

N62578.AR.003264  
NCBC DAVISVILLE  
5090.3a

MEETING MINUTES FOR THE REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION AND SITE  
INVESTIGATION OPERABLE UNIT 10 (OU 10) FORMER NCBC DAVISVILLE RI  
06/16/2016  
LEAVITT REPORTING INC

Remedial Alternatives Evaluation and Site  
Investigation Operable Unit 10  
Former Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Davisville, North Kingstown, Rhode Island

95 Cripe Street  
North Kingstown, RI  
June 16, 2016  
7:30 p.m.

*Leavitt Reporting, Inc.*

119 Broad Street  
Weymouth, MA 02188  
[www.leavittreporting.com](http://www.leavittreporting.com)

Tel. 781-335-6791  
Fax: 781-335-7911  
[leavittreporting@comcast.net](mailto:leavittreporting@comcast.net)

*Hearings ♦ Conferences ♦ Legal Proceedings*

1 MR. PARILLO: Good evening  
2 everybody. My name is Jeff Parillo. I'm  
3 with Resolution Consultants, engineer on  
4 this project working for the Navy.  
5 Tonight I will be talking to you about our  
6 remedial alternative evaluation site  
7 investigative report for Operable Unit 10  
8 QDC outfall 001.

9 The first slide presents an  
10 overview of my presentation. Starts off  
11 by giving you a brief site background and  
12 history. We'll talk through the results  
13 of the remedial investigation. Also  
14 presents to you the alternative evaluated,  
15 and the Navy's preferred remedial  
16 alternative.

17 The site is Operable Unit 10/QDC  
18 outfall 01. What this is is really a  
19 discharge point for a catch basin network  
20 underground drainage piping that  
21 originated from the former Building 224.  
22 The site includes the outflow area, the  
23 wetland and down gradient drainage ditch.

1                   The potential source of  
2                   contamination for the site historical site  
3                   activity at former Building 224 which was  
4                   used for maintenance activities and truck  
5                   washing, and maintenance materials.  
6                   Materials used at this facility could have  
7                   been discharged to the surface, washed in  
8                   the catch basin and down the drainage pipe  
9                   to the outfall.

10                   Aerial view of the site. Those  
11                   black squares are catch basins, dash lines  
12                   are the piping, the outfall is right here.  
13                   Blue line is the wetland. Here is the  
14                   drainage ditch.

15                   This is our conceptual site  
16                   model. Again, Building 224 is located in  
17                   the corner over here. You have your  
18                   network drain to the outfall. You have  
19                   your wetland, the drainage ditch, as you  
20                   can see the surface water and groundwater  
21                   all drain toward Alan Harbor. Also  
22                   important to know this culvert located in  
23                   former Sanford Road. We'll talk about

1           that a little later.

2                         This slide presents all the  
3           environmental investigations and  
4           maintenance activity that has been  
5           completed at the site. The site was  
6           discovered in 2008 when QDC was  
7           performing maintenance excavation in the  
8           area of that outfall. During that  
9           excavation they noticed soils contained  
10          some odor and staining. They contacted  
11          the Navy. The Navy came out,  
12          characterized that soil, disposed of it  
13          appropriately. And material was sampled  
14          and it was found contained TPH, VOCs,  
15          PCBs, PAHs, and metals.

16                        In 2010 the Navy went out and  
17          did an investigation on that drainage  
18          network, including a video inspection,  
19          analytical sampling of the catch basins,  
20          and again residual sediment was detected,  
21          also sampling of the wetlands. And that  
22          program really confirmed that some  
23          contamination was noted in that original

1 excavation also present in catch basins in  
2 the outfall.

3 In 2013, the Navy went out and  
4 cleaned those drainage lines. Removed all  
5 that impacted sediment. Also in 2013 QDC  
6 did a little more maintenance of the  
7 drainage ditch. All that work culminated  
8 in a remedial investigation in 2014.

9 This investigation delineated the  
10 extent of those impacts in the wetlands  
11 near the drainage ditch. Human Health  
12 Risk Assessment and Environmental Risk  
13 Assessment was completed as part of that  
14 investigation. And those studies  
15 concluded that even though contaminants  
16 were present they posed very little risk  
17 to potential receptors. However, TPH  
18 impacts to soil and sediment exceed Rhode  
19 Island criteria. The Navy determined that  
20 remediation action is necessary. And our  
21 remedial alternative evaluations and site  
22 investigation developed and evaluated  
23 remedial alternatives to address that.

1                   This slide presents some findings  
2                   of the remedial investigation. The RI  
3                   evaluated soil sediment groundwater and  
4                   surface water. Analytical samples were  
5                   collected from each of the media. For a  
6                   positive note groundwater surface water  
7                   were not identified as a remedial concern.  
8                   Did have some contaminants identified.  
9                   Iron and arsenic was detected in some  
10                  wells above screening levels, however  
11                  concentrations believed to be background  
12                  regional and not from site activity.  
13                  Surface water you had some low levels of  
14                  pesticides and metals, but the risks were  
15                  below EPA's target list criteria. Soil  
16                  and sediment, you did have a number of  
17                  chemicals above criteria. Distribution of  
18                  those contaminants were really indicative  
19                  of a point source discharge where you had  
20                  higher concentration at the outfall and  
21                  they disbursed as they moved away from the  
22                  outfall.

23                                    Again as part of the remedial

1 investigation Human Health Risk Assessment  
2 and Environmental Risk Assessment,  
3 determined that minimal risk receptors  
4 from the CERCLA contaminates. However  
5 TPH impacts did exceed the residential  
6 direct exposure criteria in Rhode Island.

7 This next slide shows boring  
8 locations that were completed. As you can  
9 see the Navy really had good data density  
10 here. And these little, above the borings  
11 locations tend to show concentration with  
12 the top of this pictorial is shallow depth  
13 and down to the deepest depth. We are  
14 really interest in yellow, orange, and  
15 red, those all exceed criteria. As you  
16 can see the majority of contamination is  
17 right around the outfall. You do have  
18 some that exceed in the drainage ditch as  
19 well.

20 That concludes the discussion on  
21 remedial investigation. The next set of  
22 slides will talk more to the remedial  
23 alternative evaluations. We developed a

1           remedy, the first step really was  
2           developing a remedial objective. This was  
3           straightforward. We wanted to prevent  
4           ecological exposures to soils, sediments  
5           impacted with TPH concentrations above 500  
6           mg/kg TPH. Again groundwater and surface  
7           water were not identified as media of  
8           concern.

9                        We developed three remedial  
10           alternatives for the site. First one was  
11           no action alternative. This was a  
12           requirement for Rhode Island regulations.  
13           It was never something the Navy was going  
14           to consider. Alternative 2 and 3 really  
15           involve the excavation of impacted soils  
16           and sediments. Where they differ is  
17           really how they address groundwater  
18           stormwater.

19                       Alternative 3 would include an  
20           active dewatering system where you were to  
21           go in and pump the water, treat it, and  
22           discharge it back on site.

23                       Alternative 2 would really involve

1 managing that water as it came into the  
2 excavation as opposed to active pumping  
3 and treating. Other than that the  
4 alternatives are pretty much the same.  
5 Excavation about 3400 cubic yards of  
6 material. Offsite disposal at a landfill,  
7 the material will be taken off site, we  
8 anticipate being a little wet. Any water  
9 generated on site would likely need to be  
10 treated and discharged back on site.

11 The preferred remedy is Alternative  
12 2. This is excavation with active  
13 management of the water. This was a  
14 chosen remedy because it does meet the  
15 remedial objectives. It is protective of  
16 human health and the environment, and will  
17 restore the site to unrestricted use.  
18 Meets all regulations, and the big ticket  
19 item we think managing that stormwater and  
20 groundwater during that remedial activity  
21 presents less challenges and there is some  
22 cost savings associated with that.

23 So what does this remedy look

1           like. First step is to complete  
2           compliance sampling to confirm the extent  
3           of excavation. Very important to really  
4           know our excavation footprint prior to  
5           mobilization because of potential dealing  
6           with the amount of water. We really want  
7           to limit that, and we don't want to end up  
8           in a situation where we're chasing it when  
9           we're in the field. Excavate of soil that  
10          exceeds TPH concentrations of 500 mg/kg.  
11          About 4200 cubic yards, all the material  
12          would be disposed of at an off site  
13          landfill. The excavated soil and sediment  
14          taken off site. That water along with any  
15          groundwater that was managed would be  
16          treated and discharged back on site.  
17          Stormwater we hope and try to route that  
18          around the excavation. And then when we  
19          are done, backfill and restore the  
20          wetlands.

21                        So this is what the remedy looks  
22                        like. Your orange areas here where we  
23                        have to dig about four feet, yellow areas

1           about two feet. These pink areas are  
2           really just habitat restoration. We have  
3           to restore that area. Also the Navy wants  
4           to do a bit of extra work to promote water  
5           flow here and drainage out to the culvert.

6                        That's my presentation. Any  
7           questions?

8                        (No questions from the audience.)

9                        If no questions, thank you, and  
10          we'll close the public hearing.

11                       (The hearing closed at  
12          7:44 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

## C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

I hereby certify that the  
foregoing 11 pages contain a full, true  
and correct transcription of all my  
stenographic notes to the best of my  
ability taken in the above-captioned  
matter at said time and place.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol DiFazio  
Registered Professional Reporter