

N62604.AR.001510
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

TIER I MEETING MINUTES 8 NOVEMBER 2005 NCBC GULFPORT MS
11/8/2005
TIER I MEETING MEMBERS

Minutes

NCBC Gulfport Tier I Meeting

NCBC Gulfport, Mississippi
November 8-9, 2005

Meeting Attendees

Art Conrad	Navy RPM
Gordon Crane	NCBC Environmental Program Manager
Bob Fisher	Tetra Tech NUS Project Manager
Bob Merrill	MDEQ
Nancy Rouse	EnviroComs

Welcome

Introductions: Art Conrad welcomed the group and briefly covered some administrative matters germane to the conduct of the meeting and the meeting facilities.

Review of Agenda: The meeting started at 1:30 pm. Everyone attending the meeting received a copy of the agenda of items to be covered.

Site 5 Remedial Investigation Overview

History of Site 5:

Site 5 was a trench-and-fill landfill open from 1972 to 1976. While there is no written documentation of disposal at the landfill, it was reported by word-of-mouth that the site received some dumpster material from the base (even though there was a contract in place to take it off base). These dumpsters reportedly contained mess hall waste, office supplies, and other miscellaneous debris. It was also reported that a large volume of DDT, both powdered and approximately 50 drums of liquid, was disposed at the site.

Site Characterization Findings:

All reports of disposed hazardous materials were rigorously investigated in the Remedial Investigation (RI). Some key RI findings follow:

- Arsenic concentrations found at this site were lower than the average concentrations found along the Gulf coast.
- DDT levels on the site are relatively low, typical for the area, and near the residential screening levels.
- A fire accelerant was used at the landfill (most likely fuel or waste solvents from Building 400) which indicates that the waste in the trenches was burned before being covered.
- A plume of chlorinated solvents moved off of the southernmost trenches of the site. Low concentrations of chlorinated solvents (in the low part-per-quadrillion range) were found in the plume.
- One surface soil sample contained an elevated concentration of the dioxin (mostly of the OCDD congener) at approximately 60 parts per trillion (ppt).

Geophysical Investigations:

Geophysical investigations were used to look for the reported buried drums on the site and to more fully delineate the site. Extensive studies, which included EM31, EM61, and GPR surveys over the course of three separate investigations, found no evidence of the reported drums. In addition to looking for buried metal, GPR was used to look for non-metallic signatures because the low pH soil in the area tends to quickly degrade the metal in the drums. The geophysical investigations did, however, successfully delineate the site. The area of the newly delineated site was reduced from eight to five acres as a result of the geophysical investigation.

Completeness of the Site Characterization:

Bob Fisher commented that the perception that the site may not be fully characterized could be resolved by bringing in existing data that was not discussed in the draft report and by more clearly identifying the approach taken in planning the investigation (i.e., the investigation was based on a presumptive remedy of capping the landfill, and was based on the Superfund Accelerated Cleanup Model and the EPA directive, *Conducting Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies for CERCLA Municipal Landfill Sites*).

Presumptive Remedy – Landfill Cap:

As stated above, the RI was planned and executed with the presumption that the landfill will be capped as the final remedy. However, whether the cap should be built below the land surface or on top of it is still to be decided in the course of the Feasibility Study (FS). It was observed that the current use for the site is for heavy equipment (scraper and dump truck) training and that this site will most likely not be suitable for that use after construction of the cap. Gordon will look into other possible uses for the site that will be amenable to the facility. We may also need to consider lining the ditch that flows along the east side of the site to address the seasonal seep issue. It was noted that the site would be closed under industrial standards.

Surface Soil:

Within this 5-acre site, one surface soil sample contained a finding of 60 ppt dioxin. The dioxin found in this sample was OCDD, which indicates that the source was most likely from burning and not from Herbicide Orange. The team discussed whether or not the site should be restricted because of this finding. It was decided that approximately 12 additional samples are needed before a responsible decision can be made. These additional samples will also aide the engineering decision to cap above or below the land surface. Bob Fisher will initiate the funding process for the additional sampling with a letter to Art. The best-case-scenario for reaching a decision point (i.e., whether or not to limit access to the site) is the first week in February. This would mean that the samples would be collected by late December of this year. Until that decision is reached, Gordon will look into ways to suppress dust on the site during equipment training exercises.

2. Site 5 Comments and Responses

The following paragraphs summarize key changes that will be made to the RI in response to comments received from the Tier I team and identify issues to be addressed prior to finalizing the RI. A full Comment/Response document will be prepared by Tetra Tech and appended to these minutes when completed.

The following changes will be made to the revised report:

1. The RI approach (i.e., supporting the design of the presumptive remedy) will be described more explicitly in the report.
2. Sampling data from the 1998 investigation, surface water data from the upstream reaches of the drainage ditch south of the landfill, and off-site data showing PCB distribution will be added to the body of the report and tables will be revised to more clearly present the data.
3. Additional surface soils samples will be collected and the results will be included in the report.
4. Cross-sections will be developed at well points within the site.
5. A map will be developed to show the results of all geophysical investigations at the site. These maps will more clearly show the northern edge of the site as defined by geophysical data.
6. The discussion regarding arsenic will be expanded and the background data from Pettry and Switzer (2201) *Arsenic Concentrations in Selected Soils and Parent Materials in Mississippi* will be included.
7. A more complete discuss of metals will be incorporated into the document and the potential of a source off base will be discussed. Gordon will look into finding old aerial photographs to see if there was anything off site that would cause metal contamination

Comments Remaining to be Addressed:

1. The EPA reviewer suggested that the risk assessment use a 0.1 instead of 1.0 as the hazard quotient. Bob Fisher will discuss this recommendation with the Tetra Tech risk assessor and with an appropriate EPA contact (to be determined).
2. The EPA review comments suggested that TEQs and PCB data be recalculated using different EPA methology. It was observed that there may be guidance available that states that EPA does not require changing calculations if new guidance is promulgated during the course of a project. Bob Fisher will search for the guidance in question.
3. The EPA reviewer suggested that the method used to select Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPC), especially with regard to .PAHs, was incorrect. Bob Fisher will work with EPA to resolve this discrepancy.

Post Katrina Sampling

Initial data from the Canal Road investigation is available. Many of the sample results are below the MDEQ screening levels for dioxin and the concentrations appear to be randomly distributed, both vertically and horizontally. Also, the pond located near the dirt piles was sampled and did not contain dioxin. The low concentrations of dioxin that were found contained TCDD. Samples were collected from Site 8 B&C were collected before Katrina, however, the laboratory was impacted by the storm causing a delay in completion of the analysis and the results are expected soon. Two separate reports will be prepared to summarize these results, a summary report of recent off-base sampling and a report for the sample results from Site 8 B&C. It was also noted that funds are available for additional Site 8 confirmation samples needed to address changes caused by the storm.

A brief discussion of the long term use of Sites 8 B&C followed. Gordon will develop a point paper expand the discussion for future meetings.

Action Items from the November 8-9, 2005 Tier I Meeting

- Bob Fisher will take the lead on revising the RI to include the changes described above.
- Bob Fisher will look need to change the risk assessment's hazard quotient from 1.0 to 0.1.
- Bob Fisher will look for documentation of EPA's direction not to change methodology during the course of a project.
- Bob Fisher will review EPA's reference on selecting Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPC) with respect the EPA's comments on the selection of PAH's in the RI.
- Bob Fisher will request funding for approximately 12 surface soil samples for Site 5.
- Gordon will discuss the future use of Site 5 with NCBC Gulfport decisionmakers.
- Gordon will address dust suppression issues during training activities a decision can be made concerning restriction of the site.
- Gordon will look for archived aerial photographs to identify any offsite sources of metal contamination.
- Gordon will develop a point paper to initiate an expanded discussion about long term use of Sites 8 B&C.