

NAVAL BASE CHARLESTON
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

Minutes of 14 January 1997

1. Introduction of the RAB Members and Guests

Ms. Wannetta Mallette introduced herself as the newly elected Community Co-Chair for 1997. She thanked her fellow members for electing her and said she's looking forward to an exciting year for the RAB as the corrective action process moves from the investigative stage into the corrective measures stage. Ms. Mallette noted that there were many new faces in the audience, and asked both the members and guests to introduce themselves. She reminded everyone that the RAB is an oversight group working with the Navy and environmental regulators on the environmental cleanup of the base and that the RAB community members represent the general public.

2. RAB Members Attending

Mr. Oliver Addison	Ms. Gussie Greene
Mr. Ray Anderson	Mr. Donald Harbert
Mr. Steve Best	Mr. Ralph Laney
Mr. Doyle Brittain	Ms. Wannetta Mallette
Mr. James Conner	Mr. Arthur Pinckney
Mr. Bobby Dearhart	Mr. Odell Price
Mr. Daryle Fontenot	Ms. Ann Ragan
Mr. Tom Fressilli	LDCR Paul Rose
Mr. Wilburn Gilliard	Ms. Priscilla Wendt

3. Guests Attending

Mr. Tony Hunt NAVFAC, SouthDiv	Mr. Joseph Johnson Community Member
Mr. Brian Stockmaster NAVFAC, SouthDiv	Ms. Myrtle Barnett Community Member
Mr. Gabriel Magwood NAVFAC, SouthDiv	Ms. Rosa Lee Benekin Community Member
Mr. Jay Bassett EPA Region 4	Ms. Pamela Williams Community Member
Mr. Paul M. Bergstrand SCDHEC	Mr. Leroy Carr Chicora/Cherokee
Mr. Rob Dunlap SCDNR	Mr. Anthony Joyner Chicora/Cherokee
Ms. June Mirecki College of Charleston	Mr. Ken Ayoub Chicora/Cherokee
Mr. J.B. Lawrence CEERD	Ms. Edith Askins N. Charleston Weed and Seed
Mr. Jack Amey Shipyard Detachment	Ms. Diane Cutler EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall
Mr. John Sulkowski E.T.C., Inc.	Mr. Dave Backus EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall
Ms. Donna Kopeski Galileo	Mr. Larry Bowers EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall
Ms. June M. Brittain Concerned Citizen	Ms. Sandy Reagan EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall
Ms. Bertha L. Singleton Community Member	Mr. Ron Severson EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall

4. Administrative Remarks and Comments on Minutes

Ms. Mallette asked for administrative remarks or comments on the minutes from the last meeting. No comments were made.

5. Subcommittee Reports

The Community Relations Subcommittee was scheduled to meet prior to the RAB meeting. Only Daryle Fontenot and Diane Cutler, the E/A&H resource person were in attendance. Since none of the community members attended, there are no new issues to report. The next meeting is scheduled for February 11, 1997 at 3:30 at Building NH-51 at the Naval Base. The Community Relations Subcommittee consists of 5 members including Mr. Fontenot.

6. Reuse Update

Nobody from the Redevelopment Authority was present to provide an update.

7. Environmental Cleanup Progress Report

Chicora Tank Farm Update

Mr. Fontenot reported that the Navy is currently awaiting feedback from the Redevelopment Authority and the City of North Charleston regarding who will be the user of the Chicora Tank Farm property. The RAB sent a letter to the Mayor stating that they were in favor of the partial demolition of the tanks. At the last meeting, a detailed presentation was given regarding the environmental investigations that have taken place at the Chicora Tank Farm. Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of that material should contact Mr. Fontenot. A discussion of those materials can also be found in last month's meeting minutes. Mr. Bobby Dearhart asked when the decision regarding the user of the tank farm will be made. Mr. Fontenot replied that it is up to the RDA and the City to meet and decide upon. Ms. Mallette added that she had hoped that the Chicora issue would be on the City Council's health and safety agenda for tonight, but it is not, so she does not know when it will be discussed and resolved. Mr. Fontenot also added that the Shipyard Detachment will be responsible for conducting the closure of the tanks.

Status of Environmental Programs

Mr. Fontenot provided an update on project status. Currently there are three Environmental Baseline Survey to Lease (EBSL)/Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) documents at Southern Division that are awaiting Commanding Officer signature. These documents, once signed, release the property for the Redevelopment Authority to lease. One of these documents includes 231 facilities. Once all three of the EBSLs/FOSLs are signed next week, there will be approximately 700 facilities available for reuse by the RDA.

The Naval Annex is currently awaiting a reuse plan from the RDA before the environmental assessment can be completed.

To date, the Navy has removed approximately 70 underground storage tanks at the shipyard and has about 12 more to go.

Building 32 asbestos remediation is in progress, and the Detachment is handling that work as well.

Mr. Fontenot introduced Mr. Tony Hunt with Southern Division to present the RCRA Corrective Action update. For the benefit of the first-time guests in the audience, Mr. Fontenot explained that the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) is the environmental law that regulates the cleanup of hazardous waste sites on the Naval Base property. Mr. Hunt began by explaining that the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) step of the RCRA Corrective Action process requires collecting water and soil samples on base to determine the extent of contamination.

For those tracking funding, Zone J (water bodies) will be awarded later this month, and the Zone L proposal is still being evaluated.

In December, the Navy held its 90% progress meeting for Zone D which is the area near the credit union. An agreement was reached that the field work in Zone D was complete and that preparation of the RFI report can begin. Progress meetings for Zones K, F, and G were held. Zone K is the non-contiguous areas, and Zones F and G are approximately in the middle of the base. A scoping meeting was held for the Comprehensive Corrective Measures Work Plan. Also, the Zones J and L Work Plans were approved by South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) on December 13th.

Mr. Hunt provided an update on Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 39. SWMUs are the sites that are being investigated at the Naval Base. A SWMU can be an area where wastes were at one time stored, and are suspected or show evidence of a release. SWMU 39 is an area that stored Petroleum, Oils, and Lubricants (POLs) in the DRMO area near the Virginia Avenue gate. Mr. Hunt showed a map of the area and explained that water samples were collected to determine if there were any releases. The Navy found some chlorinated solvents that they looked at further, and some petroleum products. Then, in order to see if the material was moving off-base, screening samples were collected outside the Navy base property using a cone penetrometer. The Navy did not find any chlorinated solvents in the neighborhood.

However, they did find some TCE in a well on Crawford Street, but after comparing the findings to what was found on base and groundwater flow direction, the Navy does not think the TCE in the Crawford Street well is coming from the Navy Base. Since then, the Navy installed two more wells to further investigate if the TCE was coming from the Base. Those wells were installed last week and the Navy hopes to have results available by the next RAB meeting.

In addition, Hess (the adjacent property owner) is working with SCDHEC to investigate if the petroleum contamination found originated from the Hess facility.

The Zone B RFI report has been approved. The Navy hopes to resolve comments on the Zone H RFI report in January. Zone H is the first Zone scheduled for the Corrective Measures Study. Also in January, the Navy expects to submit the Draft Comprehensive Corrective Measures Study (CMS) Work Plan to the Project Team for review. The Navy will be moving into the Corrective Measures process very soon and will be looking for community input.

Mr. Jim Conner asked how deep the wells are. Mr. Hunt answered that the Hess Well is about 45 feet deep and the wells that were just installed last week are 55 feet deep. Shallow wells have also been installed.

A guest from the audience asked what type of substance was maintained in the Hess tanks. Mr. Hunt replied that the tanks contain a fuel that is chemically similar to diesel. The same guest continued by asking what the purpose was for the wells. Mr. Hunt stated that the Navy's wells were installed to detect if contamination was moving offsite (from the base) or on-site (onto the base), and as it turned out, it looks as if it is moving onsite.

Mr. Arthur Pinckney asked for clarification on Mr. Hunt's earlier statement that the contamination found off base was not from the Navy. Mr. Hunt reiterated that TCE was found in an offsite well, yet the Navy had TCE and degradation compounds. Also, based on the shallow groundwater flow direction which flows from north to south, if a release occurred on the Navy property, the contamination flow would head toward Noisette Creek. Based on the information that the Navy has, they do not see a connection between the release at SWMU 39 and the TCE found in the well on Crawford Street. The next step is to collect data from the two newest well locations and write a letter to SCDHEC suggesting that there may be another potential source of contamination that is not on the Navy base.

Ms. Mallette asked if Hess is also installing wells. Mr. Hunt replied that Hess is conducting investigations and working closely with SCDHEC.

Mr. Pinckney asked that if Hess did find a leak, would they have to involve the community. Mr. Fontenot stated that right now all their testing is taking place on their own property.

Corrective Measures Study

Mr. Fontenot introduced Mr. Larry Bowers with EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall as the speaker for the Corrective Measures Study (CMS) presentation. The presentation is considered a training session for the community members so they understand the CMS process. This is the point in the environmental investigation where the RAB and community members will provide their input to the Navy regarding cleanup decisions.

Mr. Bowers began by stating that the goal of his presentation is to present an overview of the CMS process. At the end of the presentation will be a short exercise lead by Ms. Ann Ragan from SCDHEC that will request input from the RAB and community.

Mr. Bowers began his presentation by reviewing the four main steps of the RCRA Corrective Action Process:

Step 1 RCRA Facility Assessment (RFA) -Historical study looking at buildings and property and determining past use. Non-invasive study (no sampling or digging - it is primarily research).

Step 2 RCRA Facility Assessment (RFI) -This is the step that has been underway for a couple of years and is still ongoing today. Sampling and analysis takes place to define the extent of contamination on the property.

Step 3 Corrective Measures Study (CMS)-The step the Navy is just getting into which evaluates the different cleanup alternatives.

Step 4 Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) - The actual remedial design and cleanup.

The CMS is a study that is used to determine and rank potential remedial alternatives at a site. The CMS is **not** intended to select or choose the final cleanup (remember, it is only supposed to **rank** the different alternatives). The CMS does not suggest that cleanup is required for each site. For example, one of the remedial alternatives might be "no further action." Also, the CMS is not the actual cleanup step. Cleanup takes place during the CMI.

There are three main components of a CMS:

1. - Identify potential remedial alternatives
2. - Screen potential remedial alternatives

3. - Evaluate or rank potential remedial alternatives

Identifying potential remedial alternatives is like brainstorming. It takes professional experience to know what kind of contaminants are out there and what works to clean them up. The next step is screening the potential remedial alternatives. Screening actually eliminates some of the options. For example, options can be eliminated because of the characteristics of a site or the waste at a site, or because a certain technology isn't reliable.

The third step is to rank the potential remedial alternatives. To do this, certain criteria must be evaluated. There are nine criteria, four are considered "primary" and must be met. The five remaining criteria are called "secondary."

Mr. Bowers showed an example of a table used to evaluate the different options. He explained that alternatives will be ranked by site, or group of sites. The Navy and environmental regulators will be asking the community for their input on the importance of the evaluation criteria so it can be factored into this process and used to rank the best cleanup option(s). Using this table is a way to put objective measurements into the process.

After the alternatives are ranked, a public comment period will be provided and a public meeting will be held to discuss the alternatives.

In preparation for Ms. Ragan's exercise, Mr. Bowers provided an explanation of each of the criteria:

Primary Criteria - must be met

Protect Human Health and the Environment - Cleanup may not be necessary to meet this criteria. For example, if contaminated drinking water was the problem at a particular site, providing residents with fresh drinking water from another source may be a viable solution.

Attain Cleanup Standards - State and/or federal regulations or risk factors require that contaminants be cleaned up to a level that is considered acceptable.

Control Source of Release - Remove or control the source of contamination.

Comply With Applicable Standards - The technology that is selected must meet applicable standards.

Secondary Criteria

Long-term Reliability and Effectiveness - Some treatment systems run for many years. Their long-term reliability and effectiveness must be considered.

Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume - Although it seems like you would always want to meet this criteria, it is not always the best choice. For example, in the case of unexploded ordnance (UXO), it may be more risky to search, unearth, and decommission the UXO than to let it stay where it is.

Short-term Effectiveness - Most of the time, short-term effectiveness comes into play in a highly populated area where contamination may cause a high risk among residents or workers. It would be used to quickly reduce risk.

Implementability - How easy is it to implement the specific technology?

Cost - Considerations may include how much it will cost, and how much is in the budget for cleanup.

Ms. Priscilla Wendt asked if implementability includes technical feasibility? Mr. Bowers replied that if an alternative was not technically feasible, it would be screened out in the screening process.

Ms. Ragan lead an exercise to collect RAB and community member input. She hung up nine pieces of poster paper at the back of the room, each with one of the nine evaluation criteria written on it. Then she handed out seven star stickers to each RAB and community member. Each member was instructed that they should use each star as one vote to choose the criteria most important to them. All seven stars could be placed on one criteria, or one on each of seven, or any combination in between. Ms. Ragan said that after everybody has had the opportunity to stick their stars on the nine criteria posters, she will take the posters back to her office, tally up the results, and be ready to discuss them at the next RAB meeting in February.

After the exercise, a quick review revealed that the big winner among the nine criteria was protecting human health and the environment.

Follow-up Questions for North Charleston Council members regarding Chicora

Ms. Mallette asked Mr. Ray Anderson if he had any updates from the North Charleston City Council meeting regarding the Chicora Tank Farm issue. Mr. Anderson said that the Mayor had received the letter from the RAB stating their choice in closure options. Right now the City is looking at other park and recreational areas and considering those in their decisions about the Chicora property. No decisions have been made yet.

CORRECTION PAGE FOR THE 14 JAN 97 RAB MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Fontenot added for clarification that the RAB supports partial demolition as the closure method for the tanks.

Mr. Jim Conner asked what will be done with the pipelines under the Chicora tank farm. Mr. Fontenot answered that they will be drained, cleaned, and grouted from both ends (meaning that they will be filled with an inert solid).

Ms. Greene asked if partial demolition is the final decision. Mr. Fontenot verified that it is not, because a decision can't be made about closure until a decision is made about reuse. **The Navy is currently ready to proceed with Options 1 or 3 for the closure of Chicora Tank Farm.**

A question was asked that although Chicora Tank farm was recommended for no further action, it is located in Zone G, which will go through a Corrective Measures Study, so will Chicora be required to undergo a CMS? Mr. Fontenot replied that Chicora Tank Farm was not part of the RCRA Corrective Action process so it will not undergo the CMS. Ms. Ragan added that Chicora was investigated under a different regulatory program.

Ms. Greene asked members of the audience who live in close proximity to the Tank Farm to share their concerns about it. One gentleman was concerned about oil and gas contamination. Mr. Fontenot explained that environmental investigations were completed and **no contamination was found** that would require cleanup. SCDHEC supports that finding.

One guest asked what is in the tanks. Mr. Fontenot responded that all the tanks are empty with the exception of one that has some used oil in it. None of the tanks are in use. Another guest was concerned that the pipes have corroded over time and leaked oil. Again, Mr. Fontenot emphasized that environmental investigation have been completed and that **no contamination was found** that would require any cleanup.

One woman reported that she smells a strong odor of gas when she walks by the Tank Farm. Neither DHEC or the Navy knew where the odor was coming from.

Another guest asked who performed the environmental investigation at the Tank Farm. Mr. Fontenot answered that the study was completed in 1994 by an environmental contractor that was hired by the Navy. The investigation was required by and overseen by DHEC. After the study was completed, the Navy went through a year of quarterly monitoring to see if there were any releases to groundwater or soil. A copy of the report that details all the finding can be reviewed at the Dorchester Road branch of the Charleston Regional Library. Also, Mr. Fontenot has copies of the presentation that was given on the Chicora Tank Farm environmental investigation at the December RAB, and minutes from that meeting also discuss the issues that were addressed.

Mr. Pinckney asked if it would be possible to bring someone in to talk to the RAB and the community about environmental justice issues. Mr. Fontenot replied that he will talk to his Public Affairs Officer at Southern Division to see if they can arrange for it.

Another guest asked what will the demolished tanks be filled with, what will happen if the fill material settles and creates holes in the ground, and who will be responsible for it if it happens.

Mr. Fontenot answered that the tanks will be abandoned by caving the tanks in on themselves and then adding surrounding soil and a clay or man-made cap that will reduce permeability and keep water from seeping through it. The site will be graded to make sure it drains adequately.

A woman from the audience asked if there were any other similar cases to this. Mr. Fontenot said that he knows of solid waste landfills being capped and turned into recreational facilities (Mt. Trashmore in Virginia) but can't think of any other Navy sites.

Mr. Fontenot reiterated that environmental issues have been investigated and no contamination was found in either soil or water that would require any cleanup. The current issue at Chicora is the closure of the tanks - how to close them so the property can be reused.

8. Introduction of the New EPA Representative

Mr. Doyle Brittain introduced Mr. Jay Bassett who will be replacing Mr. Brittain as the EPA representative of the Charleston RAB. This will be Mr. Brittain's last meeting and he shared that he has enjoyed working with the RAB. He said he feels that a lot of progress has been made at Naval Base Charleston and in fact next month, one of the agenda items will include a discussion of the progress that has been made over the last few years. Mr. Bassett is very experienced in this process and will not require a training period. However, Mr. Brittain suggested that the RAB help Mr. Bassett by informing him about their specific concerns. Mr. Brittain thanked the RAB and added that he has enjoyed the opportunity of working with them.

On behalf of the entire RAB, Ms. Mallette welcomed Mr. Bassett and thanked Mr. Brittain for all his support and service which was met with a round of applause.

Ms. Ragan stated that DHEC is having a plaque made for Mr. Brittain because he has vested so much personally and professionally in this project. On behalf of DHEC and South Carolina Ms. Ragan thanked Mr. Brittain and wished him well.

9. Remaining Questions and Comments

One gentleman in the audience asked how he could be informed of upcoming meetings. Mr. Fontenot asked him and anyone else who is interested to provide their name and address at the back table and they will be added to the mailing list.

Ms. Mallette asked for a show of hands from RAB members if they felt the current location is a good place for upcoming meetings.

10. Adjournment

Ms. Mallette thanked the community members for coming out to the meeting, and said that it was one of the largest turnouts for community members in a long time.

Summary of Action Item

Ms. Ragan will evaluate the results of the CMS exercise and report back to the RAB at the February meeting.

Mr. Fontenot will look into having a speaker on Environmental Justice.

Attachments to Minutes

- (1) Tuesday January 14, 1996 RAB Meeting Agenda
- (2) RFI Progress Report for December 1996
- (3) Presentation - "Overview of the Corrective Measures Study"

Minutes recorded by: Diane Cutler, EnSafe/Allen&Hoshall