

N00213.AR.000429
NAS KEY WEST
5090.3a

DRAFT MINUTES FROM 6 DECEMBER 1999 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NAS KEY WEST FL
12/6/1999
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND SOUTHERN DIVISION

DRAFT

**NAVAL AIR STATION KEY WEST
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY**

**Holiday Inn Beachside, Marquesa Room
December 6, 1999 7:00 p.m.
Key West, Florida 33040**

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Present:

Ron Demes, Navy Co-Chair
Dudley Patrick, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Turpin Ballard, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV
Jorge Caspary, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Robin Orlandi, Community Member
Rick Aleman, South Florida Water Management District

Other Personnel Present Who Are Directly Related to the RAB:

Phillip Williams, Installation Restoration Manager, NAS Key West
Michael Stanka, Environmental Coordinator, NAS Key West
Eddie Russell, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (Marathon)
Karen Snodgrass, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Byas Glover, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Chuck Bryan, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.

Others in Attendance (Who Signed the Attendance Sheet):

Bill Harrison, Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) Director

Welcome

Mr. Demes welcomed all attendees to the meeting. He noted that only one topic was on the agenda for this meeting, so no meeting agenda handouts were required. The RAB members introduced themselves. Mr. Demes turned the meeting over to Mr. Patrick for the presentation of the meeting topic.

Public Concerns and Navy Responses to the BRAC Proposed Plans

Mr. Patrick opened his discussion by briefly reviewing the environmental history at the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) properties. He noted that members of the public made several comments and raised some concerns regarding the proposed plans for the BRAC sites. The Navy is currently preparing responses to address these comments and concerns and Mr. Patrick will present a summary of these responses during his presentation. He then addressed the following six concerns as noted by their respective responses:

Concern 1 - The lack of floor samples taken from the excavations is problematic. This would have defined the extent of contamination below 2 feet.

Response 1 - During delineation sampling, sub-surface soils were characterized to a depth of 8 feet. The Navy excavated to 4 and 6 feet in several areas to remove particularly high levels of contamination. In

DRAFT

response to City of Key West's concerns, the Navy is preparing residual risk data in easily understood format (color-coded maps) for City planners and administrators.

Concern 2 - Information about remaining chemicals and their locations should be provided in non-technical language so city officials and citizens unfamiliar with environmental remediation can be adequately informed.

Response 2 - Again, residual risk maps will be provided to the City of Key West that detail the location and risks to workers and park users associated with remaining contaminants. This information will be provided in a straight forward, user-friendly format.

Concern 3 - Was the City's proposed reuse considered during remedial activities and are risks acceptable to future users?

Response 3 - The Navy and its regulatory partners in cleanup (FDEP and EPA) used the Base Reuse Plan to drive all remediation decisions. Residual health risks posed by remaining (low) levels of contamination are minimal. These risks will be calculated for various likely receptors, including utility worker, landscapers, and child park user, and will be provided in the Decision Document.

Concern 4 - Information concerning the RCRA UST program should be provided in conjunction with the proposed plan.

Response 4 - Information on the UST program will be provided as the program proceeds. As stated in an earlier public meeting, FDEP allows the Navy to reach final remedial decisions on non-UST program cleanup, while at the same time holding the UST program accountable for cleanup under its purview. The UST program will use the RAB forum to provide periodic updates.

Concern 5 - The area north of Building 103 where a PCB hit was found in excess of the action level should be removed.

Response 5 - The Navy concurs and will excavate.

Concern 6 - The reliance on Land-Use Controls at Truman Annex may impede future improvements on these properties.

Response 6 - Remediation decisions were, and continue to be, driven by the Base Reuse Plan. LUCs provide a viable remedial option for low levels of contamination left in place following extensive removal of high levels of contamination. Future owners will be required to maintain the institutional and engineering controls put in place by the Navy. However, if redevelopment can not be satisfactorily planned to avoid or to incorporate these LUCs, the future owner would be obligated to contact both the Navy and FDEP before any work begins that would adversely impact the LUCs (i.e., violate the deed restrictions). At that point, both the Navy and FDEP must agree on the proposed LUC modification. In addition, the future owner will likely be liable for costs associated with the LUC modification. As stated in prior public meetings, and as contained in CERCLA Section 120, the Navy will remain responsible for addressing any previously undiscovered contamination not covered by LUCs.

Mr. Patrick also noted that several public comments related to restrictions being proposed on roadways (i.e., use of asphalt surfaces as engineering controls). He responded that the Navy and its regulatory partners are reviewing their authority under CERCLA regarding cleanups adjacent to roadways, where the contaminants of concern are the result of engine exhaust emissions. Based on the results of this

DRAFT

evaluation, some of the road surfaces (which were previously identified for LUCs) may not now need these controls.

Mr. Patrick concluded his presentation by noting that the next steps in the transfer process for these BRAC properties include the issuance of the environmental decision document, the approval of this document by Southern Division and the State of Florida, and the issuance, review and approval of the Findings of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) documents. He asked for any questions or comments and received none from those in attendance.

Adjournment

Mr. Demes adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.