



Draft

**Minutes of
Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting**

Location: NWS Earle, Colts Neck

Time: 10 April 1990, 10:00 a.m.

Objectives: Review of RI/FS Comments Prepared by WESTON for NAVFAC, Addressing EPA and NJDEP Comments regarding the Phase III RI/FS Work Plan.

Attendees: See Attachment I

Chairwoman: Ms. Adrian Townsel

The meeting was opened by A. Townsel (NAVFAC) addressing the following: Before we discuss the RI Comments, what is the Status of (DEP) SI Comments. R. Hayton replied that they will send a copy to Ms. Townsel within 1 to 2 weeks.

R. Johnson (WESTON) introduced "Responses to EPA and NJDEP Comments". Hand-outs of the comments were distributed to all present. These hand-out included Responses to both EPA and NJDEP comments, revised figures, water level maps, project schedules and a summary soil sampling and analysis for all the sites.

R. Johnson asked B. Staub (Versar) to please number their comments in the future. The discussion began with the response to EPA comments. We discussed the changes to site specific figures based on 1986 Air Photos, which showed tree lines and open areas. WESTON can provide additional copies of the 1986 Interim Report prepared by WESTON to those requesting it.

Outstanding issues - The EPA CLP Guidance in QUAPP. The Navy is using EPA Approved QUAPP treating the sites as potential NPL Sites. R. Johnson suggests CLP comparable to NJDEP.

1. Issue We cannot agree to do everything in accord with NJDEP Guidelines as they are not identical to CLP.

R. Hayton indicated that: No problem since the EPA audits NJDEP QA Program and they are basically in accord.

2. Issue

Laboratory methods will follow the CLP. No one expressed any objections. Field methods will follow the sampling plan which can include protocol included in the NJDEP sampling manual.

R. Johnson asked if there was any more to discuss on the EPA Comments issues. B. Staub indicated that there might be later, so we moved on the next topic:

Responses to NJDEP Comments

General Comments:

R. Johnson said that the soil borings will be lithologically characterized using continuous split spoon sampling. Soil samples will be taken in discrete intervals, not composited. We recommended eliminating gamma logging, since we are doing "continuous" split spoon sampling for lithologic characterization and the boreholes will not be very deep. B. Staub asked if we intend to drop Gamma logging in the "Englishtown" Deep Well at Site #7. R. Johnson indicated that the Englishtown Well is a separate issue which would be discussed later. WESTON recommended the following: synoptic water levels, a minimum of two slug test per site. B. Staub suggested that it might be better to do slug removal in the unconfined aquifer, to which R. Johnson agreed. Concerning sampling intervals, WESTON's thinking is related to repeatability more than seasonal variations and fluctuation. R. Johnson suggested dropping TOX at all sites. It's relative significance is questionable. This was agreed upon, at which time B. Hayton indicated that he "never liked TOX".

6-8 wk intervals

SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES - NJDEP

1. Deep Well Englishtown at Site #7.
2. Reported Tank at Site #7

Comments:

WESTON recommends reducing data Validation in the Second Sampling Round.

Historical Air Photo Search

Office on Environmental Analysis can assist us with historical records search. Mr. Ken Sass or Mike Ryan can pull Historical Air Photos if we give them the locations. We can contact Bob Hayton for the phone number.

J. Mahoney asked when we anticipate the first sampling. There was a general discussion of possibly sampling in July, with first analytical results available in September or October. Resampling could occur in the Fall or Winter time frame. The 3rd round of sampling could be conducted possibly next spring. J. Mahoney also wanted to know if we could begin to exclude some of the sites based on the first round results. R. Hayton indicated that with NJDEP and EPA concurrence that could be done, however, it is possible that confirmation sampling would be necessary prior to approval to illuminate a site. J. Mahoney queried if this could happen by the end of the year. R. Hayton replied that the agencies would probably request a confirmation sample.

Comment #16 L. Welkom commented on the well construction specification. She mentioned flexibility in screen placement and specification of 15' screen. Placing 2 feet of screen above the water table is acceptable. Placing 5 feet screen above the water table is not a fixed requirement if it means compromising construction of the well seals in the upper zone. WESTON will use 5' and 10' sections. It was agreed that 5 feet is not fixed and that the well screens will be adjusted accordingly taking into account groundwater level, ground surface level and seal placement.

Issue of Background Sample: B. Hayton proposed collecting both filtered and unfiltered groundwater samples. R. Johnson stated that these data are sensitive to the amount of sediment in the samples and suggested that discrete representative soil samples be collected below the water table instead of unfiltered water samples. L. Welkom said DEP wants worse case scenario (unfiltered vs. filtered). DEP wants to err on the conservative side. L. Welkom got into a discussion that most water treatment facilities filter for less than 45 micron, therefore greater fraction of suspended total load is allowed to pass therefore we want total unfiltered samples. R. Johnson responded that this was an outstanding issue and that we would get back to DEP on the issue of collecting unfiltered and filtered samples. (Action Item)

We went on to discuss site specific items and responses to specific site comments for Sites 2 through 26. (See Attachment II).

Site 2:

1. We propose dropping all piezometers at Site 2. DEP will think about it and get back to us.
2. We suggested dropping the MW near Pine Brook Road. *We Ttl* (EPA) agreed.
3. We also propose adding three (3) sediment samples.

Site 10:

We suggested eliminating the piezometers and propose sediment sampling along the drainage way. R. Hayton said to check map for stream orientations.

Site 19:

R. Hayton spoke about placing MW-19-5 off asphalt in grassy area and using protective well guards. R. Johnson talked about the wetlands to the west was recognized as a fragile area. Therefore we propose moving MW-19-6 out of wetland area closer in towards facility. We also proposed taking three (3) sediment samples along drainage and installing MW 19-4 and MW 19-5.

Site 20:

We proposed two (2) soil samples to characterize piles and eight (8) soil samples along drainageway and discharge point to characterize extent of distribution. We also proposed a full TAL Metals and CN analysis.

Site 22:

B. Staub asked R. Johnson if the reason we were not monitoring groundwater at these sites was because we believed there was very little transport. R. Johnson answered "yes".

Site 26:

We proposed one MW and four sediment samples in the tile field/depression at the end of the drainageway.

Site 7:

No obvious surface problem staining in the scrap area. The suspected underground storage tank (UST) will be dealt with during the program. Site 7 is the location of a former base quarters. The base engineering group suspects it was heated by oil. We may conduct a Magnometers survey in the suspected UST area.

R. Johnson suggested that the proposed deep well not be installed since we have not identified any contaminants of concern in shallow wells. R. Hayton said that the DEP did not ask for it; it was originally proposed by WESTON. R. Johnson responded that WESTON now proposes to eliminate it. There was general agreement.

B. Staub requested obtaining quarterly water level measurements. WESTON agreed. R. Hayton said that DEP will need time to review today's responses. A. Townsel asked if the EPA needs 6 weeks for review, and P. Ingrisano responded that it would probably be 4 weeks. After four weeks when the final comments are submitted, WESTON will finalize the responses.

**SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES IN TERMS OF WEEKS FROM TODAY'S DATE
(4/10)**

1 Week WESTON will submit Final Draft Comments and sends to NAVFAC.

4 Weeks Comments from NJDEP - EPA will be submitted. The comments will determine the agenda for the next TRC meeting.

6 Weeks TRC Meeting at NWS Earle.

DEP/EPA will send comments directly to WESTON and NAVFAC simultaneously.

Next TRC Meeting is scheduled for 6/05/90.

WESTON

A. Townsel requested six (6) copies of Interim report. A. Townsel asked B. Staub about the status of the QUAPP Review. B. Staub replied that the QUAPP comment will be sent to her by April 17. R. Johnson expressed the need to talk to WESTON Analytical Lab personnel regarding the QUAPP. Brad indicated that we will smooth a lot over by going CLP.

A. Townsel asked P. Ingrisano about the status of the SI Comments. EPA will send them to NAVFAC in a couple of weeks.

Some additional notes from the meeting:

NJDEP will assign a new "case" worker to the project. H. Cerra (NAVFAC) will also be leaving the project. Her replacement has not been identified at this time.