

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
NAS BRUNSWICK, MAINE

September 22, 1994

ATTENDEES:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Cdr. T. Brubaker	NASB (
J. Caruthers	NASB	
Lt. D. Welch	NASB Public Affairs	
J. Bond	NASB PWD Env.	
Lcdr. R. Dieffenbach	NASB PWD	
Lt. John Edwards	AOIC NAVFAC Contracts	
F. Evans	Northern Division	
J. Dunleavy	Northern Division	
S. Gent	COMSUBGRU 2	
B. Lim	USEPA	
N. Beardsley	MEDEP	
T. Smith	MEDEP	
M. Hubert	MEDEP	
R. Heath	MEDEP	
S. Weddle	Town of Brunswick/BACSE	
T. Fusco	BACSE	
C. Lepage	BACSE Consultant	
B. Walter	ABB-ES	
B. McGirr	ABB-ES	
G. Shephard	ABB-ES	
C. Dricot	ABB-ES	

MEETING DATE: September 22, 1994, 8:30 a.m.

MEETING LOCATION: NAS Brunswick

I. INTRODUCTION

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting was opened by Commander Tom Brubaker, the Base Public Works Officer, who welcomed the TRC and introduced Captain Nelson, the new Base Commander. Captain Nelson recognized the accomplishments of the TRC and said that he fully supports the groundwork that has been laid. Captain Nelson

said he hopes that the efforts of the TRC are being used as a benchmark in establishing the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB).

Cdr. Brubaker announced his retirement from the Navy and thanked the members of the TRC for the enjoyable experience of being part of a group of diverse interests trying to solve a common problem and reaching consensus. As a Brunswick resident, he will continue to be involved and watching with interest. Lt. Cdr. Dieffenbach, currently the Assistant Public Works Officer, will be replacing Cdr. Brubaker.

Cdr. Brubaker turned the meeting over to Fred Evans, the Northern Division Project Manager for NAS Brunswick. Fred Evans reviewed the agenda and noted that a new item, "Other Base Issues", has been added to the agenda.

Nancy Beardsley announced that Richard Heath would be replacing Troy Smith as the State's geologist for NAS Brunswick.

II. STATUS AND SCHEDULE UPDATE

CONSTRUCTION STATUS

BUILDING 95

Lt. Edwards said that the Navy has received money for additional soil removal at Building 95. The modification to the contract has been executed, and the contractor is in the process of remobilizing to the site. The contractor wants to use the same team that had performed the previous work because they are familiar with the site and have a working relationship with ABB-ES and Marianne Hubert of MEDEP. However, the incinerator facility in Utah which will be receiving the soil is currently down for maintenance until October 10, 1994 and will be unable to receive contaminated soil until that date.

Lt. Edwards asked what would be done on the south side of Avenue B. Bob Lim said that he has received preliminary comments from Steve Mierzykowski of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFW) and he does not concur with the revised preliminary remediation goal (PRG) for pyrethrins developed by the Navy. USFW supports the Navy's proposal to cover the site with two feet of clean fill, however, there are still levels of pyrethrins above the original remediation goal, which are still a concern outside the excavated areas.

Bob Lim said that there are natural and synthetic pyrethrins that are mainly harmful to insects and fish but not small mammals. He noted that there are no aquatic receptors at Building 95.

Jack Dunleavy said that synthetic pyrethrins are not as easily biodegradable as natural pyrethrins. Natural pyrethrin will degrade in sunlight over a couple of days.

Tom Fusco asked whether it could be determined if the pyrethrins are synthetic or natural. Jack Dunleavy replied that he was not sure but would ask the laboratory. Tom Fusco asked if it can not be determined, would it be cleaned up to the synthetic level. Nancy Beardsley said that the PRG does not differentiate between natural or synthetic pyrethrins. Fred Evans suggested that the soil be tilled. Carolyn Lepage asked what pyrethrins degrade to. Jack Dunleavy said that he would find out.

It was agreed that a conference call would be held with Steve Mierzykowski as soon as possible. Carolyn Lepage said that it would be helpful to have a copy of Steve's comments but Bob Lim said that they were only in draft form and would have to be reviewed and signed before being sent officially to USEPA. He said he thought they would be finalized the following week.

Lt. Edwards said that work should not proceed at the site because there are issues outstanding that affect the future of the site. Therefore, it was decided that the contractor will not remobilize until the week of October 10, 1994.

Five soil samples were collected in September 1994, by ABB-ES, beneath Avenue B, the locations of which were discussed at the August 4 Technical Meeting. The laboratory is finalizing the pyrethrin results. The highest concentration of pyrethrin reported in the draft data package was 1.3 ppm. DDT levels were less than 1 ppm. There were no levels above 500 ppb, the ecological risk level, or 135 ppm, the cleanup level triggered by human health risk. The lab results will be distributed to the TRC when they become available.

SITES 1 & 3, 5, 6, & 8

Fred Evans explained that during negotiations for a new contractor, there was not enough money available to award the entire contract. Therefore, the Navy is issuing a separate contract for the landfill sites. The contract will be awarded with FY 95 dollars after October 1, 1994.

EASTERN PLUME

Lt. Edwards informed the TRC that a delivery order has been issued to OHM for the construction of the treatment plant and extraction wells. The contractor's Interim Health and Safety Plan has been approved and the building site and extraction well locations have been cleared and grubbed. Other contractor submittals and plans are being distributed for comment and approval. There will be a coordination and mutual understanding meeting with the contractor's QC manager to review QC plans and responsibilities. Gene Shephard, Marianne Hubert, and Dave Welch expressed interest in attending the meeting. Lt. Edwards said that the February 1995 startup date for the treatment plant was used for negotiating purposes, however, the revised schedule depends on the subcontractor for the treatment plant. Any subcontracts have to be competitively bid and awarded as a fixed price

contracts. He noted that H.E. Sargent, which was the second low bidder, has a very good reputation, good resources, and is familiar with the plans and specifications of the project. Jim Caruthers added that H.E. Sargent is currently working with ABB-ES in Winthrop, Maine on a very similar project - a treatment plant based on the design of the NAS Brunswick treatment plant. Lt. Edwards said that to date, OHM is maintaining the schedule laid out in the proposal. Every activity is under budget and the quality of work is up to par. He added that he has only heard good things about OHM from other Navy contracts. Due to the nature of the award fee contract, where basic costs are reimbursed and a fee is subjectively evaluated based on the performance of the contractor, Lt. Edwards believes the contractor will make every effort to complete the project satisfactorily. He is confident that the final result will be a better product although a few months may have been lost in the process.

It was decided that the Navy would issue a press release or newspaper article to announce the startup of the treatment plant construction and would hold a ribbon-cutting ceremony when the plant becomes operational.

SITE 11 - FORMER FIRE TRAINING AREA

Jack Dunleavy distributed copies of the analytical results of the UST sampling, which showed the tank contents to be mostly water with some fuel compounds present. Acetone was detected at 2 ppm. There were no metals detected greater than concentrations of concern. The sampling was performed to determine which regulation would govern the removal of the USTs. Troy Smith identified three categories: 1) petroleum UST CH. 691, 2) hazardous substance, 3) hazardous waste. MEDEP agreed to evaluate the regulations with an emphasis on removal as a fuel tank versus a hazardous waste. Jack Dunleavy said the Navy would have to know soon because the contractor will be on site in October. Troy Smith hoped to have an answer within a week. He noted that the USTs could be removed at this time but details of the closure might be able to fall under Site 11.

Fred Evans noted that there had been a question about whether the slab would be left on top of the tank. Jack Dunleavy clarified that the slab would be taken out of its buried condition, and would be broken up and used as fill for the excavation of the tank. He added that TRC comments had been received on the Action Memorandum but that they would not impact the schedule. Carolyn Lepage asked about the reference to the RCRA closure order. Fred Evans replied that the Building 95 Action Memorandum had been used as an example and that the reference had been left in by mistake.

Fred Evans reviewed the revised schedule for the removal action. The final work plan and Action Memorandum will be issued on October 12, 1994. Field work will commence on October 24, 1994. Jack Dunleavy said that no public comments had been received during the public comment period which ended on September 22, 1994.

Carolyn Lepage asked if the UST samples had been field preserved. Jack Dunleavy said that the chain of custody shows that it was preserved, however, he has not talked to the sampler. He said that he would check into the preservation of the samples, especially for VOCs and metals.

Carolyn Lepage asked if a pH of greater than 2 is significant. Jack Dunleavy replied that pH is a parameter for hazardous waste but a pH of greater than 2 would indicate that it is not hazardous.

SITE 9 - NEPTUNE DRIVE DISPOSAL SITE

Fred Evans informed the TRC that the ROD is in EPA's regional administrator's office and would be signed within the next few days. He reviewed the schedule for the Site 9 Work Plan and the LTMP. Comments on the Work Plan are due October 17, 1994 and the Navy is planning to issue the Final Work Plan on November 11, 1994. The Navy will respond to comments on the Draft Final LTMP prior to releasing the Final LTMP.

Jack Dunleavy said that the Navy had not yet received copies of the fuel oil sampling methods. He stated that the Navy is proposing to use the modified EPA method 8015. Troy Smith noted that there are hundreds of modifications. MEDEP is interested in knowing detection limits, types of extraction methods (solvent used), and length of run. Jack Dunleavy said that the Navy is being encouraged to use the California LUFT method which Troy Smith believes is similar to the Wisconsin method.

Beth Walter asked what the modified method gives you. Troy Smith replied that a compound specific analysis only reports compounds on the Target Compound List. However, there may be other compounds that are not specifically identified that pose a threat to human health. A method giving total concentrations may give a better indication of contamination and show which compounds are worth remediating. For example, method 8270 may only report 600 ppb total of all compounds analyzed while Method 8015 reports 25 ppm on the same sample. Method 8015 picks up more compounds and the sum total of 25 ppm result indicates free product while the 600 ppb result using Method 8270 indicates "minor" contamination. Troy Smith summarized that it is often useful to use both the 8015 and 8270 methods. He noted that if there is a non-detect using the compound specific method but there is a high total, there needs to be some way to run a risk assessment. Troy Smith noted that the Navy could tell the lab not to run the compound specific analysis if there are no detections using the 8015 method. He added that the LUST program makes assumptions about compound identifications and has developed some cleanup standards. He also mentioned that there are MEGs for fuel oil.

Jack Dunleavy noted that the PCB/Pesticide analysis had been deleted from the Draft Final Site 9 Work Plan. Troy Smith said that he did not think it should be cut out of the investigation. If the Navy can show that PCB/Pesticides are not present, the analysis can

be deleted from the LTMP. It was agreed that the analysis would be put back into the Work Plan.

LONG-TERM MONITORING PLAN

Fred Evans stated that the Navy will be issuing an RFP to perform basewide long term monitoring. Nancy Beardsley asked what the turnaround time would be to get someone on board. Fred Evans replied that it is primarily dependent on fund availability due to the new fiscal year. Nancy Beardsley expressed concern about Eastern Plume monitoring. Fred Evans said that previously the Navy had stated that sampling would be performed within one month of treatment plant startup. Now he would like to get all the sites on a common schedule so that they can be started concurrently. Sites 1 and 3 would start at or before construction and the Eastern Plume would start one month before the treatment plant becomes operational. Therefore, all the sampling can be performed at one time.

Tom Fusco noted that if all the sampling would begin before the treatment plant startup, then it would start in January. Fred Evans agreed. Troy Smith said that he recommended that sampling start in November so that quarterly sampling would always start before the cold weather. Carolyn Lepage said that she thought monitoring should coincide with typical seasonal high and low groundwater conditions. Troy Smith noted that there is no data on which to base the highs and lows. Susan Weddle asked if anyone remembered the quarterly sampling schedule in the original RI/FS. She suggested that they check to see what months were decided upon in those earlier reports. Richard Heath said that the USGS published reports of groundwater highs and lows throughout the year and suggested using those reports. Carolyn Lepage said that the highs and low change each year and that they would be locked into sampling during specific months with quarterly monitoring. Susan Weddle suggested that they look at existing sampling data to date to determine highs and lows and look at USGS wells nearby that are similarly screened. Beth Walter noted that the concept of quarterly sampling over a five year period is that it will hit those highs and lows. Nancy Beardsley said that MEDEP would look at the USGS data.

NO FURTHER ACTION DECISION DOCUMENTS (NFADD)

Fred Evans reviewed the schedules for the NFADDs for the West Runway Study Area and the Swampy Road and Merriconeag Extension Debris Sites.

The results of the radiation survey conducted at the West Runway Study Area were distributed and reviewed by Beth Walter. The survey, which tested for gamma, alpha and beta radiation, detected no radiation at the surface above background concentrations. Susan Weddle asked how background was established. Beth Walter responded that background was established from readings taken on base but not within the West Runway Study Area.

The results of the radiation survey will be incorporated into the Final SI report. Carolyn Lepage said that she would have a radiology consultant review the data.

The results from the confirmation samples collected at the West Runway Site in May 1994 were "clean". Therefore, Nancy Beardsley said that she will be providing the Navy with a confirmation letter from MEDEP stating that no further action at the West Runway Study Area is required.

OTHER BASE ISSUES

Fred Evans turned the discussion of other base issues over to Jim Caruthers.

Neptune Drive Construction

Jim Caruthers informed the TRC that the Neptune Drive Construction project had been awarded and the construction had been completed during a two week period while he was on vacation. The opportunity to view the subsurface soils in this area was missed. He added that no odors were detected and no contamination was noted although he said the people doing the work were not experts in the hazardous waste field.

Site 9 Stream Sampling

Jim Caruthers noted that a sample location map was not included with the Site 9 sample results distributed at the TRC meeting but it was agreed that a location map would be included with the TRC minutes. A round of samples was taken in July and again in September at the same locations. The evaluation of the stream is ongoing. USFW will be doing toxicology and fish sampling work in this tributary. The work is not scheduled yet.

Bob Lim added that in the spring, USFW will be conducting a fish survey in Picnic Pond that will include sediment toxicity sampling. This sampling will provide ecological assessment information about the abundance and diversity of fish. Bob believes it will be a visual assessment.

NEX Gas Station

The draft report for the pilot project will be finalized within a month and will be distributed. Nancy Beardsley asked if the report includes the wells for the UST cleanup run by Brad Hahn of MEDEP. Jim Caruthers replied that they were included and the analytical results were distributed but that they would also be included. Jim added that the status report marks the end of the pilot project.

Eastern Plume Analytical Results

Jack Dunleavy said that wells just south of the Eastern Plume had been tested and that there were sporadic detections of chloroform. Jack said he looked at data from previous sampling events (1989, 1990, and 1991) and found similar detections of chloroform at wells in the same vicinity. The only detection for VOCs was chloroform which Jack said does not seem to be associated with the Eastern Plume. Troy Smith pointed out that chloroform is a breakdown product of carbon tetrachloride which has been detected in the Eastern Plume. Methylene chloride, methyl chloride and methane - breakdown products of carbon tetrachloride - except for methane have been detected in seeps as well as in monitoring wells. MEDEP believes chloroform could be associated with the Eastern Plume. A definite conclusion is difficult to draw from available data and therefore, more sampling was recommended both within and outside of the Plume.

Susan Weddle asked if the existing well network is sufficient to determine if chloroform is associated with the Eastern Plume. Troy Smith replied that all the wells must be sampled to determine distribution. Susan Weddle stated that before the start up of the treatment plant, all the wells should be sampled. Fred Evans noted that the Navy is saying that all the wells in the LTMP will be sampled. Troy Smith added that he is glad to see that the LTMP is not tied to the start up of the treatment plant. Susan Weddle said that she definitely wants to see one round of samples before the treatment plant starts up and changes conditions. Jack Dunleavy said that it would be a question of when the FY 95 funding was available. Susan Weddle asked if the Navy would delay the startup of the treatment plant if money were not available to perform the sampling. Jim Caruthers said no. Cdr. Brubaker agreed that a baseline is needed before the plant goes online but said that there will be another TRC and that it is too soon to be debating the issue. The TRC will be able to discuss it further once the budget for FY '95 is established.

Troy Smith noted that it would be helpful to know the time lag before the influence of the treatment plant is seen. It will be interesting to see what the samples indicate during the first quarter after treatment plant startup. Jack Dunleavy said that the groundwater model has determined travel times. He added that they are estimates but good estimates.

III RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARDS (RAB)

Cdr. Brubaker said that he had some comments and questions about the RAB topic. The Navy needs to establish a RAB as mandated by the Department of the Defense (DOD). The Navy had issued guidance that had been retracted but new guidance will be issued. Cdr. Brubaker believes that the Base may already be in keeping with the guidance but that it needs to do more to solicit community involvement. He asked what the TRC thinks needs to be done to set up a RAB and how does the Base get more people involved. What should

be the composition, number of people, and selection process? Cdr. Brubaker said that he does not think the TRC should go away because it functions very well.

Tom Fusco said that it is important to discuss why the TRC functions so well. The size of the group is not going to be important but rather the characteristics that make it work. The TRC focuses on solutions and not on blaming. The selection process needs to reflect this message. The Navy has accepted responsibility so the focus is not on whose at fault but on the solutions.

Jim Caruthers noted that the current guidance specifies that the citizens themselves will determine who and how many will be members of the RAB. Cdr. Brubaker agreed but that the DOD has placed the burden on the Station Commanding Officer of ensuring the greatest coverage possible.

Susan Weddle noted that limited advertisements had been run during the summer. She suggested that the Base re-advertise or run newspaper articles soliciting interested people to get involved. She also suggested sending a letter from the Base to local town boards and to different groups that would have interest in the project, such as the Audubon Society and the Friends of Merrymeeting Bay.

Cdr. Brubaker said that the RAB concept is intended to broaden community involvement in the restoration activity on the installation. He said that the Navy needs to make sure that it is covering all the interests of the community and he recognizes that currently it does not have the involvement of everyone that might be impacted. He recommended that the TRC continue as a forum for reviewing schedules and reaching consensus. He said that the RAB should be a vehicle through which the public communicates its concerns to the decision makers (i.e. the Navy and the regulators). The RAB would function as an information exchange, but communication would not be technically focused.

After much discussion, it was decided that the Navy would be responsible for soliciting community involvement and for calling a public meeting, where the Navy would introduce the RAB concept and the membership process. Tom Fusco agreed to facilitate at the meeting. It was also decided that, for the time being, the TRC would continue to function in parallel with the RAB.

ISSUES/COMMENTS

No other issues or comments were raised.

IV. NEXT TRC MEETING

The next TRC meeting is scheduled for January 5, 1995 at 8:30 a.m. in Building 4 at the NAS. The next technical meeting is scheduled for November 3, 1994 at 10:00 a.m.