

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
Calverton, New York

Public Meeting

-----X

7:00 P.M.
February 27, 2002

Riverhead Town Hall
Howell Avenue
Riverhead, New York

P R E S E N T:

Judithanne Hare United States Navy
Joe Kaminski Naval Air Systems Command

Dave Brayack Tetra Tech NUS
Judy Lamey

Jim Colter Naval Facilities Engineering
 Command

FREELANCE L.I., INC. - Court Reporters
259 Southfield Road
Baiting Hollow, New York 11933
Voice (631) 369-2912 Fax
E-mail FLIReporters@aol.com

Proceedings

1
2 MS. HARE: Good evening, ladies and
3 gentlemen. I think we'll start at this time, if
4 there are folks out in the hallway, we can ask them
5 to come in? Okay? Good.

6 I'm delighted to welcome you here.
7 For those of you who don't know me, I'm Judith Hare,
8 from the Naval Air Systems Command, and I'm the
9 deputy director for facilities. The Naval Air
10 Systems Command is the owner of the property we will
11 be discussing this evening. Before we proceed with
12 that discussion, I have a couple of comments that I
13 would like to make.

14 First, I'd like to thank the folks
15 who are members of the Restoration Advisory Board,
16 we have been working with these folks for a long
17 time now. And I just want to let them know that we
18 appreciate their support and their participation in
19 the cleanup efforts of the Navy's property. This is
20 a very active group. And if any of you have an
21 interest in knowing more about the Restoration
22 Advisory Board or maybe even have thoughts that you
23 would like to be a member of board, if you'll see me
24 after the presentation this evening, I'll be glad to
25 talk about the board with you and perhaps take your

Proceedings

1
2 name and we'll see what we can do to get you to the
3 next meeting and get you some information in between
4 and perhaps even get you on board.

5 Next, I would like to extend a very
6 big thank you, to the Masonic Lodge of Riverhead,
7 for allowing the meetings of the Restoration
8 Advisory Board to take place in their building. The
9 facility is absolutely perfect for our meetings, it
10 is the right size and we just appreciate being able
11 to have our meetings there, so much. And I can't
12 really begin to thank the Masonic Lodge enough for
13 their generosity in extending this building to us.

14 I'd like to introduce Mr. Jim Colter,
15 he is from the Naval Facilities Engineering Command
16 at Northern Division in Philadelphia. And Jim is
17 our program manager for the cleanup effort of the
18 Navy's property. He's going to do a presentation
19 for you this evening. So without any further ado, I
20 think I am going to now turn the meeting over to Jim
21 and he'll go over some of the ground rules for the
22 meeting and then get right into the presentation.

23 Jim?

24 MR. COLTER: Thanks, Judith.

25 I'd also like to thank everyone for

Proceedings

1
2 taking time out of their night to be with us. We
3 have five by seven cards that we handed out as you
4 came in. At the end of my presentation, I'll field
5 any questions that any of you have and we'll try to
6 answer those questions tonight. If for some reason
7 we cannot, we'll get the answers and we'll put them
8 in what we call a responsiveness summary that's
9 attached to the record of decision. If you don't
10 feel comfortable standing up and being recognized,
11 please feel free to write your comments on the card
12 and then drop it off at the table as you leave.

13 As many of you know, we are here
14 tonight to discuss the Navy's Proposed Remedical
15 Action Plan for what we call Installation
16 Restoration Site No. 1. This is an aerial
17 photograph showing the former Calverton property and
18 these -- the parcels that are shown, are the four
19 parcels that the Navy currently remains in ownership
20 of, that is to further conduct investigations and
21 remediations prior to transferring these parcels to
22 the Town of Riverhead. They total about 350 acres.

23 We are going to concentrate on this
24 area tonight in this northern, northeast parcel. As
25 you can see, there are two sites, Site 1 and Site 9.

Proceedings

1
2 Site 9 was already investigated and found not to be
3 of any concern. Once we complete our activities at
4 Site 1, then this one 140 acre parcel here, will be
5 available for transfer to the Town of Riverhead.

6 So, how did all this get started.

7 Back in 1980, Congress enacted what's known as the
8 Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation &
9 Liability Act, and everyone knows that is CERCLA, or
10 the Superfund law. Superfund or CERCLA, basically
11 outlines a seven step process for determining if a
12 site is contaminated and what actions are necessary
13 to address that site. If you ever went to another
14 public meeting, you're used to seeing a
15 representative from the New York State DEC or EPA
16 giving this presentation. The reason the Navy is up
17 here tonight giving the presentation, is in 1986,
18 Superfund was reauthorized. Part of that
19 reauthorization gave the Department of Defense
20 authority to conduct its own investigations and
21 recommend its own alternatives and remedial actions.
22 Under the watchful eye of the appropriate state or
23 EPA region. That's why I'm up here tonight.

24 The Navy is lead agent for Calverton,
25 and has been investigating this site over the last

Proceedings

1
2 ten years, and we now have a series of alternatives
3 that we have looked at and we are ready to come to
4 you and say what we think should be done and get any
5 feedback from the community, that you may have.

6 This is the typical flow diagram of
7 the processes that were on the previous slide. I'll
8 get into more detail in a moment about where we are
9 at for Site 1. But what you start with is an
10 Initial Assessment Study, basically looking at the
11 process of an aircraft assembly site. Is there
12 likelihood that contamination resulted from that
13 use? If the answer to that is yes, you go into a
14 site investigation, which is a sampling, limited
15 sampling program, to try to see if your soil or
16 groundwater has any chemicals in it. If the answer
17 to that is yes, then you go on to what's called a
18 Remedial Investigation. This process up here, the
19 RCRA Facility Assessment is the same as the site
20 investigation, only under the RCRA authority. RCRA
21 and CERCLA are basically interchangeable as far as
22 investigation and cleanup of past disposal sites.

23 The Remedial Investigation is an
24 intensive sampling program that basically tries to
25 put its arms around the bulk of the contamination

Proceedings

1
2 and how far has it traveled. How much of a
3 groundwater problem do you have, if any. And after
4 you get your arms around the problem, then you do
5 what's called a Feasibility Study, which says what
6 are the technologies out there, that will address
7 your soil, your groundwater, your sediment. You
8 evaluate numerous number of these alternatives and
9 you try to narrow down which is the best one based
10 on eight criteria. I'll get into more of that in a
11 little later.

12 Remedy selection is kind of where we
13 are at right now. We have done our alternative
14 analysis. We think we have a good idea of what the
15 best alternative is. Part of the remedy selection
16 is having the community participation. It's a
17 requirement that the New York State DEC, they
18 actually have a Citizens Participation Plan, that is
19 part of their New York State law, and it basically
20 says that to give the community an opportunity to
21 look at your plan and comment on your plan.

22 Of course, after everything is said
23 and done and everybody buys off on what the plan
24 should be, then we implement the plan.

25 To get into Site 1, here. Which is

Proceedings

1
2 why we are here tonight. Site 1's basically about
3 two acres in size. It has approximately 21 thousand
4 cubic yards of material. It's in a relatively
5 heavily wooded area. The landfill basically was
6 used for disposal of construction debris, was the
7 main use of that area. And we do have a couple of
8 sensitive issues when we finally address this site.
9 One, being a New York State endangered species that
10 has been identified to have a habitat near the site.
11 And the potential for cultural resources, basically
12 archaeological artifacts.

13 This is a plan view of the Northeast
14 Pond Area. Up on top is Route 25. These roads are
15 dirt roads that are inside the fenced property that
16 the Navy owns. And this -- the two acre disposal
17 area, is butted up adjacent to this pond. If you
18 had a chance to walk around the posters out there,
19 you would have seen a poster of several photographs
20 that we took of the Northeast Pond. Here are just a
21 few of them, to give you an idea of what the area
22 looks like.

23 This is basically the surface of the
24 landfill. It also extends up back here on an
25 elevation of about another 15 or 20 feet up. These

Proceedings

1
2 fragamides here, indicate the edge of the wetlands
3 and the pond. Right here for anyone that's
4 wondering, is a monitoring well that we installed in
5 the landfill. It goes down to depths of the
6 groundwater and take samples of groundwater to see
7 if there is any impacts to the groundwater from the
8 landfill.

9 Another shot of the surface of the
10 landfill. You can see how it's pretty heavily
11 wooded. And this edge is the edge of the wetlands.
12 The bank of this goes down about 20 feet to the
13 surface of the pond.

14 A little quick history about the
15 Northeast Pond Area. Basically, again, it was used
16 primarily for the disposal of non-hazardous waste:
17 Concrete, asphalt, metal parts, construction debris.
18 Northrop Grumman utilized this landfill from the
19 50's to about the early '80s. In the mid '80s, they
20 went and covered the landfill, all the material,
21 with a layer of soil.

22 To get into our investigative
23 history, basically following the flow chart that we
24 showed you earlier. The Navy conducted an Initial
25 Assessment Study of the entire Calverton property

Proceedings

1
2 back in 1986, identified several areas that we
3 thought had the potential for contamination. We
4 conducted a site investigation in 1991/1992. We did
5 confirm the presence of contamination at several
6 sites that recommended that a Remedial Investigation
7 be conducted to try to get our arms around the
8 problem at each site.

9 The Navy conducted that further
10 investigation in 1994/1995. We did define the
11 extent of soil and sediment contamination at Site 1,
12 but there were some data gaps that were identified
13 by the regulatory agencies that they asked us to
14 address before moving on to the next stage.

15 We filled those data gaps to their
16 request, in 1997/1998.

17 Our results basically of all that
18 investigation that we've gone over the last eight to
19 ten years, for Site 1, basically says that the soils
20 and sediments do not represent a significant risk to
21 human health under a limited exposure scenario.
22 What that means, if we had a group of people get
23 together, to conduct a site tour, and we walked
24 across the landfill. You wouldn't expect to have
25 any adverse conditions based on just walking across

1 Proceedings

2 that landfill for 10 minutes on a single day. Would
3 this site be acceptable for residential use? The
4 answer to that's no. The residential use, is more
5 of a prolonged exposure and it wouldn't be
6 appropriate to have a residential use at this site
7 if we were to do nothing.

8 The contaminants that we are talking
9 about are metals or inorganics and PCBs in soils,
10 and the same metals and inorganics as well as
11 pesticides in the pond sediments.

12 As I said earlier, when we do a
13 Feasibility Study, we evaluate our alternatives
14 against eight criteria. Those criteria are broken
15 down into three main categories: Threshold
16 criteria, primary balances criteria, and modifying
17 criteria. Threshold criteria, if an alternative
18 does not pass that, we don't consider it any
19 further, that being the overall protection of human
20 health in the environment. Does the alternative
21 comply with local laws, regulations and guidelines?
22 If it does, we go into the balancing criteria to
23 refine our choice. Those items are, is the
24 alternative, long-term, effective and permanent?
25 Does it reduce the volume or the toxicity of a

Proceedings

1
2 contaminant. Is it implementable and how much does
3 it cost? All those we evaluate against all the
4 alternatives.

5 Usually that narrows it down to two
6 or three alternatives, sometimes maybe four or five.
7 And then we go into the modifying criteria,
8 regulatory acceptance and community acceptance, and
9 this is why we are here tonight, is to get some
10 perspective on the community's acceptance of our
11 proposed remedy.

12 For Site 1, the three alternatives
13 that made it through all of the criteria, basically
14 were the no action alternative, bank stablization,
15 and capping - leaving the fill in place; and
16 thirdly, excavation and off-site disposal. To
17 qualify what I said, the no action alternative does
18 means the contamination on the site does not meet
19 any of the criteria. The Navy and defense
20 department is required to evaluate this, as kind of
21 a baseline what happens if you do nothing, and then
22 compare your costs and your implementability and all
23 your others against this no action alternative.

24 The bank stablization and capping, we
25 were considering it's a lower cost alternative than

Proceedings

1
2 full excavation. It meets all the criteria. It
3 would reduce all pathways from anyone coming in
4 contact with the material. However, in order to
5 maintain that elimination of the pathway, we would
6 have to continuously maintain the cap and the
7 stabilization of the bank basically forever. It
8 would be a yearly cost. We'd always have to make
9 sure that it's intact. That basically results in
10 the Navy's long-term liability and maintenance
11 costs, like I said, forever.

12 When we started looking at excavation
13 of the landfill, obviously if you got rid of all the
14 material, it would be relatively protective. There
15 would be nothing there anymore. It also has the
16 added benefit of not requiring any land use
17 restrictions. As I said earlier, we will be
18 transferring this property to the Town of Riverhead.
19 If we were to leave the landfill in place, with the
20 bank stabilization alternative, we would have to
21 apply a deed restriction upon transfer, stating that
22 you don't dig in this area or disturb this area or
23 use this area basically ever again. By excavating
24 and getting rid of all the material, we don't have
25 to put such a restriction on that parcel of

Proceedings

1
2 property.

3 Obviously, there would be no
4 long-term liability on the Navy's part and no
5 maintenance cost, since there would be no cap to
6 maintain. And it has the added benefit of restoring
7 the area back to its prelandfill conditions. That's
8 it in a nutshell, for the Navy's remedy for the
9 Northeast Pond Disposal Area. We want to dig it up
10 and haul it away, basically.

11 My name and address are on this
12 slide. My phone number and E-mail address, as well.
13 Feel free to contact me if you have any questions
14 that you're not comfortable raising tonight. With
15 that, does anyone have any questions?

16 MR. COLTER: Yes. We do have a
17 stenographer here tonight. If you have a question,
18 if you could stand, state your name and your address
19 and we'll get your comment on the the record, we
20 will respond to all comments.

21 MS. LONHEISS: Andrea Lonheiss, CV A
22 director Town of Riverhead. I have two questions,
23 one is you said that there would be no future land
24 use restrictions in this area but you also said that
25 it would be not appropriate for residential use.

Proceedings

1
2 Would the deed contain a restriction to that effect?

3 MR. COLTER: As far as
4 environmentally, we would not put any restrictions
5 for environmental reasons. There is an overall
6 restriction for residential use in the agreement
7 that Congress came up with, that says that we will
8 give you this property for no charge as long as you
9 use it for and an economic redevelopment.

10 MR. COLTER: Economic redevelopment.
11 So there would be a restriction in the deed for
12 non-residential use, but that wouldn't be related to
13 any environmental reason and then the deeds would
14 mirror the deeds that we've received already.

15 MR. COLTER: Yes and and secondly,
16 Site 9? In the initial slide is also within this
17 overall 145 acres. Has that area already been
18 remediated.

19 MR. COLTER: It hasn't been
20 remediated but it does not require it and and okay.

21 MR. COLTER: In the site
22 investigation process, if you -- what we did for
23 Site 9, is we -- the operations out there had a
24 potential, because of the chemicals they were using,
25 there was a potential that those chemicals could

Proceedings

1
2 have spilled. That was enough to get us into the
3 site investigation phase, where we actually took
4 samples and we basically looked at groundwater in
5 that area, soils came up clean and we looked at
6 groundwater and we did have some low level
7 chlorinated solvents in the groundwater.

8 The state asked us to do an extended
9 investigation off-site, to see what the impacts
10 were. That process took several years because we
11 weren't able to get access to the property. Once
12 we did, which was a couple of years ago, we did
13 groundwater investigation again on-site and off-site
14 and basically came up with non-detects for
15 groundwater. These chemicals do biodegrade
16 naturally. So with that, we basically recommended
17 to the state the groundwater was not an issue out
18 there. They concurred with that, and that was the
19 end of that story.

20 MS. LOHNEISS: So at the end
21 following your cleaning up there will be ROD for
22 that particular parcel that documents that.

23 MR. COLTER: Yeah. If there is no
24 adverse comments on this meeting we will pursue the
25 landfill excavation as our remedial action and we

Proceedings

1
2 will publish a ROD to that effect. Once the work is
3 done and we have satisfied all the regulators, then
4 we can determine that the property is suitable to
5 transfer and we'll write a FOST, which will
6 basically summarize all the environmental work that
7 was done from start to finish.

8 MS. HARE: You might indicate the
9 time frame, Jim, for doing the work too, so Andrea
10 has a feel for that, roughly.

11 MR. COLTER: It is kind of dependent
12 on our groundwater in this area. We have been
13 talking tonight about the soils and the landfill.
14 The other unit that is of concern is the groundwater
15 beneath. We have taken samples all through the
16 last ten years. We do have low level chemicals in
17 the groundwater and they're right at the drinking
18 water standard for those chemicals. So there really
19 isn't any technology out there that's cost effective
20 to remove those down to a non-detect type of level.
21 But we will monitor the ground water for a period of
22 time after we excavate the landfill, just to confirm
23 that.

24 We haven't really talked to the state
25 how long of a monitoring period they will require.

Proceedings

1
2 Once that's completed, we will be doing the finding
3 of suitability to transfer documentation in parallel
4 with the groundwater monitoring work that we have to
5 do. So hopefully when we get the okay that the
6 groundwater is not a concern, we'll also be in a
7 position to issue a FOST.

8 MS. ZERE: Marie Zere, Marie Zere
9 Real Estate Services. I have a question relating
10 to the amount of usable land that is left. After
11 you take out the pond, the area of the landfill, the
12 area -- the wetlands and perhaps the endangered
13 species, if you take that off, how many acres does
14 that add up to?

15 MR. COLTER: Well, this whole parcel
16 here is 140 acres. The landfill itself is roughly
17 two acres, the pond is another two to three acres.
18 What will not be usable is probably just the wet
19 areas of the pond. There are some restrictions when
20 we will transfer this regarding archaeological
21 artifacts and wetlands. I'm not really an expert in
22 that area. But this area is -- has been identified
23 as being highly -- having the high potential for
24 archaeological artifacts. And in fact when we
25 transferred the entire Calverton parcel, we did an

Proceedings

1
2 overall archaeological survey. In this area, they
3 actually did find artifacts so we know they exist up
4 in that area. I'm not sure how those restrictions
5 transfer with the real estate action, but there will
6 be at least some language in there that whoever
7 redevelops this area will have to be sensitive to
8 those artifacts and resources.

9 MS. ZERE: Have they be identified on
10 the map. Is there a way of indentifying them?

11 MR. COLTER: There is a way. I think
12 their survey is in the library.

13 MS. LOHNEISS: We have it as well.

14 MR. COLTER: The Town of Riverhead has
15 a copy of the archaeological survey so you can take
16 a look at that. I'm sure it will show you the
17 highly sensitive areas versus the lower sensitive
18 areas.

19 MS. ZERE: Thank you.

20 MR. COLTER: Any other questions?

21 Yes, sir.

22 A MAN: Steve Haizlup, of Calverton.
23 When you mention about community acceptance, I
24 didn't realize -- I didn't think that the community
25 has any right or -- to accept, over government

Proceedings

1
2 authorities.

3 MR. COLTER: That's not entirely
4 true. If there was an overall dissatisfaction with
5 what we were proposing --

6 MR. HAIZLUP: We won't know that.

7 MR. COLTER: We would basically take
8 that into consideration and go back and take a look
9 at something else, if it was very apparent that the
10 entire or a good portion of the community was
11 against what we were doing. We would find out why.
12 What those concerns are. And maybe we'd have to
13 switch our thinking to another alternative that
14 wasn't so controversial. Yes, the community does
15 have a key role in the CERCLA process.

16 As I said before, it is part of the
17 New York State Citizen's Participation Law, that you
18 have an opportunity to comment on actions that go on
19 if your community and give us your input.

20 MR. HAIZLUP: Can I follow-up.

21 MR. COLTER: Sure.

22 MR. HAIZLUP: In cleaning up the
23 area, then, you will have public meetings like
24 you're doing now and say, well, we've done this
25 step, we've done this step, and then the public has

Proceedings

1 the right to ask questions and how well it was done?

2 Is that more or less --

3 MR. COLTER: Not after we get done.

4 We won't come back and have a public meeting asking
5 ing you how we did. We'll have public meetings
6 before we do our action.

7 MR. HAZLUP: Okay, I get you.

8 MR. COLTER: We will be doing some
9 soil or groundwater actions for each parcel that you
10 see on the map. In about a month to six weeks we'll
11 actually be here again talking about the Site 7 and
12 Site 10 parcel, which is an old fuel depot area that
13 we have also been working on a remedial action plan
14 for that area, and we are just about ready to
15 announce what we think is the right thing to do. So
16 we will be here again, and shortly, to talk about
17 that. As these other plans for soil and/or
18 groundwater become available, we'll also have public
19 meetings announc ing those recommendations at that
20 time.

21 MS. HARE: Maybe I could interject
22 also. At the beginning, when I was making some of
23 my remarks, I talked about the Restoration Advisory
24 Board. The Restoration Advisory Board is open to
25

Proceedings

1
2 the public. When those meetings, and sometimes I'm
3 sure you've maybe seen the announcements for the
4 RAB, when it was going to meet and so on. The board
5 members of course that sit on the board, they have
6 been designated to be sort of like spokespersons, if
7 you will for the community, to look at what we are
8 doing, as far as cleaning up the property and to
9 give us the community's input. But that doesn't
10 mean that anyone in the community could not attend
11 those meetings, because we welcome that
12 participation.

13 So if you would like to attend those
14 meetings and you would like to be on our roster to
15 receive notices of the meetings and so on, we will
16 be more than glad to put you on that roster.

17 MR. HAIZLUP: Thank you very much.
18 It is very clear now.

19 MS. HARE: Sure.

20 MR. COLTER: Anybody else have any
21 questions?

22 MR. HISTAND: Harry Hestand, from East
23 Quogue. You said the pond is 15 to 20 feet below
24 the top elevation of the landfill.

25 MR. COLTER: Yes.

Proceedings

1
2 MR. HISTAND: How deep is the
3 landfill itself. The pond is atop of the water
4 table, correct?

5 MR. COLTER: Correct.

6 The depth varies. We actually won't
7 have a solid answer to that until we get in there
8 and start digging. Down on the east face here, of
9 the landfill, that butts up against the pond, it is
10 roughly 20 feet, and you can actually see the water
11 in the pond, it is about 20 feet of depth. As you
12 go back, this is a wooded area that you can see has
13 a pretty good slope to it. We did a series of test
14 pits throughout here to try to identify what we had
15 in the landfill. And to the best of our knowledge
16 when we started test pitting in this area, we
17 actually found virgin soil at about 10 feet down.

18 MR. HISTAND: It is probably bowl
19 shaped.

20 MR. COLTER: Yes, and probably at one
21 time gently sloped down to the pond itself. What
22 our plan is, is to basically restore that gentle
23 slope.

24 MR. HISTAND: Could it have been
25 possible they raised the elevation around the pond

Proceedings

1
2 and filled it in, that's why you have a severe slope
3 on the side.

4 MR. COLTER: This hillside is
5 naturally occurring. There have been tests and even
6 part of archaeological tests.

7 MR. HISTAND: I agree with that.
8 Maybe it is 15, 20 feet higher than the pond, and
9 when they filled in the elevation and raised it up
10 higher, then when they filled it in with sand to cap
11 the top, they met the slope of the natural
12 landscape.

13 MR. COLTER: Yes, that is basically
14 what happened.

15 MR. HISTAND: You figure it varies
16 10, 15 feet in depth.

17 MR. COLTER: Probably 10 feet to 20
18 feet, yeah. Over that two acre site. Again, back
19 in this area, is another landfill of higher
20 elevation.

21 MR. HISTAND: Right.

22 MR. COLTER: This is about another 10
23 to 15 feet in elevation here.

24 MR. HISTAND: Maybe you figure they
25 started to raise the elevation back there, to come

Proceedings

1
2 forward and the facility ceased to use the site.

3 MR. COLTER: That is entirely
4 possible.

5 MR. HISTAND: The contaminant, PCBs
6 and pesticides they were basically -- it they
7 basically came into the site because of empty
8 containers more or less you feel.

9 MR. COLTER: That is our theory.
10 When we closed the facility and did a baseline
11 survey of the property, we interviewed old employees
12 and that was basically the consensus, that it was
13 paint cans and other types of containers that they
14 chucked in here, basically just construction debris.

15 MR. HISTAND: Then you say basically
16 the pesticides and the PCBs that you found in the
17 water, they are not detrimental to human consumption
18 basically according to to current water standards.
19 Will they dissipate naturally.

20 MR. COLTER: Well in the soil, we
21 found them at levels that would take prolonged
22 exposure to be of any concern in soils. In the
23 groundwater, we actually I don't think found any
24 pesticides in the groundwater. But in the
25 sediments, we did. Right up against the landfill

Proceedings

1
2 itself -- where the landfill and pond meet. And our
3 theory is that the soils that are contaminated with
4 the pesticides, are eroding into the pond and we
5 have sink holes and all kinds of stuff going on out
6 there, that the landfill continues to erode into the
7 pond and they turn into sediments and that's what we
8 are finding.

9 MR. HISTAND: The other thing is
10 basically construction debris, so you have a million
11 dollars problem here. You going to excavate it and
12 truck it out. Where is it going, when you take it
13 there, how do you control the PCBs and the
14 pesticides.

15 MR. COLTER: Well, right now we are
16 doing a work plan to answer those questions. We
17 have a contractor under contract who we pay a lot of
18 money to give us those answers. In a nutshell, we
19 will be pulling out concrete, scrap metal, soils and
20 we will be stockpiling them on the site.
21 Segregating them and then loading them out into dump
22 trucks.

23 MR. HISTAND: My thought was if you
24 got all construction debris like you say, segregate
25 the different materials, if you have concrete chunks

Proceedings

1
2 make it into ground up concrete as a base for the
3 road.

4 MR. COLTER: We don't know where
5 these facilities are. There's a series of
6 recyclable areas for the scrap metal. Maybe there
7 will be a concrete recycler who will be interested
8 in the concrete. We don't know. The soil will be
9 tested as hazardous or non-hazardous and taken to
10 the appropriate landfill. The landfills, the
11 non-hazardous and hazardous waste disposal will be
12 off the island.

13 MR. HISTAND: There is no facilities
14 on Long Island to receive those products at all,
15 whether hazardous or non-hazardous, it all has to
16 leave Long Island.

17 MR. COLTER: Right. Our next step is
18 to put a work plan together for the state
19 regulators, outlining all your questions, basically,
20 how we are going to do it, where these materials
21 will be going. That's the next step.

22 MR. HISTAND: My last question, now
23 you created a big hole again. What are you going to
24 do with the hole?

25 MR. COLTER: We are going to

Proceedings

1
2 stablize, there won't be any cliffs remaining.
3 We'll have gentle slopes. We'll just let nature
4 take its course.

5 MR. HISTAND: The overall elevation
6 drops down 10, 15 feet again where it might have
7 been before it occurred. You'll landscape it,
8 vegetate it again, and that's the end of it.

9 MR. COLTER: Exactly.

10 MR. HISTAND: Okay, thank you.

11 MR. COLTER: In the State of New
12 York, their wetlands and natural resource group is
13 heavily involved with this process and has been, as
14 well as the state historic preservation office, to
15 ensure that their resources are protected. Your
16 local Suffolk County Health Department is also very
17 active and has been an integral part of our
18 decision-making process. And the culmination of
19 probably ten years of dealing with the local health
20 department, state health department and the DEC
21 results in this, I can tell you that there are some
22 representatives from each agency tonight and they're
23 in full support of the excavation alternative.

24 MR. HISTAND: One more question. The
25 endangered species, who is it?

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: Tiger salamander.

MR. HISTAND: Tiger salamander? He's all over. He was in Tanger Mall, too. Will he crawl back into the site after it has been cleaned. I suppose they live around the perimeter of it.

MR. COLTER: I fully expect he will.

MR. HISTAND: There's no problem, we don't have to go out and buy some.

MR. COLTER: We have to do a survey to make sure we don't disturb any habitat that he may be using while we are excavating the landfill. We are trying to get the details of that from the DEC's natural resources department. We'll integrate whatever they want us to do into the work plan.

MR. HISTAND: They reproduce pretty rapidly, I assume. The lady over here that represents the real estate, if they ever got access to the land for development, they'd have to deal with this -- what's the name again.

MR. COLTER: Tiger salamander.

MR. HISTAND: They'd have to deal with him.

They make good household pets.

That's it.

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: Any other questions.

Yes, ma'am?

A WOMAN: The question might have been asked already.

MR. COLTER: Could you state your name for the record.

MRS. GRIFFING: Joan Griffing, Baiting Hollow. I understand there will be 10 trucks per day taking out the debris.

MR. COLTER: Several trucks per day. We don't know the exact number at this point.

MRS. GRIFFING: They'll be coming out the north gate or the north side of Grumman.

MR. COLTER: Right now, we have a fence, a perimeter fence on 25. We are going to put a gate in at this area so they'll be exiting the site from this gate onto Route 25 and heading west.

MRS. GRIFFING: Okay. Because I was going to say, if they were heading east to Edwards to go to the Expressway, I don't think Edwards Avenue could take that beating from those kind of trucks, or any trucks.

MR. COLTER: What we are going to have to do when we have our remedial action

Proceedings

1
2 contractor give us a work plan, we are going to have
3 to look at the ingress and egress route of these
4 trucks and make sure that the local roadways can
5 support that. That will be part of our plan. We
6 are not there yet. But we will take that into
7 consideration. The best route and any overhead
8 structures or anything that might limit us overhead.
9 But those types of action, are considered, yes.

10 A WOMAN: Thank you.

11 MR. HISTAND: Can I again.

12 MR. COLTER: Sure.

13 MR. HISTAND: Will they be going to
14 Pennsylvania, or New Jersey or where would they be
15 traveling.

16 MR. COLTER: Hard to tell. Put those
17 types of facilities out for bid, to see who can
18 accept it, what the charges are to accept it, what
19 the mileage is to each facility. And we'll make a
20 cost analysis decision based on the takers that we
21 have.

22 Yes, sir.

23 MR. KOPP: Gary Kopp, Flanders.

24 Assuming this does go to reclamation, do you have an
25 expected date that it might go to bid. I know it is

Proceedings

1
2 a little premature.

3 MR. COLTER: Right now, the work plan
4 is under way. We are working that parallel with our
5 CERCLA administrative process. And our goal is
6 hopefully by the time that we are done with our
7 administrative process, that the work plan will be
8 approved. Right now, if that goes without a hitch,
9 we are looking to start in May.

10 MR. KOPP: That soon. I'm familiar
11 with the plan. I know its fiscal 2002 funding. The
12 project wouldn't be completed in fiscal 2002,
13 though.

14 MR. COLTER: Depends on what we find.
15 If we find a lot of big items that we can't really
16 handle with typical construction equipment, we are
17 going to have to bring bigger equipment in, which
18 will delay the whole process. If we don't find
19 anything of a surprise, we feel we can get this done
20 in two to three month time frame.

21 MR. KOPP: May would be your best
22 guess.

23 MR. COLTER: Yes. Right now we are
24 shooting for May. To get all the plans. We have to
25 get the historic preservation plan in place. We

Proceedings

1
2 have to do our endangered species survey, get the
3 results to the state. We plan on being out there by
4 the end of March, doing those surveys so, again, if
5 we don't find anything of significance we should
6 have no problem starting in May.

7 MR. KOPP: What type of artifacts did
8 you find in the historical area.

9 MR. COLTER: I'm not really sure.
10 What I heard was arrowheads, those type of things.
11 I'm not really versed in what was found there.

12 MS. HARE: On the property, as a whole
13 entity, when the historical survey was done, they
14 found a gamut of artifacts from colonial days,
15 dating way back, way beyond that. So there was kind
16 of a broad spectrum of artifacts that were found.
17 We did additional archaeological digs on the main
18 part of the property, and I remember being out there
19 and actually taking a look at some of those things
20 that were brought up at that time. So it's hard to
21 say in this case. It could be more of the same,
22 very likely.

23 MR. KOPP: Pottery, besides
24 arrowheads.

25 MS. HARE: Pottery. Even dating back

Proceedings

1
2 centuries and many centuries. So.

3 MR. KOPP: Colonial type era stuff or
4 Indian.

5 MS. HARE: If my memory serves me
6 right, there was a colonial plate. Even that was
7 found originally on the property, or part of a
8 plate. Because there was settlements in that area.
9 So I would guess that it would be more of the same
10 type of things that would be found.

11 MR. COLTER: Anything else? Well,
12 great. I would like to thank all of you for taking
13 time out of your night. It's always nice to come up
14 here to Long Island and hopefully we'll see you
15 again real soon.

16 MS. HARE: For anyone who didn't
17 sign-in on the sign-in sheet, that's right outside
18 the door, if you could do that for us before you
19 leave. And there are cards out there, if you think
20 of a last minute question and you just want to write
21 it down on the card with your name and address,
22 please do so.

23
24
25

