

N61165.AR.002918
CNC CHARLESTON
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING DATED 14 NOVEMBER
2000 CNC CHARLESTON SC
11/14/2000
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

NAVAL BASE CHARLESTON
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
November 14, 2000

North Charleston Meeting Hall
1077 East Montague Avenue
North Charleston, SC

RAB Members Attending

Tony Hunt	Navy Co-Chair
Lou Mintz	Community Co-Chair
Oliver Addison	Community Member
Matt Humphrey	Caretaker Site Office
Wannetta Mallette	Community Member
Robert Ryan	Charleston Naval Complex Redevelopment Authority
David Scaturro	for Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC
Dann Spariosu	US Environmental Protection Agency

Guests Attending

Jim Augustin	Community Member
Jania Sommers	Step Ahead Board
Lisa Belton	Charleston Center
Mark Cowell	Charleston Center
Paul Bergstrand	SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
Joe Bowers	SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
Elizabeth Frady	SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
Mihir Mehta	SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
Susan Peterson	SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
Jim Beltz	Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southern Division
Gary Foster	CH2M-Jones
Jim Greeley	CH2M-Jones
Trip Snelson	CH2M-Jones
Dean Williamson	CH2M-Jones
Suzanne Zoda	EnviroComm
Keith Johns	EnSafe Inc.

Welcome and Administrative Remarks

Lou Mintz opened the meeting. Members of the Restoration Advisory Board and audience introduced themselves.

Keith Johns (EnSafe Inc.) announced that the previous meeting's minutes (September 2000) required a few revisions. Revised minutes should be distributed with the current meeting's minutes.

Mr. Mintz noted that the meeting time is short, and asked that the regular allowance at the beginning of the meeting for new issues be used to delve right into the substance of the evening's meeting.

Subcommittee Reports

Tony Hunt said that two meetings had taken place in the last two weeks in an effort to create a list of questions and answers for the community about the upcoming activity at Building 1189 (the former dry cleaners). The Cleanup Team has reviewed the questions and provided answers. Also, in today's community relations subcommittee meeting, Arthur Pinckney and Lou Mintz provided additional comments.

Mr. Hunt introduced Suzanne Zoda, a community relations contractor with CH2M-Jones, who is working on this

Mr. Mintz stressed that it is important to receive as much input on this fact sheet as possible, so anyone interested should be certain to provide comments in the next phase.

Environmental Cleanup Progress Report

Update on the RCRA Program

Tony Hunt introduced Gary Foster (CH2M-Jones), who provided a copy of the project schedule. Mr. Foster referred the group to a handout he provided to the RAB members. The handout showed the current schedule and accomplishments as compared to the baseline schedule for the program (as presented in the previous meeting). He noted that the upper bar on the graphic shows actual progress, the bottom bar shows the baseline schedule in the 24 month schedule, beginning April 19, 2000. He said they are very close to the proposed schedule right now.

Mr. Foster said that the schedule shows about three hundred documents will be submitted by the contractor (CH2M-Jones) to the Navy and SC Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) for review and approval.

Mr. Mintz asked several questions about remediation that might have begun. Mr. Foster noted that lead-based paint removal and remediation is under way. Also, several underground storage tank locations were being monitored and prepared for excavation. Dean Williamson (CH2M-Jones) said that they expected to begin actively working on several sites in January 2001, but they hoped to begin remediating chlorinated solvents at SWMU 39 in December. The proposed solution is an enhanced biodegradation process. The hydrocarbons at that site will require a bit more planning before they begin remediation.

Paul Bergstrand (SCDHEC) pointed out the Hess should have their report in by the end of the year, showing results of the pump and treat system.

Mr. Mintz asked about the timeline for the Annex. Mr. Williamson replied that they were going to return to the area in December to see how large the source area of TCE is before they plan

their remediation strategy. He added that a series of phased approaches should be able to address contamination of the entire groundwater plume.

Ms. Mallette inquired about City of North Charleston workers that work near that area, specifically if any relocation was going to be needed. Mr. Hunt replied that the workers are not in a position to be impacted by the low levels of contamination, and no relocation is being considered at this time.

Ms. Mallette asked about a shift in completion dates were for the Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) Phase 3. Mr. Foster said the kind of scheduling program being used is very strict about scheduling one item by its predecessor. In the case of EDC Phase 3, the shift to August is because it's tied to the Phase 2 FOST, which is slightly delayed. He noted that the Phase 3 FOST will begin earlier than the schedule shows, so they are still on schedule with this element.

Mr. Mintz asked how firm their completion dates are, as presented in the schedule. Mr. Foster replied that their contract is firm, fixed-price for two years, wherein they have to get a remedy in place and property transferred. He added that they also have a twenty-year contract that will allow them to continue with long-term cleanup remedies, such as monitored natural attenuation.

Early Transfer Update

Mr. Hunt updated the RAB on the Early Transfer process that had been discussed in earlier meetings. There were some parts of the Early Transfer agreement that couldn't be resolved with the Redevelopment Authority, so the Navy has elected to put this on hold. Property will still be transferred according to the existing Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) phases (Phase 2 and Phase 3).

Ms. Mallette asked if more specifics were available on the disagreements. Mr. Hunt said that certain language in the agreement, which presented a conflict with redevelopment of transferred property that, in turn, created a problem for the insurance company.

Update on Building 1189 Cleanup

Mr. Hunt began with the topic of the cleanup at Building 1189 and its impact on the occupants of nearby Building 225. He described Building 225 as being in the area by the magnet school and their ball fields and by the old dry cleaners facility, which is Building 1189. Building 225 was renovated and has been used for approximately two years by the Step-Ahead Program.

There have been a number of meetings since September with the occupants and managers of the Step-Ahead Program, Charleston Center representatives and the RDA in an effort to resolve the issue about cleanup of Building 1189 and its impact on the residents of Building 225.

On November 2nd, the occupants of Building 225, members of the RAB, members of DHEC and EPA met at Sterrett Hall. Several possibilities were discussed, including finding suitable facilities for the occupants of 225. One option reviewed is the Naval Hospital. However, the Hospital is to be decommissioned, and the lights, water and services are being turned off on some

of the floors. In addition, the Hospital's experience with programs (other than Navy) has been limited to day programs, and not live-in programs. Mr. Hunt is trying to get the Commanding Officer of the Hospital and the Commanding Officer of the base together for these discussions.

Mr. Hunt said that Building 766 was offered as an alternative by the RDA for relocating the people in the Step Ahead program. Lisa Belton and several others from Charleston County looked at it, got some estimates for repairs and the time to repair it. The estimates were that it would take somewhere around \$500,000 and a year to complete renovations. Neither the cost nor the time fit the current needs and time line.

The next meeting with the Step-Ahead Program is Monday, November 20th.

Subcommittee Reports

Mr. Hunt reported that the community relations subcommittee met today. The main topic was discussion of the six-phase technology proposed for cleaning up the Building 1189 site. Cleanup technology used this close to an inhabited building creates a perception issue. Inadvertent exposure if emissions can't be controlled. This six-phase process looks a lot more promising. Suggestions that have come up during the last several months on ways to control those emissions or intercept any groundwater that may not be controlled during the process or just assurances that the Navy can implement this six-phase technology without moving the occupants of Building 225.

A representative from CH2M-Jones commented that there would be heavy construction noise from the drill rigs and other heavy equipment needed to cut through asphalt and repave the area. Mr. Mintz responded that the inconvenience of noise is minimal compared to the inconvenience of moving 16 families when they have no place to go and no way of getting there. Mr. Mintz expressed his confidence that the Navy is going to come up with a plan that is going to be workable for the occupants of Building 225 to live there safely.

Mr. Mintz did ask EPA and DHEC if the six-phase technology could be done safely for the children, and they said it could be done safely. Mr. Mintz also said the Navy has a responsibility to make sure this technology is done correctly without a lot of "we don't care about you, you've got to go" attitude.

Mr. Hunt stressed that the Navy has not been doing this. In fact, he noted, the Navy has gone back and reevaluated the situation. However, the primary interest is protection of human health. That's why it was suggested to relocate the occupants of Building 225.

Mr. Pinckney inquired about the fact sheet pertaining to the cleanup. Mr Hunt responded that, as part of the community relations plan, they're developing a question and answer sheet that discusses the issues of Building 1189 (the dry cleaners), the contamination and the proximity to Building 225. The fact sheet, while it's really a question and answer sheet, will be delivered to the occupants but also to nearby residents outside the fence.

There initially was a concern about the aerial influence of this six-phase technology, but the Navy

has become more and more confident that it really is not disruptive at all, and it's more of a nuisance issue.

Mr. Mintz remarked that he just recently got the feeling from EPA and DHEC is there's a good possibility the Navy will be able to remediate Building 1189 without relocating the occupants of Building 225. Mr. Mintz said he understood February is the start date. Mr. Hunt explained there's an early start date because it takes at least six to eight months just to implement the six-phase technology. The Navy chose this technology so they could be done with it quickly and they wouldn't have to spend a long time monitoring or doing other corrective actions. The goal is to clean up and deliver the property back to the community for reuse as fast as possible.

Mr. Mintz said he thought the property under Building 225 is not contaminated and didn't have to be remediated. David Scaturro (SCDHEC) responded that there were very low levels of contaminants under Building 225. DHEC would not allow the occupants to stay in the building unless it was shown that there were no threats to the occupants when the remedy is implemented. Mr. Spariosu (USEPA) added that, if this can be done safely, the EPA is fine with allowing the occupants to stay in Building 225 if they're willing to put up with the nuisance factors. The workplan, he noted, must demonstrate that the work can be done without any unacceptable exposures to the people in Building 225. Mr. Spariosu says this process has been used before in other locations.

Lisa Belton asked if any testing was done to see if the ground closer to Building 225 was contaminated and if the cleanup would come closer to Building 225. Mr. Hunt answered the Navy is planning on doing additional testing. The Navy is ensuring that the new data collected is consistent with previously collected data. There will be more soil gas sampling, where small inverted tubes are placed below the surface for a period of time then retrieved. The gas that collects in them is analyzed. Mr. Hunt added that this site has been sampled and studied for about six years.

Mr. Mintz stated the monitoring will become a lot more active while the remediation process is going on, so they will be able to identify immediately if there is any migration from those wells. He suggested that another clay-filled or air-filled barrier be put in and monitored to show any migration before it gets to the wells so that there would be an opportunity to notify everyone concerned that there's a problem. He noted that the RAB has only spoken to the primary and secondary contractor for this six-phase technology, not the contractor that will be putting the equipment in the ground. He stated that he would like to meet this contractor. Also, he said he would like the board to receive a report on the level of contaminants at Building 1189.

Mr. Mintz feels, based on the subcommittee meeting this morning, that all the parties will be able to sit down with the contractor and subcontractor within the next 14 days and get this process done with a minimum of disruption.

Mr. Pinckney asked if more people from the community would be present at the next RAB meeting. Ms. Belton responded that Sterrett Hall has been reserved for the meeting with Step Ahead residents on November 20th, and she has staff that can go door-to-door to invite the

residents on the other side of the fence.

Ms. Belton inquired if the question and answer sheet would be ready for the meeting on the 20th. It was determined that this would not be possible, due to the time needed for the draft to be revised and community relations subcommittee members for comment.

Ms. Belton wanted to know the exact chemicals in the contaminants, and whether USEPA and DHEC are comfortable saying there is not a current risk to the occupants and residents. Mr. Scaturro (DHEC) responded the main chemicals are tetrachloroethene (PCE - a dry cleaning solvent), trichloroethylene (TCE), and breakdown products of TCE. He said the preliminary studies show there doesn't appear to be a risk to residents, but they will be collecting more data to ensure that.

Ms. Belton's primary concern is the health of the occupants of Building 225. Mr. Mintz replied he was reassured by DHEC and EPA that the occupants are not at risk if the right program and the right process are put into place and they're able to monitor it. Mr. Mintz asked if it would help to see the a report on the contaminants in the ground. Ms. Belton responded she would like to see an official report stating the amount of risk to the health of the occupants.

Mark Cowell asked if the heavy equipment noise would be going on for eight months. The response was that drilling and breaking up concrete would only be during the first stage, set-up. Once operating, there will be a fan running around the clock. The fan is actually a positive displacement blower, more of a mechanical noise, and works kind of like a big vacuum cleaner.

Mr. Mintz said that he has not yet spoken to anyone that has seen or been present when such a system was working. Mr. Williamson mentioned that there had been a system running in Atlanta until recently. Mr. Hunt noted that this is a very new technology, so there haven't been many jobs that have used it. Ms. Mallette-Pratt inquired if anyone could describe the noise. Mr. Spariosu stated the subcontractor has done this process a dozen times, but he doesn't think they've ever measured the noise level. Baffles and other technologies can be used to help with the noise.

Ms. Belton said that the occupants' big concerns were not having a site to relocate to and losing the Step-Ahead Program altogether. Mr. Mintz said that he thought the occupants would be willing to put up with some inconvenience, as long as the contractors didn't do heavy duty work at all hours of the night. He said the Step-Ahead Program is willing to work with the subcontractors; the Step-Ahead Program just asks for the same cooperation.

Mr. Pinckney asked if CH2M-Jones has been trying to use local contractors or workers. Mr. Foster (CH2M-Jones) replied that the six-phase heating is very specialized work, and only one contractor has a patent on it, so there's no flexibility there. However, he told the board that one local contractor and a contractor from Rock Hill are doing the paint abatement work. CH2M-Jones is reviewing proposals for surveying work, for clearance testing, for lead-based paint abatement and monitoring well installations. He added that it looks pretty good that some of those services will go to local contractors.

Mr. Mintz added a personal note. He was glad to see DHEC well represented, interested and concerned about the community's problems and solutions for the community's protection.

Update from the Charleston Naval Complex Redevelopment Authority

Robert Ryan of the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) reported that they are waiting on the transfer of property and doing studies for stabilizing the old officers' area. The RDA is also doing some demolition projects. The RDA still has clients wanting to develop property. Phase Two of the Economic Development Conveyance will give a good chunk of land to the RDA in March. Phase Three is property currently under long-term lease - the shipyard area - which is already mostly developed.

Mr. Pinckney asked if the RDA was negotiating with the State Ports Authority. The response was no.

Ms. Mallette-Pratt offered to try to get residents to attend the meeting on the 20th. It was determined that this meeting should be for Step Ahead participants only. However, after a suggestion, it was adopted that another RAB meeting be held during the second week in December. Because of North Charleston's tree lighting celebration, which starts at 4:30 on the second Tuesday of December (a conflict with the usual meeting date of the RAB), the actual date of the next RAB meeting was not set. It was determined that the date will depend on the availability of Sterrett Hall, which Mr. Hunt will determine. The purpose of the next RAB meeting will be to bring everyone up-to-date on the progress for Buildings 1189 and 225.

Mr. Mintz repeated his statement that he would like to have a meeting with the contractor doing the six-phase work and would like to find out more about the contamination in the area of Building 1189.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes approved by:

Tony Hunt
Navy Co-Chair

Louis Mintz
Community Co-Chair