

CHARLESTON NAVAL COMPLEX
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
July 9, 2002, 5:30 PM
The Olde North Charleston Meeting Place
1077 East Montague Avenue
North Charleston, SC

RAB MEMBERS

Oliver Addison	
Bobby Dearhart	
Tom Fressilli	
Wilburn Gilliard	
Donald Harbert	Community Co-Chair
Tony Hunt	Navy Co-Chair
Lou Mintz	
Dann Spariosu	EPA
Jerry Stamps	DHEC

VISITORS

Rob Harrell	Navy SouthDiv
Robert Ryan	CNCRA
Jack Sprott	RDA
Paul Bergstrand	SC DHEC
Gil Rennhack	SC DHEC
Gary Foster	CH2M-Jones
Dean Williamson	CH2M-Jones
Kevin Tunstall	EEG
Keith Johns	EnSafe

Introduction and Administrative Remarks

Tony Hunt opened the meeting by having the RAB members and the audience introduce themselves. There were no comments on the minutes of the May RAB meeting. Mr. Hunt advised that this facility might not be available for the next RAB meeting, due to renovations. Everyone would be notified of the next location in sufficient time before the next meeting. The audience was informed to feel free to ask any questions during or after the meeting.

Subcommittee Reports

There was not a community relations subcommittee meeting this month.

Environmental Cleanup Progress Report

AOC 607 Interim Measure Status

Dean Williamson (CH2M-Jones) reported on the status of Interim Measures at AOC 607. The electrical heating system at the former dry cleaners has been running since October, about nine months, which is about twice as long as CH2M-Jones thought they would have to run it to be successful. The overall recovery of solvents from groundwater has been tapering off recently. However, they will continue to run the soil vapor recovery system for a while to make sure any vapors coming out of the groundwater will be collected.

Through this system, CH2M-Jones has collected approximately 230 pounds of solvents from the aquifer. Tests have been performed in the groundwater and results presented in chart form. Additional samples will be taken this week to see what the final post-treatment status is. The levels are not near the drinking water standard, but CH2M-Jones has accelerated the cleanup of this site by ten years or so, compared to traditional pump and treat technology.

Gary Foster (CH2M-Jones) stated that other cleanup activities for AOC 607 are scheduled for the next several years. This may include using a combination of technologies, including pump and treat. CH2M-Jones needs to complete the feasibility study first. Mr. Hunt added that there's still the possibility of some solvent being present in dense non-aqueous phase liquid form (DNAPL - undiluted) and in a dissolved phase, which is something that takes time to deal with.

Phase III Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and Environmental Baseline Survey for Transfer (EBST) Status

Mr. Foster displayed a map of property transfers in Phase I and Phase II. He pointed out the Phase I and II properties (fit to transfer), the Phase III unrestricted property and Phase III property that will have groundwater restrictions.

There are about 10 underground storage tank (UST) sites that have had some impact on the groundwater and are being monitored until CH2M-Jones completes their work. The Navy and South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) are in discussion on the wording of groundwater restrictions in deeds. Mr. Hunt added that in some of the areas to be transferred, there are unregulated underground heating oil tanks. The Navy will still assess them, remove them and, if there are any releases, conduct corrective action. Once the monitoring shows the constituents are below groundwater standards, then no further action will be needed.

For these areas the Navy is constructing interim agreements that says the Navy will do much of the same things they normally do (i.e., continue corrective action to completion). In the interim, the deeds will restrict the use of groundwater and give the Navy access to do monitoring on those sites. The final total for the areas awaiting transfer is about 283 acres. After Phase III, 850 acres will have been transferred.

Mr. Foster showed a chart of the industrial area, the southern half of the base. The green areas will be

transferred with basically no restrictions. The red areas will have water or use restrictions for industrial use as opposed to residential or unrestricted. The landfill will also have a use restriction. Mr. Foster clarified by saying that if someone wants to develop on top of the landfill, they will have to submit engineering drawings and prove the project's ability to sit on top of the landfill rather than cutting into it. There are monitoring wells on all of these sites.

CH2M-Jones is forecasting a December transfer for some sites in this area. Mr. Foster explained that there is more than one contaminant in the industrial area. Mr. Hunt added that, as part of any monitoring required on a long-term basis, it is done typically by whoever initiates the remedy. If it were the Navy, under a normal contract, the Navy would hire a contractor to do the monitoring once a remedy is in place. Under the present contract, CH2M-Jones will be doing the monitoring for a specified period of performance, which is 20 years. Once the period of performance is complete, the Navy will have to pick up that monitoring or it may be possible to close the site.

Mr. Hunt provided some information on land-use controls. He said enforcement of land use controls could be done in a number of different ways. At the Port of Oakland (California), someone purchased the property, developed it and took ownership of those use restriction liabilities. The new owners did the follow-up monitoring and site closure.

In Charleston, the Navy will place in the deeds and permits that they will conduct annual -- or whatever period is determined in the corrective measures implementation documents -- monitoring and reporting. The Navy has to do this as part of the remedy decision and CERCLA obligations during the five-year review process. The idea of a Brownfields agreement is getting subsequent property owners to agree that they'll use the property for industrial use and report to DHEC. This way the Navy will not be overseeing the new property owner's business.

Dann Spariosu (USEPA) responded to the question: What if somebody violates? He said the idea of land use restrictions in deeds is only about six or seven years old. As such, the EPA has not had a lot of time to determine the legal mechanism for dealing with someone who puts residential use in a deed instead of industrial use down the road.

Mr. Hunt added that proper zoning will help alleviate that concern and having building officials with the information about those properties. When issuing permits, building officials will have the ability to forewarn future landowners. The Navy will be required to do periodic reviews during the five-year review process.

Bobby Dearhart inquired about the RCRA sites having restrictions. Mr. Hunt said the land-based sites with unexploded ordnance have land use restrictions. Essentially they have "no dig" restrictions. The Navy has to be involved for building anything on that property, especially digging ten feet below ground surface.

The petroleum-contaminated area by the old Navy Hospital will probably have groundwater restrictions on it by the end of the year. The tank farm has been emptied and cleaned. Some of the transfer stations the Navy went back and addressed. Groundwater for Charleston is shallow, in most cases 20 feet. There are only two monitoring wells on the base that go below the Ashley formation

(the layer of rock that prevents shallow groundwater from migrating downward).

Update on Zone J/Stormwater Effluent Study/Ecological Risk Assessment

Rob Harrell (U.S. Navy, Southern Division) spoke about stormwater runoff samples in Zone J. The Navy has finished sampling Noisette Creek and Shipyard Creek. They have only completed 30 of the 56 samples for the Cooper River and have the 18 reference samples. The Navy's basic problem is drought. Without rain, they can't finish the sampling.

The Navy has started writing the effluent stormwater study for Noisette and Shipyard Creeks. Once that study is submitted, the Navy will start doing the screening levels for the environmental risk assessment for the river. He noted that they had considered advancing the study by inducing stormwater flow, but determined an induced study by flushing the drainage basins uses too much water to cover 60 acres and doesn't work well.

Mr. Harrell remarked that the most probable outcome of these studies is remediation of very specific areas. Part of the reason for the effluent study is to identify what sites are actually contributing contamination to the sediments and then address that pathway.

The Navy has agreed to separate areas of sediment contamination from land-based sites to expedite property transfers. In this way, the Navy will proceed with property transfers and address the sites that are contributing to the sediment contamination.

Reference samples were taken at the stormwater outfalls offsite. The samples include the sediment in the runoff, but not sediments from the creeks or river bottoms. Contamination in sediment in this area was mostly metals, including samples from sediment outside the dry docks. Contamination from the outfalls so far has typically been non-point source pollution, such as runoff from parking lots, and primarily contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs – petroleum by-products).

Testing of the river sediments does not go down to the marl because the Chief of Naval Operations needs to give permission. The CNO needs SouthDiv to demonstrate they're spending the money correctly on testing down to the marl. Geophysical surveys were taken at dredge depth of 32 feet and adjacent to the piers where unexploded ordnance was identified. The marl is much further down.

Recent Legislation Discussion

Jack Sprott (Redevelopment Authority, RDA) discussed new legislation: Senate bill S926. This new law mandates that the SC State Ports Authority look on the west bank of the Cooper River for suitable location. The law also removes any impediments on the Ports Authority for locating there; this primarily removed the Ports Authority from under the zoning authority of the City of North Charleston for the base.

However, the legislation authorized the City of North Charleston and the Ports Authority to decide how

the Navy base will be divided up; specifically what portion the RDA will transfer to the City of North Charleston. There really is no restriction as to where the dividing line can be.

Mr. Sprott explained that the RDA's job is to find developers for this property, not keeping the property for themselves. This legislation has not mandated that the Ports Authority has to take the property, merely to consider it. The RDA owns some of this property and leases it to tenants but would like to sell all of their property. By earlier law (Defense Base Closure and Realignment) the RDA is the only entity that can receive property from the Navy. The RDA will make sure land restrictions are in place and everything is recorded right before property transfer. The legislation says all leases have to be honored.

Mr. Sprott concluded by saying the RDA is going forward with a personal property inventory for the base, which will cost \$600,000. The real property appraisal process has been interrupted for now.

Agenda for Next Meeting

The next RAB meeting will include an update from Hess on their groundwater cleanup issues. On a final note, Mr. Hunt pointed out that Wannetta Mallette-Pratt has declined to be new community co-chair. Don Harbert will continue to be the community co-chair.

The next meeting date was set for Tuesday, September 10, 2002. The meeting location will be announced with distribution of meeting notices.

Meeting adjourned.