

N62604.AR.001283  
NCBC GULFPORT  
5090.3a

MEETING MINUTES ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER CLARIFICATION 19 MARCH 1996 NCBC  
GULFPORT MS  
3/19/1996  
NCBC GULFPORT

39501-ASSOCIATED AO

10.06.00.0004

Meeting Minutes  
Administrative Order Clarification  
NCBC Gulfport, MS  
March 19, 1996

Attendees:

Phillip Weathersby	MSDEQ	(601) 961-5302
David Peacock	MSDEQ	(601) 961-5220
Wayne Stover	MSDEQ	(601) 961-5308
CDR Jack Zink	NCBC	(601) 871-2202
LT Carol Womack	NCBC	(601) 871-3118
Gordon Crane	NCBC	(601) 871-2485
Art Conrad	SouthDiv	(803) 820-5520
Diane Glass	AFCEE/ERD	(210) 536-5269
Alan Waite	HQ USAF	(703) 697-3445
Penny Baxter	ABB-ES	(423) 531-1922
Marland Dulaney	ABB-ES	(904) 656-1293
Bob Fisher	ABB-ES	(423) 531-1922
Shannon Goldberg	ABB-ES	(423) 531-1922
Tracey Keel	ABB-ES	(423) 531-1922
Rick Ryan	ABB-ES	(423) 531-1922

A meeting was held at the Building 1 conference room, NCBC Gulfport, MS on March 19, 1996 at 10:30 am. The purpose of the meeting was to get clarification from the State regarding the conditions and requirements of the Administrative Order issued on February 14, 1996.

Q. The Base interprets the sections of the Order that refer to dioxin contamination to mean only Site 8, both offsite and onsite.

A. The sections that refer to dioxin contamination are concerned with Site 8A, B, and C. Also, these sections refer to delineation and subsequent remediation, if necessary, of dioxin found in other areas of the Base, such as Site 4 and the ditches. Off-site delineation refers primarily to areas in which dioxin was found, that is, the area north of the NCBC.

Q. Section 3.C off-base refers to Interim Corrective Measures. The Base interprets this section to be concerned with containment measures.

A. Yes, the sediment retention traps and other containment measures as necessary for dioxin-containing sediment originating from dioxin source areas.

Q. There are some general questions about the regulatory arena in which this Order is to be carried out. Is this a RCRA or CERCLA action? Who is the Base's primary contact with the State? What involvement should be expected from the EPA?

A. The regulatory driver is the same as before. The drainage ways should be considered under CERCLA. Phillip Weathersby will be

the Base's primary contact with MSDEQ. The EPA will continue to be informed, but will not play a more active role in actions taken under this Order. It is assumed that Jim Barksdale will continue to be the EPA contact.

Q. Could you clarify the terms onsite and offsite?

A. Onsite refers to all areas within the Base boundary that have been shown to contain dioxin. Onsite means basewide, including monitoring wells and ditches.

Q. A two phased approach is the most logical one for onbase. This would include a first phase of identifying locations where dioxin is present, followed by a 2nd phase to delineate the contamination.

A. This sounds right.

Q. Offsite refers to where?

A. Canal No. 1, Outfall 3 area, Outfall 4 area, Turkey Creek and Bernard Bayou.

Q. The Order requires sampling within Turkey Creek and Bernard Bayou. Is there an issue with sampling in state waters?

A. MSDEQ will address this issue and get an answer back to the Base.

Q. The Order will require that samples be collected on private property north of the Base. There may be an access problem. Does the State anticipate problems in this area?

A. After discussion of this question, it was decided that Gordon Crane would check with the City of Gulfport to see if an easement has been granted across property draining Outfall 3. If not and problems arise in gaining access, the State may assist.

Q. The phased approach will allow everyone to participate in the decision making process. The workplans will contain a plan to map out the sediment deposits and sample accordingly. The Site Conceptual Model will help in planning the sampling locations.

A. Provide the number of samples, where samples are to be taken, and the rationale for their selection and it will be evaluated during the workplan review.

Q. There is a concern on the Gulfport team that certain time frames stated within the Order are not logically constructed. For example, an exposure assessment is planned for the Base and this data will help plan the biological monitoring task; however, the assessment may not be completed in time for the biological monitoring workplan to be finished by August 1. How can we resolve these problems?

A. All questions and concerns about timeframes should be directed to Jerry Banks.

Q. It is the Base's intention to bring the contaminated sediment back to Site 8 and control the sediment with engineered controls.

This action constitutes a real risk reduction that is economically viable. What is the State's position on this proposal?

A. This idea needs to be presented in the workplan.

Q. Funding for 1996 has been planned for a long time. We are now requesting 1997 funding. Funding may drive some deadlines and the order is not a guarantee that all funds requested will be granted.

A. Any schedule changes should be discussed with Jerry Banks.