



## Brown & Root Environmental

---

C-NAVY-2-97-0019W

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

February 5, 1997

Project Number 5278

Mr. James Shafer  
Remedial Project Manager  
Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82  
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298  
Contract Task Order 218

Subject: RAB Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes from the January 15, 1997 RAB meeting.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 508-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Betsy Horne".

Betsy Horne  
Community Relations Specialist

BH:ib

Enclosure

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)  
Mr. Alfred Arruda, Jr. (w/enc.)  
Mr. Robert Belenger (w/enc.)  
Ms. Elizabeth Bermender (w/enc.)  
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)

Mr. James Shafer  
February 5, 1997  
Page 2

Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)  
Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)  
Mr. Anthony D'Agnew (w/enc.)  
Mr. Francis J. Flanagan (w/enc.)  
Mr. Mike Foley (w/enc.)  
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)  
Mr. Dennis F. Klodner (w/enc.)  
Mr. Joseph McEnness (w/enc.)  
Mr. Thomas McGrath (w/enc.)  
Mr. Howard L. Porter (w/enc.)  
Mr. Paul D. Russell (w/enc.)  
Mr. Charles Salmond (w/enc.)  
Mr. Keith Stokes (w/enc.)  
Mr. John Torgan (w/enc.)  
Ms. Claudette Weissinger (w/enc.)  
Ms. Mary Philcox (w/enc.)  
Mr. David Egan (w/enc.)  
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM (w/enc.)  
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA (w/enc.)  
Ms. Sarah White, EPA (w/enc.)  
Ms. Jennifer Hayes, Gannett Fleming (w/enc.)  
Mr. Tim Prior, USF&WS (w/enc.)  
Mr. Ken Finkelstein, NOAA (w/enc.)  
Capt. Wyman, NETC (w/enc.)  
Capt. Bogle, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. James Barden (w/enc.)  
Hon. Paul W. Crowley (w/enc.)  
Redwood Library (w/enc.)  
Councilman Dennis McCoy (w/enc.)  
Mr. Vincent Arnold (w/enc.)  
Captain Norman Pattarozzi (w/enc.)  
Dr. David Kim (w/enc.)  
Sister Annie Marie Walsh (w/enc.)  
Brother Joseph (w/enc.)  
Ms. Joanne Gorman, Newport Public Library (w/enc.)  
Middletown Free Library (w/enc.)  
Portsmouth Free Public Library (w/enc.)  
Mr. David Sanders, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. Brad Wheeler, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)  
Mr. Steve Parker, B&RE, Wilmington (w/enc.)  
Mr. John Trepanowski, B&RE, Wayne (w/enc.)  
Ms. Meg Price, B&RE, Wayne (w/o enc.)  
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
JANUARY 15, 1997

MINUTES

On Wednesday, January 15, 1997, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at the NETC Officers' Club for its monthly meeting. The meeting began at 7:06 pm and ended at 8:45 pm.

Twelve of the 19 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Al Arruda, Liz Bermender, Mary Blake, David Brown, Paul Cormier, Tony D'Agnenica, Joe McEnness, Howard Porter, Paul Russell, Chuck Salmond, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager; Captain Jon Wyman, NETC Navy Co-chair; and Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV Remedial Project Manager. Other personnel present included: Todd Bober, NORTHDIV Technical Coordinator; David Sanders, NETC Public Affairs Officer; and Brad Wheeler, Ray Roberge, and Kevin Coyle NETC Environmental Affairs. Bob Belenger, Mike Foley, Frank Flanagan, June Gibbs, Dennis Klodner, Keith Stokes, and John Torgan were not present.

Agenda items are denoted in the minutes by the underscored headings.

CALL TO ORDER

Jon Wyman, the Community Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He outlined the evening's agenda. Handouts include a fact sheet on McAllister Point Landfill, which is the subject of the evening's discussion, a copy of the executive summary of the Phase III sampling Technical Memorandum, and a compilation of the overhead graphics used in the presentations.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The Ecological Advisory Board will meet at 9 a.m., Wednesday, January 29 in Building 1. Joe McEnness asked David Brown to represent the RAB community members.

Paul Kulpa's presentation on the cleanup status of the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) will be added to the February agenda. [Because the February RAB meeting agenda is filled with discussion of documents currently under review, the FUDS presentation will be postponed to the March meeting.] A discussion of the TAG technical advisor's role with the RAB will be scheduled for a future meeting.

Committee Reports

June Gibbs, chair of the Public Information Committee, was not present. Chuck Salmond discussed a proposal he developed for a series of field trips geared toward middle and high school students to help them learn about NETC IR activities. The principals and the superintendents from the three communities expressed an interest in participating. Brad is

r viewing a request for support; the Chamber of Commerce will assist in some way, perhaps by providing business leaders as speakers.

Membership Committee Chair, Paul Russell, indicated they were still trying to recruit members. He introduced the newest member RAB community member, Tom McGrath.

Planning Committee member Jim Shafer discussed the document deliverable schedule status. All sites remain on schedule except the Derecktor Shipyard ERA. The Navy received comments from the state on the draft document on December 24; a conference call was held last week to discuss the comments. The draft final version will be issued on February 12. An updated version of the RAB document review schedule will be appended to the draft minutes. David Brown, Planning Committee chair, distributed a copy of a planning questionnaire. He asked members to return completed forms to him by the next meeting. A copy will be sent with the draft minutes to members not present.

Project Committee acting chair, Ray Roberge, outlined activity at three sites. Tank cleaning at Tank Farm Four is nearly complete; the Navy is negotiating with the state about demolition, which might occur beginning in February. The pump and treat system at Tank Farm Five was shut down last month. (This is known as the interim remedial action). The Navy is analyzing monitoring data to determine what options remain. Drilling began last week at Melville North Landfill and test pit excavation will start next week. Kathy Abbass stated that she had been asked to be on the Project Committee, but had had no recent contact. Brad reminded the RAB that Billy Fenton, who was the committee chair, had resigned when he re-enlisted. Ray was named interim chair until a community member expressed interest in the position. Brad asked Kathy to call him to discuss it.

### Relative Risk Ranking

Todd Bober, Technical Coordinator at NORTHDIV, summarized a presentation from the March 27, 1996 RAB meeting by Bob Krivinkas, Jim Shafer's predecessor. The Navy has a software program that inputs a variety of factors (chemical types and concentrations; availability to receptors, etc.) to determine where the highest risks are across all Navy sites. The results are used to allocate cleanup funds. As new data is collected from sites, the rankings are revised to identify where the greatest risks are present. NETC site rankings were expected to be high because of the base's proximity to the bay and its marine receptors.

### PRESENTATION

Brad Wheeler used the "chutes and ladders" overhead to review the CERCLA process. Two sites, Derecktor Shipyard and McAllister Point Landfill, are each nearing the point where decisions have to be made to attain a major milestone: a record of decision that selects a cleanup approach. McAllister Point Landfill has already been through that cycle once: when the cap was selected for operable unit 1. The ROD mandated cap construction, as well as another operable unit to study groundwater migration through the landfill into Narragansett Bay.

Brad reviewed the remaining activities for McAllister Point Landfill to conclude in a ROD: issue a final ERA; write a feasibility study report that evaluates cleanup alternatives; issue a proposed plan that describes the field results, the cleanup alternatives evaluated, and identifies which alternative the Navy favors; and conduct a 30-day public comment period and hold a public hearing to accept comments on the proposed plan. After the Navy and the

regulators review the comments, the Navy will issue a ROD, together with a responsiveness summary, which highlights comments received and the Navy's response to them.

Brad reviewed the history of the landfill and outlined the studies completed to date. Metals and organic contamination in sediment and mussels resulted from the landfill and its encroachment into the bay.

**Comment:** Were the sediment samples taken by the Corps of Engineers in 1988 from the floor surface or were they core samples?

**Response:** I am not sure. I will get back to you with the answer.

Although the capping project has been completed (except for the 30-years of operations and maintenance, and monitoring), the Navy needs to complete the management of migration component (OU2), which will consider groundwater, leachate, and hot spots. Greg will discuss the McAllister Point Landfill ERA, part of which will be used in OU2; the Navy will be asking the RAB for an advisory opinion on the OU2 options, which range from no action to expensive alternatives.

**Comment:** What options were evaluated in the McAllister Point Landfill FS for OU1?

**Response:** Three options were included: no action; construct a RCRA D cap (soil); and construct a RCRA C cap (plastic barrier) with revetment. There was an enormous difference in price between the two capping alternatives, with minimal difference in protectiveness.

**Comment:** You used the term NAPL. What does it mean?

**Response:** Dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPL) are dense materials that are not soluble in water. Like with salad dressing, they separate from water; there is no mixing. These comprise the hot spots we are looking for in OU2.

**Comment:** Who signs the ROD?

**Response:** The Base director and the EPA Regional Administrator.

**Comment:** What kind of feedback have you received from the public when you have held hearings/public comment periods?

**Response:** Although several articles were published over several days before the OU1 public hearing, only a handful of people attended. Interest was low.

**Comment:** When you do hear from the public, how do they contact you?

**Response:** Some contact has been face to face and through telephone calls. We heard very little on the ribbon cutting event.

Greg Tracey from SAIC continued the presentation, picking up the discussion at the point the ERA was initiated. He reminded the RAB that most of his talk would be a summary of the information they heard at the October 1996 meeting. At that time, Greg outlined the Derecktor Shipyard ERA; the methodologies of the two ERAs are similar because the physical locations are proximate, the types of contaminants and receptors are alike, and the goals are the same: to establish a baseline that establishes current risk conditions against which post-remediation risk levels can be compared.

Potential receptors that live in the water column, in and on sediment, and predators that eat these receptors were collected, as were three rounds of sediment data (TRC in 1992, Phase I from the southern area; and Phase II from the near-shore area). The behavior these animals

exhibited was compared with contaminant concentrations to which they were exposed, using benchmarks to determine if that level of exposure should present risk. These assessments resulted in a draft (September 1995) and the draft final ERA, issued in June 1996. The draft final divided the off-shore areas into six zones, based on contaminant and toxicity levels.

**Comment:** You take samples at reference stations and compare them with samples from near the landfill?

**Response:** Usually we refer to the literature first. The numbers there, benchmarks, establish the highest contaminant concentration at which no risk is expected. When no benchmarks exist, we use numbers from reference, or background, data points.

Over the winter of 1995-1996, approximately 2 feet of material eroded from the area around the toe of the revetment. Since the sediment loss changed the risk baseline identified in the draft final ERA, the Navy initiated Phase III sampling in the fall of 1996. The results of Phase III are discussed in the Technical Memorandum. Highlights include the exposure of additional landfill material; the discovery of an oily seep area 50 feet north of NSB-6; and the identification of expanded areas that contain elevated contaminant concentrations in zones 2 and 3A sediments.

The regulators are reviewing the data from Phase III. The Technical Memorandum recommends how this information can be added to create the final ERA, which is due March 15.

**Comment:** From what parts of the landfill did the material erode?

**Response:** It disappeared principally from the middle and north-facing areas, mostly between NSB-2 and NSB-4.

**Comment:** How do you anticipate these off-shore areas will be handled?

**Response:** That has yet to be determined. The problem involves more than just a physical debris problem.

**Comment:** Was the Phase III sampling conducted at the same time of year as Phases I and II?

**Response:** Yes, Phase III was conducted in the October/November timeframe.

**Comment:** Did the erosion occur after the cap was in place?

**Response:** The revetment was completed in November 1995; the remainder of the capping was completed in November 1996. Visible erosion occurred sometime between November 1995 and April 1996 when capping construction resumed.

**Comment:** Have you studied the characteristics of the off-shore material?

**Response:** The debris is thickest (up to 9 feet) closest to the revetment toe; the depth decreases with distance from the shore. It extends out approximately 80 feet from NSB-4. Near shore material is debris, including slag, which may have been generated by the incinerator on site between 1965 and 1970; farther out, the material is not embedded and appears to have moved around.

**Comment:** Why did you expand area 3A?

**Response:** The comparison between Phase III levels and previous readings was based on change in absolute contaminant concentrations. Those in area 3A showed that the change warranted zone expansion.

Comment: During the October presentation on the Dercktor Shipyard ERA, I recall remembering that sediment concentration levels were elevated in areas like the breakwater where the geography curves. Is the same true at McAllister Point Landfill in those curved areas?

Response: The northern off-shore areas are relatively clean. That means that contamination is not moving rapidly away from the landfill. Dilution also plays a factor.

Comment: What is the geography of the cove? What about current patterns?

Response: The cove contains the expected contours. The current moves principally north and south with the tide. Wind action is as important, if not more important, than tidal influences.

Greg reviewed the next steps, repeating the need to finalize the ERA, then proceed toward the public participation phase of selecting the remedy for OU2.

Comment: Will you need to shut down the site?

Response: The ROD for OU1 included engineering controls and deed restrictions. The Navy will also have to monitor the site for 30 years.

Comment: What about the need to clean up Narragansett Bay?

Response: We first need to review the alternatives that will be included in the feasibility study. It is possible that the selected OU2 alternative could be to take no action.

Comment: What would happen if we have another bad year of storms? Have any preventive measures been taken to protect the area?

Response: No engineering actions have been taken. The study was conducted carefully to ensure we have an accurate snapshot of existing conditions.

Comment: Did the storm breach the revetment? Were the stones moved?

Response: The stones did not move. They do, however, create additional energy when the waves hit them.

Brad emphasized that the Navy will look at the options to identify different levels of effectiveness. Jim Shafer reviewed the public participation activities that would follow that review. Everything up to the proposed plan is part of the study phase. The proposed plan will be presented to the RAB, a public comment period will be held and a hearing scheduled. The Navy will respond to the comments and, together with the regulators, will make a decision on the ROD. Brad passed out copies of the full Technical Memorandum.

Kymberlee Keckler stated that the McAllister Point Landfill OU2 feasibility study would be issued in October 1997 and suggested that at the February or March meeting, NETC should

schedule a discussion of the off-shore alternatives the FS may include. Brad agreed; he will add this item to the February meeting agenda.

Comment: Is there a healthy number of fish off shore of the landfill or is it barren?

Response: The striped bass fishing is good. It is a high energy area so the bottom of the bay is sandy.

Comment: Would this area be able to sustain aquiculture activity? What about diving and lobstering there?

**Response:** The area is a high energy area so it probably would not lend itself to successful aquaculture projects. As far as eating the fish caught off shore, no toxic problem exists because contaminant concentrations are below FDA safe levels.

Claudette Weissinger announced that Save the Bay is sponsoring a seminar on Narragansett Bay cleanup at Rhode Island College on January 25.

#### **NEXT RAB MEETING**

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 19. Agenda items include:

- continuing McAllister Point Landfill discussion
- providing overview of Derektor Shipyard revised draft final ERA and draft SASE report
- discussing the election of the Community Co-chair