

13.01.00.0015



## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NORTHERN DIVISION  
 NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND  
 10 INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY  
 MAIL STOP, #82  
 LESTER, PA 19113-2090

IN REPLY REFER TO

5090  
 Ser. 1776/1821/FK

DEC 21 1992

MEMORANDUM

**FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) FOR  
 INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM AT NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL  
 RESERVE PLANT (NWIRP) BETHPAGE, NEW YORK**

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of the TRC meeting held on October 28, 1992. Please contact me at (215) 595-0567 if you have any questions or comments on the minutes. Once the minutes are accepted they will be entered into the administrative record.

The next TRC meeting will be held on February 25, 1993 at 1:00 PM in the DPRO conference room. A draft agenda will be prepared and forwarded to you approximately two weeks prior to the meeting.

I would also like to announce that I have accepted a position with the Environmental Protection Agency, Region III in Philadelphia. My last day at Northern Division will be December 10, 1992. The replacement RPM will be Jim Colter. I have enjoyed working with everyone and have appreciated your support on this project.

Sincerely,

FRANK KLANCHAR

Remedial Project Manager

By direction of the Commanding Officer

## Distribution:

Bethpage Water District, John Molloy  
 DCMDN Boston, Jim McConnell  
 DLA/DPRO, Martin Simonson  
 Geraghty & Miller, Carlo San Giovanni  
 Grumman Aerospace Corporation, John Ohlmann  
 Halliburton NUS, David Brayack  
 Nassau County Health Department, Laurie Lutzker  
 Naval Air Systems Command, Robert Booth  
 NYSDEC, John Barnes  
 NYSDEC, Henry Wilkie  
 NYS Department of Health, Lloyd Wilson

Copy to:

OP-45

COMNAVFACENGCOM, Code 181A



**MINUTES OF MEETING  
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 3  
OCTOBER 28, 1992**

**NWIRP BETHPAGE NEW YORK**

Technical Review Committee Meeting No. 3 was held at the Grumman Aerospace Corporation facility in Bethpage New York. The meeting commenced at approximately 1:30 PM. A copy of the agenda and attendance list is attached.

Introduction

1. The Navy opened the meeting.

Comments on TRC Meeting #2 Minutes

1. The Navy asked if there were any comments on the Minutes of Meeting for the second TRC. There were none.

Phase 2 RI/FS Work Plan Addendum

1. The Navy asked if all TRC members received a copy of the draft addendum. Those member that did not have a copy were given one at this time. Also, it was noted that several copies of the report were missing two pages. Copies of the missing pages were distributed at the meeting. HALLIBURTON NUS discussed the planned activities under the Phase 2 investigation (from the Addendum).
2. HALLIBURTON NUS/Navy conducted the Plant No. 3 inspection on October 26 and 27, 1992. Based on this inspection, the preliminary determination was that there was a minimal potential for Plant No. 3 to be a source for the contamination found at HN-24I. However, that additional factors need to be taken into account.
3. The Nassau County Department of Health (NCDOH) asked about the activities in Plant No. 3. It was reported that TCE was historically and is currently being used in the Plant.

4. Bethpage Water District/H<sub>2</sub>M (BWD) asked if samples were being planned inside of Plant No. 3. The Navy/HALLIBURTON NUS responded that it depends upon the results of the two new monitoring wells at HN-24. Also, the Navy is now planning to add additional soil samples to the two new monitoring wells near HN-24 to evaluate contamination above, in, and below the clay layer.
5. BWD asked if a review of historical uses at Plant No. 3 was conducted. HALLIBURTON NUS responded yes, that the IAS was used as a guide during the inspection.
6. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) concurred with the BWD suggestion of sampling in Plant No. 3. HALLIBURTON NUS added that the likely sampling method (at least initially) would be a soil-gas survey.
7. Geraghty & Miller (G&M - representing Grumman Corporation) commented that the Work Plan needs to more open-ended (e.g. current Plant No. 3 activities), that it does not allow for contingencies or follow-up work. BWD concurred with comment and added that having contingency present would prevent delays inherent to a "next phase approach". The Navy took note of the comments and agreed that the contingencies mentioned at the TRC meeting will be addressed in the Work Plan. Also, the Navy commented that a additional activities at Plant No. 3 could be "split out" from the rest of the program, so as not to interfere with the schedule.
8. HALLIBURTON NUS continued with the discussion of the planned activities. NYSDEC asked about the PCB analysis. HALLIBURTON NUS explained that the rationale for PCB sampling was to collect samples and analyze for PCBs at locations where PCBs were found as Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs).
9. NYSDEC conveyed a message from the State Health Department (who could not attend), stating that the Navy should consider offsite soil sampling - especially in light of the PCBs identified during Phase 1. The Navy stated that the current position was not to sample offsite soils at this time. The primary reason is that onsite soils at the Navy (for PCBs) do not exceed New York State cleanup levels for the neighboring Hooker/RUCO site. If during the Phase II sampling, PCBs higher than the cleanup level are found, offsite sampling will be further considered.
10. An extensive discussion resulted concerning the planned Navy's computer modeling efforts. In general, G&M does not believe that the planned computer modeling efforts will achieve the stated objectives and that additional monitoring wells are required. The following decisions were made.

- a. The Navy will continue with the modeling program.
  - b. Installation of deeper wells by the Navy is not planned at this time. However, if the groundwater modeling is not successful, consideration will be given to installing deep wells.
  - c. The deep wells (if required) can also be done as a check on the computer model post ROD so as not to interfere with the schedule.
11. There was generalized discussions concerning the possible sources of contamination at HN-24I. It was decided to revise the potential location of new wells near HN-24I from "upgradient and downgradient" to upgradient and/or downgradient" with the emphasis based on upgradient areas to help locate source areas.
  12. NCDOH asked about Plant No. 10 (which is located slightly south and east of HN-24I). The Defense Plant Reserve Office (DPRO) responded that it is a QA/QC laboratory and that small quantities of solvents are used in this building. HALLIBURTON NUS responded that they will check into the potential for cesspools from the area to be responsible for the contamination at HN-24I.
  13. There was some discussion of Hooker/RUCO activities. NYSDEC discussed that a high priority of NYSDEC is to evaluate the impact from Hooker/RUCO. BWD added that it would like to be involved in activities with Hooker/RUCO.
  14. The NYSDEC questioned the planned pump tests and requested a separate meeting to discuss details. The Navy/HALLIBURTON NUS concurred.
  15. BWD stated that BWD wells 4 and 5 are a big concern because TCE is starting to show up at very low levels (below state drinking water standards). BWD asked who is covering this area. G&M responded that Grumman is covering this area, Navy is looking to the east and northeast.
  16. The BWD asked if historical scenarios were being considered with the modeling. HALLIBURTON NUS responded that it would be.
  17. Additional discussion occurred on the computer modeling. G&M reiterated their position about computer modeling, particularly fate and transport. G&M does not think model can ever be accurate enough to be

used as a predictive tool. Factors such as sources that no longer exist, wells that no longer exist, and the use of new versus old wells. The NYSDEC cautioned against trying to expect too much from the model.

18. BWD asked what are objectives of modeling and what is the Navy prepared to do if the modeling does not work.
19. HALLIBURTON NUS responded that the model objectives are in the addendum. The intent is determine if observed contamination can be accounted for by identified sources. If not, additional sources must be identified.
20. G&M gave the Navy the USGS point of contact for their modeling efforts. HALLIBURTON NUS is to contact them.
21. The Navy indicated that the next TRC meeting will be largely dedicated to the up-to-date results of modeling.
22. G&M indicated that Grumman believes the risk assessment in the RI Report (Phase 1) was premature and G&M will comment on the risk assessment.
23. The Navy presented an update on the Community Relations activities in the near future. In particular, a fact sheet and mini-fact sheet have been prepared and recently distributed to the appropriate community. A status-type update fact sheet is planned for January and May/June 1993. Also, the neighborhood workshop was planned for November 18, 1992.
24. NYSDEC requested copies of the storm drains and piping within Plant No. 3. The Navy indicated that they would convey this information to NYSDEC.
25. BWD requested some type of monthly update on the project activities. The Navy indicated that HALLIBURTON NUS provides them to the Navy on a monthly basis. Some information (financial) must be deleted, but they will look into preparing it.
26. The next TRC is tentatively planned for February 25, 1993.

## **AGENDA**

### **TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING #3 NWIRP BETHPAGE, NY October 28, 1992**

1. Introduction.
2. Comments on Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting #2 Minutes.
3. Phase 2 RI/FS Work Plan Addendum.
4. Community Relations Activities
  - Fact Sheets
  - Presentation (Offsite Drilling)
5. General comments and open discussion.