanding Officer (00B), NAS Cecil Field, P.O. Box 111, Jacksonville, FL 32215.

For more information on the public meeting or the interim action plans, please call Mr. Bert Byers, NAS Cecil Field Public Affairs Officer, at (904) 778-6055.

NAS CECIL FIELD PRESS RELEASE

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE, NAS CECIL FIELD, JACKSONVILLE, FL
904-778-6055/52**

August 22, 1994

**CECIL FIELD COMMANDING OFFICER
HOSTS PUBLIC MEETING ON CLEANUP**

Capt. Kirk T. Lewis, commanding officer, Naval Air Station Cecil Field, will host a public meeting, Thursday, Aug. 25, 1994 at 7 p.m., at the National Guard Armory, 9900 Normandy Boulevard, to discuss the interim cleanup planned for two former hazardous waste dump sites located on the base's property.

The interim cleanup proposal is part of the base's Installation Restoration Program and is designed to limit movement of contaminants from the original sites and to reduce the sources of contamination. Both of the sites contain petroleum products and low levels of solvents while one also contains low levels of poly chlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

Copies of the proposed plans are available at the Wesconnett Branch Library at 6887 103rd Street. Citizens wishing more information may contact the NAS Cecil Field Public Affairs Officer, Mr. Bert Byers at 778-6055.

-30-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NAS Cecil Field Public Meeting on Sites 5 and 17, taken on Thursday, August 25, 1994, commencing from 7 p.m. to 8:43 p.m. at NAS Cecil Field, Normandy Boulevard, Jacksonville, Florida, before Lili Marlene Menefee, a Notary Public in and for the state of Florida at Large.

SPEAKERS:

BERT BYERS, Public Affairs Officer, NAS Cecil Field.

CAPTAIN KIRK LEWIS, Commanding Officer, NAS Cecil Field.

JOHN DINGWALL, Installation Restoration Program Coordinator.

STUART C. PEARSON, Environmental Engineer, ABB Environmental Services.

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

August 25, 1994

7 p.m.

* * * * *

MR. BYERS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks so much for being here today -- tonight. This is a public meeting concerning Cecil Field's interim remedial action sites 5 and 17 at Cecil Field. My name is Bert Byers, I'm the base public affairs officer. Some of you folks have -- many of you have been sending post cards to get on the mailing list. Just wanted you to see what I look like. I checked in the parking lot, there's nobody else there, so we'll go ahead and get started.

I'd like to introduce the commanding officer at NAS Cecil Field, Captain Kirk Lewis.

CAPT. LEWIS: Good evening. I'm Kirk Lewis. I'm the brand new commanding officer of about six or seven weeks ago here at Cecil Field out here on the Westside. And just to tell you my experience, I've lived in Jacksonville 15 years, from 1976 to 1991. I went away for three years to include two years in Europe, and the Navy was kind enough to send me back. My wife and daughter and I are thrilled to be back in

1 Jacksonville and serving again at Cecil Field.

2 Well, that has nothing to do with this
3 evening, so I'll get on with our business
4 tonight so that we can conclude in an hour where
5 all of us can get home for dinner.

6 In the event, a public meeting. Thank you
7 for joining us this evening. We have a very
8 nice turnout. There is some of my staff here as
9 well as others and, of course, the public at
10 large.

11 We are here tonight to provide information
12 on a proposed environmental cleanup at the Naval
13 Air Station Cecil Field and solicit your
14 comments on the proposed cleanup. Tonight we
15 are going to describe the activities at Site
16 Number 5, the oil disposal area northwest and
17 Site 17, the oil and sludge disposal area
18 southwest.

19 Our agenda for tonight includes an
20 introduction to the Installation Restoration
21 Program at the Naval Air Station Cecil Field;
22 secondly, a discussion of the remedial action
23 process; thirdly, an overview of the history and
24 cleanup process at Sites 5 and 17; a
25 presentation of the preferred alternative for

1 the interim remedial action at Site 17; and a
2 presentation of the preferred alternative for
3 the interim remedial action at Site 5. And a
4 question and answer period at the end.

5 Each of you should have received a packet
6 tonight as you arrived. If you did not, please
7 indicate that to Mr. Byers and he'll provide
8 that to you. It contains a copy of the
9 overheads, a fact sheet, a copy of the proposed
10 plan and a list of acronyms which will either be
11 used tonight or in other technical documents
12 that you may be reviewing. In addition, a pad
13 of paper and a pen have been provided to jot
14 down any questions or comments that you might
15 have. There's also an evaluation form included,
16 I'm told, in the packet. Please fill that out
17 and turn it in, if you desire, to help us
18 evaluate the process we're going through as far
19 as this meeting this evening and future
20 meetings.

21 We ask that you hold all your questions
22 until the question and answer period at the end
23 of this presentation. However, unless our
24 presentation becomes too hard to follow, then in
25 which case we encourage you to ask questions as

1 the process goes on. But if you can wait,
2 please do so until the end. Your questions will
3 be answered by the most appropriate member of
4 our team here tonight.

5 And as I mention the team, I'd like them to
6 all stand who will be presenting and to
7 introduce themselves. Please stand and
8 introduce yourselves.

9 MR. DINGWALL: I'm John Dingwall, the
10 station's Installation Restoration Program
11 manager. I work at Cecil Field.

12 MR. PEARSON: I'm Stu Pearson, I'm with ABB
13 Environmental Services, and we're contracted
14 through the Navy to do a lot of the studies,
15 court history and practice.

16 CAPT. LEWIS: EPA, please.

17 MR. REEDY: I'm Bart Reedy, EPA out of
18 Atlanta.

19 CAPT. LEWIS: The Florida Department.

20 MR. DELIZ: I'm Mike Deliz, the Remedial
21 Project Manager at NAS Cecil Field with Florida
22 DEP.

23 CAPT. LEWIS: And the Southern Division.

24 MR. WILSON: I'm Steve Wilson, I am the
25 BRAC Environmental Coordinator at Cecil Field.

1 That position was established by DOD to
2 coordinate the environmental cleanup of the base
3 prior to closure.

4 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Let's
5 see, did I forget anyone? I don't think so. I
6 would like to point out that our meeting here
7 tonight is being transcribed by our court
8 reporter so that a record can be placed in the
9 information repository located at the library.
10 And I believe that that library installation
11 is -- help me -- it's the one on 103rd Street.
12 So that is in the local area here.

13 I am followed this evening by Mr. Dingwall
14 from Naval Air Station Cecil Field, and he will
15 continue with our presentation.

16 MR. DINGWALL: Thank you, Captain. Good
17 evening. Tonight we are going to discuss the
18 cleanups for Sites 5 and 17. These cleanups are
19 part of the Navy's Installation Restoration
20 Program or IR Program.

21 The Department of Defense established the
22 IR Program to find and correct environmental
23 problems from past practices that do not meet
24 today's strict environmental standards.

25 Until recently, the Cecil Field IR program

1 has been guided by the technical review
2 committee, a team composed mainly of
3 environmental experts with one community
4 member. The TRC is now being expanded to
5 include more community members. Once that is
6 accomplished, it will be known as a Restoration
7 Advisory Board or RAB.

8 We're looking for community members who
9 have an interest in environmental cleanup. You
10 don't have to be an environmental expert by any
11 means, just so long as you're interested in
12 seeing that Cecil Field cleans up the
13 environment properly. If you have such an
14 interest or know someone who has, please see Mr.
15 Bert Byers, our public affairs officer, after
16 the meeting tonight.

17 All cleanup decisions reflect a consensus
18 between the U.S. Environmental Protection
19 Agency, EPA, Mr. Bart Reedy, who introduced
20 himself; the Florida Department of Environmental
21 Protection or FDEP, Mr. Mike Deliz, who
22 introduced himself earlier; and a Navy
23 representative, Mr. Steve Wilson, who also
24 introduced himself earlier tonight.

25 With NAS Cecil Field slated for closure,

1 it's part of the base closure realignment or
2 BRAC. These remedial program managers have
3 tackled a problem of streamlining the cleanup
4 process, while at the same time not slowing
5 closure and still maintaining the best decisions
6 for the protection of the environment. They are
7 the BRAC cleanup team.

8 NAS Cecil Field is also on the National
9 Priorities List, or NPL, or Superfund. As an
10 NPL site, we must follow a strict procedure to
11 arrive at our ultimate goal, which is a
12 cleanup.

13 This is a remedial action time line for
14 Sites 5 and 17. It includes as part of it the
15 interim remedial action time line. The cleanups
16 we are talking about tonight are the interim
17 remedial actions or accelerated cleanups. In
18 other words, we clean up the most contaminated
19 parts of the sites in months rather than years.

20 There are two other purposes of the interim
21 remedial actions. The first is to remove the
22 source of contamination from the site because
23 once you remove the source from the site, you no
24 longer have the opportunity for the contaminants
25 to spread as far or as fast as they would when

1 you have a concentrated source at that site.
2 And the second purpose is, if possible, to
3 remove enough contamination that the site can
4 hopefully clean up itself during the remainder
5 of our study period.

6 Both Sites 5 and 17 are in the western
7 portion of the main station along Perimeter
8 Road. Site 5 is about one-half of a mile north
9 of Site 17 and is closer to Lake Fretwell than
10 Site 17 is. These two sites have been studied
11 together and are being cleaned up together
12 because of their close proximity to each other
13 and because they have similar contaminants.

14 Site 5 was a 100-foot diameter pit and Site
15 17 was a 150-foot diameter pit. Liquid wastes
16 were disposed in these pits including waste oil
17 and fuel. These underlying pits then had the
18 liquids evaporate out of them or percolate down
19 into the soil. This was normal and perfectly
20 legal, state of the art operations back at the
21 time these operations were occurring.

22 These sites had the pits then filled in
23 with soil when we were through using them and
24 allowed for the vegetation to grow over again.
25 They are now covered mainly by grasses and slash

1 pines, though there is a very small part on each
2 site that is bare because there is a heavy
3 amount of contamination right near the surface
4 at those small areas.

5 The details of our cleanup are now going to
6 be discussed by Mr. Stu Pearson of ABB
7 Environmental Services, our environmental
8 contractor.

9 MR. PEARSON: You've just heard a summary
10 of the IR Program and a summary of Sites 5 and
11 17, what happened there historically. What I am
12 going to be talking about now is the process
13 that we go through to arrive at a cleanup for
14 sites of these sorts.

15 Now, the process can be basically broken
16 down into six steps. They are shown here. The
17 step we're currently at is right here, is the
18 public comment period, and that's why we're here
19 tonight is to tell you what's going on at the
20 site and solicit comments from you to find out
21 what the public thinks about what we're planning
22 to do at these sites.

23 The first three steps have already been
24 completed, and the fifth and sixth step will
25 follow the public comment period.

1 The first step of the process is the
2 remedial investigation. What remedial
3 investigation is is a process where we go out to
4 the site, we take some samples, usually some
5 soil samples, install monitoring wells, we take
6 the groundwater samples, we analyze them for a
7 long list of chemicals to determine what's
8 present at the site and also to determine to
9 what extent the contamination is present; in
10 other words, over what area the contamination
11 extends.

12 The remedial investigation at the first
13 site -- we're talking about Site 17 here so it's
14 the one that's to the -- further to the south.
15 The remedial investigation at Site 17 found two
16 primary contaminants. And one was fuel-related
17 compounds, and that was expected based on the
18 historical use of the site as an oil and fuel
19 disposal. The other was low concentrations of
20 solvents, and solvents may have arrived at the
21 site through the disposal of paints. And they
22 were also frequently used for removal of grease
23 and other things from mechanical equipment.

24 The second step in the process is the
25 focused feasibility study. And we've put

1 together a Focused Feasibility Study report
2 which is this report here, Site 17. And this
3 report is available through the 103rd Street
4 Library if you'd like to review that.

5 What the focused feasibility study does is
6 it lays out the objectives for cleanup of the
7 site, it develops alternatives for the site; in
8 other words, different ways that we can go about
9 the cleanup to achieve the objectives, and then
10 it evaluates those alternatives against each
11 other.

12 I'm going to now talk about the
13 alternatives that we actually developed for Site
14 17. And we went through the focused feasibility
15 study process and came up with four
16 alternatives.

17 The first alternative is excavation and
18 offsite thermal treatment for contaminated
19 soil. This alternative would involve excavating
20 fuel contaminated soils, loading them into
21 trucks, trucks would transport contaminated
22 soils to an approved offsite thermal treatment
23 unit, and then the site would be backfilled with
24 clean soils.

25 Now, this thermal treatment unit that we

1 show as sort of a black box up here on the
2 screen is a process that I'd like to use the
3 analogy of being very similar to a clothes
4 dryer. With a clothes dryer you put your
5 clothes in, it rotates around to keep the
6 clothes moving, it heats indirectly from the
7 outside, and water vapor is driven off of the
8 clothes and vented to the atmosphere.

9 In this case the soils would be put into
10 the treatment unit. Again, it mixes it similar
11 to the rotation of a clothes dryer. It heats
12 the soils indirectly from the outside. It dries
13 out moisture, and it also dries out fuel-related
14 contaminants that are present in the soil.

15 Now, these contaminants are then present in
16 the gas stream, and these gases are further
17 treated before they're released to the
18 atmosphere, and that's usually through the use
19 of an afterburner. And what you get from being
20 released to the atmosphere would be very similar
21 to the exhaust from an automobile or a jet
22 plane.

23 The second alternative at Site 17 is
24 excavation and onsite thermal treatment of
25 contaminated soil. This is very similar to the

1 first alternative I just talked about. Soils
2 would be excavated, stockpiled onsite and then
3 they would be treated onsite from the thermal
4 treatment. In other words, we'd bring the
5 thermal treatment unit to the actual Site 17 and
6 treat it right there. And then the treated
7 soils would be returned back into the pit where
8 they're excavated from.

9 The third alternative to be evaluated at
10 Site 17 is excavation and onsite biological
11 treatment of contaminated soil. The soils would
12 be once again excavated, be stockpiled and then
13 be treated biologically. Once they were
14 treated, they would be returned to the site.

15 And this biological treatment is very
16 similar to what happens, for instance, in your
17 home compost. If you put your garbage out into
18 a compost pile, allow it to be degraded by the
19 naturally occurring microorganisms that are
20 present, that's what we're doing here.

21 What we are doing is we're engineering a
22 system that accelerates that process. We go
23 through mixing of the soil, and that helps to
24 deliver air. We add water and we add
25 nutrients. Nutrients would be very similar to

1 just adding fertilizer to fields to help provide
2 for proper food for the microorganisms to
3 degrade the contaminants.

4 And by doing this, we're creating the
5 optimum conditions necessary to accelerate the
6 biological treatment of the fuel-contaminated
7 soils in the most rapid manner possible, and
8 then once they are treated, again, we would
9 return them to the site.

10 The fourth alternative at Site 17 is
11 biological treatment of contaminated soils
12 without excavation. In this case we're again
13 using a biological method to treat the soils
14 except we're doing it without excavating the
15 soils from the site. And to do this, we would
16 add water and nutrients directly to the soils
17 and we would install air injection wells to
18 deliver oxygen that is necessary for the
19 biological treatment.

20 The third step in the remedial action
21 process is a proposed plan, and, again, this is
22 a proposed plan that we put together for Site
23 17, and you should have a copy of this, I
24 believe, in your packets. It should be
25 available as well at the library.

1 Now, the proposed plan does a couple of
2 things, it summarizes the remedial investigation
3 and the focused feasibility study that I just
4 talked about, and it also evaluates an
5 alternative, it presents a preferred
6 alternative.

7 In this case the actual document that you
8 have presents two alternatives as being the
9 preferred alternatives, and that was the two
10 thermal treatment alternatives. That was
11 alternative one and alternative two, and they
12 were offsite and onsite treatment of the
13 contaminated soils.

14 The reason we chose to present the thermal
15 treatment over the biological treatment is that
16 it is a very reliable treatment technology and
17 that it could be completed in a much more rapid
18 manner.

19 At this point we've actually evaluated the
20 two alternatives further and we're leaning
21 towards an onsite treatment. And the reason for
22 that is there is no risk of release of
23 contaminants during transportation.

24 Now I'm going to talk about Site 5. And
25 just to remind you, Site 5 is also an oil

1 disposal pit. It's along Perimeter Road. It
2 has a stream running right along the south of
3 the site.

4 The first step that we talked about earlier
5 for Site 17 and now we have Site 5, you'll find
6 the first two items on here are exactly the same
7 as what we had at Site 17, fuel-related
8 compounds and low concentrations of solvents.

9 We also found at Site 5 that we had some
10 free product and polychlorinated biphenyls.
11 Polychlorinated biphenyls are commonly known as
12 PCBs. And they were found at the site but at
13 relatively low levels.

14 Free product, just to clarify that term,
15 what that is is oil that was disposed at the
16 site. It's still present there as oil in the
17 subsurface. It hasn't been dissolved in the
18 water and it hasn't been totally absorbed into
19 the soil. So if you actually pulled out a chunk
20 of the soils where the free product is present,
21 you would find that the oil seeps out of it.

22 And the second step is the focused
23 feasibility study, and, again, we have a report
24 for that for Site 5, and that's also available
25 in the library.

1 We also developed four alternatives for
2 Site 5. They are slightly different than the
3 ones we had at Site 17.

4 This is the first alternative.

5 Let me back track just a little bit. We
6 have -- the cleanup objectives at Site 5 are
7 essentially the same as Site 17, and that's to
8 remediate the soils that are acting as a source
9 of groundwater contamination.

10 This is the first alternative, it's the
11 same as the first alternative we had for Site
12 17. It's excavation and offsite thermal
13 treatment for contaminated soil. Soils would be
14 excavated, loaded into a truck, transported
15 offsite, treated in an offsite thermal treatment
16 unit, and the site would be backfilled with
17 clean soil.

18 I'm going to tell you about the time and
19 cost of this. I just realized that I went
20 through Site 17 and didn't tell you about any of
21 that. But I'll give it to you on this, and if
22 you're interested in that, I can -- I'll give
23 you those numbers afterwards.

24 This alternative we estimate it would take
25 about five months to complete and would cost

1 about approximately \$5 million. It's a fairly
2 expensive alternative, and that's primarily
3 because of the fact that we have PCBs in the
4 soils at the site. It requires a more complex
5 thermal treatment unit and requires that we
6 transport it over a greater distance..

7 The second alternative is equivalent --
8 it's the same alternative as we had for
9 alternative three at Site 17. We don't have an
10 onsite thermal treatment alternative at this
11 site because of the presence of PCBs. The
12 Florida regulations prohibit the use of onsite
13 thermal treatment for soils that contain PCBs,
14 therefore, we didn't even develop that
15 alternative. This alternative is the onsite
16 biological treatment. Soils would be excavated,
17 stockpiled, treated biologically; once they are
18 treated, they're returned back to the site.

19 The third alternative at Site 5 is
20 biological treatment of contaminated soils
21 without excavation. This is very similar to
22 what we saw at Site 17 again except this would
23 happen without excavating the soils. Well, we
24 had that at Site 17 as well.

25 Again, we have the injection of air to

1 provide oxygen for biological degradation and
2 the addition of water and nutrients of
3 fertilizer to the site. This alternative -- I
4 get bad on these times. I know I forgot
5 alternative two as well. This alternative would
6 take approximately 24 months to complete, and
7 the estimated cost would be \$1.2 million.

8 Our last alternative is alternative four
9 and that's excavation and offsite disposal at an
10 approved offsite landfill. The soils would be
11 excavated, loaded into a truck, brought to an
12 offsite landfill; they'd be disposed at that
13 landfill; the site would be backfilled with
14 clean soils.

15 The proposed plan for Site 5, you should
16 also have that in your package, once again, that
17 summarizes the alternatives and presents the
18 preferred alternative. The preferred
19 alternative at Site 5 is alternative two. Once
20 again, that was excavation and the onsite
21 biological treatment.

22 The reason we chose this is -- the first
23 reason was that it's more cost effective than
24 thermal treatment, and the cost difference at
25 this site came in largely because of the

1 increased cost for thermal treatment and when
2 you have PCBs in the soils.

3 The other reasons that we chose alternative
4 two are that it's an onsite alternative. It
5 doesn't involve transportation offsite,
6 therefore, there's no risk of release of
7 contaminants during transportation.

8 And the other thing is that in doing this,
9 we would be constructing a biological treatment
10 pad, and after this remediation is done, that
11 pad will still be available for use during other
12 remediation -- remediations for other sites that
13 would be occurring in the future. So it's an
14 investment that could be used at later time as
15 well.

16 So I've given you a summary of the first
17 three steps for both sites. We're now at the
18 fourth step, and here we are at the public
19 meeting. And this fourth step is the public
20 comment period, and it really gives us an
21 opportunity to present what we're doing, and
22 gives us as engineers who work technically on
23 these projects several months to find out what
24 the public really thinks about what's going, to
25 allow you to give some input into the process

1 and ultimately into the selection of what
2 remedial process is used at the site. And in
3 fact, if -- based on the comments we get -- we
4 could potentially switch to a different
5 alternative or an alternative that hasn't been
6 considered at this point.

7 Here we are, we're here tonight for the
8 public meeting to present what is going on, to
9 solicit questions either verbally or written.
10 There's also a public comment period. It's a
11 formal period that began on August 12th and will
12 continue until September 12th. And during that
13 period, you are encouraged to, if you have a
14 chance, to go to the library, the 103rd Street
15 Library and review these documents, and if you
16 have any comments or questions, you can write
17 those down and send them to Mr. Byers, and then
18 he'll assimilate -- or assemble all the comments
19 together.

20 What we'll do is we'll put together a
21 responsiveness summary and that will summarize
22 both the comments that we get tonight and the
23 comments that we generate during the public
24 comment period with the comments sent in. And
25 we'll write those down, and we'll provide

1 responses to that and put that together in a
2 document called the responsiveness summary.

3 The fifth step in the process is an interim
4 record of decision, or IROD. What this is is a
5 document that formally explains the interim
6 remedial actions that have been chosen for the
7 site, and it also includes the responsiveness
8 summary that addresses the public comment and
9 how the public comment has been incorporated
10 into our selection of the remedial actions for
11 these sites.

12 The last step once we have the IROD signed
13 is to actually implement the remedial actions at
14 the site. And we expect that, if everything
15 goes according to schedule, this will happen in
16 October of this year.

17 Now, I'm just going to summarize again the
18 points we've gone through. We've identified
19 that interim remedial actions were necessary at
20 Sites 5 and 17 to expedite the cleanup of the
21 site and to prevent further contamination of
22 groundwater. We put together four alternatives
23 for each of the two sites and evaluated those
24 alternatives and came up with preferred
25 alternatives. At Site 17 that was onsite

1 thermal treatment. At Site 5 it's onsite
2 biological treatment.

3 There's currently a public comment period
4 that we're in the process of and once again we
5 really encourage you if you have comments to
6 give those to us. It's an important part of the
7 process no doubt, and we really want to -- we
8 don't want to work in a vacuum where we're just
9 doing the technical work and not having input
10 from the community. The IRODs will be the next
11 step, and we expect that those will be completed
12 by the end of September and then the cleanup of
13 the sites, which should begin in October of
14 1994.

15 One other point is that because these are
16 interim actions, we're not addressing all of the
17 contamination at the site. In other words,
18 there's still groundwater contamination there.
19 That will be addressed. It's part of the
20 overall -- the final remediation for these
21 sites, and we'll be doing a similar process for
22 that remediation.

23 Now I'd like to turn it back over to
24 Captain Lewis for question and answers.

25 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, Stu. I will now

1 begin that question and answer period. Again,
2 we remind you that all significant questions
3 will be recorded by our court reporter and be
4 addressed in the responsiveness summary in the
5 interim record of decisions. You may present
6 your questions either verbally so we can all
7 hear them or you may write them down, if you
8 prefer to do that, on a piece of paper that we
9 provided.

10 And to ensure that everyone here has an
11 opportunity to voice their concerns, we ask that
12 questions be limited to one per participant
13 until each participant with a question has an
14 opportunity to speak. At that time if you have
15 additional questions, they will be taken by our
16 team. When you ask your question, please stand
17 up and identify yourself for the meeting
18 recorder.

19 Two other comments before we get started.
20 If you prefer to ask questions one-on-one, the
21 team will be staying after the meeting and would
22 gladly speak with you privately if you desire or
23 personally. And then also please sign up at the
24 back at the table for future mailings.

25 Documents such as these facts sheets that have

1 been provided, and if I may, just the pink
2 sheet, for example, number 7 and 8, will be
3 mailed to all the names on the mailing list,
4 your office or home address.

5 Also, as a reminder, the evaluation sheets
6 are available and if you'd take a few moments
7 and fill those out, if you desire, and leave
8 them with us so we can evaluate the meeting.

9 And now I finished with that portion, and I
10 would say the floor is open for questions, and,
11 please, are there any questions that we can
12 answer?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

14 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, sir, please. Would you,
15 please, stand?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Complies.)

17 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you.

18 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young with the City of
19 Jacksonville.

20 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, Mr. Young.

21 MR. YOUNG: One question for the engineer
22 about the bioremediation. What products do you
23 expect to get from the bioremediation of the
24 soils; for instance, you have oils in there,
25 you've got PCBs in there, and maybe a couple of

1 other chemicals. After the bacteria -- the
2 question is after the bacteria react with these
3 on the pad, what chemicals do you expect to have
4 after the action?

5 MR. PEARSON: Now, what happens is you
6 start with a chemical compound, it's usually
7 made up of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, typically,
8 with the fuels, and those are degraded, and the
9 end products are usually water and carbon
10 dioxide, assuming the process goes to
11 completion.

12 Now for PCBs, the biological treatment of
13 PCBs is much more limited, and we may see a
14 little bit of reduction in the PCB contamination
15 during the treatment but probably not a whole
16 lot. But, again, the PCBs, the issue of that, I
17 think, is going to be evaluated as part of the
18 final remediation. The concentrations are
19 pretty low to start with, and at this point we
20 haven't done a risk assessment to really assess
21 whether they pose a risk to the environment or
22 to the public.

23 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Young.
24 Anything else?

25 MR. DELIZ: I think the highest level --

1 CAPT. LEWIS: Could you please stand and
2 identify yourself for the court reporter?

3 MR. DELIZ: I'm Mike Deliz with Florida
4 DEP. The soils -- the subsurface soils then
5 will be paved at the site. I think the highest
6 hit we've got is 4 milligrams per kilogram, and
7 it's the highest. Most of them are less than 1
8 milligram per kilogram, and that's out of -- I
9 can't tell you how many soils -- subsurface soil
10 samples. They're probably anywhere from maybe,
11 what, 70s or 80s?

12 MR. YOUNG: 65.

13 MR. DELIZ: 65.

14 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young with the City of
15 Jacksonville. I understand. I also tested the
16 oil and the free product at the ground level,
17 and there was PCBs in both.

18 MR. DELIZ: We know that, and we know what
19 you got. They're potentially found in soil --

20 CAPT. LEWIS: I did not hear what you said,
21 Mr. Young. Would you please stand and say that
22 again?

23 MR. YOUNG: Sure. I think I was the one
24 that tested the oil and the free product at the
25 ground level.

1 CAPT. LEWIS: And you said something else.

2 MR. YOUNG: And there was PCBs in both.

3 CAPT. LEWIS: Okay.

4 MR. YOUNG: But not -- as far as the oils
5 go, it should be clear that the amount of PCBs
6 in the oil as it exists right now is not a
7 regulated level. However, the regulations are
8 built on the concentration of the oil as it went
9 into the pit not as it exists now.

10 See, you have to make an assumption as to
11 what was the concentration on the way in. Was
12 the concentration the current level of, let's
13 say, 24 parts per million or was it greater? If
14 it was greater, in which it probably was because
15 it's not all transformer oil sitting in that
16 pit, then it went in at a regulated level, and
17 these gentleman are treating it as it should as
18 a PCB cleanup rather than as a type 17 which is
19 an oil cleanup.

20 CAPT. LEWIS: I understand.

21 MR. DELIZ: Okay.

22 MR. YOUNG: And then the groundwater as it
23 exists right now is at a regulated level only it
24 is -- there is a question in my mind -- I don't
25 know if the engineers can do it or not, but

1 there is a question in my mind if we can clean
2 up to the regulated definition of clean. We can
3 barely measure the laboratory. I don't know if
4 you can clean up the little bit of PCBs that are
5 in that groundwater to get down to the regulated
6 level that would say that you're clean.

7 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Young. Any
8 additional comments or questions, please?

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

10 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, sir, please.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name.] I'm a retired
12 citizen. I have three questions, if I may.
13 First, I haven't read the entire picture here,
14 but you talk about Sites 17 and 5 here, I
15 believe. Does that mean there's 13 other sites
16 to be cleaned up also -- or 15 sites?

17 CAPT. LEWIS: As a matter of fact, there
18 are additional sites to -- the final total at
19 the moment is 19, I thought.

20 MR. DONOGHUE: 19 total.

21 CAPT. LEWIS: Yeah, 19. The answer is yes,
22 there are 19.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And they have all been
24 identified?

25 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, those sites have been

1 identified in the extent that they have a number
2 assigned to them, but as far as the full work to
3 them --

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Considering the way these
5 things are covered over and that sort of thing,
6 does that mean -- did you do it from the
7 records -- written records? Memory? Just how
8 did you determine whether --

9 MR. DELIZ: Mike Deliz with Florida DEP.
10 The initial 19 sites are published, 18 are
11 listed on the IRP Program, identified by record
12 searches and -- that the military started, I
13 believe, in 1985. We have done now an
14 environmental baseline survey off the base.
15 We've done a fence-to-fence investigation, and
16 there are close to 250 gray sites that we don't
17 know much about. That doesn't mean they are
18 contaminated. It doesn't mean they are clean.
19 That means we have to do further investigation.

20 So if you're looking for a number, there
21 could be a lot more than 18 but we don't know.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My next question:
23 Considering the time frame we have to begin all
24 this, what is the Florida EPA organization's
25 responsibility in this determination of sites,

1 the degree of work to be done and the final
2 certification that it is done?

3 MR. REEDY: Bart Reedy with EPA. I'm not
4 real sure that I understand your question.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is your
6 responsibility of cleaning up these sites with
7 the time frame you've got?

8 MR. REEDY: The responsibility of the EPA
9 is to ensure that they do indeed clean up to the
10 standards that are identified in the risk
11 assessment. These -- the interim RODs that
12 we're talking about right now, they are -- as
13 Stu said there's not been a risk assessment done
14 on these things. We know -- we have a good idea
15 of just exactly how long those are, but a full
16 remedial investigation with a risk assessment
17 has not been done on the two sites as yet.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It is scheduled?

19 MR. REEDY: Oh, yes, sir, absolutely.

20 MR. DELIZ: These are just to address
21 source control for removing soils to prevent
22 further contamination of groundwater. The
23 complete remedial investigation which is
24 following the whole CERCLA process for Sites 5
25 and 17 we are going to get the draft remedial

1 investigation report which is part of the CERCLA
2 process in about February of the next year,
3 which will have all the groundwater.

4 But we will know -- we've got -- at Site 5
5 we've got 24 wells out there, groundwater
6 monitoring wells. We're going to know and we've
7 mapped in both -- we've mapped a horizontal
8 extent of contamination and the vertical extent
9 of contamination, but all that data has not been
10 plugged into a final equation for which a
11 written assessment is done.

12 MR. REEDY: An analogy would be -- you
13 think of as kind of a sponge that is steadily
14 dripping oil, and we have the opportunity to
15 quickly dig them up and prevent any further
16 contamination. A full-blown remedial
17 investigation is under way and following that,
18 we will do exactly the same thing we are doing
19 here, a public -- in public form with it all out
20 in public, so you can see it, and it will be
21 soil and groundwater contaminants.

22 MR. YOUNG: I'm Jerry Young with the City
23 of Jacksonville to answer the gentleman's
24 question. As a member of the technical review
25 committee which is going to become a RAB or

1 Restoration Advisory Board, I think what you're
2 driving at is: Are the taxpayers of
3 Jacksonville going to be stuck with the cleanup
4 bill, and the answer is no.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, no, not that. I --
6 go ahead.

7 MR. YOUNG: The Navy knows, and I believe
8 the contractors and the Environmental Protection
9 Agency and everybody else knows the groundwater
10 is not going to be cleaned up by the day the
11 captain has to turn the base over and do
12 everything he's got to to turn the base over.
13 But what they have made a commitment to and what
14 the Environmental Protection Agency is going to
15 enforce with a written agreement called the
16 Federal Facilities Agreement that exists in this
17 state, it says the Navy is going to make the
18 commitment to finish the cleanup even after they
19 turn the base over to whoever they turn the base
20 over to.

21 Now, it may be the City of Jacksonville and
22 it may be another federal or state authority,
23 but the commitment is in writing that they will
24 finish the cleanup. And can they do all the
25 sites before they close the gates, and the

1 answer is probably no. Can they get a good
2 start on it? Yes, they can, and they have made
3 the written commitment, correct me if I'm wrong,
4 Captain, that they will finish the job.

5 CAPT. LEWIS: That is correct.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And to the extent I
7 understand the difficulties for the
8 responsiveness of cleanup?

9 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The period of time here
11 has been set, contractors have been selected,
12 some estimate of cost has certainly been decided
13 on for these contractors, the extent of the
14 testing necessary to do the work has been
15 contracted for. Who are the parties to that
16 determination? Was EPA a party to it?

17 MR. REEDY: Negative. The contracts that
18 are in force right now were selected by Southern
19 Division out of Charleston, and they are with
20 ABB, and ABB is doing the investigative work
21 that we're talking about right now. There is
22 another contract with Bechtel, and both of these
23 groups are not only working here but other
24 places -- other DOD facilities.

25 So it was a DOD contract, neither the State

1 of Florida nor EPA was involved in any of the
2 negotiations or the contract in any way. There
3 was -- does that answer your question?

4 MR. DELIZ: Are you looking for a final
5 number?

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Was the EPA involved in
7 these things all along as they progress? Does
8 the EPA come in and just commence afterwards or
9 are they a party to the effective cleanup?

10 MR. REEDY: Oh, okay. We have ongoing
11 right here at Cecil a relationship between EPA
12 and DEP, the facility, Southern Division, and
13 all of us are involved as much as we possibly
14 can be. This is my only facility that I work
15 on.

16 So we are watching what's going on, and we
17 are -- it is -- the way we are approaching it is
18 as regulators, we are providing input as the
19 process is ongoing without -- so that neither
20 the Navy nor the contractor has to go back and
21 redo something again.

22 MR. DELIZ: Are you asking: Do we know
23 what the final cost is to clean up the base,
24 because we don't?

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, no. I'm trying to

1 find out who is responsible for cleaning up the
2 work, work to be done and when it's done, what
3 will be done. Who is responsible for that? Is
4 EPA a party to the start-up of the cleanup of
5 the site?

6 MR. DELIZ: These things that we're talking
7 about, these Records of Decision or the final
8 Record of Decision, which is a cleanup taking
9 place at a site.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I assumed he's with the
11 Jacksonville --

12 MR. DELIZ: Well, yeah. Well, that
13 document is signed by the secretary of the
14 Department of Environmental Protection.

15 MR. REEDY: And our region, Administrator
16 Region IV.

17 MR. DELIZ: And each site.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And you are monitoring it
19 directly?

20 MR. DELIZ: Oh, yeah.

21 CAPT. LEWIS: Could you please speak up?

22 MR. DELIZ: To answer your question fully,
23 they have to get our total concurrence that the
24 investigation is done, that the engineering that
25 they designed will probably work or hopefully

1 work, and that the method that they've chosen
2 we've agreed with.

3 Now, that's being the State and EPA. It's
4 not just the Navy saying, "We are going to do
5 this," and investigating what they want to do.
6 They've got to convince us. You know, we're
7 part of a formal team here but we're still our
8 agency.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you will be expecting
10 to ensure that it happens?

11 MR. DELIZ: Oh, absolutely.

12 MR. REEDY: Absolutely.

13 CAPT. LEWIS: Our gates are open for more
14 questions. Any additional items?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name.] I have a
16 botanical real estate interest in the area, and
17 I'm concerned with the methodology that's being
18 proposed. Why removal of the soil is the
19 preferred treatment when it seems to sense these
20 solvents and PCBs were low because it gets
21 fluids all the way down to the water level? How
22 can you determine how far to go before you've
23 reached the bottom of the pit, so to speak, and
24 then afterwards why refill the pit when this is
25 only an interim action?

1 You're going to have to take further action
2 later compounding the cost. Why not leave the
3 pit open?

4 MR. PEARSON: To answer the first part of
5 the question, how do we determine how far to
6 dig, what we propose to do is to dig down to the
7 water table, not extend below that.

8 CAPT. LEWIS: Would you tell them where the
9 water table is, please?

10 MR. PEARSON: The water table at these
11 sites fluctuates. It fluctuates from
12 approximately 1 to 2 feet below the surface down
13 to 7 or 8 feet below the surface, according to a
14 yearly cycle, depending on the precipitation and
15 so forth during the year.

16 The idea of what we're proposing at these
17 sites is to excavate during the low water
18 season, in other words, when the water is the
19 lowest. So we would excavate down to
20 approximately 7 or 8 feet.

21 Your second concern was recontamination or
22 the fact that we may want to go back and --

23 MR. DELIZ: It appears --

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Since this is an
25 interim --

1 MR. PEARSON: Right. What we're doing with
2 this interim action is addressing the soils that
3 are acting as the source of contamination to the
4 groundwater, and based on our investigations at
5 the site, we believe that the bulk of the
6 contamination that's doing this, in other words,
7 the sponge that was mentioned earlier that's
8 dripping the oil, what we're trying to do is
9 come in and take out that sponge.

10 Now, there are still going to be the drops
11 that have already come out before, and we'll
12 probably address that as part of a groundwater
13 remediation rather than a soil remediation
14 action. But that will be determined in the
15 final remedial investigation and feasibility
16 study and so forth, the final remediation of the
17 sites.

18 But to answer your question, that will most
19 likely -- we don't anticipate the fact that
20 we'll have to excavate again to get more soils,
21 but we would probably address the groundwater.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So your assumption is
23 that the groundwaters have carried away the
24 balances rather than allowing the leachates to
25 continue down below the groundwater level. That

1 seems absurd to me.

2 MR. PEARSON: I'm sorry. I didn't quite
3 follow.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It seems that these
5 contaminants because of viscosity would leach
6 below the water level.

7 MR. PEARSON: Oil-related compounds
8 actually tend to flow on top of the water. They
9 are lighter in density --

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The petroleum parts --

11 MR. PEARSON: Right.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- they are solid as
13 well, and you're addressing PCBs that would
14 leach --

15 MR. PEARSON: Right.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- further down, perhaps
17 hundreds of feet, into the aquifer.

18 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young with the City of
19 Jacksonville.

20 CAPT. LEWIS: Please stand, Mr. Young, so
21 that she can hear you.

22 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

23 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you.

24 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young, the City of
25 Jacksonville. The contractor has looked at,

1 let's say, Site 5 where we found PCBs -- this
2 happens at other sites, but let's just focus in
3 on Site 5 -- has looked at this site with
4 shallow, deep and intermediate level monitoring
5 wells. Okay. We only see the PCBs in the
6 shallow well indicating that only the shallow
7 aquifer has been affected.

8 Now, we don't drink the shallow aquifer in
9 this county. We drink the deep aquifer;
10 therefore, the intermediate and the deep wells
11 indicating that they are clean, not only PCBs
12 but almost all contaminants, indicates to us
13 that the actions that are proposed by the
14 contractor to the Navy and the State and federal
15 government is going to be adequate because we're
16 only seeing the contamination in the shallow
17 wells.

18 If you remove the soil source and they also
19 piggyback on -- if you run into free product, I
20 assume you're going to take it out?

21 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

22 MR. YOUNG: Okay. So you take the soils
23 and the free product out, you have to remove the
24 source that's permeable out of the water. That
25 leaves the concentration that we know about in

1 the water. After the contaminated soils and the
2 free product that cause the soils to get
3 contaminated in the first place are all removed
4 and you put clean soil from incineration back
5 in, you also put monitoring wells there to
6 monitor what's going to happen to the water
7 itself, the groundwater, before you to do a
8 groundwater cleanup. You just don't get
9 instantaneous because you wish studies after
10 this happened.

11 You have to let the seasonal flow of the
12 water go up and down maybe once, maybe twice,
13 one or two cycles, so that you know that what
14 you've done is working and, therefore, you will
15 be able to look at these shallow wells.

16 In the meantime, the law says that the Navy
17 must also continue to sample the intermediate
18 and the deep wells to see if something comes
19 down. They not only got to do this while we're
20 doing the cleanup but they have to do it for the
21 next 20 years.

22 MR. DELIZ: To put you at ease a little
23 bit, we know absolutely positively there's no
24 contamination below 25 feet. There's a dolomite
25 of magnesium product or magnesium carbonate

1 limestone that is acting on the -- and that is
2 the top of what we call the -- what we call the
3 Hawthorn group which is the big aquiclude before
4 we reach the Floridan aquifer, which is where
5 everybody gets their drinking water out of.

6 MR. REEDY: How many -- if I could, how
7 many wells have we gone through -- is that --
8 I'm sorry my name is Bart Reedy with EPA,
9 again. We have been through the dolomite
10 again --

11 MR. PEARSON: I think just twice.

12 MR. REEDY: -- twice?

13 MR. DELIZ: Twice at 17.

14 MR. REEDY: And it is clean. That's the
15 water that everyone is drinking from, and we
16 found the rigs have been shallow, intermediate
17 and deep. We're talking -- when Jerry was
18 talking about shallow, intermediate and deep,
19 that is -- I thought it was low.

20 Fortunately for all of us, PCBs have a way
21 of sticking to the soil, they don't travel very
22 far, and we have only found them in the
23 surficial, in the upper 15 foot of dirt and
24 water is where we have found the PCBs. They
25 don't migrate.

1 And, again, what we're going to do is we're
2 digging up -- we're digging up the sponge, we'll
3 put clean fill back in there, and that is -- you
4 know, your point is well taken of why are we
5 putting clean fill in there. We have to put
6 something back in there.

7 And when we get done with this, we will
8 complete a groundwater investigation, and the
9 groundwater will be cleaned up, but we're not
10 doing that yet, we're not to that point. But we
11 will leave contaminated groundwater out there
12 when what we are talking about tonight is over.

13 It will still be there if that's what
14 you're thinking. But we will go back and fully
15 investigate it and confirm what -- anything we
16 get we will fill, and we will clean up the
17 groundwater and make a commitment to do that
18 nationwide.

19 Does that go to your question?

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, in much greater
21 detail than was presented up here.

22 MR. DINGWALL: John Dingwall. May I add a
23 little bit here --

24 CAPT. LEWIS: Could you speak up, Mr.
25 Dingwall, please for the court reporter?

1 MR. DINGWALL: That's -- right now we don't
2 have enough money to go out there and do the
3 complete cleanup, but we do have enough money to
4 go out there and get out the most highly
5 contaminated stuff. By doing that now, we don't
6 allow the contaminant to spread out further.
7 Now, if we allowed the contaminant to spread out
8 further --

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Of course.

10 MR. DINGWALL: -- at a later date than we
11 have to clean up the groundwater, it will take
12 that much longer and that much more costly at
13 that time to clean up that additional portion.
14 And it will take no longer time to -- it will
15 take a lot less time to do the soils while --
16 when they are in a lot lower concentration
17 there.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're assuming, of
19 course, that the Navy will be able to live up to
20 its --

21 MR. DINGWALL: Well, if only Congress gives
22 us the money --

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Precisely. Do you or I
24 control that?

25 MR. DINGWALL: No, but we --

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That is beyond all of our
2 lifetimes.

3 MR. DINGWALL: Well --

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So we're dealing with a
5 variable that none of us can control. Since we
6 know that there may be other options, can we
7 continue to investigate other options or at
8 least make a determination of the depth that is
9 beyond all doubt to being adequate, just
10 stopping at the water level versus a 15-foot
11 level as you indicated to be the normal maximum
12 depth of PCBs concentration?

13 MR. REEDY: To -- well, let me --

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're talking 1 to 7
15 feet, which is a possibility, which is --

16 MR. REEDY: Well, the reason -- again, Bart
17 Reedy, EPA. The reason that the excavation is
18 so shallow is because we do have shallow water
19 down there. We don't want to get down into the
20 water and make -- it does not work when you
21 excavate like that. It just doesn't work.

22 We have contamination down below 15 feet.
23 The 15 foot that I mentioned, is that -- how
24 deep is the -- was the deepest hit on PCBs? Was
25 it not in just the shallow well?

1 MR. PEARSON: I believe it's just in the
2 shallow well.

3 MR. DELIZ: This is free product
4 measured --

5 MR. PEARSON: I'm not -- I reviewed the
6 groundwater data in that one --

7 MR. DELIZ: But when we drilled our wells,
8 Jerry, I don't think we have.

9 MR. PEARSON: As far as the soils go, we
10 have -- we only have it down to two wells.

11 MR. YOUNG: One, yes, one.

12 MR. REEDY: So we are doing what we can do
13 right now. Let me make two more points, if I
14 might. The Navy has committed, DOD has
15 committed lower D -- I'm sorry, I don't want to
16 give you a figure right now, but I was just --
17 they had a meeting two weeks ago we were at that
18 was, I believe, \$300 million for 1995 for
19 investigations and cleanups, and that figure is
20 steadily growing. That is DOD funds that are
21 committed.

22 We don't have a guarantee that, you know,
23 we're going to get funds out. It does not
24 exist. There isn't a guarantee on that. But as
25 everything goes right now, it looks as though

1 we're going to have the money to do it. We are
2 not holding up investigations nor cleanups
3 because of a lack of funds. That is not the
4 case. We are not doing that. We are going as
5 fast as we can go in the investigations and the
6 cleanups based on -- we're doing it as fast as
7 we can. There is money there.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In the interest of
9 containment you're proceeding with what the
10 interest is feasible --

11 MR. REEDY: We are proceeding -- yeah, in
12 containment with. But we're also proceeding
13 with the full-blown remedial investigations at
14 these two sites and two more where you --

15 MR. YOUNG: You've got five sites in the
16 process right now. You've got one site -- Jerry
17 Young, City of Jacksonville. You've got one
18 site that is fully excavated, AND pits, the old
19 concrete pits out there. Those pits have been
20 removed. They are in the, let's say, post
21 cleanup phase determining how dirty is dirty
22 after they've done the cleanup right now.

23 MR. DELIZ: For soil.

24 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

25 MR. REEDY: But we are -- nothing is being

1 held up right now for a lack of funds and
2 nothing in the future that I'm aware of as
3 EPA -- that I've been made aware of, does it
4 appear there is going to be a lack of funds. We
5 are conducting a full-blown investigation which
6 will probably -- they are ongoing right now.

7 MR. DELIZ: You're not getting Hyundais
8 right now, you're getting Cadillacs.

9 MR. DINGWALL: If we do not get funding in
10 the out years and we don't remove the
11 contaminated stuff now, that contaminated stuff
12 is going to be there in the out years; whereas,
13 will we have the money now, we are getting that
14 contaminated stuff out now.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You are minimizing the
16 input.

17 MR. DINGWALL: Right.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Consideration to other
19 needs or alternative three on Site 5, the air
20 injection well and the biological treatment, are
21 there other vehicles by which perhaps a broader
22 leaching of those chemicals and a more permanent
23 solution might be reached in a single phase?

24 MR. DINGWALL: Not that I know of in any
25 reasonable amount of time. Our environmental

1 consultant might want to address that more.

2 MR. PEARSON: It would be possible to
3 address the sites together, in other words,
4 groundwater and soils together. What we felt
5 though, that -- we knew the soils were acting as
6 a source of contamination to the groundwater and
7 you know that's going to continue to happen as
8 long as the soils are there.

9 By doing the interim action, we're able to
10 accelerate the process. In other words, we
11 didn't have -- if we had gone through the whole
12 process to address both soils and groundwater,
13 it would have taken longer to get to this point
14 where we have proposed alternatives; whereas,
15 now we have one alternative that is expedited,
16 and we believe that it's going to be consistent
17 with what the final remedy for the site will be.

18 MR. REEDY: Again, Bart Reedy with EPA. I
19 think I'm going to your question: Did we look
20 at other things? Yes, we did. And one of the
21 hoops that we have to go through, for one of a
22 better word, is ranking the various remedial
23 alternatives, and that does not include just the
24 four or five that are presented in the two
25 handouts.

1 But, you know -- no, there were many looked
2 at, and they were evaluated on various criteria,
3 which is set forth in the law, and those are in
4 the handouts which are in your book. These --
5 the four that are brought out seem to be the
6 most reasonable, the most implementable, the
7 most cost-effective and the ones that are most
8 reliable.

9 The ones you see that are being presented
10 to you right now are -- fit the criteria the
11 best. Congress said, you know -- Congress said
12 do it this way with these criteria, and that's
13 what we have to do, but there were a whole
14 multitude, and I wouldn't hesitate to -- I mean,
15 I wouldn't presume to say how many.

16 Do you happen to know, Stu, offhand?

17 MR. PEARSON: I don't know offhand, but
18 what we do is we look at the technologies
19 individually and usually choose the technologies
20 that seem to be applicable and then assemble
21 them into the final full-blown alternatives.
22 Technologies -- we may have looked at 10 or 12
23 technologies for each site.

24 MR. REEDY: One of the things -- for
25 example, one of the technologies that is

1 often -- often is used is incineration -- all of
2 us know what that is. But that's not acceptable
3 with these -- you know, in these situations down
4 here in Florida.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Transferring contaminants
6 to the ground from there.

7 MR. REEDY: So that's the reason. Does
8 that go to your question?

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

10 CAPT. LEWIS: I believe that there is
11 another question here, so I'd like to --

12 MR. YOUNG: The comment on the incineration
13 technology choice. Jerry Young from the City of
14 Jacksonville. One of the reasons why these
15 gentlemen were looking at only four so is
16 because I wrote a letter.

17 Let's say I was representing all the
18 citizens of Jacksonville because I sit on the
19 TRC as appointed by the mayor -- as a position
20 appointed by the mayor. I don't get paid for it
21 but I'm appointed. And I sent a letter to the
22 Navy in Charleston at their request when they
23 sent me one of those books, and I said to them I
24 wanted something fast done for Site 17. The
25 fastest thing to do in Site 17 is incineration.

1 Now, when you get into Site 5, your choices
2 are limited, as Bart told you from the EPA,
3 because of the presence of polychlorinated
4 biphenyls. There are some very serious laws in
5 this state about incinerated PCBs. As a result,
6 they have to look at another technology or they
7 have to haul the stuff out of the state. Either
8 way you may incur a lot more choice -- I mean a
9 lot less choice, a lot more money, and you end
10 up limiting the technology that you can choose.

11 CAPT. LEWIS: Sir, you haven't had a chance
12 yet. Go ahead, please.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name.] I'm with
14 industrial waste in Jacksonville. You mentioned
15 a moment ago in your presentation that the work
16 would begin, like, in October, whatever the
17 alternative is that is ultimately selected will
18 go in October.

19 Are contracts actually left for the people
20 in the field to perform the work by Bechtel, for
21 example? In other words, is it too late at this
22 point in the event that the comment period might
23 cause you to change your selection of the
24 recommended alternative? I mean how can it
25 start in October?

1 MR. PEARSON: We have Bechtel -- I'll give
2 you my understanding and maybe Bart can add some
3 things. My understanding is Bechtel is the
4 remedial action contractor. They may obtain
5 subcontractors as needed to help out with the
6 remediation.

7 If we had a significant change in the
8 alternatives, that may, in fact, delay when we
9 could begin to implement them, but assuming -- I
10 guess the October date that we're giving you is
11 assuming that, you know, we go ahead as
12 expected. Bechtel is already in the process of
13 trying to figure out what they need in order to
14 implement the alternatives we're looking at.

15 MR. REEDY: Sir --

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Go ahead.

17 MR. REEDY: Your question, if I could
18 paraphrase it, was: If you've already selected
19 a remedy -- are the contracts already let, does
20 that mean a remedy has already been selected?

21 The entire purpose of the public comment
22 period is to listen to you and listen to
23 everyone else and to ensure what we're doing
24 here fits what needs to be done as everyone sees
25 it. The reason the contract -- we're trying to

1 hurry up right now and get Bechtel and their
2 subs out working.

3 It is our plan to go ahead and implement
4 the actions that you saw, but it's not written
5 in stone. We can change things if it needs to
6 be, but we all feel -- when I say "we all," I
7 mean EPA, DEP, the Navy, everyone who has looked
8 at all the information, feels that these are the
9 best reasonable choices. Should something come
10 up, we can certainly change.

11 MR. DELIZ: Can I follow-up on that too.
12 Mike with DEP. There are nine criteria that
13 every remedy alternative are judged against and
14 one of them is the public input. So we can't
15 just blow up what the public says.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Of the nine is one of
17 them cost?

18 MR. DELIZ: Yes.

19 MR. REEDY: Oh, yes.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Of the nine how is cost
21 weighed?

22 MR. DELIZ: It shouldn't be weighed totally
23 differently but it should be taken into
24 consideration. It's like taking the stuff and
25 bringing it down to Miami to be burned, that

1 costs \$5 million. It's 4.9 something.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You mean the alternatives
3 for an offsite thermal treatment?

4 MR. DELIZ: Right. The PCB site. That is
5 the cost that's been determined. That's in your
6 hand.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, what about digging
8 it up and transporting it up to Georgia and
9 having it recycled into concrete or asphalt for
10 35 bucks? What's the matter with that?

11 MR. YOUNG: Because it's against the law --

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, it isn't against the
13 law. I do it every day. With PCBs, and it's
14 done in Florida as well.

15 MR. YOUNG: Not in my county and if it
16 is --

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, that isn't in your
18 county --

19 MR. YOUNG: This is also mine.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not what I meant.

21 MR. YOUNG: It's because there's laws
22 against it in this county.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's true. I
24 understand that. But my point is is the cost of
25 excavating it and treating it onsite. By

1 treating it offsite with thermal treatment --
2 which is less by the way than treating it
3 onsite -- is far more, both of those
4 alternatives, than to take it to Georgia and
5 recycle it in concrete and asphalt approved by
6 DNR, EPD.

7 MR. YOUNG: Leave the hole.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, that's a different
9 matter about leaving the hole. I mean, the cost
10 is there. It's legitimate, it's done every
11 day. I know because I do it every day. The
12 cost of onsite thermal treatment including
13 immobilization, the fugitive emissions, the air
14 monitoring and the work itself, and the fuel,
15 you know, you can hardly get that for -- you
16 know, you have a massive job like this perhaps
17 the lowest you could expect to pay would be 42,
18 \$45 a ton, in that range, something like that.
19 I mean that's at the low end. 40 must be the
20 absolute bottom cost, right.

21 You can haul it offsite to a thermal
22 treatment unit at 5 to \$10 a ton cheaper to
23 transport in this area, right in the
24 Jacksonville area.

25 MR. WILSON: My name is Steve Wilson. I am

1 the BEC at Cecil Field. I'm very glad you
2 brought that up because cost is one of the major
3 concerns we have of the site, and we have done
4 our very best to consider the most
5 cost-effective alternative, not necessarily the
6 cheapest. But we have on board the contractor
7 to remediate the site and part of his job is
8 letting subcontractors and his task under our
9 contracting requirements to do a certain
10 percentage -- is a large percentage in this
11 county and small businesses too.

12 And what we would like to do is to provide
13 that comment on the record, and we would
14 definitely investigate your concern in that site
15 and incorporate the remedial action contract.
16 We have no desire to waste money. If we can do
17 it \$40 a ton versus \$98 a ton, obviously we are
18 not at a point where we're going ahead. This is
19 the reason we have these meetings is to get
20 input, and we certainly appreciate it.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's all I have.

22 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you very much, sir.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

24 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, sir, please.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name.] A question in

1 regard to the turnover of the property at the
2 appointed date which is -- Commander, is that
3 the date that you're familiar with?

4 CAPT. LEWIS: Well, my boss, commander in
5 chief, Atlantic Fleet, tells me 30 September,
6 1998.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When we reach that date
8 and the EPA decides that the property is not
9 cleaned up, does that mean the property cannot
10 be turned over for any other use at that time,
11 any part of it -- all of it or any part of it?

12 CAPT. LEWIS: No, sir. We will be able to
13 turn over those areas that are determined
14 noncontaminated or never contaminated in their
15 original state, if you will. Other areas that
16 may be under cleanup remediation, ongoing
17 processes like pumping groundwater and treating
18 and so forth, will not be allowed to be turned
19 over. They will be fenced and so forth, and
20 those properties will be continued to be worked
21 by the DOD and, of course, monitored by our
22 regulatory agencies, EPA and environmental folks
23 from the State of Florida.

24 Obviously the vast majority of the property
25 over 20,000 acres is not contaminated.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

2 CAPT. LEWIS: But there are these sites
3 that we do have to deal with.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who is providing the
5 guarantee for the cleanup? Is that Bechtel?

6 CAPT. LEWIS: I do not know the answer to
7 that.

8 MR. DELIZ: Who is providing the guarantee
9 for the cleanup?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

11 MR. DELIZ: Right now the Navy is
12 responsible.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who is providing the
14 guarantee right now?

15 MR. DELIZ: I don't believe I understand
16 what you're asking.

17 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young from the City. Are
18 you trying to find out: Do they guarantee that
19 the method that they have chosen --

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. When we get to the
21 end of the term --

22 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- and the job is -- and
24 the contract is to be cleaned up, are they
25 guaranteeing your cleanup? Is the contractor

1 guaranteeing the cleanup?

2 MR. DELIZ: Let's say the method we chose
3 doesn't work, is that what you're asking, and
4 it's still dirty?

5 MR. DINGWALL: We go out and we sample
6 after the cleanup is complete and verify the
7 cleanup has occurred.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Last night?

9 MR. DINGWALL: No, at the end when the
10 cleanup is done.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Recycle?

12 MR. DINGWALL: Right. We go back after the
13 contractor says he has cleaned it up completely,
14 and we go back and verify, sample it, and that
15 is in fact what has to be done.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If you find it's not
17 cleaned up, what happens?

18 MR. DINGWALL: We have to -- then we have
19 to get it cleaned up. Either if we can hold the
20 contractors feet to the fire, fine. If we
21 can't, we have to take it out of our own hide.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, there's a time
23 frame to consider for doing all this now in the
24 reuse of the property later on. Is there a
25 guarantee in the contract on the part of the

1 contractor that he will do what the specs call
2 for as far as the cleanup goes and what he has
3 to do?

4 CAPT. LEWIS: Please, Steve.

5 MR. WILSON: I believe I can address that,
6 Captain.

7 CAPT. LEWIS: Identify yourself.

8 MR. WILSON: My name is Steve Wilson,
9 again, the BEC for Cecil Field. We have a
10 performance spec in our remediation contract,
11 and when that contractor -- or Bechtel
12 contractor subs out to a local subcontractor to
13 do whatever treatment, thermal, biological,
14 etc., he has a performance criteria he has to
15 meet, and if that contractor does not meet that
16 performance criteria, then we will keep the
17 biological, et cetera, et cetera, and the
18 thermal and when you put it back in the plug and
19 bring it out again.

20 Now, if he meets that performance criteria
21 and the system does not work, in other words, he
22 has done his job and the design was ineffective,
23 then that's not the contractor's problem, that's
24 the designer's problem, the Navy's problem.

25 But we have no intention of failing. I

1 mean, if it doesn't work, you know, as the
2 little boy said, we keep trying and trying. But
3 there is no guarantees.

4 We have selected a technology for this
5 Interim Remedial Action based on its
6 reliability. This is a short term quick action
7 to reduce the source. And we don't go pick
8 technology that maybe, you know, it might work
9 or it might not. The idea is to pick something
10 that is tried and true --

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's not a question of
12 technology, I think. It's a question of doing
13 the work in the time frame that you have within
14 the dollars that you have and the instruction
15 that the progressive of inspection as you go
16 along, make sure that the work is being done
17 within the specifications to get the work done.
18 That is being done no question about that. When
19 we get to the '98 date/'99 date, the sites will
20 be cleaned up properly.

21 MR. DELIZ: We're in the process of getting
22 it cleaned.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, we have for a long
24 time scheduled here. Why don't we get it on the
25 way?

1 MR. DELIZ: If you're treating groundwater,
2 inherently it does not take two years to clean
3 up. You know, it could take 15 years --

4 MR. PEARSON: Some sites it takes 30.

5 MR. DELIZ: -- 30 years to get it to what
6 is called for at the state reg.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, for acceptable use
8 at this time as well as in the future, it seems
9 to me that the specs should be ongoing now to
10 clean it up to where it would be pleasant and
11 safe.

12 MR. DELIZ: Except there are promulgated
13 laws in the state of Florida, and with the U.S.
14 and federal law that's saying you have to be at
15 certain levels.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, that's what I'm
17 saying. That's at the state level, right?

18 MR. DELIZ: And that's to protect and clean
19 up the environment, yes.

20 MR. REEDY: When --

21 MR. DELIZ: Does that answer it?

22 MR. REEDY: Let me take a shot at it.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When you get to '99, it
24 will be cleaned up to the specification that you
25 EPA people describe.

1 MR. REEDY: Bart Reedy with EPA. We have
2 performance specs -- I say "we" because we're
3 working together. There are performance specs
4 for the contractors. They will meet those
5 performance specs. If -- there's -- there are
6 going to be sites -- we know there are some
7 sites out here that is going to take a lot of
8 work in groundwater -- in the groundwater
9 arena. Those will not -- those will not be
10 cleaned up by the time the base is turned over.
11 We know that already.

12 But that is not going to -- that -- there
13 are two things I want to say about that.

14 One is that is not going to necessarily
15 prohibit the use of the land; and two, the Navy
16 is still on the hook to clean up the groundwater
17 and should something else turn up, the Navy is
18 still on the hook for that as well.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

20 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am, please.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm [name] and I'm with
22 Disability America at Cecil Field. I'm glad to
23 hear that Cecil Field is being cleaned up. I'm
24 really -- from what I understand it's been
25 contaminated for years and years and years. So

1 now that it's fixing to close, they are cleaning
2 it up. Well, what about all these people? How
3 will it affect -- has there been studies done?

4 These people that have worked there
5 forever, 30 years, whatever, is there any kind
6 of contamination that have been, you know,
7 around that will cause them any kind of health
8 problems or whatever? Have there been studies
9 going on?

10 These are people that have been there
11 working that long. Or are we just worried about
12 cleaning up the area and not about how it's
13 affecting the people?

14 MR. REEDY: Let me take a shot at that.
15 I'm not aware of any health studies that are
16 ongoing. We are not aware -- at the same token
17 we're not aware of any problems that are
18 associated with workers at Cecil Field or the
19 people stationed there.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, those people --
21 they weren't aware of the problems that were
22 happening either -- contaminated the area
23 either, and it happened.

24 MR. REEDY: I'll not argue that with you.

25 MR. DELIZ: With the historic sites,

1 though, there will be a risk assessment which
2 includes human health and ecological. Those
3 will be done no matter what at the 18 sites we
4 know about and sites that we deem will fall into
5 that CERCLA process or the Superfund process of
6 getting documents. They will have human health
7 risk assessment done. We're not going to
8 shortcut you there, guarantee you.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

10 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, ma'am.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Stands up.)

12 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, sir, please.

13 MR. YOUNG: This is Jerry Young from the
14 City of Jacksonville. Correct me if I'm wrong,
15 but the ATSDR -- don't ask me what it stands
16 for. They're up in Atlanta, they worry about
17 disease control, but they also worry about
18 Superfund sites and contamination to the
19 population there from -- I think has completed
20 the one for Cecil Field, and that is in the
21 library at Wesconnett. Okay.

22 Now, if you're worried about what has
23 happened to you as an employee on the base, if
24 you look at the locations of these sites, they
25 are not where employees are. And if you look at

1 the risk assessments that have been done for the
2 workers who are going to excavate these sites, I
3 would say that if you look at those risk
4 assessments, you will find out that they have
5 been out there, they -- ABB Environmental and
6 before then Geraghty & Miller and -- that you
7 don't see sick and cancerous workers because
8 they weren't out there drinking the groundwater
9 and neither were you.

10 And then folks say, "Well, you've got PCBs
11 at Site 5." However, I tested more than one
12 well there. I tested one well in the site and
13 one well outside the site, and guess what, the
14 well outside the site is clean. The well inside
15 the site is dirty, which indicated they haven't
16 -- the groundwater hasn't moved off the site.

17 And so if you're worried about is the
18 drinking water wells, a supply at NAS Cecil
19 Field, contaminated, and we would say, "We don't
20 believe so," because the contaminants don't
21 appear to have moved offsite to the drinking
22 water wells that supply your drinking water as a
23 civilian employee.

24 And there is somebody from the State of
25 Florida that comes out there and tests your

1 drinking water every year on the bases, and I
2 believe that that drinking water has been
3 certified clean as far as I know.

4 So I would say that your exposure is not
5 the same as the residents around Superfund site
6 landfills.

7 MR. DELIZ: If I could follow up on Jerry.
8 The water you're drinking at Cecil Field is
9 coming from that 350 to 400 feet below the land
10 surface. The deepest contamination we found to
11 date is about 95 feet, and that's -- it's
12 sitting on top at any of our sites, it's about
13 95 feet and sitting on top of that dolomite
14 that -- was talking about.

15 You've got to go through 250 feet of
16 additional rock. A lot of it is clay, which
17 it's really hard to get anything through it.
18 It's not -- it doesn't have a lot of
19 permeability. It's a geological term. It's
20 hard to get stuff through it.

21 All the drinking water involved in Cecil
22 Field, the Floridan aquifer, which is at the --
23 that all the water in the city of Jacksonville
24 is taken from there. If you were drinking the
25 water out of the spigot for that area that unit

1 that buries water between the surface and 95
2 feet, you'd have a problem, but you're not.

3 It's coming out from between 350, 400 feet
4 or you'd be exposed. You'd have the potential
5 for exposure but you're not. If that helps
6 out.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, it does from my
8 mind.

9 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you. Is there an
10 additional question, please?

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. [Name.] I wanted
12 to make a comment regarding the type of
13 government contract that, for example, is
14 issued. Since we're given a diploma for years
15 of government contracting, I suggested perhaps
16 knowledge that we're given the type of
17 incentives for positive performance as well as
18 deterrents for negative performance, significant
19 deterrents, since most of the time a government
20 contractor fails to perform this is simply pat
21 on the hand and say, No, don't do that again.
22 Come back the next time for your secondary
23 phase. Perhaps to significant deterrents too
24 can be addressed since trying to deal with a
25 fixed time line.

1 CAPT. LEWIS: Could you speak up, sir,
2 please? The court reporter is trying to record
3 you verbatim.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm finished with my
5 comment.

6 CAPT. LEWIS: Okay. Anything else,
7 please?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

9 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am, please.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name.] I was wondering
11 with Site 17 if you could explain a little bit
12 more, I guess, in technical terms how the output
13 gases are treated.

14 MR. PEARSON: The off gases from thermal
15 treatment unit?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

17 MR. PEARSON: There are a few ways that you
18 can actually treat it. Probably the most
19 commonly used by vendors in the state of Florida
20 for at least cleanup of gasoline sites is the
21 use of an afterburner.

22 CAPT. LEWIS: When you say "gasoline site,"
23 you mean what?

24 MR. PEARSON: Well, this technology, the
25 thermal treatment, is frequently used at sites

1 such as old gas stations where you drove up and
2 got gas and they had leaking tanks. It's been
3 used frequently for that type of cleanup. And
4 the afterburner is probably the most frequently
5 used treatment for the off gas.

6 What happens with an afterburner is gases
7 are passed through a chamber, and then this
8 chamber auxiliary fuel, the injected fuel -- I
9 mean you have fuel that is injected in there,
10 it's burned at a high temperature. What this
11 does is it chemically breaks down the
12 contaminants in the air. It burns the
13 contaminants along with the fuel that you put in
14 there, and it's a combustion process. It's
15 similar to what happens in an automobile engine
16 or in a jet engine.

17 So what you get out is a functioning of the
18 fuel that's added in the afterburner as well as
19 the contaminants that are going through. In
20 this case where we have contaminants that were
21 actually originally fuels, we don't expect
22 anything to be drastically different than what
23 you would get from, you know, an auto combustion
24 engine.

25 Is that a little clearer?

1 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you, Stu. Please, are
2 there additional comments or questions? I don't
3 see anything. I guess that we can close for now
4 and we'll, for the record --

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me.

6 CAPT. LEWIS: Oh, yes, ma'am, please, go
7 ahead.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is [name]. I am
9 the treasurer of the Pittsburgh Management
10 Corporation, and I have one question.

11 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, please.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there any guarantee
13 that we have no contamination outside the
14 boundaries of Cecil field? We have enough
15 already, as you know.

16 CAPT. LEWIS: Please, Mr. Young.

17 MR. YOUNG: Jerry Young with the City of
18 Jacksonville. What happens, [name], is the
19 state of Florida, whoever burns the soil, there
20 is already a law in existence that says what is
21 allowed to come out of the incinerator; in other
22 words, they have to sample the air as it comes
23 out.

24 Unlike your experiences with cleanup over
25 Hipps Road where you couldn't get the carbon

1 filters that you wanted to guarantee your lack
2 of benzene in your air, the afterburner in the
3 case of the incinerator will take care of the
4 benzene, and if it doesn't, the Florida
5 Department of Environmental Protection will shut
6 down the operation.

7 And this is an ongoing sampling that has to
8 take place; in other words, it's just not
9 something that, "Oh, well, you know, I think
10 we'll do this now." It is an ongoing sampling
11 process that they do have in -- outside the
12 absence of where the temperatures are lower,
13 which is more closer to temperatures of the air
14 outside.

15 It doesn't take place inside the
16 afterburner where the taking place out in the
17 outside the burner. And if the air
18 contamination exceeds what is allowed by Florida
19 law, they have to shut down, and they have to
20 fix the problem that caused it; in other words,
21 they are in violation of law.

22 In other words, this contractor has to shut
23 down and the regulatory agencies are responsible
24 for enforcing the Florida law to make sure they
25 don't exceed the levels in Florida law and make

1 sure there's a lot of benzene in exhaust that
2 are in the air.

3 MR. DELIZ: [Name], did that answer your
4 question or were you asking something else?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I was really asking
6 something else.

7 CAPT. LEWIS: Please continue then.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. What I was saying
9 is we want to know if there is any contamination
10 offsite of the whole base in the perimeter,
11 outside the perimeter.

12 MR. REEDY: Bart Reedy with EPA.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not inside but outside.

14 MR. REEDY: Right. Of all the information
15 that I have seen, we -- there is -- everything
16 that I have seen there is nothing off base.
17 Everything is well contained on the base. There
18 is nothing -- surficial water, there is no
19 groundwater, there is no soil in the base.
20 Everything is within the fence.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you have any tests
22 going outside the fence to make sure?

23 MR. REEDY: I don't want to mislead you
24 when I say outside the fence --

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Perimeter.

1 MR. REEDY: -- because it is right outside
2 the fence is where they are, and they are clean.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Approximately the feet --

4 MR. REEDY: Let's see. I would say --

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How far do you go to make
6 sure?

7 MR. REEDY: I'm sorry?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: About how far do you go
9 to make sure?

10 MR. REEDY: The rationale we use is if the
11 site -- we work our way from the site out, not
12 from out in. So everything we have tested so
13 far outside the fence is clean.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So answer my question:
15 How far outside have you tested?

16 MR. DINGWALL: About 3 to 5.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 3 to 5 what?

18 MR. DINGWALL: Feet.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Feet?

20 MR. REEDY: And it's clean there, yes.

21 MR. DINGWALL: And it's clean there, so
22 everything that far would not test.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Now, how deep do you
24 test?

25 MR. REEDY: The testing that we have out

1 here to begin is the shallow, the intermediate,
2 the deep, and then we'll also go through the
3 deep.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 3 feet shallow and then
5 deep.

6 MR. YOUNG: You must understand something.
7 The contamination from Cecil Field, the site
8 contamination was not caused by NAS Cecil
9 Field. The contamination was caused by a
10 pipeline. There is a difference in, I think,
11 what you're asking versus what he answered.
12 Yes, there is some contamination --

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, contamination is
14 contamination, whether it's fuel or whatever you
15 call it.

16 MR. YOUNG: But it didn't go from the parks
17 or fence to Cecil Field all the way up to where
18 the site exists. I mean, the area between the
19 two is clean. It's the area around where the
20 break in the pipe was that's dirty. You
21 understand what I'm saying?

22 MR. DINGWALL: And that contamination in
23 the same area where there is a plume from a gas
24 station is right next to it, and we are -- the
25 Navy is taking and cleaning up both plumes at

1 the same time, and there was one person whose
2 well that was not contaminated, but it was
3 getting close to it, and we have -- we are in
4 the process of seeing if they want us to
5 purchase their property or just wait for
6 cleanup, and we are in negotiations with that
7 person.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And that's a service
9 station or a private owner?

10 MR. YOUNG: Private owner.

11 MR. DINGWALL: Private owner right next to
12 the station.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where is the service
14 station?

15 MR. YOUNG: It's not far from the library.

16 MR. DINGWALL: Not far from 295.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

18 CAPT. LEWIS: Are there any questions about
19 sites 5 and 17, please, what we're directing
20 tonight?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Raises hand.)

22 CAPT. LEWIS: Yes, sir, please, in the
23 back.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm [name.] What is it
25 that keeps the contaminants from leaving the

1 field and moving on somewhere else and establish
2 them somewhere else? The way the water runs in
3 the aquifer and everything is away from Cecil
4 Field. So what has kept it from leaving there
5 from these sites and going somewhere else and
6 coming back up in a different place and
7 contaminate somewhere else? As long as they
8 have been there and as much rain and as much
9 water that flows down it would have leached out
10 on the other ground in between the two.

11 CAPT. LEWIS: Comment from the engineering
12 staff?

13 MR. PEARSON: The way we typically
14 investigate a site we install wells at the site
15 to determine whether groundwater contamination
16 exists, and then we follow that from the site
17 out, and we do it over the full length of the
18 aquifer, or the full depth of the aquifer. And
19 we do that until you come to the end, until you
20 start having clean wells. In other words, the
21 contaminant hasn't reached that far.

22 And you don't typically find that, you
23 know, the contamination disappears and then
24 reappears further down. What happens is it
25 continues all the way down, and at some point

1 you get beyond where it's migrated. And we
2 haven't found that any of this migration, I
3 guess, has gone off the base.

4 CAPT. LEWIS: Please.

5 MR. WILSON: I might add to that. Steve
6 Wilson. I think it may have a misconception of the
7 groundwater flowing like a stream. Groundwater
8 flows at these depths typically below a quarter
9 of an inch a year. If you leave it long enough
10 and there's no contamination, it would still
11 migrate. At some of the sites if you did
12 nothing for remediation itself because of the
13 slow moving of groundwater, it would be
14 remediated.

15 So it is a concern, but we always have the
16 wells outside to make sure that it does not
17 leave the property. And that is our primary,
18 that it does not affect property outside the
19 base.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: There is places that is
21 lower than what Cecil Field and the water will
22 be percolating days after a hard rain, would be
23 coming up in your lower spot. So what's to keep
24 that from bringing it up and bringing it back up
25 and down into the water? I mean your Hawthorne

1 is about the same depth regardless and therefore
2 a little bit of blimp, but then there's the top
3 of the ground that levels off, the water is
4 percolating back up.

5 MR. DELIZ: That is true. Beyond a doubt
6 that is true what you said. But one of the
7 things we calculate when we're doing
8 investigation is the groundwater velocity, how
9 fast is the groundwater traveling. And we take
10 a bunch of different things into consideration
11 and these are measurements that are pretty
12 accurate.

13 What Steve said may not be, you know,
14 totally the case a quarter inch a year, but
15 still some of the maximum cases are about 5 or
16 10 feet a year, and you think about that, okay,
17 stuff's been out there for 40 years. At the
18 best case, the fastest they could travel is
19 possibly 400 or 500 feet, the best case. That
20 could be the case, it may not be the case.

21 There are different characteristics that
22 you plug into this equation to figure it out.
23 And you're assuming all the little drains are
24 the same size, and that's not true. They are
25 different sizes. And that would make it a

1 little closer. All that said and done, fine,
2 but we've got some plumes that were a couple
3 thousand feet.

4 So, you know, we can say, "Yes, it is going
5 only 5 feet a year," but we have a 2,000 foot
6 plume. So there's a little fallacy or false
7 sense of security. But as best we can tell and
8 all of our geologic and engineering equations
9 that we can come up with can say, "Yeah, as best
10 we can tell none of our plumes are leaving the
11 fence line."

12 MR. REEDY: And sampling.

13 MR. DELIZ: And sampling is showing that.
14 We will not stop, we will continue at
15 groundwater levels. Does that help out at all?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Name], again. There is
17 an awful lot of concrete out there and an awful
18 lot of runways and an awful lot of aircraft
19 that's been maintained over a good number of
20 years and an awful lot of chemicals that have
21 gone up in the concrete surface, into the
22 drainage surface. Where does the drainage go
23 to?

24 MR. DINGWALL: The drainage at Cecil Field,
25 the east side of the base goes to drainage

1 ditches that discharge into Sal Taylor Creek and
2 on the west side of the base they go through
3 drainage ditches that discharge into Rowell
4 Creek.

5 Then in the southwestern portion of the
6 base these two creeks combine and -- actually,
7 Rowell Creek goes into Sal Taylor Creek at that
8 point. Sal Taylor Creek then flows off station
9 and down into Black Creek and Black Creek on
10 down into the St. Johns, and the St. Johns --

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there contamination at
12 the end of those drains to be concerned about?

13 MR. DINGWALL: At the end of the drains
14 there is -- no, there is no contamination at the
15 end of those drains to be concerned about.
16 Occasionally some oil will get through there,
17 but we have absorbent dunes at the end of it
18 that collect that.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And EPA agrees with that
20 in relation to the questions raised over here?

21 MR. REEDY: Yes, sir.

22 CAPT. LEWIS: Thank you. Anything else,
23 please?

24 Well, I'd like to have the record show that
25 we have finished at 8:42. Am I close, on my

1 Johnny Combat watch here? Thank you-all very
2 much, particularly the public and the public
3 comments. I'd also like to thank the other
4 participants this evening. I appreciate all of
5 you coming out on this Thursday night. Was
6 there some comment, Bert?

7 MR. BYERS: I just want to make sure that
8 if there's anybody here who is interested in
9 being part of the Restoration Advisory Board,
10 there is going to be a meeting next Thursday, a
11 week from today, at NAS Cecil Field. You are
12 all invited to come out to it.

13 In addition, if you're interested in being
14 part of that Restoration Advisory Board, I have
15 a facts sheet and an application back here. I'd
16 be glad to ask that you have one vote or come
17 out to the meeting at Cecil Field. Listen to
18 what the Restoration Advisory Board is all about
19 and you have an opportunity to sign up there
20 too. Thank you.

21 CAPT. LEWIS: I guess we really closed at
22 8:43 p.m.

23 (Thereupon the proceedings concluded
24 at 8:43 p.m.)
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF DUVAL :

I, Lili Marlene Menefee, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true record of the proceedings herein.

Dated this 9th day of September, 1994.

Lili Marlene Menefee
 Lili Marlene Menefee

STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF DUVAL :

The foregoing certificate was acknowledged before me this 9th day of September, 1994, by Lili Marlene Menefee, who is personally known to me.

Georganne Rodriguez
 Notary Public
 State of Florida

