

N62604.AR.000468
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 2 APRIL 1998 NCBC GULFPORT
MS
4/2/1998
NCBC GULFPORT

13.3.0.38

39501-GENERAL

13.03.00.0038



Gulfport, Mississippi

NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting
Naval Construction Battalion Center
Gulfport, Mississippi
April 2, 1998
6:40 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board met in the Building 1 conference room at the Naval Construction Battalion Center in Gulfport, Mississippi, on April 2, 1998:

Gordon Crane
Steve Dickerson
Andy Guerra
Art Holzweissig
David Marshall
Skip McDaniel

Bob Merrill
Ron Schmidting
Joyce Shaw
Philip Shaw
Jeff Stawowy
Earl Whittemore

In addition, the following guests were welcomed from the community:

Cherie Schultz
Phillip Weathersby, MSDEQ

Support personnel attending the meeting included:

Penny Baxter, ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
Art Conrad, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Marland Dulaney, ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
Casey Hackathorn, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
LT Matthew Haupt, NCBC Gulfport
Bruce King-Shey, ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
Han Maung, Morrison Knudsen, Inc.
Nancy Rouse, ABB Environmental Services, Inc.

Welcome: Steve Dickerson opened the meeting at 6:40 pm with welcoming comments and an introduction of all attending guests.

Agreed Order (AO) and Installation Restoration (IR) Program Update: Art Conrad provided an overview of the AO and IR programs. A copy of the *AO and IRP Update*, passed out during the meeting, is attached. Highlights of the presentation are summarized below:

AO Highlights:

- Comments from the Air Force and Navy are currently being incorporated into the Biological Monitoring Plan. Once the plan is complete, it will be presented to the RAB.
- The Phase II report of the on-base and off-base delineation will be submitted to the MSDEQ this month for review. Also, additional sampling will be conducted off-base (the wooded area to the north of the base) to complete the delineation.

Q: *Have we found any TCDD in any of these samples?*

A: Yes. Some of the samples contained concentrations higher than the 200 parts per trillion (ppt) range.

- Implementation of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan (sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) is currently being negotiated with ABB.
- Mr. Conrad brought a copy of the Agreed/Administrative Order, as requested at the December RAB meeting.

IRP Highlights:

- A temporary fix at the Site 4 seep was completed by excavating the area and putting in a carbon filter.
- Site 6 is still under going “pump and treat” remediation. It will continue to be treated for about a year and half.
- PCB was detected in the soil during sampling last spring. The site has since been designated as “Site 10”. A clean up will occur late this year or early next.

Q: *Is the contamination confined to an area?*

A: Yes. Additional sampling will occur, but for the most part, we know the area of contamination.

TAPP Rule: Mr. Conrad explained that the TAPP rule is an assistance program for situations where community members do not trust the facility. The TAPP Rule provides a mechanism to receive funding for additional RAB support. It can be used for interpretation of technical documents, review of proposed restoration and technologies, participation in relative risk site evaluations, assistance in understanding health and environmental implications of site and cleanup strategies, and training (under certain circumstances).

Q: *Is the funding available at any time?*

A: Yes. A maximum of \$100,000 or \$25,000 per year can be requested for the RAB.

Q: *Does the money need to be used right away? Will the opportunity go away?*

A: No. The opportunity to make use of the fund is on-going. However, the request for the funding must come from the RAB, not the Navy.

Q: *Can the fund be used more than once?*

A: Yes. However, there is a maximum of \$100,000 and \$25,000 per year.

Mr. Dickerson, RAB co-chair, noted that he was already contacted by a contractor interested in providing RAB support under the TAPP rule.

Mr. Conrad continued by saying that the tenures for both the CLEAN (ABB Environmental Services, Inc.) and RAC (Morrison Knudsen, Inc.) contractors are winding down. Efforts will be made to keep these contractors through the remediation at Site 8. However, he was told that ABB can only be used through the remediation plan and was

sorry to lose ABB's "great expertise." Mr. Conrad mentioned that RAB funding is going down and that RAB meetings may need to be done without contractor support.

Q: *Six months ago, it seemed like the money was available and "everything was good." Did that change?*

A: Site 8 is still very important and considered a priority for cleanup. The other sites, however, are a low priority and will be taken care of further down the line.

Q: *Do we have adequate funding to complete what we started with dioxin?*

A: Yes. There has been a lot of testing done, so there is a good understanding about it. The next step is to clean it up.

A need for toxicology training, focusing specifically on the toxicology of dioxin, was brought to the table. Marland Dulaney reminded the RAB that the toxicity of dioxin is still controversial. He stated that EPA recognizes 10 human carcinogens (and dioxin is not one of them). He added that MSDEQ errs on the side of caution because they don't know how to define "safe" when it comes to dioxin. Current technology only allows us to see 15 ppt, not MSDEQ's action level of 4.7 ppt.

Action at Site 4 Seep: Art Conrad presented the temporary fix of the seep at Site 4. Mr. Conrad stated that they are not sure how the dioxin moved to this area. Dioxin is found to be seeping at two locations: under the bridge and at a "mushy" spot on the embankment of the canal. About 28 tons of activated charcoal were placed at the two locations to filter the seeping water.

Q: *Does the charcoal need to be changed?*

A: Yes, eventually. The charcoal is good for about five years.

RAB Update: Nancy Rouse provided a brief overview of RAB activities throughout the nation. This was a new addition to the RAB meetings and Ms. Rouse asked the RAB to provide input as to whether there was any interest in making this a regular RAB meeting topic.

- The first national RAB caucus took place in Phoenix, Arizona in January 1998. Forty people from RABs around the country gathered to discuss topics such as, environmental justice, funding, TAPP implementation, and RAB adjournment.
- The Army was considering the possibility of disbanding the RAB at Fort Ord, California, due to its ineffective and dysfunctional behavior. Ultimately, the decision was made not to disband the RAB and set a bad precedence.

New Member Orientation: The final three training topics were presented to the RAB.

RAB Participation in the AO and IR Program Processes: Mr. Gordon Crane explained that the RAB is the "front line" to the community. Instead of simply listening to presentations and reports, the RAB should be a conduit into the community and vice versa to provide input from the community. The RAB should speak and act as a community interface to help design a better solution.

Work Completed Under the AO: Gordon Crane provided an overview of the work completed under the AO. A copy of the presentation materials was distributed at the February meeting.

Future Actions: Instead of a presentation, a general discussion developed regarding the different issues facing the NCBC. Highlights are provided below.

As part of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan, approximately 80 wells will be installed.

Q: *We heard that up to 50 - 100 people may have received sediment from the ditches and there are no records. Have there been any plans to take soil samples from the community members who received soil?*

A: There are many issues to consider as the Navy reviews this issue. For example, how do we find people who received the soil, and once we find them, how do we determine if the soil was from the ditches.

Q: *Wouldn't a long exposure to TCDD increase the health risk? What would be the long-term health effects for maintenance crews, families living on base, and the like? Shouldn't we perform an epidemiological study to determine the long-term health effects of the residents?*

A: The funding that we are working with is allocated for investigation and clean up, not to investigate the long-term health effects on the public. An epidemiological study would need to be funded from a different source.

Bob Merrill spoke about the issue of understanding the methodology behind the cleanup level. Mr. Merrill felt that discussion was irrelevant in regards to the "fairness" of the cleanup goal. He warned that the State will not change the cleanup goal of 4.7 ppt. The objective is not to change the cleanup goal, but instead to cleanup to that goal the fastest and most inexpensive way possible.

It was agreed that the issues of the health effects of TCDD, who has been exposed, and the pros and cons of conducting an epidemiological study should be topics of on-going discussion at future RAB meetings. It was recommended that toxicology training be provided to help the RAB in making its recommendation. The point was brought out that the Biological Monitoring Plan will tell us more about whether we need to do the epidemiological study.

Regarding the RAB Participation in the AO and IR Programs, Steve Dickerson asked for examples of how to be more effective as a RAB. Gordon Crane offered the examples of discussions like this evening's, or reviewing reports. It would serve the RAB well for them to bring their issue to the table.

Conclusion: The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.