

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

PUBLIC MEETING
PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN
FOR ABL SITES 2, 3 & 10

* * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LaVale Public Library
815 National Highway
LaVale, Maryland 21502

August 8, 2006

* * * * *

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

PRESENT :

John Aubert
Joshua Barber
Tom Bass
Cassandra Brown
Mark Callaghan
Ray Downs
Ginny Farris
Bill Hudson
Betsy Kagey
Steve Martin
John Waugaman

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 *(The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.*
3 *by Steve Martin.)*

4 MR. MARTIN: I'm Steve Martin. I work for the
5 Navy, and I represent the lead agency on this clean-up
6 at Allegany Ballistics Lab. I work for the Naval
7 Facilities Engineering Command Mid-Atlantic, and we're
8 here today to solicit public input on some proposed
9 remedial action plans for three of our sites at
10 Allegany Ballistics Lab.

11 I'd like to briefly introduce the team members
12 who meet regularly for this work. Let's see, I'll
13 begin with -- we have Tom Bass, in uniform back there,
14 works for the State of West Virginia, Department of
15 Environmental Protection, and we have a regulator from
16 Philadelphia, Josh Barger, Environmental Protection
17 Agency out of Region 3, and then we have John Aubert,
18 who represents NAFSEA directly. His office is in
19 California. He's sitting in the back next to Tom.

20 And then the private company that does most
21 of our work is represented well tonight. We have Mark
22 Callaghan, who will be going through the three

1 presentations on the proposed remedial action plans.
2 Mark's from the Herndon Office of CH2M Hill, as well as
3 Cassandra Brown in the front and Ginny Farris in the
4 back. And then we also have another guest from EPA,
5 Bill Hudson, as well, so without any further comments,
6 let's begin, Mark.

7 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Can everybody hear me
8 okay from here? Normally, I'd stand up, but I'm going
9 to remain here.

10 So this is the Proposed Remedial Action Plan
11 for Site 2 at Allegany Ballistics. Presentation topic
12 tonight, begin the PRAP for Site 2 Soil and Groundwater;
13 its presentation followed by a Q&A session.

14 Why do we hold a public meeting? Well, it's
15 part of the Navy's community relations program, and we
16 do that to keep the public informed, provide an open
17 forum for the public to ask questions, and it's also
18 a component of CERCLA, which is the Comprehensive
19 Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability
20 Act, which the majority of the work of ABL is being
21 conducted under.

22 Objectives of the Proposed Remedial Action

1 Plan: We document past investigations, we summarize
2 the site risk, we describe the preferred alternative,
3 and this is the opportunity for the public to provide
4 input on that preferred alternative.

5 Here's ABL itself. You can see the big site
6 here, this over here. You can see my pointer -- my
7 little laser pointer ran out, so this is Site 2 itself,
8 right over here.

9 MS. KAGEY: Would you walk through the site
10 for the one person here who hasn't been here before?

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yeah, this is Plant 1. This
12 is the developed portion of Plant 1 at least. In
13 order, the sites here, Site 1, Site 2, Site 3, Site 4B,
14 Site 10, Site 11, and Site 12 over here. Site 5 is
15 closed landfill vats. That's actually further south in
16 the undeveloped portion of Plant 1.

17 Okay, Site 2 history. Site 2 was a burning
18 ground utilized from '42 to '49. Aerial photos
19 indicated that there was a burn path approximately 45
20 feet in diameter southeast of the current location of
21 Building 361, and it's suspected that the burning of
22 energetic material at this pad caused a release of

1 contaminants into the environment. But currently the
2 site is -- there's nothing there. It's an open field.
3 It's periodically mowed. There's no visual evidence of
4 contamination or the former burn pad.

5 A close-up of the site here you can see.
6 That's it itself, right next to the river here, and
7 this is the Building 361 that I was just alluding to.

8 I'm just going to whip through these site
9 investigations here. We did an Initial Assessment
10 Study from 1983 through 1987, which concluded that
11 Site 2 did not pose an immediate threat; however a
12 Confirmation Study was conducted to assess potential
13 contamination.

14 In 1992, the facility was listed on the
15 National Priorities List, sometimes known as Superfund,
16 and a remedial investigation was conducted that showed
17 low concentrations of volatile organic compounds and
18 metals in the soil and groundwater.

19 This continued on in 1994 with a Phase II RI,
20 which indicated that the burn pad was not likely a
21 source of VOC groundwater contamination.

22 And then in 2001, we did some supplemental

1 sampling, where we collected additional soil data for
2 risk assessments.

3 Continuing on in the investigations, the Risk
4 Assessment Report, like I said, we collected soil
5 samples during numerous investigations. Groundwater
6 data from monitoring wells was also evaluated to
7 determinate an extent.

8 An investigation of groundwater beneath
9 Site 2 determined that low levels of contamination
10 were attributable to releases from Site 10, which is
11 upgradient of Site 2, and there's currently a
12 remediation action to contain and treat the groundwater
13 at Site 10.

14 A Human Health Risk Assessment was conducted.
15 We evaluated potential receptors, current and future
16 industrial workers, current and future adolescent
17 trespassers and visitors to the site, future adult and
18 child residents of the site -- it's a very conservative
19 scenario -- and also, future construction workers.

20 This all indicated that there was no
21 unacceptable risk under current or future conditions
22 and that the results of the Human Health Risk

1 Assessment indicate that no remedial action is
2 necessary at Site 2 to be protective of human health.

3 We also wanted to look after the bugs and
4 bunnies, so we did an Ecological Risk Assessment. We
5 evaluated upper-trophic-level receptors, via food web
6 exposures, and lower-trophic-level receptors. Upper-
7 trophic-level are generally things like badgers,
8 shrews, eagles, that sort of stuff. Lower-trophic,
9 we're talking more about benthic organisms, worms,
10 things like that. And that indicated that there was
11 no unacceptable risk to any ecological receptors.

12 So again, the results of the ERA indicate no
13 remedial action is necessary to be protective of
14 ecological health.

15 So, some of the important questions here, is
16 there a risk to current or future ABL tenants? There
17 is no -- there's no risk at all. No unacceptable risk
18 from exposure to soil. Groundwater's not a potable
19 source, so nobody's going to be drinking that. That's
20 not anticipated to be so in the future, and as I
21 alluded to before, groundwater contamination levels at
22 Site 2 are very low, and there's a groundwater

1 containment and treatment remedy in place at Site 10.
2 So any residual contaminant levels at Site 2 are
3 anticipated to decline naturally over time.

4 So is action needed for soil and groundwater?
5 The short answer is no. No further action is needed
6 for Site 2 soil. The soil at the site does not pose a
7 risk to humans, plants, animals, under any scenario,
8 and the soil does not represent a continuing source of
9 groundwater contamination.

10 Again, no further action is needed for Site 2
11 groundwater. It's not a potable source, and as I again
12 allude to, residual contamination is attributed to Site
13 10.

14 So what is being proposed here tonight? No
15 further action is the preferred alternative for soil
16 and groundwater at Site 2. Navy, USEPA, and West
17 Virginia Department of Environmental Protection have
18 determined that there is no unacceptable risk at the
19 site under any current or future land use exposure
20 scenarios.

21 Community participation, why are we holding
22 this public meeting here? It's part of the Preferred

1 Alternative Selection Process. That's why we do this.
2 Your comments tonight and agency responses will be
3 included in the record of decision, which is the
4 document that is going to follow this Proposed Remedial
5 Action Plan.

6 So, the Public Participation Process, July
7 24th through August 22nd, that's the public comment
8 period. Obviously, we're holding a public meeting
9 tonight. Any additional information that you need is
10 in the Proposed Remedial Action Plan. There are copies
11 of it over on the table there if you'd like to grab a
12 copy, and also, there are historical documents
13 available at the administrative record repositories.

14 MS. KAGEY: Which is here.

15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Which is here.

16 MS. KAGEY: At the LaVale Public Library.

17 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay, so public comments?

18 Verbal comments will be accepted tonight. Written
19 comments must be postmarked by August 22nd, and they
20 can be either mailed by U.S. postal mail to Robin
21 Willis at the address you see there, or they can be
22 e-mailed to Robin Willis at that address right there.

1 Also in the presentation and in the public -- in the
2 Proposed Remedial Action Plan, you will see the same
3 contact information.

4 Administrative record repositories, right
5 here, LaVale Public Library, and also in the Fort Ashby
6 Public Library in Fort Ashby, West Virginia.

7 Does anybody have --

8 MR. MARTIN: Can you go back to that one slide
9 and just -- if anyone wanted to find that, what do we
10 ask for?

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: If anybody wanted to find
12 historical records, there are CDs in both libraries
13 with the Site 2, 3, and 10 Risk Assessment Report and
14 a copy of the Proposed Remedial Plans on those CDs.
15 If anybody wanted additional information as to old
16 historical documents or documents related to other
17 sites, point of contact would be Ms. Robin Willis at
18 NAVFAC. You could call her; you could send her an
19 e-mail; you could send her a letter and request
20 documents.

21 Does anybody have any questions or comments
22 on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Site 2?

1 MR. DOWNS: Just a question as to the -- for
2 information. Unacceptable risk, that is based on EPA
3 levels?

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, that is -- unacceptable,
5 did you say, what is no unacceptable risk?

6 MR. DOWNS: No, no, I mean what -- how is
7 unacceptable risk defined? I mean, I assume that
8 there are concentrations in EPA that define what is
9 acceptable or unacceptable.

10 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. There are a few ways we
11 do that Human Health Risk Assessment.

12 One is we look at reasonable maximum exposure,
13 and that is where we take the soil and groundwater data
14 together and, to not go into too much detail, we crunch
15 the numbers with EPA guidance, using established
16 toxicological data and cancer slope factors, etc. and
17 we put all that data into a model which assumes the
18 worst possible scenario, which is that's the reasonable
19 maximum exposure. That would say that you are exposed
20 to the worst or the highest level of contamination at a
21 certain site. Everywhere you go, you're exposed to
22 that, and if you exceed a hazard index of unity, which

1 is one for non-carcinogens, that would be an
2 unacceptable risk. Or if you have --

3 MR. DOWNS: So this is a rolled up number?

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: It is a rolled up number.

5 Basically there are -- what you do is you calculate
6 hazard cautions for each individual chemical.

7 MR. DOWNS: What is the major chemical issue?

8 MR. CALLAGHAN: At this site would be low-
9 level VOCs and metals, so low levels of TCE, low levels
10 of arsenic, low levels of manganese, magnesium, iron,
11 that sort of stuff -- common compounds that you find
12 in soil, generally.

13 So all of those chemicals will be calculated
14 together to create hazard cautions, and they will be
15 rolled up into -- well, with the exception of carcinogens.
16 Carcinogens use something called incremental lifetime
17 cancer risk, where you look at the cancer slopes, and
18 that comes out as a value of one times ten to the minus
19 something, and an unacceptable risk would be something
20 that exceeds one times ten to the minus four. And at
21 this site, we have no unacceptable risks.

22 There is another phase that you can go on to

1 after that, which is a much more realistic phase. It's
2 called a Central Tendency Exposure Scenario, and that
3 is where you take the average across the site, because
4 you assume that somebody who would be exposed to
5 contaminant level at the site would not be exposed to
6 the maximum contamination level everywhere they go.
7 They're not going to permanently stay at that spot, so
8 you take an average of all the contamination of the
9 site, as though somebody was walking across the site,
10 and you do exactly the same calculations, and that
11 would be a more reasonable scenario. That's how it's
12 done.

13 MR. DOWNS: Makes sense.

14 MR. CALLAGHAN: Any more questions?

15 Okay, with that, I'll conclude the Proposed
16 Remedial Action Plan presentation for Site 2, and we
17 will move on to the Proposed Remedial Action Plan
18 presentation for Site 3.

19 Again, the Proposed Remedial Action Plan
20 presentation for Site 3 soil and groundwater, the
21 presentation is a very similar format, followed by a
22 Q&A session.

1 I've already gone over this, so I won't delay
2 too long on it, but it's part of the Navy community
3 relations program, and it's a component of CERCLA.
4 That's why we hold these public meetings.

5 The objectives of the PRAP, as you can see,
6 past investigations, summarizing risk, describing the
7 preferred alternative, and again, this opportunity to
8 provide input.

9 Again the map of the facility, Site 3 is
10 located over here, as you can see, in the southwest
11 quadrant of the developed portion of the plant --
12 sorry, southeast quadrant of the developed portion of
13 the Plant 1.

14 Let me run through the history. It was a
15 burning grounds utilized from 1950 to '58. When it was
16 active, it was 40 feet by 200 feet, and approximately
17 200 pounds of waste were burned daily at the site.
18 Again, this burning of waste was suspected to have
19 caused a release of contaminants.

20 Currently, the site consists of Building 362,
21 which was constructed to cover most of the former
22 burning ground, and there's grassy area around the

1 outside of the building, and there's no visual evidence
2 of the burn pad.

3 This is a close-up of Site 3. As you can see,
4 this building was constructed over a majority of it.
5 The rest of this is low grassy area.

6 Previous investigations, the IAS and the CS
7 from 1983 to 1987 concluded that it did not pose an
8 immediate threat; however, a CS was conducted to assess
9 contamination.

10 Again in 1992, the NPL listing for ABL and the
11 RI, which recommended further investigation of Site 3
12 based upon detections of SVOCs, TCE, and several metals
13 in soil and some low concentrations of VOCs in
14 groundwater.

15 Phase II RI, 1994, supported the RI findings
16 that low levels of VOCs in groundwater existed at
17 Site 3. And again in 2001, additional soil data were
18 required to adequately assess potential risks.

19 This was again all rolled up into the same
20 Risk Assessment Report. The groundwater data from
21 monitoring wells located around the site were used to
22 evaluate human health as well, as well as the

1 supplemental soil sampling, and this report indicated
2 no unacceptable human health or ecological risks.

3 Again, the same receptors as we've had
4 previously in current and future industrial workers,
5 adolescent trespassers, future adult and child
6 residents, and construction workers. Looking at all
7 these potential receptors indicated there was no
8 unacceptable risk under current or future conditions,
9 and the results of the HHRA indicated that no remedial
10 action is necessary to be protective of human health.

11 Ecological Risk Assessment was also performed.
12 Upper-trophic-level receptors and lower-trophic-level
13 receptors were evaluated, and the report concluded that
14 there was no unacceptable risk under current or future
15 conditions and that no remedial action is necessary to
16 be protective of ecological health.

17 So again, we throw out this question, is there
18 a risk to current or future ABL tenants? And the
19 answer is no, there is no risk, no unacceptable risk
20 from exposure to soil, and there's no unacceptable risk
21 for future potable groundwater use at Site 3.

22 Is there a risk to the surrounding community?

1 No, there's no risk to the surrounding community.

2 There are no unacceptable risks for potable groundwater
3 use at Site 3.

4 So do we need to do anything? Do we need to
5 do anything further? No. No further action for Site 3
6 soil, as I've alluded to. The site does not pose a
7 risk to humans, plants, animals under any land-use
8 scenario, and it does not represent a source of
9 groundwater contamination.

10 No further action for Site 3 groundwater, no
11 unacceptable risk for potable groundwater use, and
12 there are no off-site groundwater residential receptors
13 that are downgradient of Site 3.

14 What is being proposed here tonight? Again,
15 no further action is the preferred alternative for both
16 soil and groundwater, and the Navy, the USEPA, and West
17 Virginia Department of Environmental Protection have
18 determined that the site does not pose an unacceptable
19 risk to human health or the environment under current
20 or future land use scenarios.

21 Community participation, again, is part of the
22 preferred alternative selection, and any substantive

1 comments or responses, and they'll be included in the
2 record of decision.

3 The public comment period is the same. The
4 public meeting is obviously tonight. Again, additional
5 information can be found in the Proposed Remedial
6 Action Plan, and those documents are available at the
7 administrative record repository. Public comments
8 tonight or written and as to public contact, you can
9 see that. The administrative record repositories
10 remain the same, LaVale and Fort Ashby.

11 Does anybody have any questions or comments on
12 Site 3? Betsy?

13 MS. KAGEY: On the Site 3, you talked about no
14 remedial action for potable water. Did you do the same
15 thing at Site 2? Was there a question of potable water
16 at Site 2? I'm sorry --

17 MR. CALLAGHAN: It's not a problem. Let me
18 refresh my memory.

19 MS. KAGEY: Somehow it went by me, and when
20 you did it, it was like one of the last lines. Okay.
21 Groundwater is not used as a potable source --

22 MR. CALLAGHAN: And is not anticipated to be

1 in the future.

2 MS. KAGEY: Okay, so there wasn't anything
3 about future use of potable water at Site 2?

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. Now the thing with
5 Site 2 is that, as you can see on that third bullet
6 there, there is groundwater contamination at Site 2.

7 MS. KAGEY: And it's being treated at the
8 treatment plant?

9 MR. CALLAGHAN: Exactly.

10 MS. KAGEY: Okay.

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: It is not associated with Site
12 2 itself. The contamination under Site 2 is associated
13 with contamination from Site 10, and that site itself
14 has already gone through a proposed plan, record of
15 decision, and there's a groundwater extraction
16 treatment system in place.

17 MS. KAGEY: Okay.

18 MR. CALLAGHAN: So any residual contamination
19 is being treated, and as we say here, any residual
20 contamination of Site 2 is anticipated to decline
21 naturally over time. So that's why we feel that, using
22 the risk management's decision, no further action is

1 necessary because it will decline, and the source of
2 contamination is actually being treated and captured.

3 MS. KAGEY: I have a question that's going to
4 drive you nuts.

5 MR. CALLAGHAN: That's okay.

6 MS. KAGEY: I understand all the different
7 sites, and I've been around this particular site for
8 quite a while. Is there any future look at the entire
9 site as one, when you're dealing with things like
10 groundwater and potential -- I mean, I know there's a
11 lot of treatment of groundwater. Site 1, I think it
12 is --

13 MR. CALLAGHAN: You mean --

14 MS. KAGEY: I mean, but when you take a look
15 at Site 2 and you see the proximity of the site, you
16 know --

17 MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.

18 MS. KAGEY: I know there are sort of hotspots
19 that came up when you started, when you've done all
20 the testing, and I know there's been a lot of testing
21 there, but is there any value, maybe, to look at the
22 entire site as all -- I mean the entire area --

1 MR. CALLAGHAN: The entire facility?

2 MS. KAGEY: Facilities.

3 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay.

4 MS. KAGEY: And looking and sort of doing
5 risk assessment for the entire facility, based on the
6 individual site?

7 MR. AUBERT: You've got two different owners
8 there. Site -- Plant 1 is owned by the Navy.

9 MS. KAGEY: Uh-huh.

10 MR. AUBERT: Plant 2 is owned by ABL or ATK.

11 MS. KAGEY: Right.

12 MR. AUBERT: And, you know, in a scenario,
13 they can look at the whole thing if they want to do
14 that, but the clean-up of the sites are separate, and
15 John's going to talk later on Plant 2. He has to have
16 some time --

17 MS. KAGEY: But did you understand the
18 question?

19 MR. AUBERT: What?

20 MS. KAGEY: Do you understand the question?

21 MR. AUBERT: Yeah, I understand the question.

22 Is contaminant from Plant 2 coming into Plant 1 is what

1 your concern may be?

2 MS. KAGEY: No, no.

3 MR. CALLAGHAN: You're saying does anybody
4 look, comprehensively, at the whole site to evaluate
5 the risk.

6 MS. KAGEY: Right. Okay, if you were to sell
7 the entire site, okay, for future use. I mean it's not
8 going there at this point in time. Okay, the Navy owns
9 all the land underneath all the buildings there?

10 MR. AUBERT: Yes.

11 MS. KAGEY: Okay, so the building that's owned
12 by ABL or (*inaudible*) is a building; you own the
13 property -- the Navy owns the property, the whole
14 property underneath it. So future use, meaning if they
15 close down the (*inaudible*) and everything closed and
16 they went and the Navy wanted to deed the property over
17 to the community or wanted to sell the property as a
18 whole, at that point in time, would they do a complete
19 assessment of this property?

20 MR. AUBERT: We wouldn't do Plant 2, but Plant
21 1 would have a -- you would have an assessment of the
22 whole site of Plant 1 when they go to close it to make

1 sure that it's environmentally clean and safe to sell
2 it, yes.

3 MS. KAGEY: Right.

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: I believe there's a document,
5 and I may be misspeaking here, but I think it's called
6 FAST, which is something like Finding of Suitability
7 for Transfer.

8 MS. KAGEY: Finding of suitability, right,
9 okay, which deals with the entire site then.

10 MR. CALLAGHAN: Which deals with the entire
11 site. Now, all these individual sites are cleaned up
12 and evaluated separately.

13 MS. KAGEY: And all of this information would
14 go into that --

15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Exactly.

16 MS. KAGEY: -- if you got to the point where
17 there's going to be a transfer.

18 MR. BARBER: Well, specifically, the FAST
19 could cover the entire site that's -- it's a DOD
20 specific document when it was created, but it can also
21 be used for parcels. It was created for the BRAC
22 Program, which was for all the bases which are closed

1 or realigned.

2 There's another document that can also be
3 created or referenced, and it's called an ECOP, which
4 is Environment Condition of Property, which is another
5 type of assessment, which basically is used to
6 summarize all the other information that has been
7 pulled together on the site as well. It's something
8 else that can be used.

9 MS. KAGEY: Okay.

10 MR. BARBER: So it can be done.

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: Does that answer your
12 question?

13 MS. FARRIS: There was a facility-wide
14 baseline survey done there, I think.

15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Are there any more questions
16 on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Site 3? No?

17 That closes the presentation for Site 3, and
18 we'll move on to the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for
19 Site 10.

20 Presentation topic, the PRAP for Site 10 soil,
21 followed by a question and answer session.

22 Why do we hold a public meeting? I've

1 explained before, part of the Navy's community
2 relations program, and it's a component of CERCLA. We
3 want to keep the public informed and provide that open
4 forum to ask questions and submit comments.

5 Again the PRAP, we document past
6 investigations, summarize site risks, and we describe
7 the preferred alternative, and we solicit your
8 comments.

9 Site 10 is actually over here. Here is Site
10 10 itself. Moving on to the history of Site 10. It's
11 located in the south-central portion of Plant 1. A
12 production well was located at Site 10. That was used
13 in the past to supply potable, boiler, and firefighting
14 water to the plant. And that Production Well A was
15 discontinued in 1980 because TCE was detected in the
16 well.

17 Historical soil and groundwater data were
18 collected, and they indicated that the source of
19 contamination was the Building 157 still, which was a
20 TCE still at the building.

21 Here we go. Here is Site 10. So this was the
22 approximate location of the former TCE still, a much

1 larger groundwater plume, which is currently being
2 treated under the (*inaudible*). And as I said, this
3 PRAP is purely for Site 10 soil only. A remedy is
4 already in place for the groundwater at Site 10.

5 Previous investigations, confirmation study
6 from '84 through '87 was used to confirm or refute
7 suspected contamination, and this recommended further
8 investigation of Site 10 to identify the source of TCA
9 and TCA -- sorry, TCE and TCA contamination in
10 groundwater.

11 A remedial investigation and NPL listing,
12 obviously in 1992, and this RI identified the former
13 TCE still at Building 157 as the source of
14 contamination in that PWA well, and it recommended
15 further investigation of Site 10.

16 So in 1994, the Navy did a Phase II remedial
17 investigation, and that determined contaminated
18 groundwater posed a potential risk to future
19 groundwater users.

20 And then in 2000, we did a supplemental
21 sampling. We wanted to collect additional soil data
22 for risk assessments, to actually evaluate the soil.

1 Site 10, as I mentioned, it was separated in two
2 operable units. One operable unit 5 was to address the
3 groundwater at Site 10, and operable unit 6 was to
4 address the soil at Site 10. Tonight, obviously, we're
5 talking about operable unit 6.

6 So, basically, subsequent to this Phase II RI,
7 we collected additional soil data in the vicinity of
8 the former TCE still, and we used this to assess
9 potential risks, both human health and ecological. And
10 this investigation of soil determined that there was no
11 unacceptable risk to human health or ecological risks
12 and that no action was necessary for Site 10 soil.

13 Just to go over Site 10 groundwater again,
14 operable unit 5, the groundwater is being addressed in
15 the record of decision that was signed in 2005 and
16 groundwater treatment is in place, which involves site-
17 wide groundwater extraction and treatment, and that
18 water is then pumped to the treatment plant, which is
19 located nearby Site 1.

20 So a Human Health Risk Assessment was
21 conducted for the soil, evaluated current and future
22 industrial workers, adolescent trespassers and

1 visitors, future adult and child residents who may
2 live on the site, hypothetical scenario were very
3 conservative, but we want to do that, out of future
4 construction by the scenario. It indicated there was
5 no unacceptable risk under current or future conditions
6 and that no remedial action is necessary to be
7 protective of human health.

8 Ecological risk assessment was also done,
9 again the same species, upper-trophic-level and lower-
10 trophic-level. This indicated that there was no
11 unacceptable risk, and again, the results of the ERA,
12 no remedial action is necessary to be protective of
13 ecological health.

14 So you're asking, is there a risk for Site 10
15 soils? No, there's not. There's no unacceptable risk
16 from exposure to soil to current or future ABL tenants,
17 and there's no unacceptable risk from exposures to soil
18 for future potential residents who may reside at the
19 site.

20 Do we need to do anything further for the
21 soil? No, we don't. As we allude to, it does not
22 present an unacceptable risk to humans, plants, animals

1 under any land-use scenario and the soil does not
2 represent a source of groundwater contamination.

3 What are we proposing? The Navy, USEPA and
4 West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
5 have determined the site does not pose an unacceptable
6 risk, and that is under -- for human health or the
7 environment under current or future land-use scenarios.

8 Community participation, again I've gone over
9 this slide. It's part of the preferred alternative
10 selection, and your comments are solicited here and
11 will be incorporated in the record of decision.

12 The public comment period is the same for this
13 document, July 24th through August 22nd. The public
14 meeting is obviously tonight. Additional information
15 on this site for Site 10 soil can be found in the PRAP,
16 which is -- there are copies of them over there on the
17 table, and also these documents are available at the
18 admin. record repositories in LaVale and Fort Ashby.

19 Public comments tonight at the conclusion of
20 this presentation, written by August 22nd, and either
21 mailed to Robin Willis at the address there or e-mailed
22 to Robin Willis, or you can even call Robin Willis and

1 tell her your comments over the phone. The admin.
2 record repositories, this library here, the Fort Ashby
3 library in West Virginia.

4 Does anybody have any questions or comments on
5 the PRAP for Site 10?

6 MR. DOWNS: Can you say a little bit more
7 about the groundwater? I mean the soil is fine, but
8 the groundwater is being remediated. Can you say
9 exactly what that means and what's the basis for
10 saying, we're done; we're not going to take any more
11 water or soil? I mean, what's the end point and how's
12 that attributed --

13 MR. CALLAGHAN: Well --

14 MR. DOWN: -- to sites when that's done?

15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. So let me start first
16 with the soil. The soil has been investigated. It's
17 not a source of contamination to groundwater, so
18 there's no residual contamination there that's
19 contributed to groundwater, and there's no risk from
20 exposure to soil at all.

21 Now there is groundwater contamination at
22 Site 10. There is TCE, generally a much larger plume

1 of about 5 micrograms per liter. Let me go to a -- let
2 me go to a slide so I can allude to this a little bit
3 better.

4 Okay, here is Site 10 itself. This area
5 here, that is -- that is the extent of groundwater
6 contamination at 5 parts per billion.

7 MR. DOWNS: That circle is the plume?

8 MR. CALLAGHAN: That circle there is basically
9 the extent of the plume. Five parts per billion is the
10 drinking water standard for EPA, TCEs allowable in
11 public drinking water. So that's the extent of the
12 plume at Site 10.

13 There are -- it's a much higher level of
14 contamination actually around Building 157 South. I
15 believe the levels are 100, 150, something like that,
16 so one order of magnitude larger than the drinking
17 water standards actually surrounding the immediate
18 building.

19 MR. DOWNS: So at the boundary of the plume,
20 you said it was five?

21 MR. CALLAGHAN: The boundary of the plume is
22 five, yes. Now what is being done there, obviously

1 investigations were conducted at the site. Risk
2 assessments were conducted, very similar to this. A
3 proposed plan was held. A public meeting was held.
4 Comments were solicited. The preferred alternative
5 was determined to be continuation of the groundwater
6 extraction system.

7 The Navy actually put in an interim
8 groundwater extraction system. I'm not sure of the
9 actual date. I think it might have been 1997 they
10 actually started a pump and treat system to contain
11 the groundwater and to extract it, and then they move
12 it over to -- there is a treatment plant over here
13 that actually has an air stripper in it, and it strips
14 all the volatile organic compounds out of it.

15 MR. DOWNS: So that's everything, TCE and any
16 other --

17 MR. CALLAGHAN: TCE is the --

18 MR. DOWNS: I assume that TCE is the only
19 thing that's really exceeding --

20 MR. CALLAGHAN: There might be some associated
21 donor compounds like vinyl chloride in very small
22 levels, but that air stripper basically gets rid of all

1 the VOC contamination. So that's how it's treated,
2 so that plume itself is being maintained. The
3 groundwater's been extracted, and it's being treated
4 at another site. So that is what is being done at
5 Site 10.

6 MS. KAGEY: What you have to understand is
7 that there is a solvent disposal pit at Site -- is it
8 Site 1, where this treatment plant was built because
9 the soil was so contaminated that it continues to this
10 day to essentially contaminate the groundwater, and so
11 the pump and treat station was built primarily for
12 that, and the levels were huge. I mean, there were
13 hundreds of thousands --

14 MR. DOWNS: At Site 1?

15 MS. KAGEY: At Site 1 and that was one of
16 the --

17 MR. AUBERT: It's all along the river back
18 here. See all the little dots?

19 MS. KAGEY: Site 1 is along the river. Do you
20 see all those little dots? I'm assuming those are your
21 sample wells?

22 MR. AUBERT: Those are all wells.

1 MR. CALLAGHAN: These are -- this line of
2 wells here is the line of extraction wells.

3 MR. KAGEY: And what they did was, early on,
4 was they took samples all over the site to essentially
5 determine the groundwater flow, but also to determine
6 contaminants before it hit the river or went under the
7 river and, essentially, that treatment plant was built
8 for that site because Site 10 looks like a, you know, a
9 kid compared to what was going on with --

10 MR. DOWNS: Okay, just trying to get educated
11 here.

12 MS. KAGEY: That's essentially the background
13 of why --

14 MR. DOWNS: And I'm number two public; I can
15 say that.

16 MS. KAGEY: -- well, why they have a treatment
17 plant right there.

18 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Are there any more
19 comments on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Site
20 10 Soil?

21 MS. KAGEY: Can you just remind me what was
22 in the soil? Are we looking at metals or organics or

1 both?

2 MR. CALLAGHAN: To be honest, I don't know.

3 MS. KAGEY: Okay.

4 MR. AUBERT: In the soil for risk assessment?

5 MS. KAGEY: Both?

6 MR. AUBERT: Both.

7 MR. CALLAGHAN: But obviously, I'll go back

8 and --

9 MS. KAGEY: I don't remember either, but
10 that's okay. I can look it up.

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: I will, I will --

12 MR. MARTIN: Well, look at the -- jump up to
13 the use of the site, because it's -- if you look at the
14 use or the source of the contamination, it'll suggest
15 what we -- what was in there.

16 MS. KAGEY: It was a still, wasn't it?

17 MR. MARTIN: Yeah, it was a still, right.

18 MR. AUBERT: Cleaned up the solvents that were
19 contaminated from, I think, greasing and things like
20 that.

21 MS. KAGEY: Right.

22 MR. AUBERT: They reused the solid again.

1 MR. MARTIN: So they can still obviously have
2 TCE and any other contaminants that were in the
3 contaminated solvent.

4 MR. BARBER: I think low levels of TCE and
5 probably metals were in the soil.

6 MS. KAGEY: But at one point we had talked
7 about background, trying to figure out the background
8 of the soil. I think that was another, earlier meeting
9 we had.

10 MR. CALLAGHAN: But honestly, I will go back
11 and I will look at that in more detail, and I'll
12 present that in writing.

13 Are there any additional comments on the PRAP
14 for Site 10? Okay, with that, I will close the
15 presentation for Site 10 soil.

16 MR. MARTIN: Now, I have a comment. The RAB
17 was scheduled -- was it 7:30?

18 MR. CALLAGHAN: It was presented in the public
19 notice to immediately follow the proposed remedial --

20 MR. MARTIN: To immediately follow then?

21 MR. CALLAGHAN: To immediately following this
22 meeting.

1 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Why don't we take just a
2 few-minute break and reconvene on this table after we
3 click the microphones; right? We don't -- we're not --

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: No, we don't need a court
5 reporter for the RAP.

6 MR. MARTIN: Right.

7 MS. KAGEY: The RAP is Restoration Advisory
8 Board. It's anybody who wants to come and essentially
9 talk about what's going on next.

10 *(Whereupon the meeting was concluded at 7:10*
11 *p.m.)*

12 * * * * *

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 STATE OF MARYLAND, SS:
2 COUNTY OF GARRETT, to-wit:

3 I, Christina D. Pratt, a Notary Public of
4 the State of Maryland, do hereby certify that I
5 recorded the Proceedings of the Public Meeting held
6 August 8, 2006, and this transcript is a true record of
7 those proceedings.

8 Given under my hand and Notarial Seal this
9 _____ day of August, 2006.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Christina D. Pratt

My commission expires:
November 1, 2008