

N62604.AR.001693  
NCBC GULFPORT  
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 21 MARCH 2011 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NCBC  
GULFPORT MS  
3/21/2011  
NAVFAC SOUTHEAST



**Minutes**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD Meeting**  
**Naval Construction Battalion Center**  
**Gulfport, Mississippi**  
**March 21, 2011**

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met the Isiah Fredericks Community Center in Gulfport Mississippi on March 21, 2011:

Gordon Crane  
Charles Cook (Navy Co-Chair)  
David Marshall  
Bob Merrill, MDEQ

Skip McDaniel (RAB Community Co-Chair)  
Joyce Shaw  
Phillip Shaw

Administrative and technical support for the meeting:

Juanita Sapp, Tetra Tech  
Nancy Rouse, The Management Edge  
William Olson, Tetra Tech  
Jon Overholtzer, CH2M HILL  
Greg Roof, Tetra Tech

Guests:

Dr. Travnicek  
Councilwoman Ella Holmes-Hines

## **WELCOME**

Skip McDaniel, the Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

## **INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM UPDATE**

Gordon Crane, the Naval Construction Battalion Center (NCBC) Gulfport Environmental Restoration Program Manager (RPM), introduced the new Navy RPM, Charles Cook, and provided an overview each site as follows:

**Site 1:** The Disaster Recovery Disposal Landfill is an inactive landfill where a mock disaster recovery training area was located and used from 1942 to 1948. The Remedial Investigation Report has been completed. The remedial design has been funded and will begin in March 2011.

**Site 2:** The World War II Landfill is an inactive landfill where general refuse from the installation was disposed between 1942 and 1948. The remedial investigation fieldwork is underway, and gas collection and subsurface electronic analysis is in progress. One strong anomaly was found, and there is speculation that this could be the landfill where jeeps and other debris were allegedly buried.

**Site 3:** The Northwest Landfill and Burn Pit is an inactive landfill that was the primary disposal for the installation between 1948 and 1968. A burn pit on the site was used for firefighting training from the mid 1950's to 1966. The remedial action fieldwork is completed, and the report is in review. A Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, Decision Document, and Remedial Design are underway. At this time, the most likely remedy to be proposed for this site is a cover/barrier over the landfill.

**Site 4:** The Golf Course Landfill operated from 1966 to 1972. This site is a former landfill with a chlorinated solvent plume. The remedial action at Site 4 began in July 2010 and is scheduled for completion in June 2011. Long-term monitoring (LTM) at Site 4 will begin in 2011.

**Site 5:** The Equipment Training Area Landfill operated from 1972 to 1976. The remediation work was completed on this site in July 2009, and the grass surface received fresh sod in August 2010. The grass on the driving range has been successfully established. LTM will also begin in 2011.

**Question:** *Are they no longer going to do heavy equipment training on Site 5?*

**Response:** *They are still doing heavy equipment training in the onsite area, but outside of the area covered by the landfill cap.*

**Site 6:** The Fire Fighting Training Area operated from 1966 through 1975. The treatment system for the contaminated groundwater beneath this site was shut off approximate six years ago. We are currently in LTM to evaluate the progress of natural attenuation at the site. One year of monitoring has been completed, and year two has been initiated. The latest round of groundwater sampling was collected last week.

**Site 7:** The Rubble Disposal Area is a 3-acre site that reportedly received only construction rubble from 1978 to 1984. It was noted that there is more than construction rubble at this site. The remedial investigation for this site is funded and will begin in 2011. The investigation work plan is currently being developed.

**Site 8:** The Former Herbicide Orange Storage Area is near completion. All off-base sampling has been completed. Land use control (LUC) documents and long-term sediment monitoring will begin in 2011.

**Site 10:** Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were found in ditches at the Parade Ground Ditch. Remedial actions were taken in 1999 to remove the source of the PCB contamination. The final remedial action, a concrete cover, was completed in May 2010. LTM will begin in 2011.

**Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP):** The MMRP began in early 2010 to look at old firing ranges at the installation. The Preliminary Assessment (PA), which involved a records search, has been completed. The PA identified 10 sites where small arms were potentially used. The site inspection for two of the identified sites is in progress and will be completed this year.

## **FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SUMMARY**

Greg Roof, Tetra Tech, provided an overview of the Five-Year Review process for NCBC Gulfport.

**Purpose of the Five-Year Review:** The purpose of the Five-Year Review is to evaluate the implementation and performance of remedy and to determine whether the remedy remains protective.

**The Five-Year Review Requirement:** Five-Year Reviews are required when hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain on site that do not allow for unrestricted use and exposure and when the Record of Decision or Decision Document was signed after October 17, 1986. The five-year timeline is triggered by the date when the first remedial action was initiated that involved leaving contamination in place on the installation. The reviews will continue until the site is cleared for unrestricted use and exposure as documented in a Five-Year Review report.

**The Five-Year Review Process:** The implementation and performance of the remedy is re-evaluated every five years to ensure it continues to be protective. If the review finds the remedy is no longer protective, a change in the remedy would be recommended.

**The NCBC Gulfport Five-Year Review:** Sites 5, 6, 8, and 10 were all included in the Five-Year Review.

**Site 5 Landfill Cap:** Site 5 was the only operating landfill at NCBC Gulfport during its operation from 1972 to 1977. This landfill contained approximately 6,000 cubic yards of solid waste and an unknown quantity of liquid wastes. Landfill operations included trench and fill, typically accompanied by burning prior to backfilling. The implemented remedy at Site 5 included a landfill cap, LUCs, and LTM.

**Site 6 Natural Attenuation and LTM:** Site 6 is a former fire-fighting training area that operated from 1966 to 1975. Various flammable liquids were used in two burn pits at Site 6. Up to 500,000 gallons of waste oils, solvents, paint thinners, and cleaning compounds were reportedly burned in the pits.

**Site 8 Stabilization, Capping, LUCs, and LTM:** Site 8 was a Former Herbicide Orange Storage Area that occupies an area of approximately 21.5 acres on the north-central portion of the base. The site was used from 1968 through 1977 to store and handle approximately 850,000 gallons of Herbicide Orange (HO) in 55-gallon drums. Three areas (A, B, and C) were identified based on the level of storage and handling of HO. Site 8A was continually in use, and sites 8B and 8C were periodically used as overflow storage areas.

**Site 10 Ditch Lining, LUCs, and LTM:** Site 10 was a site with PCBs in a short section of a primary drainage ditch located adjacent to the Parade Field. The site is approximately 10 feet wide and 4 feet deep. Contamination was first detected during the dioxin delineation activities for on- and off-site surface water drainage features conducted in 1997.

Mr. Roof described the Five-Year Review as a paper study that includes site visits, interviews, calculations, comparisons of cost to Present Worth Analysis from the Feasibility Study and design, regulatory changes, and reporting. The review found the remedial actions in place for the four sites evaluated continue to be protective. Further, it was noted that remedial actions are not yet fully implemented because the Navy and MDEQ are negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide implementation of LUCs. These LUCs are being implemented, are informally ongoing, and will be formal once the MOA is final. The LTM programs for each site reviewed are in the work planning stage. It was determined, however, that there are no protectiveness issues since the remedial action is not fully implemented at this time.

Only one issue of concern was identified for the four sites reviewed. At Site 8, the concrete is being broken up due to the operation of tracked vehicles on the pad. Recommendations to address this issue include the following:

- Inspect the integrity of the concrete cover at Site 8 and make any necessary repairs.
- Ensure the unit commanders using this area to park vehicles are aware of the issue and will ensure that proper safeguards are used to prevent damage to the concrete.

The next five-year review will be completed by March 2016 and will include these four sites and any other sites that are in the remedial action phase at that time.

#### **Sites 4 Remediation Update**

Jon Overholtzer of CH2M HILL presented an update on the remediation efforts at Site 4. The remedial action at Site 4 included the following:

- Excavating sediment from 700 feet of Canal 1
- Placing geotextile and rip rap in 700 feet of bottom and side slopes of Canal 1
- Grading approximately 3 to 4 acres of the golf course for the landfill cap
- Installing a geosynthetic gas collection system and collection trench
- Installing 18 inches of low permeability soil
- Installing topsoil
- Establishing vegetation over the cap

Mr. Overholtzer provided a number of photos showing the various steps in the construction of the landfill, including the photo shown below.



**Installing the low permeability soil layer (clay) over the landfill.**

**Question:** *What is the life span of the plastic mesh that you used in the gas collection system?*

**Response:** *The plastic mesh does not decompose; it is designed to go underground. Also, it is black, which also helps it to last longer.*

**Comment:** *PVC is often used underground as a vapor barrier. I've seen it many times under buildings. It breaks down over time. It basically looks like cornflakes when the buildings are demolished.*

**Response:** *The PVC used under a typical building is 6 millimeters thick and the PVC used for these landfills is much thicker, between 40 to 60 millimeters.*

**Comment:** *I just want to make the point that the material does degrade.*

**Response:** *The EPA has done longevity testing of the material that shows that it is very slow to degrade.*

**Question:** *Has a chemist approved this plastic liner?*

**Response:** *Yes, this material was approved by the appropriate standard for the industry. Also, it should be noted that this is the industry standard for lining solid and hazardous waste landfills.*

**Conclusion**

It was agreed that the next meeting would tentatively be held on Monday, May 9, 2011, but that the date was dependent on availability of the project team members. (At the team meeting held later during the same week, it was determined that key team members would not be available to attend the RAB meeting on the scheduled date. An alternate date of June 20, 2011, was proposed to the RAB via email.) Topics proposed for the next RAB meeting include the following:

- Site 1 Proposed Plan
- Site 3 Basis of Design
- Site 2 Preliminary Remedial Investigation Field Results

The meeting closed at 7:30 p.m.