

N60200.AR.000731  
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL  
5090.3a

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND U S NAVY RESPONSE TO RESTORATION ADVISORY  
BOARD COMMENTS ON CLEANUP ALTERNATIVES FOR OPERABLE UNIT 2 (OU 2) NAS  
CECIL FIELD FL  
7/21/1995  
NAS CECIL FIELD



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVAL AIR STATION  
CECIL FIELD, FLORIDA 32215-5000

NAS Cecil Field Administrative Record  
Document Index Number

32215-000  
13.01.00.0098

To: RAB Members  
From: CDR. Mackin, Navy Co-Chair  
Date: July 21, 1995  
Re: Response to RAB Concerns

On July 13, we discussed the recommended cleanup alternatives for Operable Unit 2. We left the RAB meeting with regret that we did not have adequate time to address your concerns. We value your input and consider it to be vital to the success of the cleanup at NAS Cecil Field.

After the meeting, the BCT discussed different approaches for providing further information to address RAB concerns. The preference was to discuss these concerns in a face-to-face meeting. However, due to the short timeframe between the RAB meeting and the Public Meeting, we have provided the attached question and answer summary.

We hope this summary will answer your questions and concerns. In addition, the BCT will be happy to speak with you personally. Steve Wilson, Mike Deliz and Bart Reedy can be reached through Diane Peterson, the RAB Community Co-Chair. Please contact Diane at 384-0866.

Thank you again for your commitment and dedication to the NAS Cecil Field RAB and for making the RAB process work in our community.

We look forward to seeing you at the Public Meeting on Tuesday, July 25th.

Thank you.

## Responses to RAB Concerns on Recommended Alternatives for OU 2

Concern		Response
1	Explain natural attenuation.	The earth generally has the ability to "cleanse itself" when the <b>source</b> of contamination is removed. The process of self-cleansing is referred to as <i>natural attenuation</i> . At Site 17, natural attenuation was recommended because: (1) site conditions indicate that the natural cleansing process is already in effect; (2) there is no exposure to groundwater at the site; and (3) use of groundwater at OU 2 for drinking water would be restricted until the groundwater is determined to be clean.
2	Natural attenuation would take 15 years and \$232,000 to implement while air stripping would take 6 years and \$1,508,000. Is it worth the additional 9 years of monitoring to save \$1,276,000?	Because we expect the natural attenuation process to work, we feel that there is a very low probability of needing to follow the cleanup action with a second remedy. Yes, the BCT feels that it is a "safe bet" to try the less costly remedy first, with a very high expectation that the difference in costs (the \$1,276,000) would be available for other cleanups at NAS Cecil Field.
3	What will you do if the contaminant concentrations in groundwater continue to exceed the regulatory levels (for example, Maximum Contaminant Levels)?	The Navy will be constantly monitoring the groundwater for compliance with regulatory and risk criteria. If the concentrations of the contaminants are not observed to be decreasing, the remedy will be re-evaluated and, if necessary, a different approach will be developed.
4	What is the reuse plan for the area of the base where OU 2 is located?	OU 2 is located in an area of the base which has not been developed. Other than the unpaved Perimeter Road, there is currently no infrastructure (i.e., no water, electricity, sewers, or paved roads) in the vicinity of the site. It is expected that OU 2 will be one of the last places on the base to be developed. Current reuse plans are to maintain the vicinity of OU 2 as an open or "green" space.

## Responses to RAB Concerns on Recommended Alternatives for OU 2

Concern	Response
<p>5 Why would we select an alternative which may not meet the cleanup goals established in the feasibility study?</p>	<p>There is never a guarantee that a cleanup alternative will meet all target cleanup goals. However, all of the alternatives evaluated in the feasibility study are expected to be effective.</p> <p>In our presentation to the RAB we described some cleanup alternatives that have not been used extensively to cleanup sites. These alternatives are referred to in the as <i>innovative technologies</i>. Because these technologies have not been used for a long time, they have not had the opportunity to develop a long "track record". In the feasibility study, when we discuss reliability, this presence or absence of a track record is referred to as "demonstrated reliability". The absence of demonstrated reliability does <u>not</u> mean that the technology is not reliable. It means that it has not been around long enough to have a "track record". Again, <u>all</u> technologies are expected to be reliable and effective in cleaning up the site. Because <u>all</u> technologies are expected to work, reliability was <u>not</u> used as a deciding factor in making recommendations for the preferred remedy.</p>
<p>6 What are the chances that natural attenuation will work?</p>	<p>The chances of natural attenuation working are high because of the current conditions at the site. The factors in favor of effective treatment with natural attenuation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site contains petroleum, which is an excellent food source for the bacteria (or "bugs"), which are a key component of natural attenuation.</li> <li>• Natural attenuation is already taking place, as indicated by the fact that the "plume" has not traveled as far from the source as the groundwater flow rate would have us expect.</li> </ul>

## Responses to RAB Concerns on Recommended Alternatives for OU 2

Concern	Response
<p>7 Why didn't we choose natural attenuation for both sites.</p>	<p>While natural attenuation would ultimately work for both sites, the conditions at Site 5 are slightly different. The reason that a more "aggressive" cleanup alternative was recommended for Site 5 is that groundwater flows out of the ground and into a surface water ditch at Site 5, therefore providing an opportunity for exposure (and therefore creating an opportunity for potential risks to humans and the environment).</p>
<p>8 We don't know enough about air sparging and air stripping to make a decision.</p>	<p><i>Air sparging</i> can be compared to blowing air through a straw into a glass of coke. Eventually the drink becomes "flat", which is an indication that gas has bubbled off. In air sparging, air is blown into the groundwater through wells. Contamination in groundwater is "vaporized" or turned into gas bubbles, which are then drawn off into a vacuum created above ground.</p> <p><i>Air stripping</i> is similar to the effect of a stream flowing over a waterfall. The water and contaminants in the "stream" would be agitated, causing the contaminants to vaporize (or become gas bubbles). In this case, the gas bubbles would be drawn through activated carbon, which is the same water treatment used by household aquariums. The act of pulling the contaminants out of the water stream is called "stripping". Activated carbon treatment of these "stripped" gases then keep the contaminants from being released into the air.</p>
<p>9 Why would we try an alternative that we don't expect to work? We want to "do it right the first time".</p>	<p>Again, as we described in our response to comment No. 5, we expect all of the technologies to work. The language used in the presentation to describe innovative technologies was misleading, and we have corrected that in the presentation materials for the public meeting.</p>

# IRAN MAISONET

R.A.B. COMMUNITY  
8496 NEWTON  
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32216

Telephone 904-642-2818

7/18/95 7:17 PM

TO: AL STARGILL

SUBJECT: PERSONNEL COMMENTS ON OU#2

On July 13th a RAB meeting was conducted and the floor was opened to discussion, questions and comment period. The community was asked their opinions of the drafts on site#5 and Site#17.

My opinion on site#5 is the damage to groundwater is already in progress. Contact with ground water increases as water tables continue to rise due the increase in rain fall in the region over the past few years. I felt that the action taken needed to be swift. Get rid of the problem now and do away with monitoring.

My opinion on site#5 is the problem is being contained naturally and a monitoring program should continue. Divert your attention to the bigger problems and then come back to this one. A bacterial feeding would be a good idea.

Thank you for allowing me to make a difference.

R.A.B. RULES

IRAN MAISONET

Post-it® Fax Note	7671	Date	7/18/95	# of pages	1
To	Nancy Rouse	From	STARGILL		
Co./Dept.		Co.			
Phone #		Phone #			
Fax #		Fax #			