

1
2 Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant
3 Bethpage, New York
4

5 Restoration Advisory Board
6 Regular Meeting
7 -----X
8

9 7:00 P.M.
November 5, 2003

10 Bethpage Community Center
11 Bethpage, New York

12 P R E S E N T:

13 Joe Kaminski United States Navy
Naval Air Systems Command

14 Dave Brayack Tetra Tech NUS
15 Judy Lamey

16 Jim Colter Northern Division, NAVFAC

17 Steven Scharf NYS DEC

18 RAB Members
19 Community Members
20
21
22

23 FREELANCE L.I., INC. - Court Reporters
24 259 Southfield Road
Baiting Hollow, New York 11933
25 (516) 330.6362
E-mail FLiReporters@aol.com

Proceedings

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: This is the Bethpage RAB meeting. Today is whatever day it is. Apologize for starting late, there was a rain delay. We expected to start at six and started at 6:30. We ran over meeting. First thing to do, I'm Joe Kaminski. Anybody who is a RAB member needs to move up to this table right now. The way the RAB works, is the RAB members sit up at the table. Anybody who is in the audience sits in the back so we know who we are talking to. The RAB is the community representatives. We like to think that the people who are taking the time and the effort to be members of the RAB are representative of the community and every one of you who is a RAB member, represents hundreds and hundreds of other people. That has been proven now any number of times. We'd like you to be here. I think the rain has delayed a lot of people. So we'll get started a little late. As people trickle in, that's fine. With the table wet and everything else.

(Brief recess)

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: This is the Bethpage RAB, thanks for being here. It is the regularly scheduled meeting, November 5th, Which we

Proceedings

1
2 didn't used to do, we used to do whenever it seemed
3 like enough stuff accumulated to have a RAB meeting,
4 with -- with the experience that the Systems Command
5 gained in Texas with regular RABs, we found it was a
6 better idea. Sometimes you have a few things to
7 talk about, sometimes you have a lot of things to
8 talk about. Today we are somewhere in the middle of
9 things to talk about. At times we'll have long
10 meetings and at times we'll have shorter meetings.

11 Standard issues, standard details of
12 the meeting, are the approving the minutes of the
13 last meeting.

14 MR. COLTER: We sent transcripts out
15 without paraphrasing them. In response to the
16 request at the last meeting.

17 MR. COLTER: Did you get the
18 transcript.

19 A WOMAN: Yep.

20 MR. COLTER: I know Mike didn't.

21 MR. GRELO: I just got it today.
22 I'll review it.

23 A WOMAN: Make a motion to approve
24 the transcript if somebody will second it.

25 MR. SCHARF: I will second it.

Proceedings

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: That's done.

Backing up a minute, let me congratulate everyone who won yesterday, including one of our members, I guess is just out celebrating but that's okay.

Legislator Mangano is one of the RAB members, he did win.

MR. GRELLLO: So did John.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Failing to find anymore anecdotes for congratulations to you, I have to get right into the agenda. Which I'll get a copy of. And without any further ado we'll get right into it.

Jim, why don't you go into the agenda.

MR. COLTER: The next item on the agenda, regards the status of the Navy's off-site groundwater efforts. At the last meeting, we had an action item to update the question of implementation, and that's what I just handed out. Just a minute ago.

As you can see, basically, up on top, the installation of the outpost monitoring wells, that's what we are currently involved in and some of you may have seen the drill rig out in your

Proceedings

1
2 neighborhoods. We've gotten calls and we've talked
3 to a lot of local neighbors so we're pursuing
4 completion of that. In a second, David Brayack
5 from Tetra Tech NUS will give a little bit more
6 detailed accounting of what we have accomplished in
7 the past three to six months, and where -- what we
8 have left to do. But if you look at item eleven on
9 the schedule, install outpost well clusters, we
10 started that effort back in early June of 2003. And
11 it looks like if all goes well, we should be done by
12 the end of November. What I'll do now is turn the
13 meeting over to Dave and he can go through, like I
14 said, what we've done so far and what we have left
15 to do.

16 MR. BRAYACK: Basically, we started
17 in early June. We have been installing monitoring
18 wells since then.

19 Some of the access to the monitoring
20 wells was based on property access between the Town
21 of Oyster Bay and the Town of Hempstead.

22 But basically, just to orient you,
23 this is the Navy property in this area here? The
24 Grumman property extends out further. What we do
25 know, and Hooker Ruco is in this area here are, too.

Proceedings

But there is a groundwater plume that's starting here and moving to the south.

Grumman has active operations going on on-site to capture it at the property. The Navy is in the process of installing a remedy in this area, here, this has been an isolated hot spot. But mostly we're looking at some contamination at fairly low concentrations. It is extremely widespread and just as a point, the contamination is not the entire thickness of the aquifer. It is generally present at varying thicknesses. Generally it starts at 200 feet below the ground surface and extends to three or 400 feet below the ground surface. There are a series of water district wells down in this area, there's a Levittown water district, which is to the west. Based on computer models, the contamination in this area is never projected to hit that, at least within the next 30 years.

There's a New York Water Supply system just to the south right here. This area has also been a concern because we did find some levels of contamination just to the north of that. We installed monitoring wells specifically to monitor the contamination in that area. We have the South

Proceedings

1
2 Farmingdale water district. For your reference,
3 this is the Seaford Oyster Bay Expressway running
4 down along here. There's the South Farmingdale
5 water district, here. And then there's another set
6 of South Farmingdale Water District wells over here.
7 This is the Bethpage Parkway. This area, here, is
8 about the width of the groundwater contamination.
9 Once, again it is not continuous, it is sporadic.
10 It is generally low level.

11 What we did was installed a series of
12 monitoring wells, that based on computer modeling,
13 are located between where the contamination
14 currently is, and where these water districts pull
15 their water from.

16 The idea being these wells would be
17 used to monitor over time. They're located so that
18 they give approximately a five year warning time.
19 Meaning that if contamination shows up in this well,
20 it is then projected at about five years from now,
21 some of the contamination may enter the water
22 districts, it may not. And at that point, the Navy
23 has agreed to enter into negotiations with the water
24 districts to make sure that those water districts
25 remain protected.

Proceedings

The contamination that we're talking about is predominantly volatile organic compounds, it is very easy to treat and remove from the groundwater. To date, we installed two monitoring wells here, they are called OW, Outpost Wells 41 and 42.

Just for your information, 41 is 692 feet deep, that's from the ground surface, it goes down 692 feet. Monitoring well 42, goes to 764 feet. So these wells are extremely deep in this area.

Outpost Cluster Number 3, there's two wells there, they're installed to 516 feet and 647 feet.

Those have been installed. Outpost Well 2, they're shallower, they're 400 feet and 495 feet.

And finally, at Outpost 1, 2, and 3, we finished installing Outpost Well 1-3, last week. We finished installing Outpost Monitoring Well 1-2 just yesterday. And Outpost Well No. 1, is scheduled to be installed and be in by the middle to end of next week. Once the wells are in, they need to be developed. As we have been installing the

Proceedings

1 wells, when we get the well installed, there's some
2 formation fines. They have to be pulled out of the
3 wells.
4

5 We have sampled one of these two
6 wells. We have a problem with one of these wells
7 and we have to go in and fix it right after
8 Thanksgiving. We have installed these. To date, we
9 did find one trace level of volatile organic
10 compounds in one of these wells. We went back out
11 and resampled it because sometimes we get false hits
12 and this -- I just got the results back a couple of
13 days ago. It looks like the first sample result was
14 a false hit. The second sample which was sampled
15 more like it should be, was perfectly clean.

16 MR. GRELO: Are you doing split
17 samples on these, so we know if there's laboratory
18 error.

19 MR. BRAYACK: We collect trip blanks.
20 With trip blanks, if there's a laboratory error it
21 shows up there.

22 MR. SCHARF: What was the contaminant
23 that was in the first sample of well three, was it.

24 MR. BRAYACK: It was Well 3-1,
25 benzene at two parts per billion. Benzene is not

Proceedings

one of our site contaminants.

As we develop these wells, we are using, you know, fuels. The fuels go into the air and we have seen fuels, benzene, toluene, sometimes affect our groundwater samples. That's why we went out the second time. We are planning on going out a third time within another week or so, another couple of weeks, and resampling it a third time, just to confirm, you know, the previous result.

So, based on the modeling, the modeling had actually projected that this area would be contaminated. Based on the results, we know that the model is somewhat conservative. Based on these results we know that the contamination is actually north and that there's not as much urgency in that area as we had first thought.

These are all preliminary results. We will be issuing this in a report, yet, but that's what we found so far.

These wells over here, they'll be sampled within the next two or three weeks but of all these wells we've been installing as outpost monitoring wells, it was the three clusters that we were the most concerned with. And we have two

Proceedings

1 non-detects for any type of site contaminant so far.
2 So that's some level of comfort, there.

3 We expect, I think Jim mentioned the
4 end of November, we will be done with this outpost
5 well cluster by then. We had a little problem with
6 one of the screens on this, we are going to go back
7 in and fix it. So our end date is really more like
8 the first or second week this December.

9 Then this will complete one aspect of
10 the ROD.

11 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Will the report
12 be issued to the members before the next meeting?
13 Will you get it cranked out by then.

14 MR. BRAYACK: The report is scheduled
15 to be done probably end of January time frame.

16 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: You all will
17 probably see it before we meet again, we can update
18 it.

19 MR. BRAYACK: Okay. There's been
20 some discussion about some of the southern
21 libraries, this would be one of the records that
22 goes into it.

23 MR. COLTER: Any questions on the --
24 Yes, ma'am?
25

Proceedings

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A WOMAN: Are these monitoring wells south of the turnpike or north of the turnpike?

MR. BRAYACK: The Hempstead Turnpike runs right across about the middle.

A WOMAN: Yeah.

MR. BRAYACK: For reference, this is the Southern Parkway. The monitoring wells are roughly a third to a half a mile away between those two.

A MAN: How many miles from Hempstead Turnpike.

MR. BRAYACK: The question is how many miles.

A MAN: From Hempstead Turnpike are the wells, approximately?

MR. BRAYACK: Three or 4,000 feet.

A WOMAN: Is there anything north of Hempstead Turnpike.

MR. BRAYACK: There is some known contamination up in this area, as well.

A WOMAN: Would that be west of Stewart Avenue?

MR. BRAYACK: It would be west of Stewart Avenue. Right now, the contamination is

Proceedings

1
2 very roughly bound by about Wantagh Parkway, and
3 Bethpage State Parkway is a little too far east,
4 maybe a little closer to the Seaford Oyster Bay
5 Expressway. But groundwater from this area flows to
6 the south and just a little bit east. So anything
7 west of.

8 A MAN: You mean Wantagh Avenue not
9 Wantagh Parkway.

10 MR. COLTER: Right, Wantagh Avenue.

11 MR. BRAYACK: Yes, Wantagh Avenue.

12 A MAN: Wantagh Parkway is another
13 few miles to the west. You don't want to be over
14 there.

15 A MAN: What concentrations were you
16 founding there when you took the samples?

17 MR. BRAYACK: We got one detection of
18 benzene at about two parts per billion.

19 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We don't think
20 that's a detection, though.

21 MR. BRAYACK: That is correct. The
22 laboratory found benzene. Like I said, any of the
23 fuels.

24 A MAN: Just benzene, nothing else.

25 MR. BRAYACK: Just benzene, nothing

Proceedings

else.

MR. SCHARF: Keep in mind these are outpost monitoring wells, where we went ahead of what we project where the plume is. So we put those wells in there to monitor that before it gets to the municipal wells. And in addition to that, Tetra Tech put in a whole series of vertical profile borings down 800 feet, over about a year period, that was about two years ago.

MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

MR. SCHARF: That was an extensive effort to delineate, which turned out to be much further than we had thought, but still fortunately not far enough yet to affect the wells south of Hempstead Turnpike.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We consider the leading edge of the plume at five parts per billion for detection.

MR. BRAYACK: As far as the outpost monitoring wells are concerned, there is an action level of between .5 and 1.5 parts per billion. The objective is to protect the water districts at the detection limit.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Okay.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. BRAYACK: Which is .5 parts per
3 billion.

4 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: In the known
5 plume area we have readings from, detections all the
6 way up to the hot spot, which is very, very
7 contaminated, that we are dealing with separately.

8 MR. BRAYACK: There are places in
9 particular on the Grumman property where they are
10 routinely pulling out 500 to a couple thousand parts
11 per billion.

12 This hot spot area here, it is a
13 fairly well-defined area. Has a maximum of, I
14 believe, one or 2,000 parts per billion. Anything
15 south of the Hempstead Turnpike, is much lower,
16 maybe 100 parts per billion. There's a couple stray
17 hits down to, you know, the majority of the samples
18 are clean. So as we are sampling down over 800
19 feet, we may collect 25 or 30 samples and we may
20 find one or two samples at ten or 12 parts per
21 billion.

22 MR. GRELO: This is 100 parts per
23 billion at the turnpike area, at what depth,
24 approximately?

25 MR. BRAYACK: At the turnpike, the

Proceedings

majority of what's down here starts at perhaps a 100 to 150 feet below ground surface, which is fifty to 100 feet below the water table, and it goes to maybe two, or at the most, 300 feet below the ground surface. The water districts generally pull six to hundred feet. There's a lot of vertical buffering in there, as well.

MR. GRELO: The 500 to 2,000 on the Grumman site on the hot spots what's the depth on those.

MR. SCHARF: 300, 400 feet.

MR. BRAYACK: I think three to four hundred feet, maybe 500 feet.

MR. GRELO: Three to five.

MR. COLTER: Don't forget there's a containment system at the Grumman southern boundary that prohibits that from moving off-site.

MR. BRAYACK: That containment is three to 500 feet as well.

MR. SCHARF: Some of the contamination that migrated onto the site from the Hooker Ruco site.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: It is all going to get washed away tonight.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. COLTER: That's where we are at
3 with the first item, the installation of the outpost
4 wells, where as David said, we are nearing
5 completion of that.

6 What Dave mentioned also, was the hot
7 spot, what we designated as the GM38 area. It is
8 an area where we have up to 3,000 parts per billion
9 of contamination. So it is significantly higher
10 than the remainder of the plume that David said is
11 around from anywhere from 10 to 200. So part of our
12 remedy is to address that site and take the mass, as
13 much mass as we can, out of that area. As we
14 mentioned at the last RAB meeting, we gave a little
15 presentation about the siting of the remedy and some
16 of the options that we had in front of us and we
17 ultimately chose the area that they have pointed
18 out, that's near the intersection of Broadway and
19 Arthur.

20 What we have been doing, is talking a
21 little bit with the Town of Oyster Bay, about the
22 possibility of using their property. They have been
23 receptive to that. So what I've laid out here,
24 starting at item 17, is laid out a little bit more
25 of a detailed outline of the steps that we have to

Proceedings

1
2 go through to design the remedy and then ultimately
3 construct the remedy.

4 Basically, from item 18 down to item
5 27, we've completed that. The preparation of a
6 basis of design report. And that was handed out a
7 couple meetings ago. It was done by Tetra Tech NUS
8 and it basically just outlined the schematic of
9 what's going to be involved in this GM38 remedy and
10 the location that we have chosen. It incorporates
11 the model result that Arcadis Gerrity Miller had
12 been doing for us, with the simulation of how many
13 wells, the location of wells, the treatment plant,
14 and estimated times to clean space up, those type of
15 things. Where we are at right now is basically item
16 29. We're under the construction of the GM38 remedy
17 sub-task.

18 What we have been doing since the
19 last RAB meeting is working with our construction
20 contractor, who is Tetra Tech FW and they were
21 formerly Foster Wheeler. They have been bought out
22 by Tetra Tech, but it is basically the same company
23 that's been involved in this ever since we decided
24 to take on this action. So there's not -- there's
25 no new learning curve. It is just a name change.

Proceedings

One of the first items we have to do is we have to conduct a survey of the GM38 treatment area. We have to do this for two reasons:

One, we need the survey information so we can start putting together site plans for the design. Secondly, we need legal descriptions of this area, so that we can write up real estate agreements between the Navy and the town, that states where we are going to conduct our work and how we are going to conduct our work, and things like that.

At this point, we haven't received our FY-04 allotment of environmental cleanup funds from Congress. We usually don't get them first quarter. It usually is late first quarter or even second quarter. But what we are doing now is basically work on contracts and getting proposals from different surveys and different drillers and getting everything kind of aligned so that when the money comes in, we can make a contract award. Again, one of the first things we need to do is conduct that survey. I'm hoping to do that starting in the first of December. I'm hoping we get some money this month that we can at least make an award

Proceedings

1
2 to a survey contractor and get the ball rolling
3 there.

4 It will probably be from the time
5 they go out to the field, to come back and provide
6 drawings and submit the drawings to us. We are
7 probably looking at a deliverable date of about
8 mid-January to get some type of drawings and legal
9 descriptions from the surveyor.

10 Following that process, once we
11 receive the survey drawings, I'm going to skip down
12 to item 32, we are going to start the real estate
13 process at that point with the Town of Oyster Bay.
14 We anticipate that being a pretty lengthy process.
15 You'll see I have till July 1st in there. It's a
16 very cumbersome process with how real estate -- and
17 I'm not a real estate expert, so I'm not going to
18 try to explain all the details that go into that.

19 But while we are doing all that,
20 while we are doing our surveys and working with the
21 Town of Oyster Bay, we were asked also to conduct a
22 neighborhood workshop for the residents in that
23 area to let them know what's going on and what they
24 can expect as far as construction and time frames
25 and things like that. That's the other reason we

Proceedings

1
2 would like the survey drawings, so we can get an
3 accurate picture of what their neighborhood looks
4 like when we use that to make some posters of the
5 area to help geographically explain what we are
6 doing.

7 I talked to Steve a little bit about
8 what he thought would be a good time. We had the
9 elections coming up and now we have the holidays
10 coming up. We don't have our surveyor under
11 contract yet. What we kind of threw out is a date
12 and this isn't even published, it is not set in
13 stone, but for scheduling purposes we are looking at
14 sometime in early February. February 4th or
15 something like that. But it looks to be in February
16 we'll have some type of community workshop out
17 there.

18 MR. SCHARF: Also you may want to
19 mention, Jim, you may want to combine that with an
20 overall project review to the public, of a poster
21 session with the overall Northrop Grumman, and the
22 Navy project, so people can ask any questions that
23 they feel are appropriate or just get information.

24 A WOMAN: Are you going to hold that
25 here.

Proceedings

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. SCHARF: We are not sure where.

It might be at the Bethpage High School.

MR. COLTER: We'll probably do it at the junior high school since it is close to the neighborhood. It is going to be a poster session, it is going to be a walk-through, we'll have 15 or twenty posters set up and people can walk through. We'll have consultants and Navy personnel, state personnel, manning posters, answering questions. It is not going to be a formal sit down computerized presentation. It is going to be informal, just walk through ask any questions you have.

MR. GRELO: Will you have a public comment thing set up so people can talk or are you going to let people run wild.

A WOMAN: People are going to ask the same questions over and over again.

MR. GRELO: Why don't you have a forum where people can ask the questions? Otherwise they'll all ask the same questions. Usually the high schools are better set up for that.

MR. SCHARF: To answer your question, when we had the proposed remedial action meeting, we had a formal meeting and a forum where people could

Proceedings

1
2 stand up and ask questions and we had a
3 stenographer, as we have tonight, to take the
4 minutes. After that, we had the poster session at
5 the middle school and it worked very well, it went
6 from the beginning of the site history up to the
7 present with all the goings-on, all the current
8 activities, all the design work that was happening.
9 And everybody that came through had all their
10 questions answered, and when they were satisfied
11 they got the answer they needed, or they met the
12 people that could get them the answers to the
13 questions that they had.

14 MR. COLTER: The decision basically
15 that was back in December of 2000, was the formal
16 public hearing and public comment period, asking for
17 comments at that time.

18 At this time we wanted to do
19 something informal and target those neighbors that
20 are going to be impacted and keep it informal. It
21 is not going to be a public meeting.

22 (Whereupon, Mr. Mangano joins the
23 proceedings)

24 MR. COLTER: How you doing, Ed.
25 Congratulations.

Proceedings

MR. MANGANO: Thank you very much.

Sorry I'm late.

MR. COLTER: Continuing on with our schedule for the construction. After -- well, at the same time, again that the real estate process is being done with our real estate people in the Town of Oyster Bay, Foster Wheeler will be performing some site work to collect some data that you have to do when you do a design of any building or system. And one of those things is the geotechnical investigation. Basically they're going to go out and take soil samples and things and figure out what type of soil was out there, what type of foundation can you build, how much can this foundation support. Because we are going to be building a treatment plant with heavy equipment. So we are going to be doing geotechnical work out there, which is going to be incorporated into the design of the treatment building itself.

Another field effort that we'll have to do is what we call predesign groundwater investigation. That's basically putting in the extraction wells, where the model predicted they should be, installing monitoring wells around this,

Proceedings

1
2 and doing a pump test to actually find out what are
3 the physical characteristics of the aquifer and see
4 if that matches what the model is predicting. The
5 model is good to get you in the ballpark but now we
6 have to actually get in there and see what the
7 aquifer characteristics are and to see if we can
8 meet the pumping rates that we have to meet in order
9 to agree with the model. So -- that's all part of
10 real estate also. We'll have to get agreements for
11 the well locations and things like that. So there's
12 a lot of up-front work that has to be done. At that
13 point, Foster Wheeler, after installing all of that,
14 will conduct a treatability study, that's the pump
15 test.

16 After they collect all of that
17 geophysical data and groundwater data, then they'll
18 start doing their design or what we call a draft
19 implementation plan. If all goes well and the
20 funding comes in and the schedule goes off the way I
21 have it here, we should be seeing some type of draft
22 design or implementation plan sometime around early
23 September of 2004. We'll get that plan or design
24 reviewed by the RAB and regulatory members. And
25 hopefully put out a final plan this late October,

Proceedings

1
2 and then we'll basically have the winter to finalize
3 everything, obtain any construction permits that we
4 have to obtain and hopefully by the next good
5 construction season, starting in March of 2005, we
6 will be out there putting the treatment building up
7 and putting in the air stripping tower and getting
8 the system constructed.

9 MR. GRELLLO: When would be a
10 projected start-up, to be able to stay on schedule.

11 MR. COLTER: Probably it would take
12 about it looks like maybe 125 working days, five
13 days a week. The remedy, the system should be
14 constructed and final construction by sometime
15 September of 2005 and start-up would be soon after
16 that. I think that's a six-month construction
17 period. That's a pretty lengthy construction period
18 but you never know. Sometime in 2005 should be the
19 start-up of the system.

20 As the model has predicted we should
21 have reduced almost 100 percent of the mass sometime
22 within the seven to 10 year time frame. So that's
23 kind of what our real estate agreements would be
24 written for with the anticipation that if we meet
25 our goals at that point the system would be shut off

Proceedings

1
2 and dismantled at that point. Wells would be taken
3 out and the site fully restored at that point.

4 That's kind of where we are at.

5 MR. GRELO: When you say "reduce the
6 mass", you're talking the state TAGM levels.

7 MR. COLTER: No. We are taking out
8 as much mass, where that area now reflects the rest
9 of the plume. As Dave mentioned before, the plume
10 basically is from, you know five to 10 to 100 to 200
11 parts per billion. Our goal is not to clean that
12 site up because there is more contamination north of
13 it that will flow through. This is basically
14 getting a significantly higher concentration of
15 organics and getting them out of the aquifer. It's
16 too unfeasible to clean up the entire aquifer to
17 drinking water standards. That was part of that
18 whole public comment period several years ago that
19 that was -- it is too big, too expensive. You'd
20 have to put a pump house and air stripping tower in
21 people's yards, you know, all along the southern
22 boundary, that we kind of talked about that earlier,
23 as being infeasible. The plan now is to
24 keep -- where most of the contamination is, keep
25 that on Northrop Grumman property with the

Proceedings

1
2 containment system. What we've missed, we've
3 missed. And let's make sure that the water supplies
4 are protected and that's the purpose of the outpost
5 wells in the aquifer. There is this hot spot and we
6 want to reduce the mass there but not clean it up to
7 TAGM.

8 MR. GRELLLO: What numbers are we
9 shooting for.

10 MR. COLTER: The model basically says
11 we can get down to less than 100 in the seven to 10
12 year time frame.

13 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Explain the
14 alternate protection. Is the treatment system on
15 the water district wells. The two of those have
16 already been put in. Just reiterate.

17 MR. COLTER: In Bethpage water.

18 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Through Bethpage
19 water which has already been impacted it already has
20 the protective treatment systems on them so the
21 water that's used is never contaminated.

22 MR. GRELLLO: For the chemicals that
23 we are talking about here, what are the state TAGMs
24 on them.

25 MR. COLTER: It is federal MCL, which

Proceedings

1
2 is five parts per billion for most contaminants.
3 The federal drinking level is five. For most of the
4 volatile organic compounds, we are talking about.
5 And the state levels are similar to the federal,
6 five parts per billion.

7 MR. GRELO: How did you come up
8 with 100 parts per billion being safe.

9 MR. COLTER: We are not saying it is
10 safe. The goal is to get a higher chunk of
11 contamination out of the aquifer to reduce the
12 aquifer. It's not to clean it up.

13 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: If water that's
14 contaminated up to 100 parts per billion ever
15 reached the well, the system that is put on the well
16 knocks the hundred down to nothing.

17 Every well that would be impacted,
18 the three wells that are currently impacted, have
19 treatment systems on it. If the outpost well
20 finds -- detects a contamination level that would
21 impact the drinking water well, then the system
22 would be put on the drinking water well to make sure
23 it's.

24 MR. GRELO: But our job is supposed
25 to be restoration of the aquifer and protection of

Proceedings

our drinking water. Not cost. Cost should not play a factor here. Once it's all set up and the design standards are set up, it may be more feasible and better for the community to leave it running for another ten years and get it down to 50 parts.

Okay, of course we are not going to get it down to MCLS 5 or TAGMs. But 100 parts per million is a lot to leave. Especially when development continues to go and the accessibility of putting more treatment somewhere else, when we do have a problem, becomes unfeasible, as we are finding nowhere to set it up. Restoration is our business. 100 parts per million --

MR. COLTER: You got to understand. This whole thing, those types of questions and everything, there was a series of a lot of alternatives that were presented way back.

MR. GRELO: I understand.

MR. COLTER: We are now implementing the preferred remedy that was chosen and commented on by the public. I understand you're coming in at kind of like the home stretch here. Maybe what we need to do is meet with you separately. Because this has been a 10-year process.

Proceedings

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GRELLO: I know that.

MR. COLTER: And it has been a process that has been going on. To answer all your questions that you have a valid point on every one, we've doing that for the last ten years. But we can't do it all right here. We will be here till midnight.

MR. GRELLO: Of course not. All I'm saying for the record is that once that system is set up and running, it pays to leave it running a few more years to get it below 100 parts.

MR. COLTER: But there's more contamination there north of this that continues to come through. And then you have similar levels on the western side. You can't put a system in, that cuts that off. I mean, we've done that up on Northrop Grumman property. This system, the plume that's left the property, is too wide. You'd have to -- we are having a hard time finding a spot to put this treatment system in.

MR. GRELLO: You know that that's what I'm saying.

A WOMAN: I offered you a spot.

MR. GRELLO: That's why I said at

Proceedings

the last meeting, maybe with these studies we should be looking at injecting the treated water upgradient so we create a flush.

MR. COLTER: That's all --

MR. SCHARF: If I might answer that part of your question. That's what we are doing right now with the containment system north of the area.

MR. COLTER: Talking about GM38 *D2 remedy. The containment sump is on the Grumman site. We are pumping 4,000 gallons a minute of water and treating that essentially to non-detect and reinjecting that water through the recharge basins. Just north of Central Avenue, there's a series of recharge basins. In fact, they actually mentioned this at the last RAB meeting.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

MR. SCHARF: Injection in the sense of putting it through recharge basins. Part of the remedy, was to confirm that the containment system is working. And that work was performed by Tetra Tech as part of the ongoing process of implementing the ROD.

Not only did that show that the

Proceedings

1
2 site's being contained but it also demonstrated that
3 the groundwater is cleaning itself up south of the
4 former Grumman facility.

5 A MAN: I have a question to ask you
6 about the treatment. Now, the treatment of the
7 water. If one well seems to get overwhelmed, does
8 it shut down? Will it actually be able to handle
9 it? Or if it breaks down, the well, and starts
10 just dumping the benzene in our drinking water, does
11 an alarm go off? Does it shut down?

12 MR. SCHARF: I'm not sure I follow
13 you. You mean the treatment system Jim's talking
14 about.

15 A MAN: I'm talking about our wells,
16 our drinking water on the wells.

17 MR. SCHARF: You're talking about the
18 treatment of wells.

19 A MAN: Yeah.

20 MR. SCHARF: If the well is impacted
21 or actually if it's determined that it is impacted,
22 in the event that a well will be impacted, the goal
23 of this program with the outpost monitoring wells
24 is to put treatment on those particular wells before
25 it gets there.

Proceedings

1
2 A MAN: That's not what I'm saying.

3 MR. SCHARF: I know. But I'm leading
4 up to that. There are -- as part of this program we
5 have to sample monthly to make sure the systems are
6 working. These systems are fairly routine. If
7 these airstrippers are packed towers, as long as
8 their flow is working right, we can fairly safely
9 assume the technology is working, to do what it has
10 to do. In fact it has been demonstrated that if the
11 system fails, the whole system shuts down. There
12 are all sorts of system controls to do that.

13 If the packed tower -- the packing
14 fails, we are going to know that by all the flow
15 rates that we monitor by computer at the facility.

16 A MAN: If it is only taken once a
17 month if you happen to go two weeks past, and you
18 injected all that drinking water into our drinking
19 pipes.

20 MR. COLTER: You need to talk to the
21 water district. They have safeguards against that.

22 A MAN: This is what I'm trying to
23 figure out and find out.

24 MR. COLTER: I'm not going to speak
25 for them, they have the capacity to shut a well down

Proceedings

and continue the --

A MAN: Not shutting a well down but how much contamination got into the pipes that we all started drinking. What is that woman in California? She left a glass of drinking water from that place would you like to drink that water? I didn't think so.

MR. GRELO: If I may, what I think he's trying to project is what I said at the last meeting. We can, we cannot rely on mechanical well head extraction, because mechanical failure, and human error, I believe the best restoration that can be done is the best remedy. Take the blackout we had.

A MAN: We have a cogeneration power plant over here in Bethpage, and it knocked us all down, 60 thousand people were supposed to have power. How did Long Island get knocked out of power? It is garbage.

MR. GRELO: If there's three to five weeks between testing the plume, there could be three parts per million of TCE, or something else. We know two parts per million may not kill you over the three-week period we are drinking it, but we're

Proceedings

1
2 breathing in other contaminants in our area, and
3 other contaminants are in our food we are eating,
4 that is why I said before restoration is the name of
5 the business.

6 MR. SCHARF: If you're asking a
7 question, the state health department sent out
8 regulations which are fairly stringent and
9 conservative. The methods that are used are strict
10 across the state not just on Long Island to
11 demonstrate to the satisfaction of the health
12 department they are providing water that is potable
13 and safe to drink.

14 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We can put this
15 on the agenda.

16 MR. COLTER: We need the water
17 district.

18 MR. MANGANO: Can you invite the
19 water district down to the next meeting as a speaker
20 on the subject. So you get it on the record.

21 A MAN: I'd like to take a walk to
22 one of the treatment plants and see. There's a way
23 that you can fudge things up.

24 MR. GRELO: If you want, next time
25 I'll bring some water that has contaminants in it of

Proceedings

two parts per billion, and see if you guys want to drink it.

MR. MANGANO: I'm sure they'll be receptive. We'll get them here for the next one. If you want those answers, the water district has been very receptive. You don't need to wait three months. You can all go over there and Andy, will be able to answer those question.

A MAN: Ed, between test periods, we can be drinking two parts, five parts, five parts, 10 parts per million because the well head treatment was not doing its job. It is like making a pot of coffee. Without that coffee filter, you're going to drink the grinds.

MR. MANGANO: I would love to get them here, I was not under the impression that we could get to the point it could get into our drinking water. Every meeting I ever attended, they always represented it can't get into the drinking water to reach our homes. We should get them, those that are responsible, for that care, to be here and perhaps they can explain in greater detail how they prevent something like that. I'd like to know that answer as well. That's a great question.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. SCHARF: As a chemical
3 engineering student in college, I studied process
4 engineering, they run systems to work and they run
5 tests on it. And the companies that design the
6 systems, take samples probably every hour, sending
7 contaminated water into a given tower and insuring
8 it works that way. For example, when we start up a
9 pump and treat system you start every month, we
10 sample the wells and elevations. Once you get the
11 system running, you have a certain level of
12 confidence. Just like, I guess, just like anything
13 else.

14 A MAN: Not to overwhelm your
15 education, or your knowledge, but Three Mile Island
16 still happened.

17 MR. SCHARF: Absolutely. It is a
18 valid question. I'm trying to tell you these are
19 designed into the system. Otherwise they wouldn't
20 be putting these on.

21 A MAN: What's the safety system? I
22 would say Three Mile Island would have a greater
23 safety system, and it still happened.

24 MR. MANGANO: I was under the
25 impression that we don't pump from the areas that

Proceedings

1
2 were contaminated, that was the impression that I
3 was under. We are not pumping drinking water from
4 those areas. So I think we should get the water
5 district.

6 MR. SCHARF: That is not exactly 100
7 percent.

8 MR. COLTER: For the southern
9 districts, that is true. For Bethpage water that's
10 not. That's -- Northrop Grumman Navy paid for the
11 treatment systems on this.

12 MR. MANGANO: We'll get them down
13 here, then.

14 A MAN: Venditto wouldn't want to
15 drink that water.

16 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Jim, can we.

17 MR. COLTER: We'll invite John Malloy
18 from Bethpage water.

19 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We'll make it an
20 agenda item for the next meeting.

21 A MAN: Get technical person that's
22 treating the water, who knows how the system works
23 and what's the reliability of it. We want to see
24 how the system actually works.

25 MR. SCHARF: John Lovejoy from the

Proceedings

1
2 county health department told me the county has a
3 working model air stripping tower they can bring to
4 public meetings to show people how it works.

5 A MAN: That should be done at one of
6 those poster things you're going to have at the
7 school so they can explain how the treatment is
8 done. Because we are going to relay this stuff. We
9 have to give everybody, the truth. In case of
10 something happens, we got to show them. We are not
11 going to go on this is what they say you might as
12 well get up there and speak and let us stay home.

13 MR. SCHARF: Given the number of
14 municipal wells on Long Island, for example, that
15 have been impacted and those wells that have air
16 strippers on them and have undergone sampling at
17 different times, only a couple of companies make
18 these systems, and they're all performing up to par.
19 I would say it is a fairly good level of confidence
20 that we are in good shape. But that's a good
21 question. You want the people who do work on the
22 design to answer that question.

23 A MAN: Erin Brokovich once said that
24 too, we are in good shape. Drink the water.

25 MR. COLTER: That wraps up what

Proceedings

1
2 we've done in the last three months. Not a whole
3 lot has been accomplished because of the funding
4 issue, but we're making progress. Once the funding
5 comes in this fiscal year, by the next meeting,
6 which we'll talk about a little bit later, there
7 should be some reports out. You'll see some
8 progress.

9 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: You want to
10 summarize what Ed missed on preliminary results for
11 the Hempstead Parkway.

12 MR. COLTER: Before you got here, Dave
13 from Tertra Tech gave us an update on the status of
14 the installation of the outpost wells that we are
15 putting in upgradient of South Farmingdale well
16 field, New York service well field, and Levittown
17 well field. Right now, all four wells are in.
18 Either two or three wells are at each location
19 monitoring at different depths. We should be, we
20 completed one well today at the South Farmingdale
21 well furthest to the east. And we should be
22 finished with the third well in that cluster within
23 a couple of weeks. So after, by the end of
24 November, all of the outpost monitoring wells will
25 be in. Upgradient of the water supplies for the New

Proceedings

1
2 York Water Service water well, that was shown by the
3 model to be already within the five year time frame.
4 That contamination should already be at the outpost
5 well location. That well went in when we sampled
6 it. We didn't find any site-related contaminants,
7 the TCE or the PCB that we've been tracking. That
8 we did get a hit of benzene, but it wasn't in a
9 typical well sampling technique that we found it.
10 When we were sampling the well water after we purged
11 the well? Before we dump the water, we have to
12 sample it before it goes into the POTW. In that
13 frac tank, we found benzene. So not knowing where
14 it might have come from, we weren't back two weeks
15 later into that well and we resampled it using
16 sampling techniques. So it is actually a repetitive
17 sample of the aquifer, not in the frac tank, and we
18 found non-detect for benzene. We are going to go
19 back out in two more weeks and we're going to
20 resample the well again.

21 MR. MANGANO: On all of that, you
22 work with the local water districts, they're aware
23 of those resamplings in those districts?

24 MR. COLTER: I forward them progress
25 reports and things like that. Gary Loewshirt of H2M

Proceedings

1
2 has asked for those results. We resampled, and we
3 just got the results yesterday. So I'm going to
4 forward the results to him. I'm also going to let
5 him know we are going to go back in in two weeks to
6 resample just in case. That not being a
7 site-related contaminant. We didn't detect it. It
8 looks like that well is free of site-related
9 compounds so there's not as much urgency as the
10 model may have been predicting. So it is some good
11 news.

12 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We'll get you a
13 complete report by the next RAB meeting.

14 MR. MANGANO: Traffic, motor
15 vehicles.

16 MR. GRELO: When we find hits like
17 that and it's confirmed that it's not laboratory
18 error, is the DEC going to investigate where the
19 source is coming from, if it is not site-related?

20 MR. SCHARF: Absolutely. If we find
21 benzene from an oil spill, from a tank that's
22 leaking, we have to track that source of the spill
23 in Stony Brook. We refer that information to them.

24 MR. GRELO: Mike I had this same
25 problem with the Liberty site where they found

Proceedings

1
2 petroleum floating in one of the wells and it took
3 nine months until they decided to go after the gas
4 station that it was obviously coming from, which was
5 a block away. By the time you go through your
6 remedial design phase and you set everything up, you
7 just made the problem two or three times as bad. So
8 when we do find something like that by accident or
9 through an act of God, we need to act on it quickly.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. SCHARF: Absolutely.

12 MR. GRELLLO: Thank you.

13 MR. SCHARF: You're welcome.

14 Appreciate your input.

15 MR. COLTER: The last item on the
16 agenda is an update from your TAPP contractor, which
17 is H2M. Gary Miller is here. He's been reviewing
18 the dry well report for the Navy site that the
19 TAPP -- or the RAB had requested, that the report be
20 reviewed by an independent consultant. You guys
21 chose H2M as your independent consultant. He has
22 been doing that over the last several months and
23 I'll turn it over to Gary to give you guys an update
24 of where they are at with their review.

25 MR. MILLER: As Jim pointed out

Proceedings

1
2 several months ago, H2M was tasked with conducting
3 an independent review of the investigative study
4 work done at two drywells at plant three. These
5 drywells were previously identified as having been
6 impacted with PCBs. While there were some remedial
7 efforts taken in these drywells, soils were
8 excavated down to 28 to 30 feet, which was the limit
9 of practical investigation. The remediation stopped
10 at that point. Additional study was done to
11 determine, to gather information on the extent of
12 the PCB contamination, moving downward and
13 laterally, looking at the groundwater and then
14 looking at what options were available to remediate
15 these drywells further.

16 At this point in time, H2M has
17 reviewed all the reports. We are in the process of
18 preparing our own report and we will summarize our
19 findings and conclusions. For the purpose of this
20 meeting tonight, we prepared an executive summary
21 which highlights what we looked at and what our
22 findings are. I'll let Paul Lageraaen touch on some
23 of the highlights. We have copies. I think we may
24 have just enough to hand out to everyone.

25 MR. LAGERAAEN: What I have here, is

Proceedings

1
2 a draft copy of the executive summary for the
3 evaluation report. The evaluation report again is
4 our review as far as the investigation and
5 remediation of these two drywells over at Plant 3.

6 There were two main reports that we
7 reviewed, and they were performed by Roux
8 Associates. The first report was a site
9 characterization report. That report was
10 essentially an investigation as far as the extent of
11 PCB contamination at these two drywells. And they
12 investigated the soil contamination and groundwater
13 contamination around the two drywells. The
14 investigation was comprehensive especially for the
15 soil investigation. They determined -- for the
16 PCBs, they went a radial distance 20 feet down to
17 pretty much the groundwater table. They checked the
18 soils for contamination above the recommended soil
19 cleanup objectives for the DEC. And they determined
20 an area that was impacted with the PCBs and then
21 they also did groundwater sampling, by the drywell,
22 as well, 75 feet away. They found minor impact of
23 PCBs in the groundwater, and they also, after
24 preparing a site characterization report, did a
25 focus feasibility study on available technologies

Proceedings

1
2 for treating PCB contamination in the soils, to
3 determine what is available commercially, and what
4 might work for addressing the PCB contamination in
5 the soils. They evaluated a number of different
6 technologies and we reviewed the different
7 technologies that Roux evaluated.

8 And upon review of their focus
9 feasibility study, we feel it was a fair report and
10 they evaluated the technologies that are
11 commercially available. We also looked for ones on
12 our own. We couldn't find any that were applicable
13 to PCBs in soils.

14 As far as the soil contamination
15 went, they evaluated a no action alternative, no
16 action meaning they'd leave the soils in place,
17 versus excavation. And treating the PCB soil
18 contamination in place. And the conclusion of that
19 report in the focus feasibility study was that there
20 really is no exposure, potential human exposure, to
21 the PCBs, and a no action alternative was selected.
22 Our evaluation of that is we don't find any fault
23 with that conclusion. We don't disagree with it.
24 Leaving PCBs in place, seems, based on the exposure
25 assessment, that they had conducted, that there

Proceedings

1 really was no exposure pathways for human contact.
2
3 As long as the area drywells are paved over, there
4 is no potential human exposure to risk. So we don't
5 disagree with the conclusions of the feasibility
6 study as far as the no action alternative for the
7 PCBs.

8 As far as groundwater goes, the focus
9 feasibility study looked at remedial alternatives,
10 it didn't address groundwater. They did find minor
11 groundwater contamination above class GA groundwater
12 drinking standards, which for PCBs is .09 parts per
13 billion, and the highest concentration they found
14 was about 12 parts per billion, that's still low
15 numbers, but they were above the GA drinking
16 standards about 75 feet away. They did not do a
17 feasibility study for treating the groundwater,
18 because there was no exposure hazard for
19 groundwater. Which really is true. And also,
20 there's an extensive, as we know, groundwater
21 treatment and remediation system on-site. So, the
22 one recommendation that we would have, as far as
23 groundwater goes, and their evaluation is, that the
24 on-site treatment and monitoring program for
25 groundwater actually incorporates PCBs in select

Proceedings

1 wells, since PCBs were detected in the groundwater.

2 Just in the future, it might be
3 worthwhile to look to monitor for PCBs. As far as
4 it is our understanding PCBs aren't looked at in the
5 groundwater monitoring program. A no action
6 alternative was recommended for that, and we can't
7 find fault for that, because there is no exposure
8 pathway for a contact with the groundwater. But
9 with something like that, if you just monitor for
10 PCBs, in the groundwater treatment or monitoring
11 program at a few select locations, where you think
12 it might go downgradient from these locations, that
13 might be advisable.

14 MR. SCHARF: I would like to add that
15 the focus feasibility study was done under, by
16 direction, by Northrop Grumman at the time, as part
17 of turning the Plant 3 government-owned contractor
18 operated facility back to the Navy. The conclusion
19 that they came to report about no further action, I
20 did not concur with that conclusion. I put in
21 writing that the department wanted the PCBs to be
22 addressed in the drywells, concurrent, as part of
23 the Site 1. This has now been made an extension of
24 the Site 1. And that was how I left it. And have
25

Proceedings

you ever responded to that, Jim?

MR. COLTER: Not yet.

MR. SCHARF: That is -- just to let the community at large know that. That the work was done by Northrop Grumman as part of the process of turning the plant back over to the Navy. And those work plans were reviewed by me and approved by me, to implement, to derive data that went into this report.

MR. LAGERAAEN: Okay. Roux Associates had conducted, the initial report was a site characterization report. The purpose of that was to, basically, to determine the extent of potential contamination in soil and groundwater in between formulating the site characterization report and doing the feasibility study, which evaluated treatment for the soil, they did formulate an exposure assessment independent report. That report was a risk assessment evaluating the potential hazard of PCBs in the soils, as well as in the groundwater. It was conclusive in that exposure assessment report and they did the next step and did the feasibility study for potential remedial options.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. MANGANO: My only question is
3 when will you have the Navy determination on
4 monitoring PCBs.

5 MR. COLTER: The first thing we
6 wanted to do, was to get your TAPP contractor's
7 comments.

8 MR. MANGANO: Okay.

9 MR. COLTER: And address those
10 comments as part of our decision-making process. We
11 are almost there but we are not quite there.

12 MR. MANGANO: In the next meeting in
13 that three month period you'll have a determination.

14 A MAN: We had hoped to meet with the
15 smaller committee, yourself, and Jim McBride, to go
16 over our executive summary and from there prepare
17 our final report. We want to have that final report
18 well before the next meeting in April.

19 A MAN: Jim, could you explain
20 compared to some of the other contaminants, the way
21 PCBs move or don't move? Because it was my
22 understanding that as a contaminant, PCBs don't
23 move, or move very little, compared to some other
24 contaminants.

25 A MAN: That is correct. PCBs are

Proceedings

1
2 considered relatively immobile compared to the other
3 contaminants. The volatile organic compounds tend
4 to move at or about the same speed as groundwater.
5 PCBs are considered relatively immobile. The fact
6 that Roux did find them in a well downgradient from
7 these drywells would lead us to believe that they
8 have moved a bit.

9 A MAN: Okay.

10 MR. COLTER: One of the mechanisms
11 that we think may have happened in the process is
12 that Northrop Grumman was using, they were using TCE
13 as a cleaner for some of their equipment that used
14 PCB as a heating medium. And it is just a theory
15 that you know, upon routine maintenance using TCE to
16 clean out their equipment, that the PCBs bound onto
17 the solvents, which does migrate pretty readily
18 through the -- soils, that is our only theory how it
19 got so far down. Normally, you're right, if you
20 have a release of PCBs at the surface, they'll go
21 down to some depth and then they'll get bound up and
22 won't go any deeper. So there is some mechanism
23 that got them down to this depth. We think it had
24 something to do with the TCE, that was also found in
25 that area.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. GRELO: The impacted soil that's
3 impact with the PCBs, what depths was that at?

4 MR. COLTER: In the report, Northrop
5 Grumman, when they first discovered the drywell,
6 which the depth of the drywell itself I think was
7 eight feet below ground and it was a soil earthen
8 bottom, and that is how it got into the soil.
9 Northrop Grumman dug down to between 38 and 35 feet,
10 which is as far as their boom could go for a typical
11 excavator. Right now they backfilled that with
12 clean soil. Right now, at 30 to 35 feet, there is
13 no PCBs around the drywells. Contamination starts
14 again from below 35 feet down to the water table,
15 which is about five five feet.

16 MR. GRELO: All the impacted soils
17 are below 35 feet.

18 MR. COLTER: Yes.

19 MR. GRELO: Being there might be
20 future construction on the site, that means there
21 has to deed restrictions put on the property so we
22 know what is going on.

23 MR. COLTER: That is one potential
24 way of handling it, we'd definitely have to call out
25 the locations of these soils for future

Proceedings

1
2 construction, but there's not too many footings that
3 go down 35 feet. There's not too much risk with
4 worker exposure, but the locations of these soils
5 will need to be called out in any transfer document.
6 That's one way of handling it.

7 MR. SCHARF: Mike, for your
8 information the area of these drywells is not going
9 to be transferred. For property that is slated to
10 be transferred. There is a ROD. It's written to
11 address soil contamination, one of which is PCBs.
12 Most of that PCB contamination is at shallower
13 depths. The DEC made its response to the ROD in its
14 report to the Navy, and they haven't gotten back to
15 us yet. It is one of those things out there, given
16 all this.

17 MR. COLTER: Because we are retaining
18 that parcel, we haven't put as much urgency on that.
19 As we have trying to transfer the remaining 96
20 acres, we are trying to do, to Nassau County. We
21 are trying to do all that in the immediate future.
22 Since we are retaining that property and we are not
23 going to allow use on that property, it's not as
24 high a priority right now. Once we get the
25 property, the remaining Navy property transferred,

Proceedings

1
2 and we get some more of this groundwater system in
3 place, we are going to -- that's another one of our
4 items we have to submit.

5 MR. GRELLLO: Impacted soils 0 to 15
6 feet would be a big question, but at 28 feet, the
7 chance of human exposure are next to nothing. Like
8 you said it would just be for the worker, which
9 would probably be trained in it anyhow by then.

10 MR. COLTER: That is some of the
11 things we have to evaluate when we get back into it.

12 MR. SCHARF: Which includes possibly
13 monitoring the groundwater monitoring program, as
14 H2M mentioned, as part of their review.

15 There is going to be an excavation
16 right next to that in Site 1 for PCBs. And that is
17 going to have see.

18 However, the drywell was dug down to
19 20 feet with the sheet piling and they hit pretty
20 much the limit of excavation considering they are
21 next to Plant 3, it is right next to the building.

22 MR. GRELLLO: From my knowledge of
23 deed restrictions, if a deed restriction is put on
24 any portions of property, it has to be filed with
25 both town, county and if there's a village involved,

Proceedings

1
2 there has to be some program where a flag goes up,
3 otherwise a village or town grants an okay to do
4 something because only the county knew about it. So
5 we have to make sure those procedures are put in
6 place.

7 MR. SCHARF: It is possible. For one
8 thing the Navy may never transfer these particular
9 parcels.

10 Also.

11 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: No, that's not
12 possible. It is absolutely not possible.

13 MR. SCHARF: Jim has also mentioned.

14 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: For the record,
15 that's not possible or I'll lose my job.

16 MR. SCHARF: Jim has agreed to go
17 back and look at the possibility of new innovative
18 technologies as they come around, that are cost
19 effective, to lower the numbers in the soil. The
20 Navy does have a research center out in California
21 where they maintain a data base of all different
22 technologies that they are using as a different base
23 of clean up. Jim will go back and look at that, at
24 feasibility, what's there, what they found, where it
25 is located and come up with a response to the

Proceedings

Department's letter.

MR. GRELO: You could do a bench study and see if it works. Bioremediation has come a long way.

MR. SCHARF: PCBs are tough for bioremediation.

MR. COLTER: We actually have, I'm not sure what you call it, but it is generally something out to the technology community out there for requests for any, again that is from our service center out in California, we put out a standard issue saying if anybody has anything innovative with PCBs at deep depths, we'd be interested in seeing your proposal. So that is out there. We'll see if we get any responses, or anything like that. If it seems something, we might want to use this site as a test case, we would consider that.

That's kind of where we are at. Since the last meeting. I don't have anything else.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Right now I think we've talked about action items for the next meeting -- not action items but agenda items, which relate to some action items. And the Navy is going to ask the Bethpage Water District if they'll come

Proceedings

and make a presentation.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: We'll let you know on the agenda.

MR. GRELO: If I may, make the recommendation to put in a cluster for South Farmingdale and their potential for future impacts. That South Farmingdale also be notified considering we weren't involved in directing the decision, because we did not know we were going to be impacted.

MR. SCHARF: No, that is not true. We had a meeting. What happened --

MR. MANGANO: Why don't we write to South Farmingdale.

MR. SCHARF: Before the ROD was written, we had meetings with South Farmingdale, Bethpage Water District, New York Water Service, Town of Hempstead Water District, which is Levittown Water District, and Massapequa Water District. And we had meetings just to discuss at the time the information that we had as to what the extent of the plumb -- what we felt the extent of the plume was. But we had already asked and answered these

Proceedings

1
2 alternatives and we made a selection based on the
3 fact what was feasible and what wasn't. It's part
4 of the program, that once a ROD was signed, to do a
5 predesign study. The Navy has taken on that task
6 and completed that work. We found, as I said
7 earlier, the plume was further than we thought but
8 it's still not at the point where it will impact any
9 wells other than Bethpage at the current time.

10 MR. GRELLO: Back then, they didn't
11 feel we were ever going to get to this point where
12 this could be a potential impact of what we are
13 talking now. That's why I'm saying we weren't so
14 involved with the ROD back then, because we didn't
15 feel we were going to be impacted. From that
16 perspective, that is true. The districts were
17 notified.

18 MR. GRELLO: Yes, I spoke with them.

19 MR. COLTER: What I would offer, in
20 lieu of inviting them to the next meeting, New York
21 State, semi-routinely we meet with the water
22 districts at what we call technical advisory
23 committee meetings and we go over the status of the
24 technical plan with the Hicksville Water District,
25 the Bethpage, Plainview, and we have them here.

Proceedings

Have them all here so they can all answer the questions.

MR. COLTER: If we have a TAPP meeting, and it's up to Steve, we can invite the RAB members to come to that meeting which may be before the April meeting.

A MAN: But we seem to have to have all the water districts and see how they actually treat it. Because no offense, I don't want no oil changer going ahead and allegedly cleaning these things out and having accidents occur because I've seen it.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: There's two different agenda items here. One is to have a water district with the treatment system such as Bethpage explain how they operate.

A MAN: Not just.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: They are the only ones with the treatment system right thought.

The second agenda item, is for you to listen to the discussions that Steve routinely has with all the water districts so that you understand what they understand.

MR. MANGANO: For the record, are the

Proceedings

1
2 water districts, you're saying are communicating on
3 a regular basis about this issue.

4 MR. COLTER: Yes.

5 MR. MANGANO: Both Bethpage, that is
6 affected, and those that may be affected, they have
7 been doing that for how long.

8 MR. SCHARF: Two years now.

9 There's two consultants that
10 represent all the district, D&B and H2M. I'm sure
11 they routinely discuss what's going on here amongst
12 themselves and also with each other, the two
13 different consulting firms.

14 Keep in mind, this is a state ROD for
15 the overall Navy and Grumman site. In order to get
16 funded for their work, the Navy had to write their
17 own ROD specific to their site. It incorporates
18 everything that's in the DEC ROD, but it spells out
19 parts that the Navy need funding for to implement.

20 As part of the overall ROD, one of
21 the things it calls for is this meeting, periodic
22 meeting with the water districts. Technical
23 advisory committee meetings. These were set up to
24 advise the state of what's going on. However, these
25 meetings we have on a semi-routine basis have grown.

Proceedings

1
2 When we have these meetings we get 30, 40, 45 people
3 coming. Unfortunately we do them during the day,
4 which makes it difficult for the afternoon person to
5 attend.

6 A MAN: I'll be retired.

7 MR. SCHARF: There you go.

8 It kind of has developed a life of
9 its own, these meetings. They weren't originally
10 envisioned to open them up to the public, but I
11 don't see why we can't. Everything we discuss
12 there, is everything we discuss here. It is the
13 ongoing updates. It give us updates what's going on
14 with the overall process.

15 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: So, we have an
16 action item for Steve to invite the RAB to the next
17 water district meeting, to a water district meeting
18 as you see fit. I don't know that you need to bring
19 the whole public in. If you bring the RAB members
20 in, that would make sense, because they represent
21 the public.

22 MR. SCHARF: What Jim and I were
23 talking about is, was sometime in February we were
24 going to have this public availability session.

25 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Its going to get

Proceedings

1
2 too confusing.

3 MR. SCHARF: In terms of time.

4 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: It will get
5 confusing.

6 To have them come and listen to the
7 water district, that is one item.. A water district
8 with a treatment system can come here and explain
9 how they operate it. That's two items the.

10 The third item is going to be for
11 you, to review this process we know about, because
12 we have been at it so long, could you make a
13 presentation at the next RAB meeting that reviews
14 the whole thing.

15 MR. SCHARF: I can do that.

16 CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: I see three
17 things that shouldn't be confusing. We shouldn't
18 also confuse that with this neighborhood workshop,
19 which is all about there's going to be people in
20 your neighborhood drilling wells and putting up
21 stuff and don't misunderstand what's going on. That
22 is four different things.

23 MR. SCHARF: I don't mean we should
24 have them all exactly during that time, the TAC
25 meeting and to have the RAB meeting. We're all

Proceedings

shooting toward the date in February.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Sometime in February will be cool. It doesn't have to be a RAB meeting.

MR. MANGANO: You want to get the water district at the RAB meeting, for the RAB record, about the questions you have raised about the drinking water. That's we are going to do that one, right?

A WOMAN: In April.

MR. GRELO: To tell us about the operation of the system. We want to know about the possible failure and how long it had to detect.

MR. MANGANO: You need the water district to do that.

MR. GRELO: Testing done on Monday the 22, when is the next testing done? What is the possibility for failure in between testing, how long does it take for the samples to get out and the results to come back, is there a backup generation for the well head treatments?

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Right. That can be conveyed to Bethpage. Although this is a Navy RAB, and we cannot cause Bethpage Water District to

Proceedings

present that to you.

A MAN: We'll get a hold of you.

MR. MANGANO: I feel confident if they say no, can you alert us if they're saying that they won't. If they say no, can you alert us well in advance and we'll try to appeal to them.

MR. SCHARF: Dave, can you put something together how an air stripper works.

MR. BRAYACK: Why don't we have the water districts do it.

MR. GRELO: The question is not so much how it operates, it is the possibility for failure and how long our, exposure would be and maybe even a human risk assessment. If we had 10 failures in a 10 year period and we drank two parts per million of TCE and threes part per billion of PCBs or whatever, what would be the health risk assessment over a 10-year period if it happened 10 times, to an eight year-old, 20-year old and an 88-year old.

MR. SCHARF: I think Gary Miller may be able to address the issue. If they didn't feel a high degree of confidence these things worked well and did what they were designed to do, they wouldn't

Proceedings

1
2 be putting the systems on.

3 MR. MILLER: I'm not an expert in the
4 design of stripping towers but there are other folks
5 in our firm that do that. As far as I'm aware, most
6 if not all water districts do have backup water
7 generation. When we had a blackout a month or two
8 ago, the water kept running. So they do have backup
9 generation. But as with any mechanical system,
10 there's always a chance of failure. There are
11 safeguards built in so the treatment system keeps
12 working. I'm not an expert. John Part (ph) of the
13 technical advisory committee would be happy to come
14 down and go through the details.

15 MR. GRELO: I agree with 100 percent
16 of what you're saying. But if you ask any water
17 district if they'd rather have restoration of the
18 aquifer or well-head treatment, you know what the
19 answer's going to be. That is what brought up the
20 conversation leaving 100 parts per billion.

21 A MAN: We run into problems with
22 shifting breaking pipes. They have pipes right now
23 that are copper pipes that are getting pin pricks in
24 them and nobody knows where it's coming from. It's
25 not low voltage. We took houses, separated

Proceedings

everything from it, and tested it.

Then they claim it is from the flux.
It it is not from the flux.

A PERSON: Pinning occurs in copper
pipes. It is very well-documented.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Agenda item is
going to be get Bethpage Water District down to get
your question answered.

MR. SCHARF: They're good questions
and we'll get them to answer your questions to your
satisfaction.

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: Another action
item.

MR. SCHARF: They're going to review
the whole nine yards for us. Start us from the
beginning.

We'll have to have those
presentations that Gary Miller put together and work
on something. Have to modify something.

A WOMAN: I have been to water
treatment plants, and they seem to be checking stuff
every single day.

MR. COLTER: That's good news.

Thank you every one for coming.

Proceedings

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: One of you guys
will have to substitute for Jim before the meeting
is over.

Would you all like to know when the
next meeting is?

MR. GRELLO: Yes. When is the next
meeting?

MR. COLTER: April?

CO-CHAIR KAMINSKI: First Wednesday
in April.

(Time noted: 8:37 p.m.)

-o0o-

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

I, JENNIFER MAUE, a Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing Matter, taken at the time and place aforesaid, is a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am neither
counsel for nor related to any party to said action,
nor in any wise interested in the result or outcome
thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 14th day of March, 2004.

Junger Mann

JENNIFER MAUE