



FINAL DECISION DOCUMENT
LANDFILL AREA 2
FORMER LEE FIELD NAVAL AIR STATION
GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FLORIDA
FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITE PROPERTY NUMBER: I04FL0085_04

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jacksonville District
701 San Marco Boulevard
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

March 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Decision Document is being presented by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to describe the Department of Defense selected alternative for the Landfill Area 2 Site within the former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Formerly Used Defense Site Project Number I04FL0085_04 located in Green Cove Springs, Florida.

The Secretary of Defense designated the Army as the Executive Agent for Formerly Used Defense Sites, regardless of which Department of Defense component previously owned or used the property. The Secretary of the Army further delegated the program management and execution responsibility for Formerly Used Defense Sites to the Corps. The Corps is the lead agency for investigating, reporting, evaluating remedial actions, and implementing remedial actions at the former Lee Field Naval Air Station.

On the basis of the data collected during the remedial investigation efforts conducted at Landfill Area 2, there is no contamination related to the military's use of the site that would pose a threat to human health and the environment. The investigations found no evidence the site was used by the military as a landfill or other indications of subsurface disposal. Therefore, no action is necessary for the Landfill Area 2 Formerly Used Defense Site project to protect human health and the environment.

A No Action determination was selected in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S. Code § 9601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 300 *et seq.*, as amended .

The state regulatory agency, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, supports taking no action for Landfill Area 2.

Based on information currently available, the selected alternative is protective of human health and the environment and satisfies the statutory requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act §121(b).

The estimated cost for this decision for Landfill Area 2 is \$0.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1:	DECLARATION.....	1
1.	SITE NAME AND LOCATION.....	1
2.	STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE.....	1
3.	DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVE	1
4.	AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE	1
PART 2:	DECISION SUMMARY	3
1.	PROJECT NAME, LOCATION, AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION.....	3
2.	PROJECT HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	3
2.1	PROJECT HISTORY.....	3
2.2	PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS.....	4
2.3	CERCLA ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	4
3.	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	4
4.	SCOPE AND ROLE OF RESPONSE ACTION.....	5
5.	PROJECT SITE CHARACTERISTICS	5
5.1	SITE OVERVIEW	5
5.2	SUMMARY OF SITE CONTAMINATION.....	6
5.3	CHEMICALS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN	7
6.	CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE LAND AND WATER USES	8
6.1	LAND USES.....	8
6.2	GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER USE	8
7.	SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS	8
7.1	HUMAN HEALTH RISK SUMMARY	8
7.2	ECOLOGICAL RISK SUMMARY	9
8.	SELECTED ALTERNATIVE.....	10
8.1	SUMMARY AND DESCRIPTION.....	10
8.2	COST ESTIMATE	10
8.3	ESTIMATED OUTCOMES	10
9.	DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES.....	10
10.	REFERENCES.....	11
PART 3:	RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY.....	13
1.	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND LEAD AGENCY RESPONSES.....	13
1.1	FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMENTS	13
1.2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	13
2.	TECHNICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES	13

ATTACHMENTS

Figure 1 - Project Location

Figure 2 - Landfill Area 2

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Corps	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FUDS	Formerly Used Defense Sites
GCTL	groundwater cleanup target level
Lee Field	former Lee Field Naval Air Station
SCTL	soil cleanup target level

PART 1: DECLARATION

1. SITE NAME AND LOCATION

Site Name: Former Lee Field Naval Air Station. Landfill Area 2
Formerly Used Defense Site Property Number: I04FL0085_04
Federal Facility Identifier: FL9799F4368

The former Lee Field Naval Air Station occupies approximately 1,560 acres along the St. Johns River in Clay County, Florida, within the City of Green Cove Springs. State Road 16 runs through the northern part of the property and U.S. Highway 17 borders the property to the west. The Landfill Area 2 site encompasses approximately 7.5 acres of land at the western edge of the former Lee Field Naval Air Station.

2. STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE

This Decision Document presents the Selected Alternative for the Site. The Selected Alternative was chosen in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S. Code § 9601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan. This decision is based on the Remedial Investigations and Proposed Plan for this site.

The state regulatory agency, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection concurs with the Selected Alternative.

3. DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

The investigations found no evidence that the site had been used by the military as a landfill or other indications of subsurface disposal. The human health and ecological risk assessments identified no unacceptable risks to human health or the environment. As the lead agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) determined that no action is necessary to protect public health or the environment. A No Action determination is the appropriate selected alternative for Landfill Area 2.

4. AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE

This Decision Document presents the No Action determination for Landfill Area 2 at the former Lee Field Naval Air Station in Green Cove Springs, Florida. The Corps is the lead agency for the former Lee Field Naval Air Station Formerly Used Defense Site and developed this Decision Document in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan. This Decision Document will be incorporated

into the existing Administrative Record File for the former Lee Field Naval Air Station, which is available for public review at the Clay County Public Library, 403 Ferris Street, Green Cove Springs, Florida. Addition of this Decision Document completes the Administrative Record for Landfill Area 2. The Administrative Record is protected from additional documents being added. This document, presenting the basis for the No Action determination, is approved by the undersigned, pursuant to Memorandum, OAIM-ZA, September 9, 2003, subject: Policies for Staffing and Approving Decision Documents, and to Engineer Regulation 200-3-1, *Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Program Policy*.

APPROVED:

ALVIN B. LEE, SES
Director of Programs

Date
20 March 2017

PART 2: DECISION SUMMARY

1. PROJECT NAME, LOCATION, AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION

The former Lee Field Naval Air Station (Lee Field) occupies approximately 1,560 acres along the St. Johns River in Clay County, Florida, within the City of Green Cove Springs. State Road 16 runs through the northern part of the property and U.S. Highway 17 borders the property to the west. The Landfill Area 2 site encompasses approximately 7.5 acres of land at the western edge of the former Lee Field. Figure 1 presents a site map of the former Lee Field and shows the Landfill Area 2 boundary. The project site, which is located in an industrial park, is heavily wooded with trees and undergrowth. The only cleared areas are along an east-west dirt access road; an unpaved north-south-trending path that parallels the east side of the eastern boundary swale; the western edge of the landfill adjacent to an industrial facility; and an east-west dirt path that cuts through the middle of the landfill, connecting the east-west access road with the western edge of the landfill (Figure 2). There are no buildings or other permanent structures situated within the boundaries of the project site.

2. PROJECT HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

2.1 PROJECT HISTORY

The area known as Lee Field was initially developed by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) in 1940 and was used as a pilot training base during World War II. The installation contained extensive docking facilities with access to the St. Johns River, a railroad system, multiple aircraft runways, and supporting structures. Following the war, the facility was used as a Naval Station to mothball shallow-draft fleet ships. In 1963, the ownership of Lee Field was transferred from the DoD to the City of Green Cove Springs. In 1965, the City of Green Cove Springs sold the property to J. Louis Reynolds. Mr. Reynolds began developing Lee Field into an industrial park property (Reynolds Industrial Park), and site development has continued. In 1981, Mr. Reynolds transferred the property to Clay County Port, Inc., a corporation that continues to do business as Reynolds Industrial Park.

A review of historical aerial photographs indicated the earliest activity in the vicinity of Landfill Area 2 on an aerial photograph dated April 4, 1942. Various features including a fence line, the eastern drainage swale, and the former east-west access road appeared from 1942 to 1945. The first observed activity within the Landfill Area 2 site is shown on the January 23, 1947 aerial photograph. In this photograph, the ground surface in a portion along the eastern edge of Landfill Area 2 appears to have been disturbed or cleared of vegetation. The period of most activity at the site, based on the aerial photographs, occurred from 1947 to 1958. Various disturbances or ground-clearing activities were noted during this time. Storage of abundant equipment and/or materials was noted on the 1958 aerial photograph. Post-DoD activities were documented at the landfill area from approximately 1982 through 1990 using aerial photographs. These activities included clearing of vegetation, shifting of the former east-west access road to the north, and disturbance of the soil in the southern half of the

site. Evidence indicating that the area was used as a landfill was not observed on any of the aerial photographs reviewed.

2.2 PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

To evaluate the nature and extent of potential contamination associated with the use of Landfill Area 2 by the DoD, several preliminary environmental studies investigations were conducted by the Corps and others. These preliminary environmental studies included the installation of two groundwater monitoring wells (USACE, 1986), the collection of two composite subsurface soil samples, the collection of groundwater samples from the two previously installed wells (Environmental Science and Engineering, 1988), and their subsequent resampling (Dames & Moore, 1992). Although several metals were detected in the soil samples, these were thought to be naturally occurring and not from a contaminant source (Southern Chemists Laboratories, 1993). The concentrations of the metals lead and chromium detected in the groundwater samples did not exceed Florida Groundwater Guidance Concentrations in place at the time. In 1998, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency oversaw an expanded site investigation of several suspected waste disposal sites at the former Lee Field, including Landfill Area 2. One surface and one subsurface soil sample were collected and analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, metals, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls. Several metals were detected in the soil samples; however, their concentrations did not exceed Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Soil Cleanup Target Levels (SCTL) in place at the time (Black & Veatch, 2000). SCTLs are default, risk-based cleanup goals based on direct human contact (i.e., direct exposure) and on soil acting as a source of groundwater or surface water contamination (i.e., leachability). The approach used by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) for calculating SCTLs is based on USEPA Soil Screening Guidance documents (1996a, 1996b). In a baseline human health risk assessment, they are applied in the COPC screening step, as described in FDEP (2005), similarly to RSLs.

2.3 CERCLA ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

There have been no Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act - related enforcement activities at this project site.

3. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, DoD, and U.S. Army regulations, the Corps has kept the local community involved throughout the environmental investigation process of Landfill Area 2. Community involvement was facilitated through public notices and meetings, which allowed members of the community to provide comments and recommendations during the site characterization and alternative selection process.

Prior to the Remedial Investigation, Administrative Record files were established at the Corps Jacksonville District Office and at the Clay County Public Library, which currently contains the

Landfill Area 2 Community Relations Plan, Remedial Investigation Work Plan, Remedial Investigation Report, and Proposed Plan.

Representatives from the FDEP have participated in the environmental investigation process through Technical Project Planning meetings, and reviewing and commenting on project plans and reports.

The Final Supplemental Remedial Investigation Report (Shaw and Terranear, 2012) for Landfill Area 2 was made available to the public at the Clay County Public Library on June 14, 2013. The Proposed Plan was made available to the public on January 26, 2016. A public meeting was held on January 28, 2016 at the Green Cove Springs Police Department Community Room to present the results and recommendations and to solicit public comment. At this meeting, representatives from the Corps were available to answer questions about the preferred alternative. No questions were asked during the public meeting. A public comment period for the Proposed Plan was held from January 28 to February 29, 2016. No comments were received from the public during the comment period.

4. SCOPE AND ROLE OF RESPONSE ACTION

Based on the findings of the Remedial Investigation, the Supplemental Remedial Investigation and subsequent groundwater sampling events, the second Supplemental Remedial Investigation, and FDEP concurrence with No Action (FDEP, 2014), there is no action necessary to protect public health or the environment and a No Action determination response is appropriate for Landfill Area 2.

5. PROJECT SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The project site encompasses approximately 7.5 acres and was identified during the 1987 confirmation study as a former DoD related facility (Environmental Science and Engineering, 1988). The 1953 facilities map identifies this as the location of a Public Works storage area. A review of historical aerial photos suggested the presence of what would typically look like a public works storage yard, but no visual evidence that suggested landfilling activity by DoD was observed. By the late 1960s, the site appeared unused with scattered tree growth. No activity was observed post-DoD ownership that would suggest landfilling activities occurred at the site.

5.1 SITE OVERVIEW

The project site is heavily wooded with trees and undergrowth; few cleared areas are present. Potential human receptors under future land use scenarios include: groundskeeper (soil and groundwater), construction worker (soil), trespasser (soil), and hypothetical child/adult resident (soil and groundwater). Ecological receptors are also considered present within the project site including sensitive and endangered species. Listed species likely to inhabit the area include the eastern indigo snake (federally threatened) and the gopher tortoise (state endangered).

5.2 SUMMARY OF SITE CONTAMINATION

A Remedial Investigation was conducted at the Landfill Area 2 site from September 2000 to October 2002 (Shaw, 2004a). The objectives of the Remedial Investigation included identification of the approximate Landfill Area 2 boundary and determination of the presence and nature of contamination in groundwater, surface soils, and subsurface soils in the vicinity of Landfill Area 2. The activities completed in support of these objectives included historical aerial photograph review, test pit excavation, monitoring well installation, surface and subsurface soil sampling, and the collection of groundwater samples.

Review of the historical aerial photographs did not indicate use of the area as a landfill by DoD. To confirm this finding, twenty test pits were excavated beginning at the site boundary and continuing inward. Shallow debris, including steel cable and a metal container lid, were found in two of the test pits. No other debris or wastes were encountered in any of the remaining test pits.

Twenty surface soil samples were collected along with eight subsurface soil samples and analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons, and target analyte list metals. Four of the surface and two of the subsurface soil samples were also analyzed for polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. The results of these analyses indicated that arsenic, benzo(a)pyrene, and iron were present in four of the surface soil samples at concentrations greater than Florida SCTLs. Bromomethane and total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons were present at concentrations greater than the SCTL in one subsurface soil sample.

Six new groundwater monitoring wells were installed and sampled along with the two existing wells. All of the samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, target analyte list metals, total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls. Two of the samples were also analyzed for polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. The results of these analyses indicated the presence of acetone, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, di-n-octyl phthalate, and total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons. Of these compounds, only bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate exceeded the FDEP Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels (GCTL). GCTLs are default groundwater cleanup goals based on health considerations and aesthetic factors. GCTLs based on the protection of human health are calculated using a lifetime excess cancer risk of one in a million (1×10^{-6}), or using a hazard quotient of one (1.0) (FDEP, 2005). Metals such as iron, aluminum, manganese, sodium, and thallium were also present at concentrations exceeding GCTLs. A combined statistical and geochemical evaluation of the groundwater data, however, indicated that the concentrations of these metals were likely naturally occurring.

The Remedial Investigation results suggested that although various amounts of debris were noted over the land surface of this site, no indications of subsurface disposal had been identified.

Based on FDEP comments, supplemental Remedial Investigation activities were conducted in November 2004 to further determine the presence and nature of potential contaminants detected in groundwater, surface soil, and subsurface soil. Sixteen soil samples were collected from eight locations and analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons, and target analyte list metals. The analytical results from these samples indicated that arsenic was the only target analyte list metal exceeding the SCTL. Total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons were also detected above the SCTL in one soil sample. Volatile organic compounds and semivolatile organic compounds were not detected at concentrations greater than SCTLs in any of the samples. Two additional groundwater monitoring wells were also installed at this time. Groundwater samples were collected from the eight existing monitoring wells and two newly installed monitoring wells in both January 2005 and July 2005 and analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, and target analyte list metals. The analytical results indicated that aluminum, iron, lead, manganese, thallium, and vanadium were present at concentrations greater than GCTLs. With the exception of a single detection of lead; however, these concentrations were found to be naturally occurring and unrelated to DoD site activities. No other metals, volatile organic compounds, or semivolatile organic compounds were detected above the GCTLs at this time (Shaw, 2005a and Shaw, 2005b).

Remedial Investigation activities at the Landfill Area 2 site concluded in 2011 with additional test pit excavations, subsurface soil sampling, and the sampling of all ten groundwater monitoring wells. Soil samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons, and target analyte list metals. The groundwater samples were also analyzed for anions, alkalinity, total suspended solids, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls. The test pit excavations encountered no buried debris that would indicate that the area had been used as a landfill. Soil analytical results indicated that arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene were present at concentrations greater than residential SCTLs in two soil boring locations in the northwestern section of the site. Total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons were detected in samples collected from three wells, but at concentrations below the GCTL. No other volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, pesticides, or polychlorinated biphenyls were detected in the groundwater samples. Iron, aluminum, and manganese were detected at concentrations exceeding their respective GCTLs; however, the results of the former Lee Field background study (Shaw, 2004b) indicated that metals detected in all environmental media are likely associated with naturally occurring concentrations of these analytes as part of the mineral matrix of site soils and sediments.

5.3 CHEMICALS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN

The Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment performed during the 2004 Remedial Investigation included an initial screening step to identify chemicals of potential concern. This screening step included a comparison to risk-based screening levels and, for metals, a comparison to site-specific background soil or groundwater concentrations. The soil risk-based screening levels were derived from the SCTLs assuming a hazard quotient of 0.1 and an incremental lifetime cancer risk of 1×10^{-6} .

The groundwater risk-based screening levels were similarly derived from the GCTLs. Benzo(a)pyrene is the only chemical of potential concern identified in the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment for Landfill Area 2 soil. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate and acetone are the only chemicals of potential concern identified for groundwater.

6. CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE LAND AND WATER USES

6.1 LAND USES

The project site is privately owned and zoned heavy industrial; no buildings are situated within the boundaries of Landfill Area 2. The future land use for this area is expected to remain unchanged.

6.2 GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER USE

There are no surface water bodies or known water wells (drinking, irrigation, etc.) within the boundaries of the project site.

7. SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS

A Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment and screening-level ecological risk assessment were performed as part of the 2004 Remedial Investigation to evaluate potential human health risks and ecological risks associated with exposure to Landfill Area 2 environmental media.

7.1 HUMAN HEALTH RISK SUMMARY

Exposure scenarios were developed for the following receptors under future land use scenarios: groundskeeper (soil and groundwater), construction worker (soil), trespasser (soil), and hypothetical child/adult resident (soil and groundwater). The likelihood of future residential use is negligible, but the evaluation of residential land use has been requested by the State of Florida unless an institutional control that prohibits residential land use is in place, but it is usually evaluated anyway to fulfill the DODM 4715.20 requirement to analyze an Unlimited Use and Unrestricted Exposure (UU/UE) alternative. Incremental lifetime cancer risk and noncancer hazard values were calculated separately for each receptor scenario. The incremental lifetime cancer risk is an estimate of the excess risk posed by exposure to the specific carcinogen source in question (e.g., contaminant(s) in site environmental media). The incremental lifetime cancer risk is the risk that an individual exposed to a specific source(s) will develop cancer, beyond the cancer risk that would be expected for an individual who is not exposed to the sources(s). The average lifetime cancer risk for the U.S. population is estimated at approximately 40 percent (American Cancer Society, 2016). The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan states that acceptable exposure levels are generally concentrations that represent an excess upper bound lifetime cancer risk, or incremental lifetime cancer risk, to an exposed individual of between 1×10^{-6} (1 in 1,000,000) and 1×10^{-4} (1 in 10,000). The FDEP uses an incremental lifetime cancer risk goal of 1×10^{-6} . For the sake of illustration, if it were assumed that an individual had exactly a 40 percent chance (400,000 in 1,000,000) of developing cancer at some point in his life without a specific exposure, an additional

exposure at an incremental lifetime cancer risk of 1×10^{-6} would result in an overall lifetime cancer risk of 400,001 in 1,000,000 for that individual.

The potential for noncancer effects is evaluated by comparing the hazard index of an exposed individual in one of the evaluated exposure scenarios to a value of 1. A hazard index value greater than 1 indicates a possible concern for potential adverse health effects; a hazard index value equal to or less than 1 indicates that adverse health effects are unlikely.

For Landfill Area 2, the hazard index values for all receptors were less than 1, with the child resident having the highest value (hazard index=0.2). This indicates that no adverse human health effects are likely for any exposed individuals.

The highest incremental lifetime cancer risk value was for the hypothetical child/adult resident, at 6×10^{-6} . This value is well within the target risk range of 1×10^{-6} to 1×10^{-4} . The incremental lifetime cancer risk values for the other three receptors were 1×10^{-6} or less; human health risks less than 1×10^{-6} are identified in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan 40 CFR § 300.430(e)(2)(i)(A)(2) as de minimis (i.e., negligible). The incremental lifetime cancer risk for the hypothetical child/adult resident was entirely associated with benzo(a)pyrene in soil and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate in groundwater.

Benzo(a)pyrene was detected in only two of the surface soil samples, only one of which exceeded the risk-based screening SCTL. Further, benzo(a)pyrene was not detected in any of the additional eight surface soil samples collected subsequent to the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment or in any of the Landfill Area 2 subsurface soil samples. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, a common laboratory contaminant, was detected in two of the nine groundwater monitoring well groundwater samples collected prior to the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment, only one of which marginally exceeded the GCTL used for screening in the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was not detected in any of 20 groundwater monitoring well samples collected subsequent to completion of the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment. In conclusion, it is unlikely that either of the risk-driving chemicals of potential concern benzo(a)pyrene and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is related to former DoD activities at Landfill Area 2.

7.2 ECOLOGICAL RISK SUMMARY

The Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment was performed to determine whether DoD-related chemicals are present at concentrations that may have adverse effects on ecological receptors. The Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment identified the eastern indigo snake (federally threatened) and the gopher tortoise (state endangered) as listed species likely to inhabit the area. The Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment included a comparison of maximum detected concentrations to benchmark screening values to identify chemicals of potential ecological concern. A total of 12 chemicals of potential ecological concern were identified, using this conservative screening process, including eight metals and four polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons.

Of the eight metals identified as chemicals of potential ecological concern, only chromium, iron, and mercury exceeded their respective background screening values, had concentrations that exceeded those reported in laboratory blanks, and are not macronutrient minerals (e.g., calcium, potassium, and sodium). Of the organic chemicals of potential ecological concern, fluoranthene was detected in three samples and the other three polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons were detected in two samples. Further, most of the polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon detections were below background screening concentrations.

In summary, the Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment concluded that based on a spatial evaluation, generally low concentrations of chemicals of potential ecological concern, and the conservativeness of the benchmark screening values, the potential for ecological risks associated with chemicals detected in Landfill Area 2 soil is minimal and is regarded as acceptable.

8. SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

Development or evaluation of other alternatives was not conducted since the investigation results concluded no unacceptable risk to people or the environment. This means no action was determined for the site.

8.1 SUMMARY AND DESCRIPTION

No Action is the determination for Landfill Area 2. This determination would involve continued use of the site in its current condition. This determination places no restriction on land use or access. Five year reviews are not required.

8.2 COST ESTIMATE

There are no costs associated with the No Action determination.

8.3 ESTIMATED OUTCOMES

The expected outcome for Landfill Area 2 with No Action as the determination is that nothing will change and that there will be unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. No restriction will be placed on current or future land use.

9. DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

The Proposed Plan was released for public comment on January 28, 2016. The Proposed Plan identified a No Action determination for Landfill Area 2. Since no comments were received from the public, no significant changes were made to the Proposed Plan.

10. REFERENCES

American Cancer Society, 2016, ***Lifetime Risk of Developing or Dying From Cancer***. Accessed on-line at <http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancerbasics/lifetime-probability-of-developing-or-dying-from-cancer>.

Black and Veatch Special Projects Corporation (Black & Veatch), 2000, ***Final Expanded Site Inspection Report, Reynolds Industrial Park, Green Cove Springs, Clay County, Florida***, June.

Dames & Moore, 1992, ***Preliminary Contamination Evaluation Report, Former U.S. Naval Air Station, Lee Field, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, December.

Environmental Science and Engineering, 1988, ***Final Engineering Report for Confirmation Study at Former U.S. Naval Station, Lee Field, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, March.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), 2014, ***Letter Re: Former Landfill Area 2, Former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Site ID#: COM_325649; Project ID# 341242, Clay County – Waste Cleanup***, August

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), 2005, ***Technical Report: Development of Cleanup Target Levels (CTLs) for Chapter 62-777, F.A.C, Division of Waste Management***, February.

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), 2012, 40 CFR Part 300

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw) and TerranearPMC, LLC (Terranear), 2012, ***Final Supplemental Remedial Investigation Report Landfill Area 2 Former Lee Field Naval Air Station Green Cove Springs, Florida***

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw), 2005a, ***Final Supplemental Remedial Investigation and First Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report, Landfill Areas 1, 2, and 3, Former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, August.

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw), 2005b, ***Final Second Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report, Landfill Areas 1, 2, and 3, Former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, December.

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw), 2004a, ***Final Remedial Investigation Report, Landfill Area 2, Former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, April.

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw), 2004b, ***Final Installation-Wide Background Chemical Data Study Report, Former Lee Field Naval Air Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, Revision 1***, February.

Southern Chemists Laboratories, 1993, ***Letter Report Accompanying Chemical Analyses of Water, Soil, and Sludge Samples***, Southern Chemists Laboratories, Jacksonville, Florida.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 1986, ***Contamination Evaluation of Former U.S. Naval Station, Lee Field, Green Cove Springs, Florida***, September.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1996a, ***Soil Screening Guidance: User's Guide, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response***, EPA/540/R-96/018, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1996b, ***Soil Screening Guidance: Technical Background Document, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response***, EPA/540/R-95/128, Washington, D.C.

PART 3: RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

This Responsiveness Summary summarizes all comments for the Proposed Plan received from the public and FDEP regarding the preferred alternative and general concerns related to the site.

1. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND LEAD AGENCY RESPONSES

A 32-day public comment period started on January 28, 2016. The Corps provided information to the local community on the No Action determination through a public meeting held on January 28, 2016, allowing the public an opportunity to convey any questions and/or concerns about the Site to FDEP for consideration in the remedy selection process.

1.1 FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMENTS

No FDEP comments were provided during the January 28, 2016 public meeting.

1.2 PUBLIC COMMENTS

No comments were received during the public review period.

2. TECHNICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES

None.

ATTACHMENTS