

N61165.AR.002928
CNC CHARLESTON
5090.3a

NOTES FROM BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE TEAM MEETING DATED 8 OCTOBER
2002 CNC CHARLESTON SC
10/11/2002
CH2MHILL

Notes from October 2002 BCT Meeting Navy's CNC BCT Office, Charleston, SC

PREPARED FOR: Charleston Naval Complex BCT
PREPARED BY: Richard Garcia
DATE: October 11, 2002

The October 2002 BCT Meeting was held at the SCDHEC Administrative Building, Room 2395, Columbia, South Carolina. The meeting began at 1300 hrs on Tuesday, October 8, 2002, and concluded at 1130 hrs on Wednesday, October 9, 2002.

Tuesday, October 8, 2002

The meeting began with introductions of team members, agenda review, and action item review. The action items list from the previous meeting was reviewed with the following outcomes:

- Comments were received by Tony on the FOSET development.
- Letter from CH2M-Jones requesting approval for onsite disposal of clean groundwater and soil samples at the source has been drafted and should be forwarded soon.

Hess Discussion

Steve Freeman from Amarada-Hess gave a presentation regarding the status of the remedial efforts at their facility, which borders the northern boundary of the base. According to Mr. Freeman, a plume attributed to the former operations at the oil storage yard has been fully delineated. The original wind powered passive system was ineffective. Total fluid pumps augmented this system, but are not resulting in a cost effective alternative at this time. Hess is currently designing an air-sparge system to address the plume. Hess is also performing AFR every other month. Several sparge points are scheduled to be located within the base and access to the site will be required as part of installation, maintenance, and monitoring activities. Hess hopes that the system will operate no longer than five years.

Tom B. noted that the proposed Hess sparge system should not affect the plume or any remedial action being performed by CH2M-Jones at SWMU 39, nor does CH2M-Jones believe that SWMU 39 will obtain NFA status prior to the Hess plume, based on the cleanup duration suggested by Hess.

The MTBE findings at the site were discussed. It was noted by Tom B. that MTBE does not appear to be related to any activity by the Navy. Mr. Freeman also stated that their operations typically do not generate a source of MTBE at the 50 to 60 ppb levels recorded at the wells. The team discussed other potential upgradient sources from the site with no clear indication of a source. It was noted that some stormwater and other underground utility service lines could have served as a vehicle to transport the contaminants to the site. Mr. Freeman also noted that they have not sampled any wells down gradient from the south railroad spur that runs east to west near the MTBE hits. Laurie stated that under the Pollution Control Act ultimately, the owner of a property is responsible for any contamination at its site if a generator cannot be identified.

It was also discussed that Hess should identify any LUCs in the areas of their plume, such as groundwater usage and access to the system and wells, so that the information can be incorporated in the FOSET. This information will be required around the February-March 03 time frame. A MOU between DHEC and Hess may also be beneficial to document future activities associated with this plume.

RDA Request for Excavation Permit to Construct Cement Plant

A discussion regarding a proposed cement transfer facility was lead by Tony. Portions of the proposed facility are planned over an area of SWMU 6 and 7. The facility will consist of a pile supported structure design to have piles 5 to 6 feet on center, each 14 inches square. Pesticide contaminated soils have been previously excavated at the site but groundwater contamination remains an issue. The piles most likely will be driven a few feet into the cooper marl formation, which is located approximately 25 below surface at this location.

Foundations at the base are typically designed by either surcharging the site and using a floating foundation or by supporting the structure with a pile foundation. The selected approach for this facility is the pile supported structure.

The goal at this meeting was not only to address this facility but also to establish a set of guidelines to be used on future request were the proposed facility or structure is located within a SWMU or AOC. The responsibility to prove that the facility will have no effect on the SWMU or AOC will fall back on the developer, but both the Navy and DHEC should establish the criteria and reasoning required from the developer to demonstrate that no effect from the activity would harm/affect the plume, the employees performing the work, nor the future occupants of the structure. At a minimum the list will require the developer to demonstrate what effect the structure will have on the vertical and horizontal extent of the plume and how it will impact the final remedy proposed for the site.

As an action item it was decided that each BCT member would compile by the next BCT meeting a list of concerns that could ultimately affect a plume, workers at the

contaminated site, or future occupants at a proposed facility over an existing SWMU or AOC.

It was also agreed that CH2M-Jones would overlay the proposed cement transfer site over SWMUs 6 and 7 and provide the analytical data from the CMS to identify the risk from the proposed activity.

Meeting Recap / Parking Lot / Review Wednesday Agenda

Under the parking lot items we discussed the repercussion of the recent oil spill in the Cooper River by an Evergreen ship. It was noted that a vessel released reportedly 2,500 gallons of fuel and that significant staining was observed along the bulkhead at the CNC property. Ms. Amy Daniels, a Navy representative, has been videotaping the contamination from the spill along the base property. It was noted that the Coast Guard is currently the lead agency on the spill cleanup. Rob H. has been assisting them with obtaining facility drawings of the base. The Zone J work, currently being performed by Ensafe, may be affected by the spill. Because the release took place on September 30th, the same day that the FOST for EDC phase III was scheduled for signature, it was decided at the meeting to generate an addendum to the EBS that would document the incident for the benefit of the RDA.

The team reviewed the agenda for the following day and the meeting was adjourned.

Wednesday, September 11, 2002

Update on Field Activities and Status of Various Sites

CH2M-Jones provided an update on activities at the following sites:

SWMU 3: Installation and sampling of 6 wells.

AOC 21/54: Installed 2 wells and sampled 4 wells.

AOC 633: Installed 4 wells and sampled e wells. Free product was observed in one well.

SWMU 607: Collected perimeter air samples. Results were all below action levels.

SWMU 166: Final injection scheduled to be completed this week.

SWMU 9: 21 wells sampled.

AOC 680: Collected two soil samples.

AOC 596: Collected one soil sample.

SWMU 17: sampled for PCBs. Result discrepancies noted. Over drilling of wells scheduled

for this month.

SWMU 5: Slab removal underway. Soil excavation scheduled for next week.

SWMU 39: Bailed free product twice. Need to check grout at well.

AOC 613: Gauged 55 wells after sewer repairs were completed.

Well Inspection/abandonment/Installation: Inspected zones G and F. Zones A and E to follow. DHEC requested that well logs be provided on a PDF file on a CD for sites that will remain active. Paul would like to observe the abandonment of wells. Paul requested that we notify the local DHEC district office 48 hours prior to the installation of new wells.

AOC 617: Work plan to be issued for pump test to evaluate zinc recovery.

AOC 36/620: Building demolition underway. Soil excavation to be performed this month.

AOC 722: Approach to plume being evaluated by Tom and Dean. Further delineation may be required.

Revised Submittal Tracking Table

The submittal tracker was reviewed at the meeting. Gary presented key submittals under review by DHEC and EPA and upcoming documents to be submitted by CH2M-Jones.

Discussion on Early Transfer Schedule, Permit Descoping and FOSET Outline and Progress

Tony provided a review of the ongoing EBS, FOSET, and permit descoping activities and schedule. The EBS and FOSET documents are schedule to be submitted to the regulators later this month. Tony requested that these documents take precedence for review over any other document. A 30-day review period was identified. Dann noted that the EBS document might require prior review to the FOSET in case any specific site issues arise.

Tony also reviewed Exhibit B from the FOSET, which provides a table that outlines each site by zone, site description, site concerns, current status, exposure, and references.

Tony indicated that the Navy was proposing use of the LUC Management Plan (LUCMP) to implement Land Use Controls at the sites between the time the EBS/FOSET is submitted and the time in which the permit modification/descoping is revised. He suggested that the LUCMP be incorporated to the FOSET as an appendix, which the Department and EPA then approve. David S. agreed with the proposed content and intent of this document but suggested the name of the document be revised to Interim Measure, so that it can be tied to the RCRA process.

David explained that the Department only concurs with the FOSET versus having regulatory approval and enforcement of the terms and conditions.

Tony reviewed the proposed changes proposed by the permit descoping, including the main areas of the permit and the appendices affected. It was noted that no CMI will be in place therefore the IM will serve as the CMI. The LUCs will be identified by parcel. Tony also noted that the LUCs would be conservative in nature to prevent having to establish additional LUCs once the permit is revised. It will be much easier to delete LUCs than to establish new ones. Copies of the permit revision were provided at the meeting.

Project Managers Meeting

During the Project Managers session the final list from documents reviewed over the past year under the Cooperative Agreement was presented. Both the Navy and DHEC agreed on the effort.

Tony also conducted a detailed review of the permit-descoping document, emphasizing the areas that were changed. A meeting scheduled for the 15th of October will provide a forum to discuss the changes.

The next BCT meeting will take place in Charleston on November 12 and 13 and Mansour will be the coordinator. Preliminary topics identified included:

- Review list of concerns associated with new construction activities in areas of existing SWMUs and AOCs
- Human Health EI
- RAB Meeting - Early transfer presentation and Update on Field Activities

Action Items

- Develop list of concerns associated with new construction activities in areas of existing SWMUs and AOCs
- Tony and Gary to develop EBS addendum to address Cooper River oil spill.

List of Attendees:

U.S. Navy: Rob Harrell, Tony Hunt, Jeff Meyers (10/09/02 only)

USEPA: Dann Spariosu

SCDHEC: Jerry Stamps, Paul Bergstrand, Gill Rennhack, JoCherie Overcash, Mansour Malik, Laurie Landmeyer (10/08/02 only), Stacey French (10/09/02 only), and David Scaturo (10/09/02 only).

CH2M-Jones: Gary Foster, Tom Beisel, and Richard Garcia.

RDA: Robert Ryan (10/09/02 only)

Hess: Steve Freeman (10/08/02 only)