



Brown & Root Environmental

C-NAVY-3-97-0045W

March 11, 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 Meeting Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed is a copy of final minutes from the February 19, 1997 NETC 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
March 11, 1997
Page 2

Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)
Mr. Anthony D'Agnerica (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. 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.)
Newport Public Library (w/enc.)
Ms. Joanne Gorman, Middletown Free Library (w/enc.)
Portsmouth Free Public Library (w/enc.)
Capt. Wyman, NETC (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
FEBRUARY 19, 1997
MINUTES**

On Wednesday, February 19, 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 7:05 pm and ended at 9:15 pm.

Eight of the 20 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Al Arruda, Liz Bermender, David Brown, Paul Cormier, Joe McEnness, Tom McGrath, 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; and Brad Wheeler, IR Site Manager, NETC Environmental Affairs. Tony D'Agnew, Frank Flanagan, June Gibbs, Howard Porter, Paul Russell, and Chuck Salmond provided notice of their absence. Bob Belenger, Mary Blake, Mike Foley, 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 noted that among the handouts was a list of the RAB Teamwork Ground Rules that members should tuck into their binder pockets for easy reference. A poster-sized version will be present in the room during each RAB meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Brad Wheeler spoke for the Public Information Committee. No change has occurred since the last RAB meeting; however, he and Chuck Salmond are still working to advance the multi-level school IR education effort.

Membership Committee Chair, Paul Russell, was not present. However, Captain Wyman indicated that the Portsmouth Town Council had sent a letter stating it had appointed Byron J. Hall as their representative to the RAB. Paul should send them a letter, together with a RAB application, telling them that the RAB's jurisdiction addresses IR sites in each of three communities, not just McAllister Point Landfill.

Planning Committee member Jim Shafer reviewed the RAB Review Dates Calendar. The Draft SASE and Draft Final ERA for Derecktor Shipyard have been issued (and copies are now available for distribution). The next document the RAB will receive is the final McAllister Point Landfill ERA. In April, the McAllister Revised Draft Final RI Report and Derecktor Final ERA will be issued. New additions to the calendar include the Draft Work Plans for Gould Island and NUWC Disposal Area (due in June). Also to be issued in June is the Derecktor Draft Final SASE. All projects are on track.

The next version of the calendar will include two additions: a proposed plan for long-term monitoring at Tank Farm Five and an on-shore removal action at Old Fire Fighter Training Area (OFFTA). The Navy wants to shut down permanently the pump and treat system at Tank Farm Five because recent monitoring has shown that the groundwater is not contaminated. Instead, the Navy wants to conduct long-term monitoring to ensure that the contaminated groundwater related to the pump and treat program has been removed. At OFFTA, old subsurface piping used to support the training activities has been found. Brown & Root will begin field work this spring to look for and remove contaminated soil. Despite the removal action, the long-term CERCLA RI/FS process will continue to study the site as a whole.

Dave Brown discussed two issues: he received three responses to his planning questionnaire and encouraged those who have not filled one out to do so. Dave also attended the January 29 Ecological Advisory Board meeting and related his response to information he gleaned from it through an information flow chart. Important technical decisions are made at these meetings that directly effect how cleanups occur. If the RAB wants to know what those decisions are, RAB members need to ask hard questions of the presenters. He reminded the RAB of the Vision for Aquidneck Island workshop last November and announced that on March 1, Middletown is conducting a meeting on conserving and coordinating water supplies. Dave also mentioned that June Gibbs' husband had been in an accident but was not sure of the circumstances or his condition.

In Ray Roberge's absence, Jim Shafer spoke for the Project Committee. The Melville North Landfill investigation has concluded. The Navy will meet with Paul Kulpa to determine what remedial options are available for the landfill's closure. The Navy is also in the process of closing Tank Farm Four. Last minute issues have arisen on the subject of their demolition but these should be ironed out next week.

APPROVE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes from the January 15, 1997 RAB meeting were accepted as written.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mary Philcox of the Aquidneck Island Citizens Advisory Board handed out a summary of information about the EPA Technical Assistance Grants (TAG). When Congress amended CERCLA in 1986, it added provisions to enhance community involvement in cleaning up Superfund sites. Qualified citizens groups can apply for site-specific 3-year grants of up to \$50,000. The successful group uses the funds to hire a technical advisor to interpret the technical issues raised during NPL site studies. Their meetings are open to the public (they may become monthly once the TAG advisor is up to speed). The TAG advisor will attend RAB meetings at the TAG group's request. Requests from the RAB for assistance from the technical advisor should be relayed through Joe McEnness. The TAG group will use RAB meetings as one of the mechanisms they have available to help inform the public about NETC's IR activities.

Mary introduced the TAG Technical Advisor, David Egan. David mentioned that although his firm, Louis Berger and Associates, assists federal facilities in meeting their Federal Facility Agreement obligations, it will take some time studying NETC-specific information for him to come up to speed. David is a hydrogeologist who has worked almost exclusively on Superfund sites; the firm employs staff with a variety of technical disciplines and their subcontractor, Parr Engineering, has experience in turning former landfills to beneficial reuse.

Comment: Is the TAG program linked to the IR Program?
Response: It is only linked to the Superfund part of the IR Program, so FUDS sites are not included in the TAG scope.

Comment: Will you identify places in the cleanup process where the public can be involved?

Response: David expects to experience a significant learning curve about the base and is looking for information about future uses. Brad stated that transactions on data will focus on the 12 sites included in the NPL listing. David is also looking for information in downgradient areas. Brad responded that as far as he knew, all downgradient areas on the base are Narragansett Bay. Captain Wyman stated that David's firm already has all the information he is asking for because they conducted an archeological survey for NETC.

Comment: What is the need for a RAB when a TAG group exists that is funded by EPA?

Response: Mary suggested that the RAB can tap into the expertise of the advisor, who offers an independent view of technical material. Brad placed the two entities in context, stating that Congress created the TAG program to address CERCLA sites (most of which are not on federal facilities) before the RAB concept evolved (which are specific to federal facilities).

Comment: How many people are affiliated with the TAG group?

Response: The four members of the Board of Directors include: Emerson Wildes, President; Ken Kubic, VP; Mary Wehle, Treasurer; and G. W. Humphrey, Secretary. The other members include Dave Lemler, Roy Anderson, Michael Embury, Bob Driscoll, and Dave Brown. Although several of these people hold office in town, none represents those interests directly on the board. Brad mentioned that some of these people were on the Technical Review Committee, the group that was replaced by the RAB.

Comment: Why aren't you a member of the RAB?

Response: There is no requirement that the TAG group be represented on the RAB. However, Dave Brown is performing as their liaison. Brad mentioned that he met with David Egan two weeks ago and intends to sit down with him again soon.

Comment: Will the TAG have a role in public hearings?

Response: Because of the existence of the RAB, which is involved in each phase of NETC studies, Dave expressed hope that RAB member issues would be aired long before the public hearing takes place.

NEW BUSINESS

Brad announced that since this is the first anniversary of the NETC RAB, celebratory cakes await the RAB during the post-meeting social hour.

One of the agenda items for the next meeting is the nomination and election of a new Community Co-chair. Chuck Salmond has volunteered to have his name placed in nomination.

PRESENTATION

Steve Parker of Brown & Root Environmental used a series of handouts to illustrate his presentation on the draft Study Area Screening Evaluation (SASE), which was conducted at the on-shore portion of Derecktor Shipyard. The first three overheads depicted information pertinent to both the on and off-shore studies.

A Preliminary Assessment (file search, site walk) was conducted at Derecktor in 1993. The report recommended that more in depth studies be initiated on shore and off shore. The off-shore study (Ecological Risk Assessment- ERA) was conducted in 1995 and 1996 while the SASE (on shore) study was performed in 1996. Both studies detected polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PCBs, tributyltin, and metals; the on-shore study also found pesticides and SVOCs. The handout defined these contaminants, the settings in which they are usually found, and their common sources.

Derecktor Shipyard was divided into four investigation areas. The North Waterfront was used for parking and storage. Central Landfill includes Building 42 (and areas where chemicals were stored and sandblast grit was stockpiled) and Building 6, the set up and pipe shop. The Building 234 Area was used to build ships. South Waterfront contains excavated material and a large soil berm runs its length.

The goal of the SASE was to identify the contaminants present at the shipyard, identify receptors that are there, and evaluate whether the contaminants are able to effect the receptors. The study searched for contaminants in surface and subsurface soil, and groundwater; samples were sent to laboratories for analysis. Possible receptors include humans (under both current and future land use), and plants and animals. Possible areas where contaminants could effect receptors include surface runoff and outfalls, groundwater, and leaching. Also the study reviewed the possible impact of a contaminant if it changed from one form to another.

The SASE findings showed: no appreciable risk to site industrial workers; minimal ecological risk since little area is present to support plants and animals; and releases likely ended up in the bay. SASE recommendations are to dispense with the RI and FS since contaminated areas are isolated. The report recommends repairing or sealing some damaged storm drains and initiating removal actions for: TBT-contaminated material under the Building 42 sump; PCB contamination in surface soil northeast of Building 6; and SVOCs south of Building 234. A series of outfalls is present along the shoreline. Most drain local roofs and storm drains. However, two, 3B (which collects runoff from north of Building 42 and between Buildings 6 and 42 and the railroad track) and 10B (which collects from the area east of Building 6) are near the highest off-shore contaminated areas that Greg Tracey will discuss next.

Comment: If you conduct a removal, does it effect future land use because you would have to demolish existing buildings?

Response: If a building is sound and does not need to be torn down, a removal could proceed by excavating through the building floor.

Comment: Has the Navy told you what to do next?

Response: No. They, too, have just received the SASE; we expect comments.

Brad reminded the RAB that the site remains in Navy jurisdiction. Any actions taken on shore at Derecktor will be conducted with a view to the Navy retaining ownership. He stressed that the report found no site-wide risks; the only problems encountered were localized.

Comment: Were you able to get out on the "T" pier during the SASE?
Response: Brad warned against investigating it for safety reasons but we conducted a quick survey. The structure is unsafe.

Comment: Were you able to get out onto Pier 1?
Response: No. It is just a concrete pier supported by pilings. Captain Wyman mentioned that NUWC is now using Building 6 and wants to use Building 42. The rest of the site buildings will probably be demolished.

Comment: Did you find the freshwater stream in the South Waterfront area?
Response: A wetland exists east of the South Waterfront. A culvert from the wetland drains through the South Waterfront. The outfall is still there.

Comment: Could the SASE be used as the basis for a No Further Action Decision Document?
Response: Yes. An SASE is equivalent to a Site Investigation.

Brad stressed that the Navy wants to do the cleanup quickly and return that part of Derecktor Shipyard to a useful function.

Comment: Did you envision future uses in the SASE?
Response: Yes. We performed a risk evaluation and assumed that future use would be the same as the current use.

Comment: Did you perform a risk assessment?
Response: No. The risk evaluation that was performed is less intensive than a full-blown risk assessment but we did include both industrial and residential land uses to be conservative.

Comment: At least one state agency has expressed interest in the shipyard. Did you factor in the types of uses they would need?
Response: The state Department of Transportation was interested in opening a marine terminal. Paul Kulpa intends to include a statement in the state's comments on the draft SASE that that type of future use was not included in the report evaluation. Kathy Abbass mentioned that the state has begun an archeological survey off Goat Island so it may be safe to assume that that is the location the state is focusing on for the terminal. Brad stated that the draft SASE evaluated Navy uses only.

Comment: The risk evaluation concluded that no real problem exists but you indicate that you want to conduct a removal action. Aren't those positions contradictory?
Response: The soils under the sump in Building 42 were not included in the risk evaluation. We view it as a "hot spot". However, the other areas of concern were included in the risk evaluation. It just makes good sense to address the hot spots as a conservative measure.

Comment: Were air pollution and increased runoff issues from building demolition included in the risk evaluation?
Response: No. They were not because the Navy does not intend to remove the building slab.

Comment: How would you remove the PCBs?

Response: The SASE field study only found PCB-contaminated soil down to 1 foot. Samples taken down to 4 feet showed no contamination. So we would excavate the soil down to 1 foot and remove it.

Comment: How large a surface is contaminated?

Response: The hot spot is in a low area, so we theorize that water contaminated by PCBs where the transformers were stored may have leaked onto the parking area and into the adjacent vegetated area. We would conduct more sampling before the excavation began to delineate the extent of the hot spot.

Comment: Will you prepare a work plan for the removals?

Response: That depends on the regulatory process the Navy needs to follow. If the process is a non-time-critical removal, then a work plan would be prepared before an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is developed.

Greg Tracey from SAIC continued the presentation, highlighting the changes made between the draft and draft final Derecktor ERA. He reminded the RAB that in November he presented the results of the draft, which included summary tables. The tables depicted the level of risk based on comparing the amount of exposure to the effect that exposure had on a receptor. Those depictions did not change between versions.

What did change were additions or revisions to the draft's data base. These include:

- incorporation of data from a Department of Justice study on sand blast material in bay sediments and a Narragansett Bay Project habitat survey.
- revision of the approach used to interpret the benthic community, at the state's request.
- revision of the way benchmarks for PAHs' effects on fish were evaluated.
- changes to the assessments that evaluate tissue residue effects and the bird exposure assessment model.
- standardization of the risk ranking strategy.

As shown in the ERA fact sheet, the two areas of high risk, stations 27 and 29, roughly coincide with the two outfalls Steve pointed out in his presentation. Seven other stations present intermediate risks.

Comment: How are tissue studies performed?

Response: We collect and study receptors that are important to the local environment (lobster, mussels, clams, and cunner). Once they are analyzed, we determine what the laboratory numbers mean by comparing those levels with levels from species collected from reference sites. We also compare the numbers to benchmarks taken from the literature.

Comment: What parts are analyzed?

Response: For fish, the whole fish; for lobster, the claw and tail meat. We do not analyze bivalve shell because we are trying to determine trophic transfer. That is why we only study the edible parts.

Comment: Did you encounter any areas in Coddington Cov where everything is dead?
Response: At Station 25, for instance, not much of a benthic community was found. This could result from local anaerobic conditions. In locations where the chemistry is high and no animals are present, we assume a "smoking gun".

Comment: How is this area impacted by major storm events?
Response: The study did not evaluate flow during storm events. However, the hydrographic study found lots of cobbles along the cove's southern shore, which is exposed to strong northwest winds. Other portions of the cove are fairly well sheltered from impacts from typical storms. Hurricanes are another question.

Comment: Are the high risk areas in exposed locations?
Response: There is a positive relationship between the decreased level of energy in the risk areas and contaminant presence.

Comment: Would you be worried about eating lobsters taken from the area?
Response: The study did not include a human health risk assessment but the levels we found compare favorably with the FDA guidelines. No, I would not be worried about eating local lobsters.

Brad shared the Navy's plan for the area. For the on-shore area, the Navy wants to restore the shipyard to occupied status by aggressively undertaking the recommended removals around Buildings 234, 6, and 42 this fiscal year. For the off-shore area, the Navy wants to proceed with a feasibility study to evaluate potential options that address the contaminated areas. Brad asked for an advisory opinion by the RAB on both determinations. Except for some concerns Paul Kulpa indicated on the part of the state underground injection staff, all RAB members expressed support for these approaches. Joe McEnness and Betsy Horne will draft and distribute a letter memorializing the advisory opinions. The projects will be added to the RAB calendar.

Comment: Will the off-shore FS also include options about where to haul the material if it is excavated?

Response: Yes. It will. Disposal costs for excavated material are always high.

Comment: A recent Save the Bay Bulletin included an article on locations for disposing of dredged material. One site was north of the Newport Bridge. Would this location be feasible to disposal of the high risk area materials? Have you consulted with Save the Bay?

Response: We would want to piggyback on local dredging activities. We have talked with the Army Corps of Engineers about the Providence River dredging. We will instruct the FS writer to coordinate with Save the Bay. Kymberlee stated that most dredge sites will not accept sediments from Superfund sites.

Comment: Will more data be collected for the FS?

Response: Yes. And more will be collected before the on-shore removals commence.

Todd Bober, Technical Coordinator at NORTHDIV, summarized the FS process as it relates to potential action at McAllister Point Landfill. The FS will review site conditions such as habitats present, physical characteristics like grain size and energy levels, ecological findings, and confirm that the debris extends up to 50 feet beyond the toe of the slope and ranges in thickness from 0 to 9 feet. All FSs use nine criteria to evaluate potential remedial options.

For McAllister, these options can include no action (which is required in all FSs); remove near-shore debris; monitor the area; extend the revetment; cap the sediments; dredge the area; or some combination of these options. Brad asked if the RAB had other options it wishes to have included in the FS.

Comment: What is the ecological risk of the physical debris remaining in the water?

Response: Although there is no human health risk from the debris, its presence is a public safety concern. In addition, ash from the on-site incinerator is undoubtedly mixed in with the debris in the sediments. One of the key issues the FS will use to evaluate options is the level of risk stemming from the sediments and debris.

Comment: If a citizen should ask how risks at Derecktor and McAllister compare, what is a correct response?

Response: They really cannot be compared. At McAllister the bulk of the risk is physical, from the presence of the debris; at Derecktor the bulk of the risk is from contaminated sediments. However, both sites contain both physical and chemical contamination.

Comment: Where is the breach in the revetment at McAllister?

Response: The slope of the landfill rises some 50 to 60 feet at an approximate 18 degree angle. The revetment, built of large stones, is present along the slope to the water's edge. Over the winter of 1995/1996, after the revetment construction was completed, natural material (sediment) eroded from the toe of the slope, exposing debris.

Comment: Is it possible that the construction of the revetment caused the erosion?

Response: That is very possible. The majority of the erosion occurred between NSB-2 and just south of NSB-4, which is the location of the highest energy in the area.

NEXT RAB MEETING

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

- continuing McAllister Point Landfill FS discussion
- signing the RAB advisory opinions adopted for the Derecktor Shipyard strategies
- nominating and electing a new Community Co-chair