

300.03.00.0002

0317

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

Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant
Bethpage, New York

Restoration Advisory Board
Regular Meeting

-----X

7:00 P.M.
September 30, 1999

Bethpage Community Center
Bethpage, New York

P R E S E N T:

Joe Kaminski United States Navy
 Naval Air Systems Command

Dave Brayack Tetra Tech NUS
Debbie Cohen

Jim Colter Northern Division, NAVFAC

RAB Members

FREELANCE L.I., INC. - Court Reporters
259 Southfield Road
Baiting Hollow, New York 11933
Voice (516) 369-2912 Fax
E-mail flli@aol.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. KAMINSKI: I want to welcome you to
3 the initial meeting of the Naval Weapons Industrial
4 Reserve Plant Bethpage Restoration Advisory Board,
5 which I'm sure will soon be better known as the
6 Bethpage RAB. I'm Joe Kaminski, I'm on the second
7 page of your hand-outright now, I'm with the Naval
8 Air Systems Command. I want to welcome you here on
9 behalf of Admirals Lockheart, Seidel and Captain
10 Ball, who formed the chain of command down to my
11 immediate supervisor, Judithanne Hare, who is listed
12 on your agendas as the person that should be
13 speaking here, where I am.

14 Judith was called away, I guess it was
15 last week on an emergency meeting, she sends her
16 deepest regrets and I'm sure she would rather be
17 here than where she is this week which is in Austin,
18 Texas at a public hearing on an emergency wastewater
19 permit that we need, the Naval Air Systems Command
20 needs for the facility that we own in MacGregor,
21 Texas in order to start a pump and treat system on a
22 groundwater issue down there.

23 The state of Texas doesn't check with us
24 on when they hold their public hearings, and even
25 though Judith had this planned well in advance, she

1 Proceedings

2 had to be down there because of the fact that Texas
3 asked for the owner to be there and we are that
4 Federal owner, just as we are the Federal owner of
5 the facility here at Bethpage. As you all know, as
6 the owner of Bethpage, one of our primary goals is
7 to transfer the property to the County of Nassau, to
8 Nassau County, for economic redevelopment.

9 In order to do that, we have to meet
10 certain environmental regulations and we are certain
11 that the RAB will help us in the process of bringing
12 those regulations and that charge up to a
13 conclusion.

14 My boss, Judith, would be able to do this
15 presentation to you with two hands tied behind her
16 back and one eye closed. I'm not quite as good at
17 it as she is. So, I'm going to ask Jim Colter from
18 the engineering command to jump in any time to help
19 comment, or elaborate on any portion of the
20 discussion that we're in, at any given time.

21 To go through the agenda with you, what
22 we are going to do tonight, is slightly different on
23 this slide than it is on your handout agenda. We'll
24 go -- after I finish with this preview, we'll go
25 through introducing ourselves, asking each person to

Proceedings

1
2 introduce themselves. When that is over, I'll give
3 you 10 more slides of what a RAB is all about, and
4 how a RAB functions. That is probably the next 10
5 slides, or so, in your hand-out. After that, we'll
6 go into the election of the community co-chair. At
7 that point the Navy will leave the room. The
8 recording will stop, the RAB is the appointed Navy
9 co-chair and will retain that position.

10 After the election of the co-chair, we'll
11 return, the Navy will return and Mr. Colter will
12 give you a brief introduction as to what's gone on
13 on the remediation program here at Bethpage. With
14 the help of the newly elected co-chair, we'll set
15 the agenda for the next meeting. That is a pretty
16 ambitious agenda for tonight. There may be a number
17 of questions that will arise, a number of issues
18 that people will bring up. We should look at that
19 as the kinds of things we'll bring up in the next
20 meeting. We'll try to stick to the agenda for this
21 meeting.

22 Before we get into the introductions, let
23 me give you background on the RAB concept in
24 general. It originated in 1994, actually as an
25 outgrowth of Technical Review Committee, TRC, the

1 Proceedings

2 Navy and DOD are the TRCs, which were composed of
3 the Navy and regulators, looking at the various
4 cleanup efforts. And it became obvious to the
5 Department of Defense, I think with the urging of
6 EPA, that something was lacking. And that was the
7 input from the community. So about 1994, DOD came
8 out with a policy that the Navy followed through on
9 for turning the TRCs into Restoration Advisory
10 Boards. The benefits were pretty clear, it gave the
11 community a better understanding of what the Navy
12 was doing and let the Navy take the input from the
13 community. In particular things like priorities and
14 incorporated that into what was going on, and it
15 established some credibility and trust that would
16 not otherwise have been there.

17 And it led to more responsive cleanup. I
18 think each one of us probably comes into this
19 meeting and the concept of the RAB with a little bit
20 of healthy skepticism. I believe as we work
21 together over the next couple of months, couple of
22 years, probably, that we will establish that
23 credibility and trust and bring the program forward
24 quicker.

25 The RAB concept is national in scope. As

Proceedings

1
2 I mentioned, Naval Air Systems Command has three
3 other RABs besides this one, one out in Calverton in
4 Suffolk County, two down in Texas, at MacGregor, and
5 in Dallas. We may be starting one up in Connecticut
6 at our facility, out in Bloomfield, in the upcoming
7 year.

8 As a RAB, you all are a member of an
9 elite group. You get to have at least the name of
10 the co-chair in a book the Restoration Advisory
11 Board Directory, that the DOD puts out. You can
12 look at this later if you want to to see the other
13 RABs. This is updated annually. I'm not sure we
14 are going to make the next update which is going I
15 think about right now, but as soon as we can we'll
16 get the Bethpage RAB into this book of RABs. I'll
17 ask the community co-chair later on, when that
18 person is selected, to fill out the form that allows
19 their names to be put in this book.

20 As part of a RAB concept, you are made
21 privy to a lot of information that you would not
22 otherwise see.

23 Jim will be giving out a lot of that as
24 the course of the RAB goes on. One of the things
25 you get from other sources, and I will be able to

Proceedings

1
2 give you tonight, is a volume on the whole Navy's
3 Installation Restoration Program.

4 This was passed or sent to each RAB
5 co-chair toward the beginning of this year, back
6 around March, the letter is dated in March. You
7 didn't exist in March, but you existed a few months
8 later. I'll leave this with the community co-chair
9 and the entire RAB can look at the entire Navy
10 Restoration IR Program and compare what is going on
11 here at Bethpage.

12 I want to remind you to take a careful
13 look at your RAB workbook that was handed out to
14 this evening. Section 2, is the mission
15 responsibilities operation section. At the end of
16 the -- at the session today, we are going to ask you
17 to sign on to that mission statement. So you need
18 to take an opportunity tonight to read through it.
19 Most of the slides that I'm going to go through in a
20 few minutes, paraphrase that. We'll talk more about
21 that in a little bit. Also in that workbook is good
22 background information on CERCLA and national
23 programs, and in particular fact sheets on what is
24 being done here, at Bethpage, at this particular
25 time.

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

Proceedings

In the packet, I think it is still there, is a glossary, or a list of acronyms that you can refer to. I think one of the best -- I've used three or four acronyms already tonight. I think no matter what it is, everybody in the Federal Government puts together two words and they create an acronym. I have no hesitation to ask my colleague, Jim Colter what do you mean by that acronym.

When you don't understand what an acronym is, ask what that acronym is. Any time you want to have a discussion this evening, feel free to ask questions.

With that brief overview, I'd like to go into the introduction of the RAB members.

Sir?

A MAN: My name is John Lovisolo, I'm a member of the community. Are there funds to have an independent expert in mediation to give advice to the RAB.

MR. KAMINSKI: At a future meeting when the agenda is established, you'll be given a full description of possibilities like that. Rather than me giving you a cursory answer, I'd rather you hear

Proceedings

1
2 a briefing that goes on for perhaps 15, 20 minutes,
3 that we are not prepared to give tonight.

4 Jim Colter gives that, I don't. We'll
5 let you know about that.

6 We think in general the people working
7 for the Navy will be able to provide you with the
8 answers you need. If that is not the case, we'll
9 find out how to do that.

10 A MAN: I was looking for someone that
11 would be on the side of the community, as opposed to
12 the side of the Navy.

13 MR. KAMINSKI: Like I say, we need to
14 establish a degree of credibility and trust, and
15 that doesn't happen in the first five minutes that
16 I've spoken here. Certainly as I've said, a degree
17 of skepticism, like you're showing, is healthy. And
18 I'm sure we can work that out as we go along. I
19 would like you to hear the full story, though.
20 Thank you.

21 Introductions, I'm Joe Kaminski -- start
22 with me and go to Jim Colter, and go around the
23 table this way.

24 I'm Joe Kaminski, I'm with the Naval Air
25 Systems Command. I have been an environmental

1 Proceedings

2 engineer for in excess of 30 years. I guess I got
3 into the business when I was growing up in Baltimore
4 and would go down to Chesapeake Bay each summer and
5 see the bay getting dirtier and dirtier as the years
6 went by. I thought it would be a good business to
7 get into. I'd like to hang around long enough to
8 see Bethpage participate in being one of those
9 accomplishments as well.

10 MR. COLTER: I'm Jim Colter, I'm the
11 Navy's project manager for the Bethpage site. I
12 have been working on Bethpage since 1992. I'm an
13 environmental engineer, by education. I'm
14 basically -- I work out of the Philadelphia office.
15 Our Naval Facilities Engineering Command is
16 headquartered out of Washington, D.C. and we have
17 seven sister agencies around the country,
18 Philadelphia office being one of those sister
19 agencies. And our job is basically to secure
20 funding, congressional funding, and put that into
21 investigations and remediations for the Navy's
22 property up here.

23 MR. SCHARF: My name is Steve Scharf,
24 I'm with the New York State DEC, I'm the project
25 manager on the Grumman Aerospace and the Navy

Proceedings

1
2 Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant Project which is
3 the hazardous waste site. I work with the Division
4 of Environmental Remediation. We are working to
5 come to a decision on groundwater issues, as well as
6 all the other issues involving scaling down of the
7 former Grumman facility.

8 I'm out of the Albany office but there
9 are -- if there ever are questions on a local level,
10 you can always contact the DEC out of the Stony
11 Brook office.

12 MR. MANGANO: Ed Mangano, Nassau County
13 legislator and resident of Bethpage.

14 MR. RESCH: Ed Resch, local resident, if
15 anybody needs anything, if I can help anybody out,
16 call me at home.

17 MR. SIMONSON: Marty Simonson, I work
18 with the DCMC, Defense Contract Management Command.
19 I have worked in Bethpage for the last seventeen
20 years.

21 MR. TRINGALI: Roy Tringali, I live in
22 Hicksville. I'm a member of the Community Council
23 in Hicksville, Hicksville municipal and former
24 Northrop Grumman employee.

25 MR. LOVEJOY: John Lovejoy, I'm here

Proceedings

1
2 representing my supervisor Bruce Mackay, who is at
3 another public hearing tonight with the Nassau
4 Public Health Department and couldn't make it. I
5 would like to take back any concerns anyone has to
6 the office if I can.

7 MR. KELLY: I'm Tim Kelly, Nassau County
8 Department of Public Works. I'm a hydrogeologist in
9 the environmental division.

10 MS. MANGANO: Linda Mangano, the editor
11 and publisher of Bethpage Tribune, and Bethpage
12 resident for seven years.

13 MR. McBRIDE: Jim McBride, bethpage
14 resident. I've done environmental health and safety
15 work for the corporation I work with.

16 MR. FENDER: I'm Rich Fender, I'm
17 representing Supervisor John Venditto. Also, I'm
18 also a resident of Hicksville for the last 46 years.

19 MR. KAMINSKI: Thank you. Thank you all
20 for coming, again. We appreciate it. We are going
21 to change the printed agenda, to the agenda on the
22 screen, here. I'm going to run through the slides
23 on what a RAB is all about and what happens, and
24 then you'll have an opportunity to elect a co-chair
25 and take a closer look at the Section 2 of your work

1 Proceedings

2 books. As I said, I'm going to kind of
3 paraphrase -- as I go through here, paraphrase
4 Section 2, leave a few things out, and add a few
5 things on responsibilities. Sort of follow that
6 format in Section 2, though.

7 Let me switch to Purpose. What is a RAB?

8 Well, basically, it is a forum for discussion. It
9 is a place where the Navy and regulatory agencies
10 and the community come together and discuss the
11 restoration program. In this case, Bethpage. I
12 think the key word is advisory. The Navy advises
13 the community as to what the Navy is doing. The
14 community advises the Navy of what is important to
15 the community. What is a priority for the
16 community, and the regulatory agencies advise all of
17 us on what the regulations are. And that is pretty
18 important too.

19 The RAB will consider important
20 environmental cleanup is such as priorities like I
21 said, clean up levels, remedial action alternatives,
22 and we'll do it in a partnership way, where we
23 cooperate and work together to get those benefits
24 that EPA and DOD envisioned in 1994, when they
25 started the RAB concept.

Proceedings

1
2 As I said earlier, the technical review
3 committee still exists here so it contains the
4 regulators and the Navy, and this evening we are
5 adding the community members. The RAB is co-chaired
6 by the Navy and community co-chairs. As I said,
7 my boss, Judithanne Hare, is the Navy co-chair.
8 She's appointed by the commanding officer. The
9 community co-chair is elected. The RAB is jointly
10 operated and all members are considered equal.
11 There is a series of responsibilities that go along
12 with the RAB and we can run through them.

13 The Navy is responsible for explaining
14 the cleanup actions. They'll be able to convey to
15 the RAB and the public in general what it is that
16 the Navy is doing. As an example, would be at
17 Calverton there was initial discussions that were a
18 bit too technical for me to understand, Dave, and
19 the consultant working for Jim, was able to take
20 complicated groundwater contamination charts or
21 issues or samples and turn them into a perspective
22 that could be seen actually in a computer program to
23 better explain what we are doing. From that we have
24 done a better job to figure out what we are doing
25 out there. So the Navy needs to explain its

Proceedings

1
2 actions in that way. And work with input from the
3 community to incorporate into what the direction
4 that the cleanup should go. The Navy provides
5 administrative and logistics support, RAB work
6 books, minutes and notes -- being recorded and will
7 be turned into minutes. The Navy will distribute
8 various discussion materials from time to time and
9 the Navy puts all of the documents that the Navy has
10 to do, to cause this cleanup to occur, in a public
11 repository which is the Bethpage public library so
12 all the documents that are required for cleanup are
13 public information to be put in that repository.

14 Responsibility of the regulatory agencies
15 are to identify the issues. I've never known a
16 regulatory agency that has any trouble with that
17 that should function pretty well. Explaining the
18 regulations as you said is important. I work with
19 activities in five or six different states and
20 regulations do vary quite a bit from state to
21 state. We need the regulators to explain both to
22 the Navy and the community what the regulations
23 really say.

24 Of course they are going to ensure
25 compliance with the regulations with their job.

1 Proceedings

2 Another important job of the regulatory community is
3 to educate all the RAB members and example of that I
4 saw at the formative meeting we had a couple of
5 months back when two members from which ever New
6 York regulatory agencies it was I'm not sure, stood
7 up and again they explained to the people assembled
8 what a particular regulation meant in the context of
9 the question that had been asked at that time. That
10 was excellent and I was pleased to hear that
11 happening.

12 Community members act as a liaison with
13 the community, knowing what the concerns of the
14 community are, as John has expressed, and being able
15 to convey them and know what is wanted out there.

16 But it is also necessary for the
17 community members to understand the Navy process,
18 the Navy has a huge bureacratic process to go
19 through to achieve cleanup. There is a lot of
20 issues that are not environmental, contractual,
21 budget, getting approvals, competition with other
22 places.

23 Jim will give you a lot more information
24 on that as things go along. It is a not a matter of
25 the Navy saying we can go out and do things right

Proceedings

1
2 away. There is a lot of back and forth
3 communication with regulatory agencies and others,
4 that is something you need to understand and learn
5 as you become RAB members.

6 The community members need to provide
7 constructive cleanup input. I emphasize
8 "constructive". This is not to say that there isn't
9 an occasion where someone would want to vent a
10 little bit. We saw some people at Calverton last
11 night giving their personal opinions. About some
12 issues that they had. It is good for us to hear
13 that, but we need to keep on the agenda and keep
14 track of where we are trying to go. And, really, a
15 personal agenda, as such, is not the thing to bring
16 to a RAB meeting. But we all get excited, and I
17 want you all to get excited about what we are doing.

18 The community members need to explain the
19 decisions that are made and take them back to the
20 community.

21 All RAB members have a responsibility to
22 prepare for the meetings. That means read. Most of
23 the time, the Navy will be sending out things ahead
24 of time; take a look at it, read it and come
25 prepared. Attend all the meetings.

1 Proceedings

2 There are ways that we'll get
3 into -- we'll have alternates if you need to, but
4 attendance is important. And everyone should make
5 sure that all the issues are brought forward. I
6 don't think we'll have any trouble with that one.
7 Reviewing and reporting on the reports. The Navy
8 has a responsibility to come back and answer
9 questions that are asked from the floor.

10 Everyone should report back to the group
11 they represent, there are some people here, like
12 here, that are representing somebody else. I'll go
13 back and tell my boss what went on. Everybody
14 should do that when you go back to your community.

15 Co-chairs have particular
16 responsibilities. The Navy co-chair, my boss, most
17 of the time needs to coordinate with the community
18 co-chair on what the next agenda should be.

19 The Navy co-chair has to ensure that the
20 Navy is meeting the specifications of the RAB, that
21 we are presenting materials in a way that they are
22 understood, and responding responsibly to the
23 questions that are being asked. Make sure that we
24 are not aloof or anything like that. Indeed, in
25 addition, the Navy co-chair needs to make sure that

1 Proceedings

2 everybody has an opportunity to speak, that everyone
3 has an opportunity to contribute, that they are all
4 being heard. Then to refer to any questions that
5 might come up, that don't have relation to clean-up
6 to the appropriate place.

7 So there still will be times for most
8 questions to be discussed, whenever it is necessary.

9 Community co-chair responsibilities
10 mirror the Navy co-chair's responsibilities in that
11 the community co-chair has to coordinate with the
12 Navy co-chair to develop the agenda. The community
13 co-chair is going to have -- develop a close
14 one-on-one working relationship with my boss.

15 Judith calls the community chairs of the other RABs,
16 on occasion, and you'll get to know her pretty well.

17 Community co-chair needs to make sure the
18 community members participate in an open,
19 constructive manner, stay on the agenda, meet
20 expectations of the Navy to move this thing forward,
21 get it cleaned up and get it given to Nassau County.

22 Any concerns that are brought forward or
23 any questions that are answered, and reported back
24 to the community.

25 Make sure we are not forgetting something.

1 Proceedings

2 Basic operating procedures: Meetings are
3 called by agreement at a convenient location. If
4 this is a convenient location, we could keep this as
5 a place to have the meetings. Often the community
6 co-chair or one of the RAB community members has an
7 input in that. If this is the place, we can keep
8 it, and we can talk about that later. Setting the
9 place for the agenda of the Navy, announce meetings
10 in advance and provide you with handouts, if
11 necessary. Navy will be responsible for the minutes
12 that are being taken right now.

13 But in between RAB meetings you are all
14 encouraged to get together among yourselves, and
15 participate in subcommittees collectively or
16 individually, and discuss what it is that ought to
17 be presented at the next meeting.

18 In your handouts, this section is called
19 Membership. I've called it Commitment, because you
20 have made a big commitment by being here. We have
21 left the number of members blank, number of
22 alternates, because it is possible to add or
23 subtract from that. Totally voluntary for your
24 being here. If you feel you need to do something
25 else, there is not anything wrong with leaving,

Proceedings

1
2 there is nothing wrong with us adding people to the
3 RAB as they want to make it kind of a commitment.

4 If someone doesn't come for an extended period of
5 time, there is an option for the community, not the
6 Navy, to ask them to step down.

7 Finally, almost finally on this slide,
8 the participation is really important.

9 Participation is not just attendance, but as I say,
10 it is reading and understanding and making sure you
11 know what's going on.

12 This whole concept is flexible, we can
13 amend the mission statement as necessary. And
14 cleanup in and of itself is flexible. Cleanup
15 decisions have to be made often, almost always are
16 made, without having the total amount of information
17 that could conceivably be gathered. It is almost
18 always impossible to pay for all of the information
19 that would be conceivable to gather. But the other
20 side of that coin is that it is usually possible to
21 come up with the series of finite alternatives that
22 aren't going to change much with the information
23 that is available.

24 Expect the Navy to take interim action on
25 cleanup, which it is doing, and completion of those.

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

Proceedings

Everything is done in conformance with the regulation of the State of New York and the federal regulations. As I said earlier, the effective date of this RAB, in effect will be when everyone signs the mission statement and operating procedures.

Going to take about a 10 minute break right now. I'd like the RAB members to use that time to take a look at that Section 2, to make sure they understand it, and then get together and elect your co-chair. The Navy is going to leave. The minutes are going to stop being taken. I'd like to ask, if I may, Ed Mangano, who knows a little something about elections, to lead the group when the Navy leaves.

Take time to read Section 2, if you haven't done it.

MR. MANGANO: I have been involved on many levels. I have attended mostly all of the meetings, if not all of them. I myself from that, I'm not going to be the co-chair, so I'll help you in the selection process. I would suggest, instead of everybody leaving, there is a little office over here in the community center, if the members of the

Proceedings

1
2 RAB would like to convene in there over the next 10
3 minutes. We could read the statement and see if we
4 all agree on that and seek -- give everybody an
5 opportunity to present their credentials and why
6 they want to be the co-chair and then the group will
7 do it by vote.

8 MR. KAMINSKI: If you want to, you can do
9 that. Let me encourage you the fact the community
10 members that are in the audience are part of the
11 selection process. If you want them to listen in to
12 it. I don't know if you want to cram everybody in.

13 MR. MANGANO: If the Navy doesn't want to
14 be here, you can convene in the office.

15 MR. KAMINSKI: That is up to you. You
16 come in and get us when you're done.

17 (Off the Record at 7:45 p.m.)

18 (The Proceedings Reconvened at 8:10 p.m.)

19 A MAN: We are happy to report that we
20 met, and we have elected the chairman, Mr. McBride.
21 I'd like to introduce James McBride as our
22 co-chairman of the RAB.

23 MR. KAMINSKI: Welcome to a lot more work
24 than you expected.

25 MR. COLTER: We do it that way,

Proceedings

1
2 unfortunately.

3 A MAN: We have also adopted the
4 operation mission statement procedures with the
5 following amendments, we amended Section 5-A to read
6 "RAB shall consist of nine members from the
7 community and one non voting alternate member."

8 I'll give you this, if you want a copy of
9 that, it is nine and one. We have already elected
10 our alternate non-voting member, that is Mr. John
11 Lovisolo, and he's joined us at the table.

12 MR. KAMINSKI: Excellent, thank you very
13 much. That almost ends my duties as the surrogate
14 -- I'm sorry, it almost ends my duty as a surrogate.

15 I have a couple more slides to go through
16 but I'm going to do that after Jim takes you
17 through. The only thing we have left to do
18 administratively is future meetings, and thank you
19 all for being here.

20 A MAN: How do you want this signing to
21 take place?

22 MS. COHEN: Have you got the page that
23 Judith has already signed? We can pass it as we go
24 along here. Judith has already signed this copy,
25 you can put your names on.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. KAMINSKI: Again, I have two more
3 slides, and that is at the end of Jim's
4 presentation. Then all we have left to do is talk
5 about the agenda of the next meeting and then we'll
6 give a final closing and thank you.

7 So I'll turn it over to Jim, here, to
8 talk about the restoration program, which is what we
9 are really here for.

10 MR. COLTER: Evening, everyone. Again,
11 my name is Jim Colter, I'm the project manager for
12 the Bethpage property. I have been working at the
13 site since 1992, my main job in addition to my
14 duties out at Calverton, is to secure funding to
15 hire consultants, perform investigations, work with
16 the regulatory agencies in making decisions and
17 implementing decisions with various remedial
18 actions.

19 I work for the Northern Division, Naval
20 Facilities Engineering Command. We are headquartered
21 out of Washington, D.C., and we have seven sister
22 agencies around the country. The Northern Division
23 is responsible for all the naval installations in
24 the 10 Northeast states.

25 Basically, the creation of the

Proceedings

1
2 Installation Restoration Program, and I'll refer to
3 it from now on as the IR Program, was because back
4 in the '40s, '50s, '60s, the war years, it was
5 acceptable that the old industrial ways of handling
6 waste we now know to be potentially damaging to the
7 environment. However, back in those times, defense
8 of the nation was paramount and we really didn't
9 know much about the chemicals that we were using.
10 30 years later, we have a lot more education, a lot
11 more data, and a lot more research that has
12 happened. We now know that some of the things that
13 were done for disposal weren't the best for the
14 environment.

15 In 1975, the DOD department of defense
16 took the first step to create a program to identify
17 the environmental problems at all of its federal
18 facilities, Army, Navy, Air Force.

19 Then in 1980, after that initiative,
20 Congress enacted what is known as the Comprehensive
21 Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act.
22 You all know it as CERCLA.

23 Basically, CERCLA consists of these
24 following reports that have to be done by a
25 responsible party, submitted to a regulatory agency,

Proceedings

1
2 concurred with, and then you're allowed to proceed
3 to the next report.

4 They consist of a preliminary assessment.
5 Basically, you go out and look at the ways that you
6 handle your chemicals, where you dispose of your
7 chemicals, where you stored your chemicals, to see
8 where there might be a potential for releases to the
9 environment. After you identify what they call
10 Areas of Concern, you go to a site investigation,
11 you take some quick samples, just to see if you have
12 chemicals in your soil, chemicals in your
13 groundwater. It is a very quick program, very low
14 cost program.

15 If you confirm that you have chemicals in
16 the environment, then you proceed to a Remedial
17 Investigation, which is a more comprehensive, more
18 costly investigation, that basically tries to
19 delineate the nature and the extent of the soil or
20 groundwater or sediment contamination, whatever you
21 might have.

22 Once you've identified the problem, then
23 the next step is a Feasibility Study that offers
24 alternatives and technologies to address that type
25 of contamination. Different alternatives for soil

Proceedings

1
2 exist than do for groundwater. Basically, we put
3 every technology out there that we know of and we
4 screen them for cost, long-term effectiveness,
5 community acceptance. There is nine criteria items
6 that we go through. Basically we work with the
7 regulators to pick the best technology that will get
8 the job done quickly and as economically as
9 possible, because the money that we use in the IR
10 Program, is Congressionally appropriated dollars,
11 and we all know where that comes from, that is
12 taxes. So it is incumbent upon us to try to do what
13 is cost effective not -- the pockets aren't as deep
14 as they once were, and we have to try to do the best
15 we can with an ever shortening pot.

16 Once the best alternative is chosen, and
17 historically that was between the regulators and the
18 Navy, we would go to a public meeting and say this
19 is what we decided. At that point, at different
20 times, the community would say I have a problem with
21 that for various reasons, that maybe the Navy and
22 the regulators didn't think of. Basically we had to
23 start from scratch. That's one of the main reasons
24 for establishment of the RAB, is instead of getting
25 those comments at the 11th hour, we try to get them

Proceedings

1
2 up-front before we start making our remedial
3 decisions.

4 Once again, we pick the best alternative
5 that meets community concerns, and that meets
6 regulatory statutes. We do a Record of Decision
7 that basically is a legal document that binds the
8 Navy to whatever decision is in that Record of
9 Decision, or ROD.

10 Then of course we design the remedy and
11 we implement the remedy.

12 Following the same logic as on the
13 previous slide, the Navy's program here at Bethpage
14 commenced back in 1985 with the initial assessment
15 study. That was completed in 1986, we then -- we
16 then did a remedial investigation, and I'll get into
17 the details of these as the slides go on. We did a
18 remedial investigation in 1992. The EPA and New
19 York State DEC, in the middle of our investigation,
20 issued a RCRA operating permit for the Bethpage
21 facility, that outlined certain corrective measures
22 that had to be done before we could terminate that
23 permit.

24 Based on the funds of the Phase I, we
25 found we had data gaps and we had to proceed to a

Proceedings

1
2 Phase II RI, that was completed in 1993. We did our
3 feasibility study and outlined all the different
4 technologies available for soil and groundwater in
5 1994. Some of you might remember a public meeting
6 that we had back in 1994, that outlined what the
7 remedy for the soils at Bethpage was going to be.
8 That again was held in the Fall of 1994. The New
9 York State DEC and the Navy signed a Record of
10 Decision for the soils and we call that Operable
11 Unit 1, in 1995.

12 We have partially designed a portion of
13 the remedy, and I'll get into again more details as
14 we go along, and we are out there right now,
15 actually, doing some cleanup. Implementing a
16 remedial action, if you will.

17 So back in 1986, the initial assessment
18 study identified three areas of concern at the
19 Bethpage property, you'll all know that it is a
20 fairly small property, roughly 105 acres. The three
21 areas where -- that are called Site 1, Site 2 and
22 Site 3, are the former Drum Marshaling Area on the
23 east end of the big plant, plant there; the Recharge
24 Basin Area and associated grounds associated with
25 the Recharge Basin Area was Site 2, and an old bone

Proceedings

1 yard, if you will, a Salvage Storage Areas Site 3.

2 Basically they took, because of the
3 operations and the storage and things like that,
4 these were identified, some samples were taken,
5 however, in the IAS, and chemicals were detected.
6 So we basically combined the Initial Assessment
7 Study and the site assessment process into one.
8

9 The report recommended a remedial
10 investigation be conducted.

11 As I said earlier, the EPA and New York
12 State DEC issued a RCRA permit in 1992. Although
13 it's a RCRA operating permit, because we were
14 already under way with our CERCLA process, the
15 agreement was made to continue to investigate the
16 Bethpage property under the CERCLA program. That is
17 basically just a terminology difference between RCRA
18 and CERCLA.

19 So in August of 1991, we developed a work
20 plan that basically outlined everything, all the
21 samples we wanted to take, how we were going to take
22 the samples, the labs that were -- going to analyze
23 the samples, the techniques they were going to use,
24 to ensure quality of the sample. Before we do any
25 field work, we are required to put this work plan to

1 Proceedings

2 get and submit it to the DEC and the local health
3 agencies for review and comment.

4 Basically that was again conducted
5 in -- completed in August of 1991. Shortly
6 thereafter, we were out in the field taking our
7 samples in all these sites and we finalized the
8 Remedial Investigation Report in May of 1992. As I
9 mentioned earlier, based on the regulatory concerns,
10 there was a conclusion that there was some data gaps
11 in our investigation that needed to be filled before
12 any decision could be made.

13 So basically in 1992, we put together
14 another work plan, submitted that to the DEC for
15 review, and we finalized that in November.

16 The Phase II work basically consisted of
17 some off site groundwater sampling, to determine if
18 our groundwater contamination may have emanated
19 offsite. PCB delineation in soils at the Drum
20 Marshaling Area and the Recharge Basin Area, that
21 was one of the conclusions of the Phase I, that we
22 did have PCBs in soils and we needed to better
23 delineate the extent of that.

24 Thirdly and probably most importantly, we
25 developed a groundwater computer model for the

Proceedings

1
2 Navy's property to try and anticipate what has
3 happened over the years and what might happen in the
4 future.

5 During 1993, the whole year we basically
6 were in the field doing field work and we submitted
7 our report to the DEC later that year and got it
8 finalized in October, 1993. The year after that, we
9 developed our Feasibility Study outlining the
10 alternatives that we saw for the soils and the
11 groundwater on the Navy's property. We submitted
12 that again to the DEC, and we got that approved in
13 March of 1994.

14 Immediately after that, we wrote a
15 Preferred Remedial Action Plan, known as a PRAP,
16 basically picking the best alternative, after input
17 from the community at a community meeting.

18 Real quickly I'll go through what that
19 ROD, the contents of the ROD were. In July of 1995,
20 the Navy and the New York State DEC jointly signed
21 that, basically making it a legal document,
22 outlining the following actions that the Navy now
23 has to meet.

24 It said that the Navy would excavate PCB
25 contaminated soils above an industrial cleanup

Proceedings

1
2 number, as the Navy's property was considered to be
3 an industrial facility which is 10 parts per million
4 at Site 2, where the recharge basin is. We
5 completed that in 1996. The ROD also stated that we
6 would remediate volatile organic contamination in
7 soils at the former Drum Marshaling Area, being Site
8 1, using an air sparging soil vapor extraction
9 technology. We basically constructed that system, a
10 couple of years ago, and start up of that system was
11 in June of 1998, it continues to run out there today
12 and we are hoping to continue to run that all of
13 next year. We'll reevaluate the soils at that point
14 and see if our cleanup has met its objectives for
15 soils.

16 It also said that the Navy would excavate
17 for metals that were considered to be hazardous out
18 at Site 1, and again, PCB contaminated soils out at
19 Site 1 in excess of the industrial cleanup goal of
20 10 parts per million. Because of the construction
21 of the air sparge system, which has a lot of pipes
22 and a lot of equipment, we have to wait until that
23 air sparging system is completed so we can dismantle
24 it and go in and conduct our excavations.

25 A couple other items of the ROD that

Proceedings

1
2 dealt basically with some groundwater issues. It
3 said that the Navy would fund construction of a
4 treatment plant in the Bethpage Water District Plant
5 No. 5, located to the south of the Navy and north of
6 Grumman properties. Most of you are aware of the
7 location of that. Basically, the water district had
8 some regulation that they not allow outside agencies
9 to construct systems for their supplies, and so an
10 agreement was reached where the Navy would basically
11 reimburse the Bethpage Water District so they could
12 go ahead and construct the treatment plant under
13 their own specs, using a contractor that they are
14 comfortable with.

15 That funding was forwarded to the
16 Bethpage District back in August of 1996. That
17 treatment plant has been completed. It is ready to
18 be operational if needed. The other part of what we
19 have been investigate -- yes, sir.

20 MR. LOVISOLO: Just a question. The
21 treatment you were talking about before for the
22 industrial area, you said, was that -- was I correct
23 in understanding it was down to 10 parts.

24 MR. COLTER: Ten parts per million, yes.
25 Which is nationally recognized as a safe level for

Proceedings

1
2 industrial operations so that the people that work
3 there aren't exposed 365 days. It is basically
4 where they work so there is a lot less exposure, and
5 it is a whole calculation done by the EPA, New York
6 State DEC.

7 MR. LOVISOLO: What are the local regs
8 for drinking water.

9 MR. COLTER: This was a soils cleanup,
10 which is different -- it is a different cleanup
11 number than if you had PCBs in groundwater.
12 Offhand, I don't know what the number is in
13 groundwater, but PCBs are very -- they are not very
14 mobile. They adhere to the soil and it is very
15 difficult in -- the groundwater at Bethpage is
16 roughly 50 to 60 feet depth. So it is very
17 difficult for PCBs that are spilled on the surface
18 to migrate to that type of depth. It does happen.
19 But at Site 1, we have actually found it to be down
20 to, like, 30 feet. So there's really -- as far as
21 the Navy's property goes, right now we don't have
22 PCBs in groundwater.

23 MR. MANGANO: What about the local
24 residents in the area. How is that going to affect
25 us? You're saying just on that property.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. COLTER: Right.

3 MR. MANGANO: Fine. How far does that
4 plume go to the people in the area between
5 Hicksville and Bethpage? Your people work
6 immediately on that area. We have people who live
7 around that area. They have to be there 365 days a
8 year.

9 MR. COLTER: That question came up back
10 in the 1994 public meeting, and that was a very
11 vocal concern of the community, and rightfully so.
12 To answer that question, we actually went out into
13 the local community and sample various yards and
14 residences for PCBs. In a nutshell, we didn't find
15 that the PCBs at the Navy's property had been blown
16 over or migrated over into the community. We -- we
17 gave those results to the Department of Health and
18 the residents seemed to be happy at the effort that
19 we did.

20 MR. MANGANO: It is contained to the Navy
21 property and only the Navy property, is that
22 understood.

23 MR. COLTER: Yes.

24 A MAN: Could you quantify that for us,
25 that you're cleaning it up to a standard of 10 parts

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

per million?

You find the PCBs, and then you address it, you're going to remove them.

MR. COLTER: Right.

A MAN: So you get a detect of 10 parts per million or less.

MR. COLTER: Right.

A MAN: Can you quantify that as a health risk what you would have to do to have that adversely affect your health? Do you have -- if somebody -- if you walked over it, would that affect your health? If you picked it up, if you fell in it, would that affect your health? Would you have to ingest it?

I want to get some kind of degree that you're going to clean it up to an industrial standard. What does that mean to us that have to live here?

MR. COLTER: To be honest with you, that is a very involved answer to that question. We could actually spend an agenda item to give that answer to you. We can do that if you'd like.

The quick answer to that is it is based on a risk assessment, and it is a very lengthy

Proceedings

1
2 process, involving a lot of calculations, a lot of
3 numbers that go into a calculation to come up with
4 that number. The 10 parts per million has been
5 calculated by other -- different agencies, the
6 EPA -- around the country, different state agencies,
7 the Navy has done calculations and basically has
8 said that because of your exposure time being a
9 couple hundred days a year, because you don't work
10 there on weekends, things like that, all those
11 calculations get run through, and they come up to 10
12 is safe for the on-site work, basically.

13 It does talk about ingestion of soils,
14 how much you have to ingest. That would be eating
15 the soil. So that's very unlikely. Direct contact,
16 inhalation of the dust. There is a whole slew of
17 calculations. If you want to see those
18 calculations, we can put that on as an agenda item.
19 It would be too difficult to try to get into that.

20 A MAN: I understand that. I would
21 respectfully ask the chair to consider that.

22 We have to raise the level on that. Two
23 questions come to my mind with it. You talk about
24 the PCBs in the soil. As part of the '94 study, is
25 there a hydrogeologist's report in there for the

Proceedings

1
2 mobility.

3 MR. COLTER: Yes.

4 A MAN: The PCBs we are talking about are
5 in the subsurface soil, or are capped in impervious
6 soil, or both.

7 MR. COLTER: Both. Right now it is Site
8 2, we have actually excavated the PCBs. The surface
9 soils are clean. When you excavate to get to a
10 subsurface area, you have automatically excavated
11 the surface and disposed of whatever concentration
12 that is.

13 A MAN: Have we capped it.

14 MR. COLTER: No. After we are done with
15 all our excavation, we have to finish Site 1, we put
16 either gravel or a soil type of covering over these
17 areas as a safety reason, on top of the excavations
18 that we have done.

19 A MAN: Didn't you say you completed one
20 site, though.

21 MR. COLTER: Completed the excavations.

22 A MAN: It is not a closed site yet.

23 MR. COLTER: No. Basically, for a site
24 close-out, we have to submit an application to the
25 DEC and we haven't done that yet.

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

Proceedings

A MAN: So it is still all active. You haven't signed off on any of it yet.

A MAN: No.

A MAN: Two issues, the inside of the building and outside of the building on Plant 3.

MR. COLTER: Oh, okay.

MR. KEEL: Plant 3, on the inside, is under the direction of the RCRA program. And currently the entire 105 acres is still Class 2, which is a hazardous waste site under the regulation. What the Navy is looking to do is delist that, and transfer that majority of property, correct me if I'm wrong, to the county. Some of it will never go to the county.

MR. COLTER: Not never, but for the near future, that being the Site 1.

MR. KEEL: Unless something can be resolved specifically at Site No. 1 and possibly around those two drywells, which are adjacent to Site 1.

MR. COLTER: Something the county has to consider in the future, is whether we maintain it at 10 parts per million or whether we can contain it.

MR. MANGANO: As far as the county goes,

Proceedings

1
2 we are not taking any land that has contamination,
3 number one. We have made that pretty clear and we
4 have been working with the Navy on that point.

5 We have been working on it to a point and
6 extent where they are surveying the property and
7 we'll retain title to certain sections until they
8 are cleaned. That will keep the onus on the Navy
9 to complete the cleanup while still allowing parts
10 of the property that are clean to be transferred and
11 used. So you know that is the approach that the
12 county and that really I've insisted on, that we go
13 in that area. So if we are focusing on what we are
14 taking, that is where this question of how many
15 parts per million is safe?

16 MR. COLTER: Real quick, I'll explain
17 another hat that I wear. I'm in charge of getting
18 the documents together to transfer, environmentally
19 transfer the property. We have to write what is
20 called a Finding of Suitability to Transfer.
21 Basically that document takes all of our historical
22 information, summarizes why we feel the property is
23 suitable for transfer, and that gets sent to the
24 regulatory agencies for review. So although the
25 strict purpose of the Restoration Advisory Board is

Proceedings

1
2 to review installation and restoration documents,
3 and these finding of suitability to transfers are
4 not part of the IR Program. But I'm still in charge
5 of that at this site. I've just taken it upon
6 myself, because we have to have a basically public
7 review period of this information, to make use of
8 the RAB to -- so you all will be getting copies of
9 what we call a FOST document to review and to give
10 us any concerns you may have. Those concerns you
11 can bring up at a public meeting and give them to
12 the DEC, so we'll utilize the RAB concept here to
13 try to get that process forward.

14 A MAN:: Follow-up, Jim. You mentioned,
15 in one of the documents, you detected metals. What
16 are the other solid soil contaminants that we are
17 talking about.

18 MR. COLTER: Basically we call them PAHs,
19 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, the constituents you find
20 in asphalt, tire rubber.

21 A MAN: Nothing exotic.

22 MR. COLTER: No.

23 Sir.

24 MR. LOVISOLO: Ed, giving a little
25 comment, doing that risk assessment that takes into

Proceedings

1
2 account certain factors such as how many hits you're
3 recommended to take per million.

4 I say in doing a risk assessment, getting
5 back to what you were asking about before, they take
6 in consideration how many hits or how many
7 fatalities per million you're prepared to take, and
8 that is based on the adult population, the juvenile
9 population, and these things. So I think perhaps
10 the Department of Health might be able to give you
11 some specific information on that.

12 A MAN: I hope we would take that
13 suggestion, share it with the committee and do a
14 complete.

15 MR. MANGANO: As well as birth defects,
16 and everything else.

17 MR. COLTER: To let you know, the health
18 department was an active member of the Technical
19 Review Committee. All these remedial reviews went
20 through the national department of health and state
21 department of health, and they concurred with that
22 cleanup action of 10.

23 A PERSON: You're saying at an industrial
24 level, an acceptable level for contamination is 10
25 parts per million.

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. COLTER: Yes.

A PERSON: What is the residential standard.

MR. COLTER: One.

A MAN: Will there be any surface contaminants left? After your process, is there anything.

MR. COLTER: No. Pretty much, when we excavate Site 1, we have surface and subsurface, and we'll basically be taking up all the surface soils to get to the subsurface locations, and things like that.

A MAN: Any property that you propose to transfer the surface contaminant will be zero.

MR. COLTER: No, not zero. They will be below regulatory cleanup standards. There may be a chemical that you will detect, but it is not above a regulatory cleanup standard.

A MAN: What about the PCBs, if you're taking them up and covering them, will there be any left on the surface.

MR. COLTER: The new surface will have none, it will be a clean soil we use as a cover. There may be residual PCBs on what is the old

Proceedings

1
2 surface, but it will be below the cleanup level of
3 10.

4 A MAN: Let me put it this way: When
5 the Navy completes its proposed remediation, will
6 there be any PCBs that the public or anyone working
7 on the property or visiting the property or walking
8 through the property could come in contact with on
9 the surface of the property.

10 MR. COLTER: No.

11 A MAN: The answer to that is no.

12 MR. COLTER: No.

13 A MAN: That is all outside. But you're
14 talking about inside contamination.

15 MR. SCHARF: That was dealt with by the
16 Grumman corporation. They removed all the equipment
17 inside the building and all the facilities located
18 in-plant, which is a huge building, over a million
19 square feet.

20 Get residuals left in the concrete and
21 surface subsurface areas in the building.

22 Then they had to dig soils out that are
23 sometimes to a depth of 30 feet, without damaging
24 the structure. And that's been going on for the
25 last three years.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. COLTER: I have a slide at the end,
3 here. I will summarize what they have done.

4 A MAN: Just to restate my own point so
5 I get that clear: I want to include the inside.
6 Whether it be inside a building or outside a
7 building, is there any PCBs that the public could
8 come in contact with, whether they walk through the
9 property, work on the property, walk their children
10 through the property, after you have completed your
11 remediation.

12 MR. COLTER: No, there won't be any PCBs
13 that they can come in contact with.

14 A MAN: Nothing that they can come in
15 contact with.

16 MR. MANGANO: How are they excavating the
17 property right now to take out the contaminant?

18 MR. COLTER: As far as type of equipment.

19 MR. MANGANO: How are they removing the
20 soil.

21 MR. COLTER: Just basically with a
22 backhoe type.

23 MR. MANGANO: The dust and everything
24 could possibly be air borne.

25 MR. COLTER: We have -- as part of our

Proceedings

1
2 remedial plan, we have air monitoring that goes on
3 that is required as part of the work. We have
4 people out there with air monitoring equipment,
5 monitoring the air.

6 MR. MANGANO: During the wind factor, are
7 they with the wind.

8 MR. COLTER: Yes. Wind factors are
9 considered. If we do get particulates registering
10 in our air monitoring equipment, we institute
11 mitigating members, and we water it down to mitigate
12 the dust. So there are members in place to protect
13 that, yes.

14 MR. SCHARF: You may want to mention
15 too, at this point, residual PCBs that do remain or
16 that are allowed to remain, they are in a position
17 never to come in contact with anybody because they
18 will be too deep for exposure, which is something we
19 are in discussion with right now. It is very
20 specific areas on the Navy property.

21 MR. COLTER: As this RAB continues, you
22 know, we have other work that has to be completed we
23 are by no means done. We are not anticipating being
24 done in the next several years, so this RAB will be
25 in establishment for sometime and as these issues

Proceedings

1
2 come up, I can't answer all your questions tonight.
3 Quite frankly, we haven't gotten there yet. That is
4 what you're all here for, to participate with us so
5 we make sure we do the right thing.

6 A MAN: I want to clear up that one
7 point: That really the surface at this
8 point -- the this point, the surface exceeds the
9 residential standard.

10 MR. COLTER: Yes. Of the property that
11 we are going to retain, exceeds the residential
12 cleanup standard.

13 A MAN: And the property you're going to
14 transfer, obviously, does.

15 MR. COLTER: Not at Site 2, no.

16 A MAN: It is the other way, then. It is
17 the property you're going to retain that you're
18 cleaning up.

19 MR. COLTER: Yes.

20 A MAN: The property -- when you transfer
21 something.

22 MR. COLTER: It will be suitable for
23 transfer. It will be below any regulatory standard.

24 A MAN: I understand that. I want to
25 talk to the surface. Maybe it goes beyond, you

Proceedings

1
2 know, like, the technical end. But just in plain
3 kind of, like, English so we can understand it, from
4 what we can come into contact with, getting back to
5 that issue, the surface of this property, meaning
6 anything that you could walk by, touch, have a child
7 run through, that will be free of PCBs, therefore it
8 will really exceed -- it will meet the residential
9 standard, the surface of the property, because it
10 will be less than one part per million?

11 MR. COLTER: Yes, if you took a sample of
12 the.

13 A MAN: If I fell down, if I rolled in
14 it, if I ingested the soil, it is going to have no,
15 zero, or obviously less than the one part per
16 million.

17 MR. COLTER: Correct.

18 A MAN: Which is the residential
19 standard.

20 MR. COLTER: Correct.

21 A MAN: I needed to get that clear.

22 A MAN: To follow-up on what Ed was
23 saying. You targeted a number of areas based on the
24 industrial cleanup standard. Are there other areas
25 where you come -- where we hit positive for

Proceedings

1
2 contaminant but they are below industrial standard.

3 That haven't been identified as a site.

4 MR. COLTER: No, all the sites have been
5 identified. Our Site 3, which is our Salvage
6 Storage Area, didn't have any PCBs. They had those
7 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons below the cleanup
8 standard. So we basically have -- we haven't
9 submitted it yet, but we really have no action, no
10 further action for soils at the Salvage Storage
11 Area.

12 MR. MANGANO: How deep does it go,
13 contaminants.

14 MR. COLTER: At which site, Site 1.

15 MR. MANGANO: One, two and...

16 MR. COLTER: Well, two has been
17 remediated to below -- we took subsurface soil
18 samples, and I can't really remember exactly to what
19 depth. But as we, in our investigation, we
20 identified what depths had contamination for PCBs
21 above 10. We went down to that depth to excavate.
22 It was fairly shallow, I believe 8 to 10 feet was
23 the depth we went to.

24 MR. SCHARF: That was the sludge drying
25 area. Every time we established recharging the

Proceedings

1 basin, we take the sediment out and dry it out.

2 MR. COLTER: For Site 1, we have
3 identified PCBs down to a depth of 35 feet, as I
4 mentioned earlier. We do have other areas that I'll
5 mention at the end of the presentation that have
6 just recently been included in the Navy's program.
7 They were identified by the Northrop Grumman
8 Corporation.
9

10 In a deal made between Northrop Grumman
11 and the Navy, they are going to investigate the
12 extent of the contamination and then turn that
13 remediation over to the Navy. At those locations,
14 we have confirmed PCBs down to 60 feet.

15 A MAN: Maybe we could get it the next
16 meeting, a printed map.

17 MR. COLTER: I have a map here. I'll
18 show you.

19 A MAN: A stand, when you say Site 1 we
20 can glance at it so we don't have to stop.

21 MR. COLTER: If I can continue real
22 quick, I have a few more slides, and we'll answer
23 more questions if we have more time.

24 The other concern obviously other than
25 soil at Bethpage, is underlying groundwater. Since

Proceedings

1
2 1994, the Navy, Northrop Grumman Corporation and the
3 New York State DEC have all been working jointly to
4 come up with a one remedy system, if you will, to
5 address groundwater. The Navy was pursuing its own
6 groundwater treatment on the Navy's property as part
7 of the Feasibility Study that was done in 1994. The
8 DEC came in ,and similarly Northrop Grumman was
9 pursuing their own action for their property. The
10 DEC came in and asked us if we would put both plans
11 aside and work jointly in coming up with one
12 groundwater remedy for the Navy/Northrop Grumman
13 properties.

14 It sounded like a good idea, sounded like
15 we could save taxpayer dollars. So we started that
16 process back in '94.

17 Part of groundwater treatment that was
18 done was that Northrop Grumman Corporation paid for
19 treatment on the Bethpage Water District wells,
20 Plants 4 and 6, similar to what the Navy did for
21 Plant 5.

22 Before we put any remedy in place for
23 groundwater, again we had to do a feasibility study.
24 That preliminary Feasibility Study was completed in
25 1996 and submitted to the DEC for review. Because

Proceedings

1
2 we felt pretty strongly that one of the alternatives
3 stood out head and shoulders above the rest as far
4 as implementability and cost, Northrop Grumman
5 started constructing that system as an Interim
6 Remedial Measure. When I say "interim", it is
7 not -- it was not known at that time if that would
8 be the final remedy. We figured it would be part of
9 the final remedy and thought it would be a good idea
10 to put a pump and treat system in and start cleaning
11 groundwater while these technical discussions and
12 the regulatory review process was going on.

13 Northrop Grumman volunteered to take that
14 initiative and they constructed basically a pump and
15 treat system and completed that in 1997. That
16 system is up and running today.

17 I'll get into the details real quick of
18 what that system entails in a minute.

19 So after we got regulatory comment on the
20 preliminary feasibility study, Northrop Grumman
21 prepared a revised feasibility study and submitted
22 that to the DEC earlier in 1998. And submitted
23 basically a draft -- I'm sorry submitted the draft
24 actually in February of 1999. The final
25 feasibility study is expected this winter. The DEC

Proceedings

1
2 will then hold a public comment period to basically
3 outline the contents of what the final remedial
4 alternative will be. And we expect to sign a Record
5 of Decision with the DEC and Northrop Grumman
6 sometime in March of 2000, which is, right now, the
7 current schedule.

8 I'll go real quickly. There's a lot more
9 detail to this groundwater remedy but the highlights
10 basically of it are that there is four deep
11 extraction wells. Three are new, one is Grumman's
12 Production Well No. 1. These wells are located to
13 the southern boundary of Grumman's property and they
14 are all connected to a brand new air stripping
15 treatment facility constructed on Northrop Grumman
16 property. What this system is designed to do is
17 basically capture all groundwater on the Navy and
18 Northrop Grumman properties, run it through a
19 treatment system, discharge it to the recharge
20 basins.

21 Obviously, when we constructed this
22 system, we are going to take care of all the
23 contaminated groundwater that is on the property but
24 obviously other contaminants have already left the
25 boundary of the Grumman property. That is why

Proceedings

1
2 Northrop Grumman and the Navy installed a treatment
3 system in the Bethpage Water District located
4 immediately downgradient of the property.

5 So if there is any concerns on the
6 quality of the drinking water coming from the
7 Bethpage Water District, there is a treatment system
8 on those plants. So if contaminants do get there,
9 and you know, the water district routinely samples,
10 and that is their mandated mission, is to supply
11 safe drinking water so there should be no concerns
12 on your part as far as the quality of your tap
13 water.

14 MR. LOVISOLO: A quick question.

15 MR. COLTER: Yes, sir.

16 MR. LOVISOLO: What is the closest
17 proximity to the water district's wells to where the
18 contaminants are.

19 MR. MANGANO: 200 feet.

20 MR. COLTER: Northrop Grumman has
21 installed what we call sentry wells, upgradient of
22 water district wells. I'm not sure, I think the one
23 sentry well is several hundred feet upgradient of
24 Plant 4, and it does have -- it has had detection,
25 of VOC contaminations in that sentry well. That is

Proceedings

1
2 what prompted Northrop Grumman to go ahead and
3 basically construct a treatment system on that
4 plant.

5 MR. LOVISOLO: Did they make that
6 determination when the pump and treat system was in
7 operation, or when it was off.

8 MR. COLTER: We have been investigating
9 this property jointly since the early 1990's. Back
10 in, again, the mid-1990's is when that potential
11 scenario was discovered and -- so it was well before
12 the completion of the treatment system.

13 MR. SCHARF: Jim, you may want also to
14 explain in a little detail that the Navy site and
15 the Grumman site are two separate listed sites under
16 the registry, and that the RAB is only associated
17 with the Navy site and not with the Grumman site.
18 However, it is all intertwined because the Operable
19 Unit 2 groundwater issue, as it says here, it was
20 put together as a joint approach in order to
21 facilitate implementation of a regional remedy.

22 One other thing that is not listed here
23 is that the Occidental Corporation at one time owned
24 the Hooker facility to the northwest of Grumman.
25 Groundwater contamination also associated with that

Proceedings

1
2 site is now largely between the northern end of what
3 used to be mainly Grumman property. And at one time
4 they were trying to bring all three parties together
5 in this regional groundwater issue. However, for a
6 number of reasons, the decision was to split off the
7 Occidental -- the Occi site from the Northrop
8 Grumman sites. The Occi site is being handled by
9 the Environmental Protection Agency as an NPL site.
10 And as we go along, the DEC was going to be holding
11 *a public meeting at some point on Operable Unit 2,
12 based on the feasibility study being produced by
13 Grumman, which incorporates the issues that the Navy
14 has. So that's why the RAB's associated with the
15 Navy site, but not with the Grumman site, and DEC
16 will be holding a public meeting. In a sense, it
17 may seem a little confusing, but to clarify that
18 point, so you all understand the agencies involved.

19 A MAN: Steve, how would the RAB find out
20 about the -- any of the activities associated with
21 other sites? Are we able to get on a distribution
22 list for the mailing of that, about upcoming events?

23 MR. SCHARF: That is with the
24 Environmental Protection Agency, the person to
25 contact is *Sirude Quadri, Q-U-A-D-R-I, his phone

Proceedings

1
2 number is 212 637 4233. There is also citizen
3 participation specialist with EPA that can handle
4 those questions.

5 A PERSON: There is a repository of all
6 data at the library, just like this site has.

7 MR. SCHARF: The EPA is doing a separate
8 groundwater remedy with Occi, and their own
9 feasibility study for that portion of the plume, and
10 that is -- the main contaminant of concern there is
11 vinyl chloride. There are also compounds called
12 tentatively identified compounds; and the other
13 issue is also some of the same volatile organic
14 compound associated with the Northrop Grumman site.

15 Just to briefly discuss it, it gets more
16 detailed but I won't go into that here.

17 MR. KAMINSKI: If the RAB wants to, we
18 could do it.

19 MR. COLTER: The last thing I want to
20 mention on the groundwater remedy although we don't
21 have a ROD in place, based on the expertise of our
22 consultants that both Northrop Grumman and the Navy
23 hired, we felt that this containment system, pump
24 and treat, would be the most cost effective
25 solution. What we also expect on the back end of

Proceedings

1
2 this pump and treat system, is to have a long-term
3 monitoring program that is going to extend several
4 years into the future, basically for two reasons:

5 One, to prove that the system's operating
6 as it has been designed. Two, to show hopefully we
7 are cleaning up the groundwater in and around the
8 Navy's property and thereby stopping further
9 migration off site.

10 To that end the Navy has agreed to
11 construct twenty additional groundwater monitoring
12 wells in the Town of Oyster Bay, Town of Hempstead
13 communities. We have just started that process. We
14 have to do -- we have to work with the towns. We
15 are hoping to put those wells in the township right
16 of ways so we can work with the town agencies. We
17 have not really approached them yet with this. This
18 is pretty preliminary. The Navy does have some
19 legal requirements that we have to get site access
20 agreements. That protects both the Navy and the
21 local towns. So we have started that process. It
22 is a lengthy process, but we are hoping to begin at
23 least installing some of the wells sometime next
24 year, or early in the calendar year 2001.

25 After those wells are installed, Northrop

Proceedings

1
2 Grumman will then step in and their consultant will
3 institute a quarterly or semi-annually or whatever
4 the agreed upon frequency sampling is determined by
5 the regulators for those twenty wells, and I think
6 30 other wells that are already in the local
7 community and on Northrop Grumman property. As I
8 said, they will be doing some frequency of sampling
9 for the next 10, 15 years or however long it has to
10 be done.

11 MR. LOVISOLO: Is there a listing of how
12 many wells they are and where they're screened at.

13 MR. COLTER: I could give you that. I
14 couldn't give you that tonight. But since the Navy
15 is constructing these wells under its IR Program,
16 it's obviously part of anything that we can share at
17 the Restoration Advisory Board. If you want more
18 detail on our monitoring installation, we can put
19 that on as an agenda item for a future meeting.

20 I have the last couple slides here.
21 Newly discovered areas of contamination that have
22 just recently been included in the Navy's IR
23 Program. These areas were identified by the
24 Northrop Grumman Corporation during their efforts to
25 vacate the Navy's property. Northrop Grumman had

Proceedings

1
2 leased 105 acres from the Navy upon termination from
3 that lease, they were mandated to return the land in
4 a condition not exactly as they got it, but in a
5 condition that is favorable and that meets Navy
6 requirements. That is what prompted a lot of
7 sampling in Plant 3, a lot of excavation in Plant 3,
8 a lot of investigation in and around the buildings
9 and they -- these three additional areas were
10 discovered by Northrop Grumman. Most of the areas
11 that they discovered they remediated themselves.
12 These areas posed a much bigger problem, a much more
13 expensive problem. And to help facilitate them
14 vacating the property, the Navy agreed to put it in
15 the IR Program, which is already going to be running
16 over the next several years into the future.

17 Again, we made basically a deal with them
18 if they did the investigation, and came up with the
19 remedy, the Navy would include it in its IR Program,
20 go for funding, and when funding became available,
21 would implement that remedy. So the three areas we
22 are talking about are all to the south, if you're
23 familiar with the Navy's property at Plant 3,
24 located to the south of the property. I'll show you
25 a map here in a minute. Basically what we call Area

Proceedings

1
2 of Concern 22, which is former UST location, the
3 tanks were removed back in the '70s or early '80s, we
4 are now founding residual petroleum contamination
5 there. We're investigating that, trying to
6 determine the size of the petroleum contamination,
7 how deep it is, if there is a free product layer on
8 the groundwater.

9 The field work for that, that is
10 something the Navy has undertaken for its
11 initiative. That field work has been done and we
12 are now getting the report prepared to submit to the
13 regulatory agencies.

14 The other two areas are drywells.
15 Basically these were investigated under a county and
16 EPA program called Underground Injection Control,
17 UIC. Most of the drywells that they found
18 contamination in, Northrop Grumman went in and dug
19 them out, cleaned them out, filled them back in with
20 clean soil. Again these two represent orders of
21 magnitude of contamination above any of the other
22 drywells, and they asked the Navy if they would take
23 over the cleanup of that. We agreed, again, with
24 the caveat that they delineate what the problem is.
25 They are out there today actually, doing sampling,

Proceedings

1
2 doing field work to delineate those areas.

3 A report subsequently will be submitted
4 to the regulators, we'll all get together and try to
5 come up with what is the best approach. Again,
6 since it is in the Navy's IR Program, it is eligible
7 to be discussed at the RAB meeting.

8 This kind of gets to what we talked about
9 earlier. What Grumman has done as far as
10 environmental restoration of the property. This
11 is not included in the Navy's IR Program. It was
12 initiated solely by Northrop Grumman, voluntarily by
13 Northrop Grumman, to facilitate and try to meet the
14 requirements of the lease, and return the property
15 into a pretty good condition. In a quick nutshell,
16 they took over 32 hundred samples and they removed
17 over 13,000 tons of contaminated soil. A lot of
18 that was inside Plant 3 as Steve mentioned earlier.
19 They had to go through the concrete block floor,
20 excavate the soil, and keep the integrity of the
21 structure in place. They then filled it with clean
22 soil and put either a wood block or concrete cap
23 back on, depending on where they were in the
24 building.

25 So any source area that might have

Proceedings

1
2 historically existed in the plant because of the
3 type of equipment that is there, basically has been
4 removed. This basically is a rough sketch of the
5 Navy's property. Those of you that are familiar
6 with the area know that Northrop Grumman owns
7 property in and around this. They have over the
8 last several years conveyed certain properties to
9 the local developers, they own bits and pieces of
10 what used to be the Grumman campus. This still is
11 the Navy property. Again, we are trying to transfer
12 as much of this as we can to the county in a timely
13 manner.

14 This area, here, known as Site 1, drum
15 marshalling area, this drywell 34-07, this drywell
16 20-08 and this UST site, this will be carved out in
17 some fashion and retained by the Navy because we
18 anticipate that this will be a quite lengthy cleanup
19 program. We can't do it within the next year or
20 even two years. And so the agreement has been made
21 with the county that we carve that parcel out on
22 paper, the Navy will retain ownership, we'll come up
23 with some type of easement agreement with the county
24 to allow them access to that land. Basically, this
25 is a roadway so we need to keep access to that

Proceedings

1
2 roadway open. Although the Navy will own the
3 property, it will still be able to to be hopefully
4 reused by development corporations. Eventually, as
5 funding becomes available, as we finish our
6 investigations, we can clean the site up and
7 transfer -- at some point basically transfer this
8 parcel over to the county, at some point well into
9 the future.

10 Site 2 is a Recharge Basin Area. This
11 area over here is an area of former sludge drying
12 bed, which was an operational process done by
13 Northrop Grumman. This area is where we detected
14 PCBs and surface and subsurface PCBs.

15 As I mentioned earlier, the boneyard
16 salvage area, that would be Site 3, here, although
17 depicted as Site 1 an -- I think we did correct it
18 for the RAB workbook, though. But basically soil
19 contamination, we didn't find much. We found some
20 chemicals that were below regulatory standard and
21 our position is there is no further action for soils
22 required there.

23 Groundwater contamination underlies most
24 of this site. Again, we are working with that,
25 putting a treatment system in to the south of -- the

Proceedings

1
2 southern boundary, of the Northrop Grumman property,
3 to address basically both Navy and Northrop Grumman
4 groundwater contamination.

5 That is it for a summary of what we have
6 been doing the last seven, eight years here at
7 Bethpage, both by Northrop Grumman and the Navy.

8 Again we can get into a lot more detail
9 of decisions that have already been made if the RAB
10 so desires. But that's my attempt to give you a
11 quick bullet summary of what we have been doing.

12 A PERSON: Plant 12, has that been
13 addressed at all.

14 MR. COLTER: Plant 12 is Northrop
15 Grumman.

16 A PERSON: Two weeks ago, there was an
17 article on some kind of cleanup there at plant 12.
18 It was in the local papers.

19 MR. COLTER: Okay, that would be a
20 Northrop Grumman initiative with the DEC, if they
21 are ready to make a decision on a cleanup remedy,
22 then they are holding a public meeting to announce
23 that to the community. That is not Navy property so
24 I don't have much information at all on that.

25 MR. LOVISOLO: Out of curiosity, that

Proceedings

1
2 13,000 tons of contaminated soil, I'm wondering
3 where it wound up going.

4 MR. COLTER: I don't know.

5 MR. LOVISOLO: Town of Hempstead, maybe.

6 MR. COLTER: Maybe Suffolk County. I
7 don't know. That was initiated by Northrop Grumman.
8 I wasn't involved in that. I don't have the details
9 on what landfill that might have been taken to or
10 really any of the specifics of what they did with
11 it. If that is important, I can certainly get the
12 information.

13 MR. LOVISOLO: No, it is not. Out of
14 curiosity.

15 A MAN: Those removals, are those
16 certified. There is a whole process when somebody
17 removes and transfers a contaminated material.

18 MR. COLTER: Yes. Each time -- if I'm
19 not mistaken Grumman identified over 250 areas of
20 concern. Basically 250 IR sites. As they
21 investigated each one, they wrote a report, either a
22 big report or in some cases maybe a couple of pages
23 to the Stony Brook office of the DEC, saying this is
24 what we found, this is what we want to do, here is
25 how we plan to do it, do you have a problem with it.

Proceedings

1
2 The state most of time came back and said we concur.
3 Northrop Grumman went out, did their excavation, did
4 their sampling to make sure they got out what they
5 were supposed to get out, and again forwarded
6 another report saying this is how much we dug up,
7 this is how many contamination samples we came up
8 with, this is the result of the samples. We think
9 we are done. What do you think. Nine times out of
10 10, the DEC came back said yes, we concur.

11 Yes, there is a process. Although
12 Northrop Grumman is not required, as the Navy is, to
13 put their documents in a public repository. That is
14 a federal requirement.

15 A MAN: But they are required to get the
16 DEC's approval.

17 MR. COLTER: Yes.

18 A MAN: Correct?

19 MR. COLTER: Yes.

20 A MAN: That has been monitored.

21 MR. COLTER: I would suggest if anyone
22 has a question on that, call the Stony Brook office
23 of the DEC and I can give you a name if you want to
24 talk to.

25 A MAN: If you want to get an answer to

Proceedings

1
2 the question, the state DEC is monitoring that
3 process.

4 A MAN: It has been contaminated for a
5 long time.

6 MR. SCHARF: Plant 12 is a separate
7 issue you asked about earlier, that is Northrop
8 Grumman property solely. That is located on the.

9 A MAN: I know exactly where it is, hook.

10 MR. SCHARF: Northrop Grumman has
11 submitted a work plan on Plant 12 to the RCRA
12 Program, which is an active facility permitting
13 process, to a group out on the Stony Brook. In this
14 work plan they want to go in and remediate areas
15 that were identified that are still small areas of
16 concern at Plant 12 and they want to -- before
17 Grumman transfers that property, they want to
18 address the environmental issue and still remain
19 there.

20 MR. COLTER: We have been here a --

21 A MAN: One more thing, that big tower on
22 the runway, can you identify it?

23 A MAN: It is a water tower.

24 A MAN: Is it a water tower.

25 A MAN: I believe Northrop Grumman paid

Proceedings

1
2 for that. It is a Bethpage water tower. That is a
3 permanent water storage tower.

4 MR. KEEL is it used now?

5 A MAN: No, it is under construction.

6 A MAN: Jim, what is the feasibility
7 before the weather turns of getting for the RAB a
8 field walk of the sites so we have a better
9 understanding of what we are actually talking about.

10 MR. COLTER: A site visit?

11 A MAN: I find it better to take a look
12 at it first before I start reading any technical
13 documentation.

14 MR. COLTER: Normally we hold these RAB
15 meetings every quarter. We lack for agenda items.
16 Sometimes we have a report that is under review. We
17 don't have anything new to discuss. Three months,
18 believe it or not, is a very short time frame to get
19 environmental documents submitted, prepared, and
20 reviewed. So there will be a lot of time we are
21 struggling for an agenda item. We can cancel that
22 RAB meeting or fill it with agenda items. One can
23 be a site visit.

24 Next quarter is the dead of winter and it
25 will be getting dark soon. I'm on call, basically

Proceedings

1
2 as much as I need to be. You guys get together,
3 find a time that is convenient within the next
4 couple of weeks, next month or so. I would be happy
5 to make a trip up here and during the day on a
6 Saturday, whatever you guys deem appropriate. I
7 will be more than happy to come up here and take you
8 around the Navy property.

9 MR. KAMINSKI: The second option is to
10 wait to have another RAB meeting inside and have the
11 RAB meeting that would come in the spring at the
12 site when it's light enough to take you all through
13 there. It is up to you guys.

14 A MAN: It might be a better idea to, as
15 soon as we could, just to get over there.

16 MR. COLTER: I would suggest you talk
17 among yourselves over the next couple days, give
18 Judith a call. I'll leave my card, you can call me
19 directly and let know what you have decided.

20 We have been here a couple hours. I'm
21 happy to entertain a few more questions if you like.
22 I don't want to extend it too far. I want to maybe
23 talk about some agenda items that you guys have been
24 noting. I'd like to get a summary of what those
25 might be. We might not be able to hit them all but

Proceedings

1
2 we can certainly hit a couple of them if the RAB and
3 community feel it is appropriate.

4 MR. KAMINSKI: What I have so far is
5 there is some interest in the aspect of independent
6 assistance, some interested in academic discussion
7 of the risk assessment, what the risk assessment is
8 all about. Some more maps.

9 A MAN: We would want that specifically
10 in terms of what is on the property, what is going
11 to be left, what the Navy intends to -- how the Navy
12 intends to leave the property. We want the risk
13 assessment specific to the site rather than a
14 general education.

15 A MAN: Review all the risk assessment
16 that was performed.

17 MR. COLTER: That risk assessment was
18 performed while the contamination was there. It
19 was performed to determine what level of cleanup we
20 had to do. A lot of those actions are being
21 implemented. A lot of risk that was identified no
22 longer exists.

23 A MAN: Right. We would rather
24 know -- what you're leaving or what you intend to
25 leave and the risk associated with that, as opposed

Proceedings

1
2 to going over a two hour meeting of what a risk
3 assessment is and how you do it. John was starting
4 to explain it. If anyone disagrees, say it. We
5 want to go specific to that issue.

6 A MAN: What milestones they have reached
7 and how you drew the conclusions to come to the
8 standards you have met.

9 MR. KAMINSKI: Potentially related off
10 site issues at some point in time, New York DEC will
11 help us with that. You all need more maps, more
12 explanations from map standpoint, where monitoring
13 wells. You need more information like that.

14 A MAN: A standard one and leave it off
15 to the side so when anyone is speaking Site 1 you
16 can glance at it.

17 MR. COLTER: We are developing a
18 geographic information system, a GIS for
19 environmental data. It it is basically a computer
20 database compiled with a lot of information. It
21 enables you to click on a building, a structure, a
22 well and get all kinds of data on what the structure
23 is, the dimensions of the structure. If you click
24 on a well, we'll have information on analytical data
25 of that well, such as when it was sampled, what

Proceedings

1
2 chemicals we found in it. We are using it out at
3 Calverton right now. It has gone a long way in
4 taking seven, eight years of data and putting it
5 basically under one report. It has gone a long way
6 helping us to explain to the community what we have
7 done out there and need to do. We have already
8 gotten that about 90 percent complete, and we'll
9 anticipate using that at future TRC and RAB
10 meetings.

11 A MAN: I have a question. As it
12 relates to the areas that you're going to retain and
13 at some point possibly probably transfer to the
14 county, for future development, somebody is going to
15 go in there and dig a footing and build something.
16 They are going to disturb what you did.

17 MR. COLTER: Right.

18 A MAN: Can we get a handle, including
19 with the existing building, for argument's sake
20 Plant 3 may stay or somebody might take it down
21 subdivide it, somebody is going to do something.
22 Does that disturb any of what has been done? Does
23 that then take some of that soil that is down below
24 the gravel that you have placed, and make that an
25 issue.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. COLTER: Couple different answers to
3 that.

4 A MAN: You don't have to answer it
5 tonight. You can supply that as part of future
6 development.

7 MR. COLTER: I can give you an overview
8 quickly. Another process that goes on an
9 environmental impact statement, it is a federal
10 process. The federal government is mandated to take
11 a look at the environmental impacts but they deal
12 with traffic, noise, historic, archaeological.
13 Things like that. What are the impacts of
14 transferring this property to the county. That is
15 done also by my division in a separate group. It
16 also heavily relies on the government entity, in
17 this case being the county, doing a redevelopment
18 plan. It takes a look at what the county would like
19 to do and assesses the impacts of implementing that.

20 So there is a plan out there that says
21 what the county wants to do with the property. In
22 some cases it is demolition and other cases things
23 are going to remain. It is totally separate
24 process.

25 To answer your question, though, if we

Proceedings

1
2 were leaving contamination in the subsurface, there
3 is not going to be in direct contact with anybody as
4 long as a cap is in place, or as long as that gravel
5 cover is in place. What the Navy would do if we are
6 not going to remove it, is put a deed restriction on
7 the property.

8 The deed restriction would say that it is
9 going to let everybody know what's there and it is
10 going to say that as it stands now it is not a
11 danger. However, if you want to disturb that and
12 you want to make changes to it, it is your
13 responsibility and our deed restriction normally
14 says you have to consult with the local regulatory
15 agencies before doing anything in that area. At
16 this point, I don't think we are going to have much
17 in the way of deed restrictions for the environment.
18 Any area where we would have to restrict use of the
19 property, we are going to retain it. So that.

20 A MAN: That was the path -- kind of
21 keep it in the Navy's hands and their responsibility
22 to clean it up, and then we would take it.

23 I want to mention on the other thing.
24 The county developed a plan through several public
25 meetings that we had here in Bethpage. But, really,

Proceedings

1
2 the plan is just used as a basis to stimulate this
3 study. It is not -- it doesn't mean that that is
4 what is going to happen to the property. But if you
5 went along the course of not having a plan, this
6 study would -- may not be as exhaustive or as
7 detailed, and that is why we dedicated resources to
8 do several scenarios, and we elicited experts that
9 predicted what a developer may want to do or may
10 want to propose. It doesn't mean that that will be
11 it or it can be it. This study is based on what
12 would happen, based on those scenarios.

13 So you understand, even after this
14 process, even after the transfer, even when it goes
15 out and developers want to purchase it and in fact
16 if it does get purchased, it still has to go through
17 all the municipal processes and all those hearings
18 that are required if they want to change zone or
19 need special use permits. I can't imagine a
20 property of this size not having fallen into that
21 category. That's another whole stage of hearings
22 that you'll get into. That study is used as a basis
23 for this study, the what-ifs, so we can apply what
24 we are learning here today and ask questions base on
25 that. Keep that in mind.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. COLTER: I want to add on to that
3 response of John. Obviously the Navy tries its best
4 to identify every area of contamination that is on
5 its property. The Bethpage area is 100 acres. It
6 is fairly small. We are fairly confident that
7 we've hit all the areas. A site like Calverton,
8 that's 3,000 acres, there is a lot of area out there
9 and a lot of undeveloped area and we are not sure
10 what has happened historically in there. So the
11 Navy covers itself on that. When it transfers
12 property, it puts in place a deed restriction or
13 covenants that says in the course of your
14 redevelopment of the property, if you dig a
15 foundation, and you turn up contamination, you know,
16 there is an agreement that the town is going to take
17 this property with the understanding that that
18 scenario happens. But the Navy is going to want to
19 come back on the property. We are not going to want
20 to mess around with property access agreements,
21 legal agreements and all this other baloney that we
22 normally have to do. We want to gain access to that
23 property. They have to agree to give us that access
24 so we can do an investigation and see what we missed
25 and things like that.

Proceedings

1
2 We don't profess that we hit it 100
3 percent of the time all the time. There is a
4 recognition out there that we to have to leave an
5 avenue open, just in case we did miss something. As
6 again for Bethpage, it is fairly small. We have
7 been doing this for ten years. We work closely with
8 Northrop Grumman. We know what operations they
9 conducted. It's a tight property. There is not
10 much area to hide. Between the efforts of Northrop
11 Grumman voluntarily and the Navy's IR Program, I
12 think we've hit most of them.

13 MR. LOVISOLO: Would there be objection
14 for the -- GIS software to be given, for example, to
15 the water district so they could incorporate it with
16 their system and for their different layers and such
17 like that they would be able to have some.

18 MR. COLTER: Typically, the Navy shares
19 all its, basically its technology with those who are
20 capable of using it. You need certain software to
21 run a GIS program. If a RAB member has that
22 capability, we are not opposed to submitting that to
23 them for their use. Similar to all the regulatory
24 agencies, if they have the technical capability to
25 use that program, we give it to them and let them

Proceedings

1
2 run their own scenarios and -- all the data in the
3 GIS are in the reports that are in the library, so
4 it is all public information.

5 The GIS is going to be very central to
6 the Navy's property. The water district right now
7 is working with the DEC, Northrop Grumman and the
8 Navy. Northrop Grumman has developed a groundwater
9 model similar to what we did for the Navy property.
10 They have done it for the Navy, Northrop Grumman,
11 and south, down to the Bethpage Water District.
12 They basically tripled the size of the Navy's
13 groundwater model. That model has different layers.
14 It shows computer modeling of where contamination
15 may end up; that is how we designed the treatment
16 system, to make sure we capture the groundwater.

17 So the water district is involved in that
18 process. They really haven't asked that they be
19 given that model to do their one review. I'm sure
20 if they did that, Northrop Grumman would share that.

21 Anything else? It is getting late.

22 A MAN: There's two agenda items you might
23 want to include. You're submitting your final FS in
24 '99, a review of what is being submitted. And also
25 really a general understanding of the groundwater

Proceedings

1
2 models and the soil characteristics.

3 MR. KAMINSKI: I'm going to ask Jim to
4 come up with a tentative agenda and get back to you
5 by phone, trade phone numbers.

6 A MAN: We'll get the copy of the
7 tentative agenda, and mail it out to everyone to
8 comment on it. If we all agree on it, we'll send
9 it back and come up with a formal agenda.

10 MR. COLTER: It is possible, these are
11 involved, some of those will take up the whole two
12 hours.

13 A MAN: Can you indicate
14 that -- indicate which ones is a subject of one
15 meeting versus three.

16 MR. COLTER: Sure.

17 A MAN: So we can get a better idea and
18 you can prioritize.

19 MR. COLTER: Okay.

20 MR. KAMINSKI: Also get together with
21 Jim, trade phones on when and if you want to take a
22 daytime site visit, as Jim said, any time.

23 A MAN: Is everybody in favor of doing a
24 daytime site visit?

25 Why don't we all look at a Saturday

Proceedings

1
2 coming up in the next four weeks, or so, and we'll
3 talk and come up with an idea and come up with a
4 tentative date and I'll get back on it with you.

5 MR. KAMINSKI: I have one more slide. It
6 says you all made a serious commitment. A lot of
7 civic hard work, we appreciate your participation,
8 take a lot of dedication, a lot of energy, a lot of
9 time and primarily you care, that is why you're
10 here. I think the fact that you care is what we
11 need the most and I'm delighted at the communication
12 we have had this evening. I think it is going to
13 get even better. I want to thank you on behalf of
14 the Navy, as I take off my surrogate mantel and give
15 it to your co-chair.

16 THE CO-CHAIRMAN: Anybody have anything
17 else. Motion to adjourn.

18 A PERSON: So moved.

19 A MAN: Second.

20 THE CO-CHAIRMAN: Anyone opposed?

21 Let's go home.

22 (Time noted: 9:28 p.m.)

23 -oOo-

