

00220



55 Jonspin Road
Wilmington, MA 01887

(508) 658-7899
FAX: (508) 658-7870

C-52-3-5-2159W

24579

March 10, 1995

Project Number 1703

Ms. Deborah Carlson
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mailstop 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113-2090

Reference: Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298, Navy (CLEAN)
Contract Task Order No. 0173

Subject: Minutes to the third Ecorisk Advisory Board Meeting

Dear Ms. Carlson:

The draft minutes of the third Ecorisk Advisory Board meeting are enclosed. The format which you requested was used to the extent possible, but the nature of the presentation was not focused on specific documented comments, it was more of a general presentation to address overall concerns. I have prepared the minutes to briefly summarize the presentation and to address the questions raised by the attendees.

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Stephen S. Parker".

Stephen S. Parker
Project Manager

Enclosure

SSP/ib

c: J. Trepanowski, M. Turco, Halliburton NUS (w/encl)
J. Quinn, URIGSO (w/encl)
File ~~0173-3.2~~ (w/encl)

1703-

DRAFT
THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
NAVY INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
NAVAL EDUCATION & TRAINING CENTER (NETC)
NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND

March 3, 1995

HALLIBURTON NUS CORPORATION
CONTRACT NO. N62472-90-D-1298
CONTRACT TASK ORDER NO. 0173

Prepared By:
Stephen S. Parker
Project Manager

Prepared For:
Ms. Deborah Carlson
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Navy, Northern Division

MINUTES OF THE THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

MARCH 3, 1994

The third Ecorisk Advisory Board Meeting for the Naval Education and Training Center was held in Building 1 of the Naval Education & Training Center in Newport, Rhode Island on March 3, 1995 to discuss outstanding issues related to the off-shore ecological risk assessment for McAllister Point Landfill. Attachment A presents a list of meeting attendees. The minutes of the meeting follow.

OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTION - Stephen S. Parker, Halliburton NUS Corporation

A recap of the first two Ecorisk Advisory Board Meetings was presented, to set the stage for the agenda. The meeting agenda was presented, which included the following discussion items:

- Outline for the Draft Final Work Plan
- Goals and scope of the ecological risk assessment (ERA) for the McAllister Point
- Preview of the problem formulation and conceptual model for the McAllister Point Landfill ERA
- Location of next sampling stations at McAllister Point
- Discussion of outstanding technical issues
- Schedule for submittal of the work plans and reports

A fourth Ecorisk meeting to discuss the ecological risk assessment was tentatively proposed for the end of May or beginning of June 1995, following the completion of most of the analysis of the samples but prior to the submittal of the Draft Ecological Risk Assessment for the McAllister Point Landfill.

A package of materials was passed out for the meeting by Dr. James Quinn. Mr. Stephen Parker presented the agenda for the meeting, and summarized the project organization and roles of all the Navy and contract team members.

Mr. Andrew Miniuks stated that he would no longer be the RPM for the project and that his replacement would be Kymberlee Keckler, who was introduced.

Draft Final Work Plan Outline - Stephen S. Parker, Halliburton NUS Corporation

The proposed revised outline for the Draft Final Work Plan was presented, which included a general approach for the performance of the ecological risk assessments for NETC sites, and site-specific chapters that addressed the problem formulation for each site, as well as the sampling and analysis plan for each site.

MINUTES OF THE THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

It was recognized that the Ecorisk Advisory Board was not satisfied with the format of the Draft Work Plan, but that this submittal of the work plan would be a Draft Final, and it's format would have to be somewhat similar to the Draft Version to assure that the comments were addressed.

There was some open discussion on the revised outline, and Ms. Susan Svirsky (USEPA) and Mr. Cornell Rosin (CDM) stated specific concerns with the sections describing the problem formulation and development of the conceptual model. It was agreed that Mr. Wayne Munns would present the steps for the problem formulation and the development of the conceptual model, and that the work plan outline would be revisited later during this meeting.

PROBLEM FORMULATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL - Dr. Wayne Munns, SAIC

The approach for the problem formulation and development of the conceptual model was presented. The following comments were interjected during this presentation:

- Mr. Andrew Miniuks (USEPA) asked if the volume of contaminated sediments will be determined. Dr. Munns indicated that they are not currently directed to do that, but information generated by the sampling program and the geophysical survey would support an estimation of the volume of contaminated sediments.
- There was a general comment that, in addition to the contaminants in groundwater which may be leaching into the bay, the surface soils from the landfill should also be considered in the ecological risk assessment given the potential migration of soil contaminants into the bay via soil erosion.
- Mr. Paul Kulpa and Mr. Christopher Deacutis (RIDEM) stated their concern regarding the fact of not using polychaetes as species of concern since they are common prey for finfish. It was recognized that analysis of body burden of polychaetes is generally not feasible, due to the biomass required. Dr. Munns and Dr. Tracey indicated that contaminant concentrations in tissues of polychaetes (Nereis was mentioned as an example) can be modeled based on sediment chemistry data and information on the lipid content of the tissues. A concern was also raised about not assessing the contaminant exposure of flounder, and Dr. Munns pointed out that the mummichog would be used as a general surrogate for finfish. Dr. Munns also agreed that the work plan would clearly address the use of surrogate species.
- Mr. Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) indicated that there are two types of lobsters in the area, a sedentary group, and a transient group that appears to migrate north and south in the bay. He asked that both exposure scenarios be addressed in the ecorisk assessment.
- Ms. Susan Svirsky (USEPA) asked if gross abnormalities on mummichogs would be addressed. Dr. Munns stated that if mummichogs are present, then any gross abnormalities observed will be recorded.

MINUTES OF THE THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Dr. Munns continued with the conceptual model portion of his presentation:

- Ms. Susan Svirsky (USEPA) asked if the influence of Gomes Brook and NUSC Stream would be addressed in the off-shore risk assessment. Mr. Simeon Hahn pointed out that these streams were not specific to McAllister Point, but may be contributors to the contaminant loading into the bay. It was not resolved how to approach these streams in regards to on shore vs. off shore assessments.
- There was some discussion regarding on the scope of the ERA regarding the projection of future risk. It was agreed that the assessment of future risk under current conditions was within the scope of the ERA. However, future risks under potential remedial actions were beyond the scope of the ERA and would not be addressed.
- Dr. Munns proposed using the osprey as a surrogate species representative of avian predator receptors. Ms. Svirsky stated that she would check with Tim Prior of The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding their preference, and will get back to the Navy directly.

Dr. Munns briefly described the 10 pages of the handout which show the projected format of the Ecological Risk Assessment Report, and asked attendees to review this outline for comment at a later meeting.

Break

LOCATION OF NEXT SAMPLING STATIONS AT MCALLISTER POINT - Dr. John King

Dr. King presented the proposed sample locations for phase 2 sample collection in order to reach a consensus for the field activity. Fifteen sample locations were described, and one additional reference station, located in Cranston Cove, on Jamestown Island.

- Ms. Svirsky (USEPA) asked if sediment samples will be co-located with biota samples. Dr. King stated that they would be as much as possible, and that the sediment and biota samples will be collected within a radius no greater than 15 feet.

Dr. King presented a mosaic of strip charts generated during the side scan sonar survey. This mosaic shows what appears to be a man-made pile of sediments immediately to the north of the breakwater. Former location D3 was unknowingly placed directly in this area, which may be the reason for the chemistry findings at this location, which were anomalous compared with the other offshore stations. The EPA requested that these readings be confirmed. It was subsequently determined that a seventeenth sample station be added to confirm the former D3 location.

Dr. King presented a summary of samples to be collected, describing the different parameters for which each sample will be analyzed.

MINUTES OF THE THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

- Mr. Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) asked what the depth of the deep cores and grab samples would be collected from. Dr. King responded deep cores would be collected from 0-1 meters and the grab samples are collected from 0-10 cm, but the standard operating procedure includes analysis of only the 0-2 cm interval.
- Mr. Ken Finkelstein (NOAA) asked if the metal and concrete debris along the landfill slope is to be evaluated regarding the physical stress on the receptors. He asked if field notes could be developed and reported to describe any potential stresses on the habitat from this material. Greg Tracey also pointed out that the diversity analysis would also address that issue.
- It was also indicated that the Navy is retrieving that a large amount of this debris along the shore and installing a revetment, and the nearshore samples will be placed outside the revetment (location of the revetment will be surveyed by the construction contractor).
- Mr. Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) stated that in shallow holes dug by himself along the landfill base, a sheen and an odor were observed, although the top two inches appeared to be clean. There was an extensive discussion on the appropriate sample depth to reflect this condition without compromising on the comparability of the toxicity results and physical parameters of the sediment samples. It was agreed to collect the sediment samples in the nearshore locations 1 through 7 from a depth of 0-6 cm, as opposed to the sample depth of 0-2 cm in other sampling locations.

Dr. Tracey presented the sampling and analysis plan for toxicity testing and biota. With regard to toxicity testing, it was noted that the coarse nature of the nearshore sediments may require the use of an alternate amphipod species (*Leptocheirus*). The presentation also summarized the location and number of depurated and non-depurated bivalve samples as well as the location of fish and lobster samples.

- Concern was raised on the issue of comparability of sensitivity between two species but was resolved when noted that data exist to show that these species are comparably sensitive despite different grain size preferences.
- A consensus was reached regarding the location and number of samples as identified in the presentation package. It was requested that some latitude be given in cases where organism availability may preclude successful collection such that the sampling/analysis effort be redistributed to other location and or matrices (e.g., lobster tissue groups).
- It was also noted that *Mya neoplasia* may not be possible due to absence of organisms.
- It was agreed that sewage pathogen indicators (*E. coli*, *Clostridium*, total and fecal coliforms) would be measured in sediments and bivalves at a selection of stations.

MINUTES OF THE THIRD ECORISK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

OPEN DISCUSSION TO RESOLVE OUTSTANDING TECHNICAL ISSUES AND THE OUTLINE FOR THE DRAFT FINAL WORK PLAN

Sample management and data validation concerns raised at the 10/27/94 EAB meeting were addressed in the Preliminary Report prepared by URI GSO on December 20, 1994. Some comments on this report had been drafted by the EPA, and these comments are to be submitted by Mr. Miniuks to the Navy on March 7, 1995. Mr. Miniuks gave to the Navy the three comments pertaining to the sample collection, analysis and maintenance. These were resolved at the table:

- Holding times for mercury in pore water collected during Phase I sampling were exceeded. No analysis of mercury in these samples will be performed. However, analysis of mercury within the approved sample holding times will be performed on the seventeen samples collected during phase 2.
- EPA data validation procedures are specific to chemistry data collected, and do not apply to the toxicity data collected.
- Tier "11" data validation is a typographical error, Tier II is the correct methodology.

Mr. Simeon Hahn (NAVFAC) stated that the proposed report outline was distributed with the hand-outs, and the meeting attendees were asked to review it. Ms. Svirsky pointed out that new EPA Region I guidance for ecological risk assessments will be issued in the spring, and that the report will have to follow that guidance.

During the meeting Mr. Stephen Parker, Mr. Hector Laguette, and Mr. Simeon Hahn revised the outline of the Draft Final Work Plan. This second revision was typed up and distributed. Initially, the EPA gave concurrence on the approach, which included site specific plans for ecological risk assessments as addenda to the general work plan. Mr. Cornell Rosin, however, had some concerns and thus it was agreed that the revised proposed outline would be reviewed by the EPA and comments would be faxed to HNUS and the Navy in the afternoon of 3/3/95.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 P.M.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

3RD ECO ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MARCH 3, 1995
NETC NEWPORT RHODE ISLAND

	NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE
1.	Stephen Parker	HNUS	[REDACTED]
2.	Hector Laguelle	HNUS	[REDACTED]
3.	GARY TRACY	SAIC	[REDACTED]
4.	Simon Hahn	NORTHDIV	[REDACTED]
5.	John King	GSO/URT	[REDACTED]
6.	JIM QUINN	GSO/UKI	[REDACTED]
7.	Christopher Deacutis	RIDEM/NBP	[REDACTED]
8.	Paul Kulpa	RIDEM/DSP	[REDACTED]
9.	WAYNE MUMNS	SAIC	[REDACTED]
10.	Km Fildner	NOAA	[REDACTED]
11.	DEBBIE CARLSON	NORTHDIV	[REDACTED]
12.	TODD BOBER	NORTHDIV	[REDACTED]
13.	Bill Mansfield	NETC NPT	[REDACTED]
14.	LT Tom Magwanic	NETC	[REDACTED]
15.	BRAD WHEWLER	NETC	[REDACTED]
16.	MARY PATRIAR	COM	[REDACTED]
17.	CORNEE ROSIO	COM	[REDACTED]
18.	KYMBERLEE KECKLER	USEPA	[REDACTED]
19.	Susan Svirsky	USEPA	[REDACTED]
20.	Andrew Minichis	USEPA	[REDACTED]
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			
27.			
28.			
29.			
30.			