N00101.PF.003101
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH
5090.3b

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) UPDATE FORMER NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH MA

(PUBLIC DOCUMENT)

02/12/2015

RESOLUTION CONSULTANTS

Naval Air Station South Weymouth, MA
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes
February 12, 2015

1. INTRODUCTION

John Goodrich, RAB facilitator from the Office of Public Collaboration, opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. He requested that all attendees sign-in. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A. Introductions and affiliations were skipped given the small group in attendance. There were no comments or questions regarding the October 9, 2014 RAB meeting minutes.

The February meeting presentation focused on the on-going work at the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP), presented by Dave Barney (Navy).

2. PRESENTATION

Mr. Barney began the presentation with the site background and history. Results from the Remedial Investigation (RI) and other preliminary investigations identified several areas of contaminated soil. These targeted regions were part of the first round of excavations conducted at the STP. Excavations were completed to the limits determined in the Record of Decision (ROD); however, chemical of concern (COC) concentrations in confirmatory soil and sediment samples exceeded Remedial Goals (RGs).

A Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) Addendum was finalized in 2014 to eliminate potential human and ecological receptor exposure to COCs present in site soil and sediment at concentrations above the selected RGs. The scope of this remedial action (RA) was to remove four drainage pipes and sediment within identified during a previous investigation as potential continuing sources of contamination to the drainage ditch. Additional removal areas included: a fifty foot length of the drainage ditch downgradient from the ditch headwall and several upland areas remaining from previous excavations. The Previous Remedial Action outlined four excavation depths (1 ft, 1.5 ft, 2-2.5ft, and crushed stone backfill up to 20 ft). Confirmatory samples were collected post-excavation to confirm the removal of impacted soil and sediment. Many locations were within RGs outlined in the ROD; however, continued polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) exceedances were detected. These exceedances led to additional investigations and this second phase of the RA which focused on the removal of Pipes 1-4 and related impacted soil and sediment. In addition, soil from Area A2-sample B4, Area A2- sample B5, and the historic filtration beds were to be excavated.

Erosion controls were set-up prior to the start of the second phase of the RA and vegetation was removed. Between the first and second phases of the RA, the wetland was re-delineated by the Master Developer and marked accordingly. The new mapped wetland now included several building footprints and the trickling beds associated with the STP. This changed the overall conceptual site model (CSM) of the site, but not the planned scope of work.

Carol Keating (EPA): What was required by the ROD to be excavated and removed?
D. Barney: The ROD specified that impacted surface soil would be removed to unrestricted use. These areas included the two upland areas (Area A's) and two wetland areas (Area B's) covered in the first phase of excavations.

D. Barney briefly explained the engineered purpose for each of the four pipes. Pipe 1 was believed to be the effluent discharge line for the original STP system and did not go through the headwall. Pipe 2 was the effluent discharge pipe from the expanded system and discharged through the headwall. Pipe 3 came from a storm water catch basin near the road and discharged through the headwall. Pipe 4 had an unknown usage, was located at a higher elevation than the other pipes and did not go through the headwall.

RAB Member: Where did the sludge from the sanitary system go before the STP was built?
D. Barney: All sewage was gravity fed to Building 7 (previously known as Sewage Treatment building and located near the former fire station). It worked similarly to a private septic system where liquids were pumped off to a leach field and solids remained in place. The tank, vault, and baffles for Building 7 have all been cleaned out and closed.

The second phase of the RA began with Pipe 1. Once uncovered, Pipe 1 appeared to be part concrete and part asbestos pipe. Once the suspected asbestos was uncovered, excavation operations ceased and the material was inspected and sampled. The results confirmed the presence of asbestos containing material (ACM). An asbestos notification form was submitted and an ACM abatement plan was drafted, approved, and implemented. No ACM was found in the other three pipes. Pipe 4 was made of corrugated metal and was used for storm water runoff.

An additional Scope of Work (SOW) was developed under the RA Addendum based on the results obtained from the second phase of excavations. The purpose was to investigate and remove potential upgradient continuing sources of contamination associated with the former STP. The SOW included:

- Perform test pitting and upgradient sampling
- Remove additional subsurface pipes and remove impacted soils
- Remove material from three subsurface chambers, break floor, and backfill
- Remove material from the two subsurface trickling filters (north and south), break floor, and backfill
- Remove material from former subsurface primary tanks (north and south), break floor, and backfill

Pipes 5 and 6 were successfully excavated, removed, tested, and backfilled. The trickling filters were approximately twenty-five feet in diameter and six feet deep. The filters were filled with small diameter filter material. This material and remaining soil within the trickling filters was removed in addition to any remaining infrastructure. Once this was done, holes were drilled in the bottom of the filters to prevent water from accumulating in the bottom. During the removal of fill from the north trickling filter, mercury droplets (used as a bearing lubricant) were observed at the base of the trickling bed spindle. Operations ceased and a mercury response plan was drafted and implemented. The mercury was containerized and a specialty hazmat contractor performed mercury decontamination of the potentially impacted material. When the spindle was demolished, a small amount of mercury was encountered in the soil. The soil and mercury were containerized in two separate drums. Soil samples were collected from beneath the spindle for mercury and did not indicate elevated mercury levels. The southern trickling filter spindle was demolished to assess the presence/absence of mercury. No mercury was detected.

Soil from the excavation of the trickling filters is still on-site and will be transported and disposed of once all excavation work is complete. Additional work remaining includes:

- Remove Pipes 7 and 8
- Remove material from two primary tanks and break bottom
- Remove material from two chambers
- Perform wetland restoration
- Remove sediment from the drainage ditch
- Perform final site restoration
- Mend and maintain erosion controls

RAB Member: Will the drainage ditch be re-excavated before site restoration?

D. Barney: The second excavation has not been done yet. In 2011, the ditch was cleaned-out nearly to the clear zone headwall. Additional sampling has been done at the ditch since the discovery of contamination in the pipes. A similar confirmatory sampling procedure will be implemented once the drainage ditch is excavated again. Further excavations will occur if exceedances are detected.
EPA: All this information will be made available in the Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR). All the findings from this RA and previous investigation will be reported in the ROD Amendment and go through a Public Hearing and comment period.

D. Barney explained that the excavations will remove surficial contaminants across the site. Some areas of pesticide impacted soil will remain on-site because they are located in a delineated wetland and/or are located at depth. As a result, a Land Use Control (LUC) will be put in place to restrict use in the future. Anne Malewicz (MassDEP) clarified how LUCs prevent land use at a site were contamination remains in the subsurface and does not pose a risk to human or ecological receptors. Once a LUC is in place, it will be the responsibility of the Navy to monitor and ensure that development is not occurring on the land.

RAB Member: It would be best for the community if the Navy and EPA agreed to remove the contamination from the STP rather than leaving it in place and instituting an LUC.

EPA: One of the conditions to having an LUC in place is the annual monitoring and Five Year Review Process which ensures that the LUC is still enforced and protective. Community involvement and oversight acts as an additional layer of protection. Options for Remedial Action will be evaluated in a Focused Feasibility Study (FFS). The FFS will evaluate in situ remediation, in addition to LUCs and excavation.

D. Barney: When it comes time to develop an FFS, the Navy will look at general response actions, including an in-situ option to remediate the pesticides in the deep subsurface.

RAB Member: There was a breach in the erosion control. Was this before or during the excavation? Was any contaminated sediment washed past the wattles?

D. Barney: Anything that would have washed past the erosion controls is already in the drainage ditch. Any contaminated sediments that migrated past the wattles will be removed during the excavation.

4. *UPDATES*

Building 81

The Navy is preparing the Remedial Design (RD)/ RAWP to implement the remedy outlined in the ROD. Boreholes/injection points, treatment infrastructure, and utilities from the previous pilot study remain at the site and could potentially impact the migration of contaminants and pose a health and safety risk for the ROD specified remedial action. An investigation will be done to locate these utilities; the RA Work Plan is currently being developed.

Building 82

Several rounds of post-injection monitoring have been completed. The next round of sampling is scheduled for March (weather/conditions permitting). The Navy is looking to reach remedy complete status this summer.

Rubble Disposal Area

More information will be available for the next meeting.

Sewage Treatment Plant

No further discussion.

SRA

The overburden injection wells have been installed and developed. Tree clearing was conducted to allow equipment and trucks access to the two injection grids. Overall, the vegetation clearing was limited. Bedrock injection wells are still in the process of being installed. Adjustments are being made due to the bedrock dipping more than originally expected.

West Gate Landfill

A sampling event was conducted in December. The next event is scheduled for March (weather/conditions permitting). Sampling is still scheduled for the other landfills.

The next RAB Meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 11th 2015. Topics of discussion could include: LUCs across the site, Public Hearing for STP or Industrial Operations Area (IOA), B82 groundwater results, Solvent Release Area update, and Rubble Disposal Area methane concerns.

EPA asked to have the IOA and Hangar 1 Summary Status added to the table for the next meeting.

RAB Member: Have the public benefit lands been conveyed by the National Park Service?
D. Barney: The Navy is not aware if any of those lands have been transferred from the Park Service.