

N62604.AR.000661  
NCBC GULFPORT  
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 6 FEBRUARY 2007 NCBC  
GULFPORT MS  
2/6/2007  
NCBC GULFPORT



*Gulfport, Mississippi*

**Minutes**  
**NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting**  
**Naval Construction Battalion Center**  
**Gulfport, Mississippi**  
*February 6, 2007*

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at The Crystal Inn on February 6, 2007:

Art Conrad (Navy Co-Chair)	Cherie Schulz
Gordon Crane	Joyce Shaw
David Marshall	Philip Shaw
Bob Merrill	Earl Whittemore
Joseph Mitchell	
Skip McDaniel (Community Co-Chair)	

Administrative and technical support for the meeting were provided by:

Bob Fisher, Tetra Tech NUS  
Bob Mertz, Tetra Tech NUS  
Jean Remley, NCBC Gulfport  
Nancy Rouse, EnviroComs

Other attendees included:

Mike Keller (Sun Herald)

**Welcome:** Skip McDaniel, the Community RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:30 pm.

**Installation Restoration Program/Administrative Order Update:** Art Conrad, the Navy Co-Chair of the RAB, provided the following overview of all of the environmental restoration projects currently underway at NCBC Gulfport:

**Site 8 – The Former Herbicide Orange Storage Area:** This project includes sampling, delineating, removing, transporting, stabilizing, and capping contaminants associated with Site 8. The status of the project as of the date of the meeting follows:

- Excavation of all dioxin contaminated material above 38 ppt is completed.
- The excavated material is stabilized in “lifts” on Site 8A.
- The contaminated material stabilized on Site 8A is covered with 12 inches of Roller Compacted Concrete (RCC) providing a 13 acre area for storing heavy equipment.
- All excavated ditches on base had been restored.
- All excavated areas off base are filled and mulched. Seeding and planting were underway to restore area as wetlands.
- An engineering evaluation was underway to address dioxin-contaminated material found along Canal Road. The study will recommend excavation and transfer of the material to Sites 8B and 8C.

**Site 1 – Disaster Recovery Disposal Area:** Site 1 is an inactive landfill where a mock disaster recovery training area is currently located. The landfill was used from 1942-1948. A Remedial Investigation is planned to begin in April 2007.

**Site 2 – World War II Landfill:** Site 2 is an inactive landfill where general refuse generated at the base was disposed. The landfill was used from 1942-1948. A Remedial Investigation is planned to begin in mid- 2008.

**Site 3 – The Northwest Landfill and Burn Pit:** Site 3 is an inactive landfill that was the primary disposal area from 1948-1968. A burn pit on site was used for fire-fighting training from the mid-1950's to 1966. A Remedial Investigation is underway, report to follow.

**Site 4 – Golf Course Landfill:** Site 4 operated as a landfill from 1966-1972. A Remedial Investigation has just been completed and the report is in review. A Feasibility Study and a Remedial Design are being planned.

**Site 5 – Equipment Training Area Landfill:** The landfill located at Site 5 operated from 1972 to 1976. The site is currently used for heavy equipment training. A Remedial Investigation has completed and a report is in review. A Feasibility Study is underway and a Remedial Design is in planning

**Site 6 – Fire Fighting Training Area:** Site 6 contained two fire-fighting training pits which operated between 1966 and 1975. An enhanced bio-slurper system has ended productive removals. A site evaluation was presented to MDEQ, additional sampling was completed and a Decision Document which recommends site closure is in review.

**Site 7 – Rubble Disposal Area:** This 3-acre site reportedly received only construction rubble from 1978-1984. A Remedial Investigation is planned for mid-2008.

**Site 10 – Parade Ground Ditch:** Site 10 is discussed below.

**Site 10 Update:** Bob Fisher of TTNUS provided the following update of Site 10 activities.

High concentrations of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other electrical transformer components were discovered during Herbicide Orange studies in 1996. The initial studies were followed by a source removal action in August of 1999. The source removal was followed by a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study. The Remedial Investigation included sampling, an evaluation of the nature and extent of contamination, and a risk evaluation. This study found PCBs in the soil to depths of up to 15 feet. The PCB concentrations in the soil and sediment ranged from no-detection to 83 parts per million. The study calculated that approximately 33 pounds of PCBs remain in the nearly 450 cubic yards of contaminated sediment and soil. The investigation showed that groundwater was not impacted by PCB contamination.

The Human Health Risk Evaluation determined direct exposure to PCB-contaminated subsurface soil was a potential health risk. The Ecological Risk Evaluation determined that direct contact with or ingestion of surface water and/or sediment at Site 10 was a risk to some non-human organisms.

The Feasibility Study established three cleanup objectives (called Remedial Action Objectives) for the site: 1) Prevent direct exposure above the human health risk limit (1000 micrograms per

kilogram which is the same as 1 part per million); 2) Prevent erosion and transportation of PCBs within the ditch system; and 3) Comply with Federal and State requirement.

The Feasibility Study evaluated four alternatives:

- *Alternative 1: No Action*
- *Alternative 2: Institutional Controls/Monitoring*
- *Alternative 3: Surface Water Controls, Excavation, Surface Protection and Monitoring.*
- *Alternative 4: Dewatering, Excavation and Offsite Treatment/Disposal.*

The detailed and comparative analysis of the alternatives determined that only Alternatives 3 and 4 meet these cleanup objectives and that implementability will be a key consideration in selecting the preferred alternatives in the next step, the Proposed Plan.

*Question:* Where did you take the PCBs that were removed?

*Answer:* The PCB-contaminated material was placed in an EPA approved landfill.

**Proposed Canal Road Dredge Pile Cleanup Plan:** Bob Mertz of TTNUS provided the following update of the Proposed Canal Road Dredge Pile cleanup plans.

Investigation of the Canal Road Dredge Piles included collection of thirty-eight samples from the piles and one sample from an adjacent pond. The study showed dioxin concentrations ranging from 0.1 to 42.4 parts per trillion (ppt) in the soil. The average dioxin concentration was 15 ppt. Thirty of the dredge pile samples exceeded the state's residential action level of 4.26 ppt. The pond sample did not exceed 4.26 ppt.

The Canal Road investigation results indicated the need for further action. In response, an Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) was conducted to assess removal of the piles. The EE/CA assessed the best way to remove and manage roughly 6,500 cubic yards (9,000 tons) of dioxin-contaminated material from the 4400-foot-long dredge piles.

The EE/CA will include plans for removing all dredge pile material with dioxin concentrations greater than 4.26 parts per trillion. Post-excavation sampling will be performed to confirm that the dioxin-contaminated material has been removed. The dredge pile area will be restored and the excavated material will be placed on Site 8 and managed to prevent any further release.

*Question:* How will the dredge pile area be restored?

*Answer:* Material will be removed to restore the site to pre-dredge pile elevation and the site will be covered with clean top soil and re-vegetated.

*Question:* A lot of the area is wetlands. How do you intend to perform the work in a wetland area?

*Answer:* The piles are located on a narrow strip on elevated land along Canal Road. We will be able to remove the piles without disturbing the wetlands.

*Question:* Are you planning on containing the contamination during the removal action?

*Answer:* Yes, we will probably use sediment recovery traps (SRTs). Erosion and contamination control will be addressed in the removal plans.

*Question:* How will you get to the contaminated material? Will you be building a road or removing trees?

*Answer:* We do not know yet. The EE/CA does not get into the details of the removal. A cleanup design will address these issues at a later date.

*Question:* Where will you take the contaminated material?

*Answer:* The material will be placed on Sites 8 B&C on NCBC Gulfport.

*Comment:* One RAB member stated that they would like to see Site 8 B&C capped.

*Question:* Are you going to look at the Canal Road landfill to look for the missing piles?

*Answer:* Requests for sampling the landfill should be addressed to MDEQ.

*Question:* Is the landfill in question permitted?

*Answer:* Yes, it is a Class 2 Rubbish Fill. The landfill would be under the jurisdiction of the Solid Waste Division of MDEQ.

*Comment:* It was noted that while not currently a “dump”, the landfill was built in the same area of a former dump.

*Question:* Are there any alternatives to bringing the dredge pile material onto Sites 8 B&C?

*Answer:* No, the only other alternative would be to haul to another landfill, and that would be cost prohibitive.

*Question:* How would this removal impact the potential widening of Canal Road?

*Answer:* Future road widening would not be impacted once the removal is completed.

*Question:* Is there a potential for migration of the contaminants?

*Answer:* No. It has been observed that flood water does not reach as high as the piles. This observation has been confirmed with the sampling results which show non-detects in areas where migration would have been expected from recent flooding.

*Question:* Where does Canal One drain?

*Answer:* Canal One drains into Turkey Creek.

*Question:* So the canal moves everything off of the base into Turkey Creek?

*Answer:* The on-base ditches act as small retention basins. Further, there is a small pond on base connected to the ditches and serves as an additional settling pond.

## **Conclusion**

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for May 1. However, the RAB expressed a willingness to reschedule to accommodate finalization of the Canal Road EE/CA and/or the Site 10 Proposed Plan.

The meeting closed at 8:30 pm.