

NAVAL BASE CHARLESTON  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

Minutes of 10 June 1997

Live Oak Community Center, 2012 Success St., N. Charleston

1. Introduction of the RAB Members and Guests

Mr. Daryle Fontenot, Navy Co-Chair, brought the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for coming out. RAB member and audience introductions were made.

2. RAB Members Attending

Mr. Steve Best

Mr. Bobby Dearhart

Mr. Daryle Fontenot

Mr. Wilburn Gilliard

Ms. Gussie Greene

Ms. Jeri Johnson

Mr. Ralph Laney

Ms. Wannetta Mallette-Pratt

Mr. Lou Mintz

Mr. Arthur Pinckney

Mr. Odell Price

Ms. Ann Ragan

LCDR Paul Rose

3. Guests Attending

Mr. Tony Hunt NAVFAC, SouthDiv

Mr. Brian Stockmaster NAVFAC, SouthDiv

Mr. Gabriel Magwood NAVFAC, SouthDiv

Mr. Jim Beltz NAVFAC, SouthDiv

Mr. Henry Shepard NAVFAC, SouthDiv

Mr. Paul M. Bergstrand SCDHEC

Mr. Johnny Tapia SCDHEC

Mr. J. Michael Reubish CEERD

Mr. Kevin Tunstall Shipyard Detachment

Ms. Myrtle Barnett Community Member

Mr. Leroy Carr Chicora/Cherokee

Ms. Henrietta Collier Chicora/Cherokee

Fannystein' Greene Chicora/Cherokee

Ms. June Mirecki College of Charleston

Mr. Joseph M. Land, Sr. Galileo Quality Institute

Ms. Susan K. Dunn Grassroots Coalition

Mr. Eartley Washington

Mr. Joseph Johnson

V.P. Simmons

Mr. Mac McNeil Bechtel

Ms. Diane Cutler EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall

Mr. Larry Bowers EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall

#### 4. Administrative Remarks and Comments on Minutes

Mr. Fontenot asked for comments on minutes from last meeting and for any other administrative remarks. None were offered.

#### 5. Subcommittee Reports

Mr. Fontenot reported on the Community Relations Subcommittee that met prior to the RAB meeting. In attendance with Mr. Fontenot was Mr. Arthur Pinckney, Ms. Wannetta Mallette, and Mr. Lou Mintz. Additional changes were made to the Chicora Tank Farm Fact Sheet which will be finalized shortly and should be distributed to the mailing list in July. Another topic of discussion was the Charleston RAB webpage. SouthDiv will be supporting the RAB by maintaining the webpage and providing the server. Information will include what is a RAB; history on the Charleston RAB; list of members; meeting minutes; fact sheets; and information on the speakers bureau, community relations plan, information repository, and who to contact for more information. Eventually a meeting schedule will be added. Although other RABs around the country have webpages, this will be the first RAB covered by Southern Division, and once established, others will be modeled after it. The next subcommittee meeting will be on August 12, 1997.

Mr. Pinckney informed the RAB that the Shipyard Detachment Subcommittee had scheduled a meeting but it was canceled due to the weather. He has some material that he will share at the August meeting regarding what the Detachment has been doing.

#### 6. Reuse Update

Ms. Jeri Johnson reported that there have been three meetings of the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) since the last time she presented material to the RAB.

May 1: The child care center was leased to the College of Charleston to run a model child development center out of the child care center. They anticipate about 112 children and are going to encourage tenants to use the center. The RDA also executed a license with the City of North

Charleston for the City's birthday celebration on June 13. Building 641 was leased to a Canadian environmental management group called Groupe Sani Mobile, Inc.

May 20: Agreed to lease to the City of North Charleston a small building and three finger piers for a joint law enforcement organization. RDA also leased a series of three of the large warehouses in the west end to Neal Brothers who packages/ships high tech equipment. Agreed to lease two buildings at the north end in the former DRMO area to Carolina Marine Handling.

June 10: Agreed to execute a construction contract to upfit the remaining floor in Building 400. Part of the lease with DHEC's Environmental Quality Control Trident office was that the RDA would upfit the space. The construction contract was approved and the low bidder was Installation Services of Goose Creek for roughly \$440,000. Construction should be complete in the middle of September. The authority also approved a \$580,000 utility study by Davis & Floyd which is funded half by the authority and half by the Dept. of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment. The utilities study will hopefully permit the eventual transfer of the water and sewer system. Part of the scope of the study is to do a base-wide stormwater management plan which has been mandated by DHEC before the authority can undertake any upgrades or repairs to the base drainage system. Finally, the Authority approved a reuse plan for the Naval Annex which is a Wilbur Smith contract. That plan envisions the annex parcel being developed for light industrial purposes. Now that the reuse plan is approved, the Navy can complete an environmental assessment and subsequent disposal of that property to the RDA.

Ms. Gussie Green added that there will be shuttle buses to the City of North Charleston birthday celebration on the 13<sup>th</sup>, and that 25% of the children slots for the model child development center will go to DSS recipients. Ms. Mallette provided additional event details.

Mr. Bobby Dearhart inquired about the shipping containers being stored on the base - he said he would hate to see one end of the base turning into a container storage area. Ms. Johnson said the RDA has been lax on making the tenants keep their containers within their leased areas, but needs to ensure that it happens.

Mr. Reubish inquired about subleases. Ms. Johnson reported that there have been a number of subleases, so many in fact, that she hasn't been mentioning them. On the sublease report (attached) the secondary subleases are the items that are indented. Mr. Reubish asked if there were any controls to keep tenants, who enter into subleases below market price, from making a lot of money on sub-subleases. Ms. Johnson stated that she hopes the tenants can make money on

their subleases, but they are not permitted to enter into any agreements without the RDA's and Navy's approval. She said there are no windfalls to any of the tenants because the RDA reviews all the agreements and leases so that they are not making undue profit.

## 7. Environmental Cleanup Progress Report

### *Status of Environmental Programs*

Mr. Tony Hunt provided the progress report. For the sake of those who have never been to a RAB meeting before, he explained that the base is divided into zones as depicted on the map provided, and within each zone are Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) and Areas of Concern (AOCs). The progress for each specific zone can be found in the handout entitled Naval Base Charleston RCRA Facility Investigation Progress Update.

Regarding funding, all of the awards have been made through the Corrective Measures Study. In May, the state completed their review of Zone C and submitted their comments to the Navy. Discussions to resolve outstanding issues with Zone H continued. One of the outstanding issues was determining what the contaminants of concern were at each site. Part of that includes comparing the value, say, for an inorganic to the risk-based-concentration, or background. If there is not a background level, then the comparison can not be made. The reason background is determined is because the soil contains minerals which have elements, and when sampling is done, those elements are detected. The Navy has to be able to differentiate between what is in the soil and what is a contaminant based on a release. Determining background is something that has to been done in every zone. In May, discussions regarding background were completed for Zones A, C and portions of E.

In June, the Navy will continue field work in Zones J (water bodies), K (SWMU 166), and L (where direct push technology (DPT) is being done on sewer systems and utilities). Also in June the Navy will continue discussions on background issues and document review.

Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU 166): SWMU 166 is an area in the Naval Station South Annex. To review, the Navy found a release of chlorinated solvents in that area. Groundwater sampling suggested that it was migrating toward the interstate. Geoprobe samples were taken to see if the chlorinated solvents had migrated under the highway. Mr. Hunt presented a map of sampling locations and the results at each location at three different depths; shallow, intermediate, and deep. Only one area at the shallow sampling depth had chlorinated solvents, and none was found at the deep level. Most of it was in the intermediate zone.

In onsite samples, the Navy found Trichlorethylene (TCE) and its degradation products. What was found in the offsite samples was tetrachlorethylene (PCE) and its degradation products. The Navy was expecting to see TCE and DCE (dichloroethylene) if it was from the release at SWMU 166 - not PCE. So what the Navy thinks they're seeing is migration from the SWMU 66 release co-mingled with a release from another source across the highway. This scenario makes it much more difficult to differentiate the extent of the Navy's contamination.

To further clarify, Mr. Hunt explained the PCE degrades into TCE which degrades into DCE which breaks down further into vinyl chloride and eventually into carbon dioxide. Generally you don't see this sequence in the opposite direction in the environment. The next step is to get a better understanding of the groundwater velocity and flow direction. This will be done through slug tests. A literature source will also be necessary to try to determine where the PCE might have come from. The Navy may also use groundwater modeling to help them locate the best possible location for installing monitoring wells on the other side of the highway.

Mr. Mintz asked if the heavy rains from a week ago will affected the groundwater monitoring. Mr. Hunt replied that the rainwater infiltration may affect the results of the upper aquifer, but not necessarily the intermediate area where the solvents were found. Someone asked how deep is the Cooper marl in that area, to which Mr. Hunt responded 35 to 45 feet.

Mr. Pinckney asked how the solvents will affect the drinking water in that area. Mr. Hunt stated that if a well was installed in the area of contamination, that it would not be advisable to drink the water. The Navy looked for wells but did not find any in the area. A production well was discovered through DHEC records, but it is south of the affected area which doesn't pose a concern. There would be a concern if someone had a well installed for irrigation purposes but were instead using it for drinking water.

Ms. Mallette asked if the Navy has heard anything about the Hess report regarding SWMU 39. Mr. Fontenot said that he's expecting it in the mail anytime now.

### *Chicora Tank Farm*

In past meetings it was brought to the attention of the Navy that an odor of gasoline or oil has been reported in the vicinity of the tank farm. Last week Mr. Hunt and a representative from EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall went out to the tank farm and sampled around the tank vents with a meter that detects volatile organic compounds. In two tanks, volatiles were detected outside the vents,

and in one in particular (tank O) there was a distinct odor. Tank O was used to house used oil, and currently there is more than just residue left in the tank. Ms. Green, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Mallette went to the site on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. What the Navy proposes is to put a charcoal filter on the vent of tank O to alleviate the odors until the tanks can be cleaned and properly closed.

Another issue that came out in the community relations subcommittee meeting is the fact that it seems to be taking forever to get a response regarding reuse of the Chicora tank farm. Mr. Fontenot asked if the RAB is interested in establishing a deadline in which a reuse decision should be made on Chicora. The subcommittee recommended using the date of August 1, 1997 as a deadline to receive a response on whether the interested entities are intending to use the tank farm. If no one is interested in using it, then the Navy can continue to move toward closure without undue waiting. This issue has been out since February or March, 1997. Mr. Fontenot was informed that the North Charleston City Council approved option #3 (partial demolition of the tanks) but did not say they wanted the property. If the RAB agrees on a deadline, Mr. Fontenot will bring the information to SouthDiv to inform them that the RAB wants to move ahead with this issue.

Mr. Carr stated that at the neighborhood meeting last week, every member said that they wanted the property used for a recreation park and informed the Mayor of their wishes. Mr. Fontenot commended them for taking steps on their own.

Mr. Fontenot asked if there were any RAB members against setting a deadline. Nobody was against it. Ms. Mallette recommended that a RAB representative address the issue at the next City Council meeting on June 26th. Mr. Mintz volunteered.

Ms. Ragan asked if the property would be provided as a public benefit conveyance. Ms. Johnson replied that if it were to be used as a park or for education it could be obtained for no cost. Ms. Ragan continued by asking if the city didn't want to use the property, could a neighborhood association or entity of local or state government use it? Ms. Johnson stated that a local government could but there are a number of strings attached and it could only be used for certain uses under the public benefit conveyance.

Mr. Pinckney asked that even though the odor will be eliminated from tank O through the carbon filter, are there any other fumes that may need to be addressed? Mr. Fontenot said that he will check into it with the air specialists at SouthDiv, but his understanding is that the amount of fumes resulting from petroleum tanks does not exceed any air standards or require further action.

Mr. Reubish asked that if nobody wants to use the land, what will the plan be? Mr. Fontenot answered that they will revert to Option 1 - fill the tanks with sand and leave them as is.

#### 8. Questions and Answers to Grass Roots Coalition Concerns

Mr. Fontenot handed out copies of questions from the Grass Roots Coalition that were originated in 1994. Mr. Fontenot recently updated those responses. Those with arrows next them have updated responses. Mr. Fontenot asked that everybody review the questions/answers at their leisure and if there are additional questions, or if anyone doesn't understand the answers, to come back with those questions at the next RAB.

Bobby Dearhart inquired about questions #3 regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). His understanding is that there is a new reuse plan that is being looked at; has a decision been made that the new reuse plan is not going to affect the EIS, or is there going to have to be a revision to the EIS. Mr. Fontenot clarified that what is being looked at is how to implement the reuse plan, not actually a new plan. Ms. Johnson added that it's probably about two months away from completion but it does not envision major revisions. This plan will be a major element in deciding how much the RDA will pay for the property.

#### 9. Remaining Questions and Comments

Mr. Fontenot asked if the RAB members are supplying information to the community, or getting input from the groups they support. Are the RAB members making the effort to share information with the community they represent? A few members said that they are. Mr. Fontenot asked if there is anything that can be done to help the members, especially the community representatives, get the word out. He re-emphasized the purpose of the RAB members is to act as liaison between their specific constituency and the Board. He asked that everybody solicit their groups and bring information back to the RAB.

Mr. Fontenot asked if the RAB is happy with the current meeting location. A discussion ensued, and the final decision was that meetings would continue to be held at the 2012 Success Street location.

A community member asked what will happen to the housing on base along Saint John Avenue. Ms. Johnson stated that almost all of the little brick houses have been leased to various social service agencies. For the historic houses, they are still awaiting the recommendation of the Fluor Daniels study about how to use those, but it will not be used for residential purposes.

A discussion ensued about the need for more information on what the RDA is doing. Mr. Fontenot suggested that Ms. Johnson can bring that back to the RDA and see what the board says about it.

Ms. Mallette asked where the RAB's EPA representative was today. Mr. Fontenot replied that he is on military duty for two weeks. She pointed out that Doyle Brittain never missed a meeting and requested that if Mr. Bassett was going to be absent again, that he send a replacement. Mr. Fontenot said he will share the RABs concern with Mr. Bassett.

Mr. Mintz asked what happened to the RAB newsletter that used to be produced? Ms. Johnson said that it was an RDA newsletter which was a product of the first RDA. The newsletter was discontinued when the first RDA was disbanded.

Mr. Pinckney offered the suggestion that the RAB community members write a letter to Doyle Brittain's supervisor about how well he worked with the RAB. Clarification was requested regarding the purpose of the letter, was it simply to express appreciation, or was it to ask for him back? Mr. Pinckney also noted that they have nothing bad to say about Jay Bassett, but that they just want to express their appreciation about how well Doyle worked with them. Mr. Pinckney and other interested RAB members will meet to draft the letter.

Mr. Fontenot said that Don Harbert and Bob Veronee called earlier to say they would not be able to attend today's RAB meeting.

**There will NOT be a meeting in July. The next meeting will be August 12, 1997 at 6:00 p.m. at the same location - Live Oak Community Center at 2012 Success Street.**

#### 10. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

