

N61165.AR.004856
CNC CHARLESTON
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING DATED 12 DECEMBER
1995 CNC CHARLESTON SC
12/12/1995
CNC CHARLESTON

COMMANDER, NAVAL BASE, CHARLESTON
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
Minutes of 12 December 1995

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Daryle Fontenot, Co-Chairman of the RAB. He welcomed everyone and thanked the community representatives and Mr. Lee Cooper of the GAO for attending.

2. RAB Members Attending.

Mr. Daryle Fontenot *Co. JAMES*
Mr. Van Robinson
Mr. Virgil Johnston
Mr. Bobby Dearhart
Mr. Steve Best
Mr. Joe Bowers*
LCDR Nick Cimorrelli

Mr. Don Harbert *Co. BRANIFF*
CAPT Jim Augustin
Mr. Doyle Brittain
Ms. Wannetta Mallette-Pratt
Mr. Lou Mintz
Mr. Ralph Laney

*Joe Bowers was sitting in for Ms. Ann Ragan

3 Guests Attending.

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mr. Tony Hunt | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mr. Brian Stockmaster | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mrs. Pat Franklin | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mr. Jim Beltz | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| LCDR Jim Berotti | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mrs. Kim Reavis | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mr. Joe McCauley | SOUTHNAVFAC |
| Mr. Jim Moore | DOD Base Transition Coordinator |
| CAPT W. F. Nold | CHASNAVSHIPYD |
| Mr. Tom Gerken | CHASNAVSHIPYD |
| Ms. Sally Kuhl | COMNAVBASE |
| CDR P. H. Dalby | CSO |
| Ms. Jeri Johnson | RDA |
| Mr. Lee Cooper | GAO |
| Dr. Jim Speakman | EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall |
| Mr. Todd Haverkost | EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall |
| Mr. Peter McPheters | EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall |
| Mr. Robert Maddox | EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall |
| Mrs. June Brittain | Citizen |
| Ms. Mary Anderson | CAC |
| Mr. I. Bennett | GCSC |
| Ms. Susan Dunn | GCSC |
| Mr. Ron Ruys | MilVets |
| Ms. Gussie Greene | City Council |
| Mr. Thomas Long | Grass Roots Coalition |

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

4. Comments on Minutes.

The minutes were approved as written and will be placed in the Repository.

5. Sub-Committee Reports.

Mr. Daryle Fontenot reported that the Community Relations Sub-Committee was working on a Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) Fact Sheet. He said that they were also working on finding a suitable meeting location and a suitable location for the Information Repository. Mr. Bobby Dearhart commented that perhaps the community representatives present might have suggestions for a new meeting location. Mr. Fontenot asked that anyone with suggestions call him. A report on these last two items will be made during the January meeting.

There were no other Sub-Committee reports.

6. Update on Environmental Cleanup.

Daryle Fontenot, the BRAC Environmental Coordinator for NAVBASE Charleston, said that an overview of all of the environmental programs would be covered in the future and not just the RCRA Facility Investigation Progress. These programs will include underground storage tanks, asbestos, water/wastewater, PCBs, etc. to give everyone a better understanding of all of the environmental issues.

He first reported that the Navy will be awarding a contract to the Shipyard Detachment in January 1996 for conducting an Asbestos Survey. This will be an update to a 1985 Asbestos Survey and will indicate where asbestos abatement will be required.

Mr. Lou Mintz questioned why another Asbestos Survey was being performed when he thought all asbestos information had already been accumulated. Captain Augustin told him that as far as the Navy knows, there is no asbestos in the buildings that are going into layup where there is any violation in compliance with asbestos laws and regulations. Mr. Fontenot tried to explain to Mr. Mintz that there is a requirement to update Asbestos Surveys to see if there are any changes and to identify each surface where there is asbestos.

Captain Augustin explained that the present Asbestos Survey was performed in 1985 and the Navy knows where the asbestos was then. From year to year the Navy is responsible for compliance. When asbestos becomes friable, it is taken care of. If anything, this new Asbestos Survey will confirm that the Navy has done a good job in managing the asbestos over the past 10 years. Mr. Fontenot said that when property is leased or transferred asbestos has to be identified. It does not necessarily require any action, but it must be identified to the new tenant.

Mr. Fontenot offered to meet with Mr. Mintz on a one-to-one basis to explain asbestos regulations.

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

Mr. Virgil Johnston of the RDA asked if there were any buildings on Base where asbestos would prevent leasing. Mr. Fontenot said that Building 32, the Powerhouse, could not be leased at the present time due to asbestos.

The next environmental program discussed was underground storage tanks. He said that a Petroleum Tank Management Plan was being prepared which will identify all tanks and recommend what action needs to be taken for each tank. The Shipyard Detachment is also working on a Petroleum Remediation Plan which will formulate the plan to accomplish remediation on the tanks. These Plans will outline pipelines, USTs and ASTs and what the final disposition should be; that is, remove or abandon in place. They will also address how to deal with all contamination.

Mr. Virgil Johnston asked if property would be unavailable for lease if a tank was abandoned in place. Mr. Fontenot explained that if, for instance, a tank is located beneath a building, it probably would not be cost effective to demolish the building to remove or remediate the tank. Abandoning a tank would not necessarily prohibit leasing/transferring a property.

Both of these Plans will be complete by 1 March 1996. Mr. Fontenot offered handouts explaining the UST process.

Mr. Tony Hunt, SOUTHNAVFAC Remedial Project Manager, then took the floor to explain the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI). RCRA is the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and was passed by Congress in 1976. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Management Act (HSWA) was passed in 1984 and requires that releases from past Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) be cleaned up. SWMUs are areas where any hazardous material which becomes a hazardous waste is stored.

He explained for the benefit of newcomers to the RAB meeting the RFI process. He said that the investigation involved going out and looking at places such as soil, groundwater or surface water where releases have occurred and determine the impact to human health and the environment. This is done through a series of steps. The first step is to determine which sites need to be investigated. The second step is where samples are taken and then analyzed to determine what the impact is. Then a Corrective Measures Study determines what the best method is for cleaning up the sites which pose a risk. At that point, there is a public comment period where the public will have an opportunity to comment on remedial actions and what the Navy intends to do. What has been done so far in the RFI process is to divide the Base up into Zones for sampling purposes.

Mr. Hunt offered handouts of the RCRA process and handouts showing the Zones.

Mr. Hunt said that the only change in the past month is that the total requirement left for funding the RFI has decreased from \$4.5 million to \$3.1 million. This is just a result of re-looking at estimates. Also, Zone K has been funded for the RFI Work Plan.

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

Mr. Todd Haverkost of EnSafe/Allen and Hoshall, gave progress for the month of November. Last month, several issues were brought up that needed to be resolved to finish up the Zone H report and complete the Zones C and I reports. These were taken up as action items at the Project Team meeting following the RAB meeting and agreement has been reached. Now the Zone H report will be submitted on 22 December and the Zones C and I reports will be submitted 30 days afterwards. No more slippages are anticipated.

The issues were:

Ambient Water Quality

The State has provided guidance on establishing groundwater mixing zones. That is, if a site meets certain conditions, they will allow us to possibly establish alternate cleanup levels where there is no suspicion that contaminants will impact any type of receptors.

Action Levels

The Navy was looking for a threshold that would allow a determination of whether a site would be carried into the Corrective Measures Study. The action levels are not cleanup levels - they are simply a threshold to allow the site to be evaluated further to determine the feasibility of the cleanup. For the most part, those levels are essentially 1 in a million excess cancer risk under a residential scenario or in the case of something like metals that present a hazard, anything that exceeds a hazard index of 1 or total petroleum hydrocarbons of over 100 parts per million. These would be the general baselines. There may be some sites where some alternative levels would be provided if there is sufficient justification for them. That will have to be handled on a case by case basis.

Future Land Use - Residential versus Industrial

It was agreed that at the very minimum, the RFI will provide a baseline risk assessment which will evaluate a future residential scenario. That is the most conservative approach. An industrial scenario will also be provided that will allow the people who make the risk management decisions to see if there is a level somewhere in between the residential and industrial scenarios that will be a viable option.

Land Surface Improvements

This directly affects the industrial scenario under the risk assessment. That means that pavement, structures or anything that may provide a barrier where workers will not get exposed to soil that underlies those physical barriers can be taken into consideration. This allows a risk assessment to be prepared which reflects actual conditions rather than hypothetical future scenarios.

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

Another item that was not discussed last month was the RFI for Zones A and B. As of today, groundwater is being sampled. All soil sampling has been completed except for 7 locations. Essentially, all the work that was proposed in the Work Plan is about 90% complete. There was a map made available to attendees to show what has been done. He also made available a map which showed the Industrial Area.

Mr. Mintz asked if a "commercial" cleanup level might possibly be allowed by the State which would be somewhere between residential and industrial. Mr. Joe Bowers from DHEC said that the State wanted to reach the most conservative and reasonable cleanup level but said that the decision would have to be made at a high level in DHEC and he did not know if this was going to happen.

Mr. Johnston mentioned that Cochrane Hall has always been a school for adults. He asked whether it would have to be cleaned up to a higher level if it were to become a school for children. Mr. Havercost said that he didn't think it would change, because it was going to be cleaned up to the residential level which is the most conservative level.

Mr. Johnston asked if the residential level would be applied to the entire Base. Mr. Havercost said that that would be a risk management decision as part of the Corrective Measures Study.

Captain Augustin said that the Cleanup Team had met earlier in the day and discussed the topic of cleanup levels. Ms. Ann Ragan of SC DHEC participated by telephone and she said that the State's goal is to clean up to residential level as the most conservative level. She said that if at some point it was not feasible to get to residential, there would be a consideration of the cost benefits of establishing some middle ground. As of today, the State standard for cleanup is residential and there is no other stated goal.

Continuing the Environmental Update, Mr. Brian Stockmaster, a SOUTHNAVFAC Environmental Engineer, explained Interim Measures which were brought up at last month's meeting. He said that Interim Measures are an opportunity for the contractor to get into the field and take action a little sooner in the process but that the process still has to be followed and not circumvented. Currently, steps are being taken to allow the Shipyard Detachment of about 150 people to stay on after 1 April 1996 to help get the base cleaned up. Steps are also being taken to allow the Shipyard Detachment to conduct some of these Interim Measures at approximately 23 sites on the Base. All of this is still in the planning stage but at a future meeting recommendations on what should be done at these sites will be presented and input will be requested.

Mr. Tony Hunt concluded the Environmental Update by saying that the only projected activity for December is to submit the Zone H report on the 22nd. Mr. Mintz wanted clarification on the \$2,768,213 spent on an Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) in 1992. Mr. Hunt tried to explain that it was a

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

comprehensive "Fence-to-Fence" Survey. It was a very comprehensive document search which went into environmental records and was designed to give the Navy an indication of where potential sites of concern were and what the concerns might be. It also addressed asbestos. Even though there was an Asbestos Survey done by Westinghouse in 1985, there is likely to be deterioration over the years. The walk-throughs done during research for the EBS were nothing close to a comprehensive Asbestos Survey done by qualified asbestos inspectors.

Mr. Ralph Laney explained that as part of the Shipyard closing, each building is being walked through as part of the closure process. If there is any torn, lagging, or spilled asbestos, it is being corrected. This way, the buildings can be leased. However, this new Asbestos Survey is needed before property can be transferred because the new owner must be told of asbestos on a surface-to-surface basis. Also, if in the future any buildings are demolished by any party, this same information must be available before demolition can take place.

Mr. Mintz asked how much the Asbestos Survey would cost and he was told that it was about \$218,000.

This Survey is to protect the Navy from future liability.

Again, Mr. Mintz was offered a one-to-one meeting to help him understand asbestos regulations.

7. Risk Assessment.

Mr. Doyle Brittain of the EPA said that one of the things that the RAB is supposed to do is to represent various groups in the community and help each other make decisions and set priorities as the process is worked through. The RAB is painfully working through the process. At the end of December the Zone H report for the Southern end of the Base will be received; hopefully in an approvable manner. Assuming that it's received in an approvable manner, the EPA and the State will be approving it about the end of January or the first of February. The report is not light reading - it is about 2-1/2 feet thick. There is a lot of data there so it's going to be a slow and tedious process to work through. What this means is that it should be available in February to the general public in the information repositories. Then the next stage, the Corrective Measures Study, will begin. This will determine what the best cleanup methods are, how well they work at each of the hazardous waste sites and what it would cost to use each of those cleanup methods. Once the Corrective Measures Study is complete, there will be public meetings where the public will have the opportunity to comment as far as to which cleanup method they recommend be used. There is one important factor in this and it's call Risk Assessment. As the current investigation continues a Risk Assessment is being done. That is, all the hazardous waste that is there is being determined and what risk it poses to human health and the environment. When we talk about the environment it means the fish, the birds, the other wildlife, the plants and whatever else is in the area that may be affected by this contamination.

This information on the risk assessment will be in the RFI Report which will be received at the end of December. If approved, it will be available to the general public at the end of January. There is going to be a lot of information in it and is going to contain a lot of strange words and funny numbers; like a risk assessment of 10 to the minus 6. The average person doesn't know what that means and yet it will be made available to the average person.

Mr. Brittain offered to have the EPA doctor/toxicologist who specializes in this type of work attend the RAB meeting in January and walk everybody through it in plain English so that you can understand what 10 to the minus 6, 10 to the minus 5, or 10 to the minus 4 means. Those are various cleanup levels. A lot of times you hear about cleaning up to residential standards. This is talking about cleaning up to 10 to the minus 6. There is a cleanup standard of 10 to the minus 5 and a cleanup standard of 10 to minus 4. Somewhere in that range is where the EPA does cleanup. This is the standard Federal way of doing it - somewhere between 10 to the minus 4 to 10 to the minus 6. There is a little leeway as to the level that is chosen and the trade-off on that is that when the RFI Report is received in January, it is going to say that a certain hazardous waste site as it currently is poses a certain risk.

The question that the RAB and the public are going to have to answer is whether that is an acceptable risk or do you want it cleaned up more than that. As we go through the Corrective Measures Study, various cleanup methods will be tested at each of these hazardous waste sites. Some will work and some won't. Some will cost a whole lot of money, some will cost a little money and some will cost something in between. At the end of the Corrective Measures Study, there will be public hearings and at that point in time the community will be asked "how clean is clean?" "Are you going to be satisfied with cleanup at 10 to the minus 6, 10 to the minus 5, 10 to the minus 4 or what?" If there is a cleanup of 10 to the minus 4, it may cost "X" million of dollars, if you clean up to 10 to the minus 5, it's going to cost this extra number of millions of dollars, but if you clean up to residential standards its going to cost this "whopping" number of millions of dollars.

At the public hearings, the general public is going to be asked "how clean is clean in your mind?" "How clean do you want it cleaned up?" "How much money do you want to spend on it?" "What cleanup alternative do you want?" Everybody will have 45 days to provide input and state their opinion. You can say you don't want the hazardous waste left there at that certain level - it's too big of a risk - you want it at a further cleanup level and you want a certain cleanup technique to be used and you want to spend a certain amount of money. You, as the general public, have the opportunity to provide input into that process. It will go back to the State. The State and EPA are not going to make these decisions in a vacuum. Ultimately, it will be a State call. The EPA will have input into it just like the general public has input into it. It's important that everyone understands what the numbers mean when you read the RFI Report when it comes out in January or early February. Everyone needs to understand what this thing called "risk" means.

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

Mr. Brittain said that, if everyone wanted, the EPA doctor who specializes in toxicology and who specializes in this kind of risk, would attend the January RAB meeting and give an hour or so talk to explain it in plain English. That way, everyone has an opportunity to understand the RFI. Mr. Brittain then suggested that at the February meeting, the contractor who has done all of the work and collected all of the information to come up with the Risk Assessment give a presentation. He could explain what the data shows - here is what was found at the hazardous waste sites - here is what risk it poses. The contractor would be presenting the hard data and after hearing the EPA doctor in January you will be able to understand what the contractor is talking about in February. You'll know what the numbers mean. An educated community can make good, solid decisions as far as the cleanup levels that are out there. The only constraint for the EPA toxicologist is that he can only come to an afternoon meeting. He is willing to fly down in the morning, put on the presentations, answer questions and fly back that night. He is willing to come back in February and sit as a member of the audience, let the contractor make the presentation and, if necessary, answer any questions that come up.

There are going to be a lot of reports coming out over the next few months. They are going to contain a lot of this data and a lot of decisions are going to have to be made by the public. The government has been slow getting to this point of making hard decisions and getting recommendations and has taken a lot of criticism because of it. Everybody is learning. This is a new process. Nobody has been through shutting down a big Base like Charleston. Mistakes have been made along the way and the mistakes aren't cheap but that's okay because progress is being made.

There was some disagreement among the RAB as to whether the toxicologist should talk to the group after they read the RFI Report rather than before, but a vote was taken and the majority felt that it would be more beneficial if the toxicologist came in January before the RFI Report is received. He will be put on the January RAB Agenda for Risk Assessment Training.

Mr. Van Robinson asked if the RFI Report was going to provide information so that decisions can be made regarding cleanup level versus time versus money. Mr. Brittain said that that kind of information would not be available until the Correction Measures Study is complete in June or July.

Mr. Johnson asked if there could be more than risk assessment in a Zone. Mr. Brittain said that there would be one risk assessment, but all of the risks will be looked at. Mr. Bobby Dearhart clarified this by saying that there was only one Risk Assessment document, but that there are multiple risk assessments within a Zone because each site is looked at and addressed. The Risk Assessment will be on a site by site basis.

Ms. Susan Dunn said that she had a problem with afternoon meetings and so did a large portion of the general public. She said she understood having to adhere to a professional's (the EPA toxicologist) timetable to educate the RAB, but that the

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) Minutes of 12 December 1995

RAB needed to find a way to communicate the education to the general public at other than afternoon meetings. She said that the public was not going to get involved unless the RAB really worked hard to see that it happened.

Mr. Fontenot and Ms. Mallette-Pratt both said that the RAB was continually trying to work out a timetable and a meeting location suitable for all and the Community Relations Sub-Committee would continue to do so.

8. RAB Organizational Changes.

Mr. Joe Bowers of SC DHEC, standing in for Ms. Ann Ragan, said that Ms. Ragan would be attending the January meeting and asked that he pass on some information to the RAB. Ms. Ragan, as the Federal Facilities Liaison, deals with various community groups such as the RAB. She asked Mr. Bowers to request time on the January agenda to discuss some organizational changes. Ms. Ragan would like to form some additional sub-committees to work on issues in between RAB meetings and report to the RAB prior to meetings.

9. Other Business.

Mr. Johnston of the RDA announced that the lease with Babcock & Wilcox has been signed. There are now three partners in the Controlled Industrial Area - CMMC, CSI and B&W practically take over the entire CIA. He also said that he thought the Border Patrol might be reversing their position and coming to Charleston after all. He said that the Immigration Service might also come in.

Mr. Van Robinson said he had heard that a filming production company might be coming on Base. Mr. Johnston said they might want to take over the three warehouses and part of the parking lot near the old Credit Union. He said that there shouldn't be any environmental issues involved with this lease.

Mr. Fontenot announced that the agenda for the January meeting would include the Risk Assessment Briefing, RAB Organizational Issues, Sub-Committee Reports, and an Environmental Progress Report.

11. Adjournment.

It was announced that the next meeting is scheduled for 9 January 1996 at 2:00 p.m. The location will be announced at a later time. The meeting was adjourned.

Summary of RAB Recommendations and Suggestions

- ◆ Find suitable meeting location
- ◆ Find suitable location for Information Repository
- ◆ Put Ann Ragan on Agenda to suggest reorganizing RAB
- ◆ Arrange for doctor/toxicologist to attend January and February RAB meeting
- ◆ Arrange for contractor to give presentation on RFI at February RAB meeting

Attachments to Minutes:

- (1) December RAB Meeting Agenda
- (2) RFI Progress Report for November

Minutes recorded by:

Barbara Eller, SOUTHNAVFAC

Minutes Approved by:

Daryle Fontenot
Co-Chairman

Don Harbert
Co-Chairman

Tuesday, Dec. 12 1995

Charleston Naval Base

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

2:00 PM Location: **Naval Hospital** Charleston @ corner of Rivers and McMillan Avenue. in North Charleston. Meeting will be in the **Cafeteria** located in the basement of the multistory building on the side toward Rivers Avenue.

2:00 PM RAB MEETING

- A. Introduction of the RAB Members and Guests
- B. Administrative Remarks, Comments on the minutes of last meeting
- C. Subcommittee Reports
- D. Environmental Cleanup Progress Report Cleanup Team
- E. Future RAB Discussion Topics Mr. Doyle Brittain
 - Risk Assessment Mr. Joe Bower for
 - RAB Organizational Changes Ms. Ann Ragan
- G. Remaining Questions and Comments from Visitors
- H. Other Business
- I. Agenda for Next Meeting

**Please mark your calendar: Our next meeting is Tuesday, January 9, 1996.
Time to be determined.**