

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING  
NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE PLANT CALVERTON  
RIVERHEAD MASONIC LODGE, RIVERHEAD, NEW YORK**

**March 14, 2001**

The eighth meeting of the RAB began at 7:05 pm and ended at 9:40 pm. RAB members attending were: Judith Hare, Joe Kaminski, and Jim Colter from the Navy, community members Sherry Johnson, Sid Bail, Bill Gunther, Ann Miloski, John Pedneault, Vincent Racaniello, Warren Voegelin, Jean Mannhaupt, Louis Cork, and Bob Pohlman; Jeff McCullough representing the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), Marsden Chen representing the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), and James Pim representing the Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SDCHS). Members absent included community members Henry Bookout, Randolph Manning, Lorraine Collins, Joe Pannone, and Vanie Tuthill; Andrea Lohneiss representing the Town of Riverhead, Martin Simonson representing the DCMC, New York State Department of Health (HYSDOH), and U.S. EPA Region II.

There were also several people attending from the local community.

**WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Judith Hare, the Navy Co-chair, welcomed everyone to the eighth meeting of the RAB. Ms. Hare reviewed the agenda and stated that Mr. Jim Colter would be providing an update on the status of activities at the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant (NWIRP). Ms. Sherry Johnson stated that there were several topics that the RAB would like to discuss: the Sportsmen's Club findings, TRC meeting update, and the TAPP Proposal.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The stenographer transcripts from the October 24, 2000 RAB meeting were paraphrased and summarized into meeting minutes. The minutes were mailed out to all the RAB members for review. No comments were made on the October 24, 2000 RAB meeting minutes and the minutes were approved as written.

## UPDATE ON STATUS OF ACTIVITIES AT NWIRP CALVERTON

### **November 8, 2000 TRC Meeting**

Mr. Jim Colter began by stating that he would be providing an update and status of activities that the Navy has been conducting since the last RAB meeting in October. A Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting was held on November 8, 2000 with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and the Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS). At the TRC meeting, the Navy presented what had been presented at the October 24, 2000 RAB meeting. The presentation included discussions on the Site 1 bank stabilization project, the air sparge system and product recovery at Site 2, monitored natural attenuation (MNA) study at Site 7, and an update on Site 6A/Southern area.

### *Site 1 (Northeast Pond) – Bank Stabilization Project*

The concept of full landfill excavation versus capping and bank stabilization was discussed at request of the RAB and Navy peer review. It was thought that because of the relatively small size of this landfill that it might be more practical, though possibly more expensive, to excavate the entire landfill. This would then eliminate all Navy liability and monitoring requirements. The Navy decided to do a Feasibility Study (FS) exploring different bank stabilization alternatives. This study will be incorporated into a combined RI/FS report for Site 1. The plan is to have the draft report to the regulators by July 30, 2001. This report will discuss all field work activities that have occurred at the landfill in the past in addition to discussing the landfill excavation vs. capping and bank stabilization vs. the no action alternative. Based upon regulatory and RAB input, the Navy will decide how to proceed.

### *Site 2 (Fire Training Area)– AS/SVE*

Since the October 24, 2000 RAB meeting, the air sparge/soil vapor extraction system (AS/SVE) that is run every summer had been shut down for winter. An annual report discussing this last operation is due out by the end of March 2001. The free product recovery for the season was also completed. The free product recovery record will evaluate how the system did and if it is worth continuing. At the TRC, it was recommended that several test pits be dug near the historically highest areas of fuel recovery to determine what is remaining on the water table. Depending on what is found, perhaps excavation would be more practical versus trying to recover it through more passive methods. The incorporation of these test pits for Site 2 will most likely follow the proposed schedule for the monitored natural attenuation parameters field work for Site 7 which is scheduled for Fiscal Year 2002.

*Site 7 (Fuel Depot) – MNA*

The Draft Feasibility Study was submitted on January 10, 2001. Comments were requested on that by March 2, 2001. On March 8, the Navy had a phone conference with the DEC concerning the documents that the Navy had submitted and the status of their review of them. The Navy recommended in the Site 7 Report to pursue an air sparging/soil vapor extraction system. The DEC had no adverse comments concerning this, so the Navy began drafting a Preferred Remedial Action Plan or PRAP which will include the air sparging/soil vapor extraction plan versus source area removal. The AS/SVE would be run for as many years as necessary until either the remedial goal is reached or it is determined that the system is running inefficiently (that it is costing more than it is removing). At that point, the Navy and the Regulators will look at monitored natural attenuation as a final action. If all goes well, the Navy should be close to a record of decision in August.

*Site 6a/10b (Fuel Calibration/Southern Area) – Update*

An RI report is being drafted for this site and a draft is due to the Regulators and the RAB by April 13, 2001. This report basically states that the nature and extent of the groundwater contamination for these sites has been adequately defined. However, there are still some questions with the vertical extent of the plume that the Navy believes will be answered with the pre-design field work data that will be collected when evaluating and/or designing a remedial alternative. After the remedial investigation is finalized, the Navy will move onto a Feasibility Study where different alternatives will be evaluated. There is a possibility that there will be a different remedy for Site 6a than for 10b because of the levels of contamination, but both will include the monitored natural attenuation evaluation for which data has been collected in the summer of 2000.

*Site 9 (Electronic Counter Measures Site) – Site Investigation*

The Navy submitted an extended site investigation report for the electronic counter measures site (Site 9) in the northeast corner. At Site 9, there was low level VOCs contamination in the groundwater at the fence line. The Navy was requested to go off-site to determine how far the contamination extended. They were denied access for about two years until the summer of 2000. They then went and collected two rounds of groundwater samples in 10-12 locations. This data came back as non-detects. This data was put into a report and sent to the Regulators. As of the phone call, there were no adverse comments on the findings and the site can be closed with no further documentation with the exception of the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). This will summarize all the activities and results and that it is determined by the Navy that the land is suitable to transfer to the Town of Riverhead.

*Sportsmen's Club/Peconic River Discussion*

A question was raised about the Sportmen's Club not being able to use their well water and that the groundwater emanating from the Calverton source will go into the Peconic River and whether these issues would be addressed further with the Southern Area.

Mr. Colter explained that the hydraulic study that the Navy did for the Peconic River showed that the river itself is a surface expression of groundwater. The groundwater basically flows up and comes out and feeds the Peconic River. Therefore, it can be expected that any groundwater contamination will not go underneath the river, but will express itself at the river's surface water. Any contaminants will not go underneath and continue to migrate further south, but will come up to the surface water. Any contamination will stop at the river and not migrate any further. However, they are low level volatile organic compounds and it isn't expected that there will be any adverse impacts to the Peconic River. The Navy has, in the past, sampled sediments and surface water at the river and have not found anything. This will be explained in further detail in the RI report due out in April 2001.

Mr. Brayack explained that as part of a program last summer, a well was installed between the paint shop and Site 6, the Fuel Calibration Area. A vertical profile boring was done, meaning they collected samples on the way down to 200 feet below the ground surface. It is known that there is groundwater contamination in this area in the range of a thousand plus parts per billion. For comparison, drinking water standards are about five. Another area of contamination is associated with the Engine Test House.

A series of piezometers were installed along Grumman Boulevard in the summer of 2000. Piezometers are basically temporary wells. Piezometers 112 and 113 were drilled on the Sportsmens's Club property. The groundwater from this area will ultimately make it into the Peconic River. The question is whether the contaminants associated with it will move with it. If they do, what will the concentrations? The Peconic has been sampled a few times and the contamination has not been found. What is also known, is that at a depth of 8 to 100 feet below the ground surface, there is an upward gradient of five feet. This is rather significant and explains why the contamination would not flow under the Peconic. Approximately half to two-thirds of the wells throughout the area had nothing detected in it. There are more non-detects than there are detections.

The migration of the contamination may also be explained by overland transport associated with the culverts that run underneath the roads. Contaminated groundwater may have risen in the

ditches and flowed much quicker. In this area, groundwater is only three to five feet deep. During events, such as snowmelt, etc. that cause the water table to come up to a level that could be above the ditch line. It is only about a foot from the ground surface at that point. Any contaminated groundwater could easily enter the ditch here. The contamination is much further out than you would expect from the groundwater flow velocities. What normally might take 5 or 10 years could occur in just one day under the right conditions. The groundwater flow rate here is 100 – 200 feet a year, faster toward the river and slower away from the river generally, however flow is also dependent upon the underlying material and gradient. What is known is that the shallow groundwater is much more coarse and the groundwater flows through it much more quickly at rates of 100-200 feet per year. The deeper groundwater is much tighter and flows more slowly at rates of 10-20 feet per year.

In 1997, the Navy with the Nature Conservancy did a groundwater survey for the entire area. A synoptic sampling was done, four times, quarterly, in one year. Based on that, the entire area was reasonably delineated as to where the groundwater was flowing.

There are some wells that are relatively deep suggesting that the majority of the contamination is staying shallow. There is one exception to this, however, this being well TW-113 on the Sportsmen's Club property. Because of this wells were installed further downgradient. Because a non-detect wasn't reached with this well at its deepest point, it is planned to go back and drill this well deeper.

#### *TW-04 Area*

The range of free product in the TW-04 area extended roughly from 10-15 feet west of TW-04 and extended east about 60-80 feet. The north-south range was approximately 30-50 feet. Grumman put in a series of shallow water table wells looking for free product formation. The Navy is doing free product recovery, so there are trace amounts right now. The free product is predominantly fuels, diesel fuel and jet fuel, with chlorinated solvents making about half to 1 percent. At times, there was over a foot of free product contaminated with chlorinated solvents. Later tests revealed that it was a fuel/chlorinated solvent mix. At the edge, there were no chlorinated solvents. Where deep contamination is found is where the mix is found.

### **ACTION ITEM REVIEW AND DISCUSSION TOPICS**

#### *TAPP Proposal*

The steering committee discussed feasibility of TAPP for community RAB members in downgradient groundwater modeling of southeastern boundary of the existing data, to find out future impacts or intrusion to the Peconic River. A hydrogeologist and GIS specialist were also researched. The motion was made to pursue the TAPP proposal and the motion was carried.

#### *Thank You Letter*

A letter of thanks was sent to Warren Voeglin for use of the Masonic Lodge for RAB meetings. Mr. Voeglin stated that the letter was received and read and Mr. Colter verbally thanked him for his cooperation.

#### *Meeting in Denver*

A meeting is scheduled for May 18-20 in Denver, Colorado. This meeting is put on for the co-chairs of restoration advisory boards all across the country. Both Navy and community co-chairs are invited. Community Co-chair Johnson stated that she would not be available to attend and that an alternate would be chosen.

#### *Membership*

The RAB is going to look at membership again since some members have not been attending and several are interested in attending. North Fork Environmental Council has requested a seat and Erik Dumont of the Citizens Campaign For The Environment has attended a couple of times and the organization is interested in a seat also.

#### *Discussion*

A RAB member asked if the Fire Training Area document that was sent to the RAB was a final. Mr. Colter stated that it is the final nature and extent and that a similar schedule would be followed as was for Site 7: take a synoptic round of groundwater samples, monitor natural attenuation parameters, and do a Feasibility Study.

Another question raised was why only volatile organic compounds were focused on for the Fire Training Area. Mr. Colter stated that metals were sampled for in the earlier rounds, but metals were never found downgradient from the source area. Detections are there and if there had been widespread high level contamination, it would have been included in the Phase II Workplan.

A member asked if an on-site audit of the laboratory used in 1997 had been performed at any time. Mr. Colter stated that the Navy has a certification process that each lab must pass to be used on any Navy contracts. If they do not pass the criteria, they are not used.

Mr. Pim asked if the Navy would object if the State requested that inert materials be returned to the landfill at Site 1. The State is concerned about what would be best for the wetland for the removal. Mr. Colter mentioned another issue with this site. Site 1 is considered a highly sensitive archeological area. As part of the closure, the Navy must do a cultural Resources Survey. The Navy hired a cultural archaeologist who went to the site and tested the pits. They found artifacts that deemed the area as highly sensitive for archeological artifacts. What they are going to do is do a detailed analysis. If they choose to do it for the 22 acres, it will be expensive and time consuming. A RAB member suggested that the Navy speak with Lorraine and the Montauk tribe to get their opinion on the issue.

Ms. Hare stated that the next RAB meeting should be tentatively planned for June 2001 and the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.

#### **POSTSCRIPT NOTE**

Stenographer's transcripts are prepared for RAB meetings to assist the Navy in preparation of meeting minutes. The transcripts are available in the NWIRP Calverton Information Repository at the Riverhead Free Library. To assist the stenographer, RAB members and other attendees at the meeting are requested to speak one at a time for the stenographer to accurately transcribe the meeting discussions. Any participant at the RAB meeting who would like to have their comment formerly documented for the record is requested to state their name prior to speaking.

---

**Agenda**

**Restoration Advisory Board  
Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant Calverton**

**March 14, 2001  
Riverhead Masonic Lodge, Riverhead, NY  
7:00 p.m.**

**Welcome and Agenda Review**

Judithanne Hare  
Naval Air Systems Command

**Review and Approval of Minutes**

All Members

**Status of Activities at NWIRP Calverton**

Jim Colter  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command – Northern Division

**Action Item Review and Dates and Discussion Topics for Future Meetings**

All Members

**Closing Remarks**

Judithanne Hare  
Naval Air Systems Command

*Presenters will be available after the program for questions.*

---

**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY NAVY  
FOR REGULATORY REVIEW  
THROUGH FY 2002**

**NWIRP CALVERTON, NEW YORK**

<u>SITE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PLANNED SUBMISSION DATE</u>	<u>ACTUAL SUBMISSION DATE</u>
Site 7	- Final Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) Workplan	24 Mar 00	28 Apr 00
	- MNA Viability Report & Current Site Conditions (2000)	2 Oct 00	2 Oct 00
	- Draft Feasibility Study (FS) Report	16 Dec 00	10 Jan 01
	- Draft Decision Document	30 Jan 01	
	- Final FS Report	16 Mar 01	
	- Final Decision Document	23 Mar 01	
	- ROD for Final Remedy	25 Jun 01	
Site 1	- Draft Action Memorandum & EE/CA (AM/EECA) for Bank Stabilization (Interim Remedy)	3 Oct 00	3 Oct 00
	- Final AM/EECA for Bank Stabilization	2 Dec 00	On Hold
	- Draft Final Combined RI/FS Report	30 Jul 01	
	- Final Combined RI/FS Report	7 Nov 01	
	- Draft Decision Document for Final Remedy	24 Nov 01	
	- ROD for Final Remedy	2 Jun 02	
Site 2	- Final RFI Report	30 Dec 00	5 Mar 01
	- Draft Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) Workplan	12 Dec 01	
	- Final MNA Workplan	26 Jan 02	
	- Draft Feasibility Study (FS) Report	23 Jun 02	
	- Final CMS Report	29 Oct 02	
Site 6 & Site 10B	- Final Workplan for 2000 Fieldwork	16 May 00	5 May 00
	- Analytical Results from 2000 Fieldwork	5 Oct 00	5 Oct 00
	- Draft RI Report	27 Dec 00	<b>13 Apr 01</b>
	- Final RI Report	26 Apr 01	
	- Draft FS Report	1 Aug 01	
	- Final FS Report	29 Nov 01	
	- Draft Decision Document	31 Jan 02	
	- Final Decision Document	7 Apr 02	
	- ROD for Final Remedy	9 Jul 02	
Southern Area	- Final Workplan for 2000 Fieldwork	16 May 00	5 May 00
	- Analytical Results from 2000 Fieldwork	5 Oct 00	5 Oct 00
	- Draft RI Report	27 Dec 00	<b>13 Apr 01</b>
	- Final RI Report	26 Apr 01	