



Brown & Root

Services

55 Jonspin Road / Wilmington, MA 01887-1020 / 978-658-7899 / Fax: 978-658-7870

C-NAVY-3-98-1129W

March 10, 1998

Project Number 5278

Mr. James X. 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 are the minutes from the February 18, 1998 RAB meeting. If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 978-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

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

Betsy Horne
Community Relations Specialist

BH:b

Enclosure

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)
Mr. Alfred Arruda, Jr. (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)
Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)
Mr. Anthony D'Agnew (w/enc.)
Ms. Beth Everett (w/enc.)
Mr. Mike Foley (w/enc.)

Brown & Root Environmental



A Halliburton Company

Mr. James X. Shafer
March 10, 1998
Page 2

Mr. Byron J. Hall (w/enc.)
Ms. Elizabeth Mathinos (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. John Torgan (w/enc.)
Ms. Claudette Weissinger (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary Philcox (w/enc.)
Mr. David Egan (w/enc.)
Mr. Tom Nicholson (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM (w/enc.)
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA (w/enc.)
Capt. Jon Wyman, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Bob Jones, Groton (w/enc.)
Mr. David Sanders, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Peter Palmerino, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Kevin Coyle, NETC (w/enc.)
Ms. Melissa Griffin, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Woody Monaco, NETC (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.)
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)
Councilman Dennis McCoy (w/enc.)
Mr. Vincent Arnold (w/enc.)
Dr. David Kim (w/enc.)
Mr. Brian Bishop (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.)
Mr. R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)
Ms. Diane McKenna, B&RE, Wilmington (w/enc.)
Mr. Garth Glenn, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/enc.)
Ms. Meg Price, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/o enc.)
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

**NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 18, 1998**

MINUTES

On Wednesday, February 18, 1998, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at the NETC Officers' Club for its monthly meeting. The meeting began at 7:00 pm and ended at 8:59 pm.

Seven of the 17 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Mary Blake, David Brown, Byron Hall, Liz Mathinos, Tom McGrath, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager, Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager, and Captain Jon Wyman, Navy Co-chair. Todd Bober, NORTHDIV's NETC technical manager represented Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV's Remedial Project Manager. Kevin Coyle and Dave Dorocz were present from the NETC Environmental Division. David Sanders represented the Public Affairs Office. David Egan, the Aquidneck Island Citizens Advisory Board (AICAB) TAG technical advisor was present, as was Sarah White, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator. Other guests included Navy representatives, numerous members of the public, as well as representatives from the Senators' (Chaffee and Reed) and the Congressman's (Kennedy) offices. Beth Everett, Joe McEnness, T. R. McGrath [who submitted his resignation effective February 12], Chuck Salmond, Howard Porter, and Paul Russell provided notice of their absence. Al Arruda, Paul Cormier, Tony D'Agnenica, Mike Foley, and John Torgan were not present.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Captain Wyman, the Navy Co-Chair, welcomed the RAB and guests, and introduced Captain Bogle, NETC's Commander. Captain Bogle announced the presence of guests from the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), who were in Newport to discuss plans to bring three inactive ships to Pier 1. Captain Bogle emphasized the Navy's intention to continue a dialogue on this effort with local officials and the Aquidneck Island public.

PRESENTATION ON MOVING THREE INACTIVE SHIPS TO NEWPORT

The presentation was supported by a series of overhead talking points and graphics. Captain Hall from NAVSEA placed the action in perspective with some history about the fleet and the process the Navy uses to address inactive ships. From approximately 1975 to the present, the ratio of inactive ships to active ships has been growing; it is now around 196 inactive vessels to 300 active ones. Inactive vessels are divided into six categories: retention mobilization (could be reactivated); hold for foreign military lease; hold for foreign military sale

(to our allies); donation (to non-profit entities); experimental use by the Navy; and federal agency transfer or scrapping.

The defense realignment policy resulted in closure of many naval facilities, including the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Because the base is being turned over to the City of Philadelphia, only two berths will be available for inactive deep draft ships, so three ships (the carriers ex-FORRESTAL and ex-SARATOGA, and the battleship ex-IOWA) must be moved. Initially, the Navy screened 21 facilities along the east and gulf coasts that could potentially accept the ships; that list was pared to five after considering environmental impacts, available berthing, site availability, and cost.

The Chief of Naval Operations reviewed NAVSEA's Environmental Assessment on the project and issued a finding of no significant impact (FONSI). The assessment identified NETC as the preferred alternative site. The presentation advised that none of the vessels had ever been painted with tributyltin paint; that any leaching of the copper-based paint from their hulls would not have an impact (and that periodic testing would be conducted to monitor the leachate effect); that only minor exterior maintenance would be needed after berthing; that the vessels' presence in Newport was consistent with historical pier use; and that the benthic community would be exposed to only minimal impact from pile driving operations. NETC was selected from the list of five sites after a determination was made that it would require no dredging, it had a history of berthing deep draft ships, the site was available at the appropriate time, and it presented minimal environmental impacts and was the lowest cost alternative.

The Navy is now working on the mooring configuration, which will be designed to withstand a 100-year storm. The aircraft carriers will be berthed on either side of Pier 1, with the battleship on the south side of the pier between the carrier and the pier. Camels (barges) will be placed between the carrier and the battleship to ensure an appropriate separation. The ships are expected to arrive at Newport late in the summer of 1998.

Pier 1 needs some preparatory work, including assessing underwater structures, testing bollards, installing new fender piles and electrical and telephone lines, constructing security and maintenance facilities, and hiring maintenance personnel. Captain Hall showed some photographs of Pier 1 from several angles and distances, with computer-generated images of the battleship and aircraft carriers superimposed to provide a sense of how the area would look once the vessels are berthed. These pictures showed the ships were not view obstructions.

Captain Chiaverotti, from NAVSEA Detachment, Portsmouth, Virginia, Officer in Charge in of the Navy's inactive fleet, discussed the ship preparation and storage activities. All hazardous materials and ozone-depleting substances are removed during the ships' initial inactivation. A survey was made of asbestos-containing material, PCBs, and luminescent gauges. Curator items such as sign boards and ships wheels were removed. Fuel, supplies, outfitting, and ammunition was offloaded. To ensure safety and security, all underwater openings were sealed, flammables were removed and friable asbestos areas sealed, intrusion alarms will be installed, fire extinguishers will be placed on the ships, and adequate lighting will be maintained. The ships' exteriors will be painted before leaving Philadelphia and will be touched up as necessary. The ships will be safety cleaned and watertight integrity will be

established before they are towed to Newport and the ships will be maintained at Pier 1 in this condition.

The Naval Inactive Ship Maintenance Facility (NISMF) in Philadelphia will remain responsible for the ships; a government-owned commercially-operated (GOCO) contractor (Global Associates Management Company) will represent NISMF in Newport with one permanent site manager. Approximately 12 full-time equivalent positions will result. Eight will include the site manager and a 24-hour security force; the remaining positions will be for seasonal painting and maintenance personnel. The GOCO's duties include ensuring that routine maintenance, safety checks, and seasonal maintenance (keeping the vessel interior dry) occur; assisting in cannablizing equipment requested by active duty ships; conducting the annual water quality monitoring for copper leachate effects; escorting NAVSEA-approved visitors aboard (such as memorial groups); responding to safety, environmental, and security incidents; preparing the vessels to ride out storms; cooperating with Coddington Cove restoration efforts; and ensuring the oil boom surrounding the ships is working properly.

Comment: What is the status of the Saratoga?

Response: It is in experimental hold status.

Comment: Could it be donated to a non-profit group?

Response: Yes. Some active interest has been expressed but no application has been received.

Comment: What do you mean by experimental?

Response: "All I will say is that it is reserved for future research use."

Comment: How often are the ship underwater hulls painted?

Response: Never. They don't need to be painted to eliminate barnacles. That is not an issue for inactive ships.

Comment: Are the other two deep draft vessels that will remain in Philadelphia in the same classifications as the three expected to come to Newport?

Response: No. The aircraft carrier ex-AMERICA and the battleship ex-WISCONSIN are in mobilization status.

Comment: How long might the vessels remain in Newport?

Response: No longer than necessary. The Navy is trying to reduce the number of inactive vessels in its fleet. We don't want to move these ships around any more than is necessary. They could be in Newport for a while or they could be disposed of quickly.

Comment: Will those ships have any security?

Response: There will be a security gate on the pier and the ships brows and access doors will be secured.

Comment: Will a time come when any of these three ships will not be protected by a 24-hour guard?

Response: No. All will have gates and guards for as long as they are in Newport.

Captain Wyman thanked the NAVSEA representatives for making the presentation. The regular order of the meeting resumed. The minutes were adopted without change.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Membership Committee - Paul Russell was unable to attend tonight's meeting. [T. R. McGrath submitted his resignation, effective February 12. He has moved to the west coast.]

Public Information Committee - Woody Monaco offered the RAB web page address: www.cnet.navy.mil/newport/rab_.htm. Woody can be reached at 401-841-6376 or via e-mail at NETC-NEP.40E12@netpmsa.cnet.navy.mil. Claudette Weissinger noted that Bob Krekorian from PAO was creating an abutters list.

Planning Committee - Dave Brown had to leave the meeting early. Tom McGrath discussed a Community Member Question Checklist Dave prepared to assist RAB members in focusing on important issues as they review RAB documents. A copy will be included with the draft minutes; it will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Project Committee - Kathy Abbass stated that a representative of the CRMC had cancelled attending her committee's 6 pm meeting. [Laura Miguel from CRMC is scheduled to meet with the Project Committee at 6 pm before the March 18, 1998 RAB meeting.] Kathy also discussed Jennifer McCann, who represents the Aquidneck Island Partnership, which is attempting to develop an island-wide vision. Jennifer asked if she could make an hour-long presentation at an upcoming RAB meeting. She also wants to interview RAB members and include their statements in a documentary to show the public. Kathy will ask her to speak at a 6 pm Project Committee meeting as a first step; Kathy will coordinate the timing with David Sanders so the public notice for that evening's RAB meeting can also highlight an invitation to attend the 6 pm discussion.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT MCALLISTER POINT FS

Todd Bober, NORTHDIV's technical manager, provided some background on the McAllister Point Landfill feasibility study. The 1993 ROD for the site resulted in construction of a cap. The ROD also required that additional studies be pursued to evaluate sediment, groundwater, and landfill gas.

The Navy has not chosen a preferred alternative at this time. The Navy's preferred alternative will initially be determined in the proposed plan, which will be issued in draft at the end of July. Public and regulatory comments received could modify the proposed plan. The ROD will articulate the selected remedy and contain a responsiveness summary that characterizes comments the Navy receives during the public comment period and that responds to those

issues. The Navy has received comments on the draft FS from the Aquidneck Island Citizens Advisory Committee, EPA, David Brown (provided as a handout), NOAA, RIDEM, and other Navy experts.

As a result of these comments, the Navy is reviewing cost data for alternatives presented in the FS as well as examining the following additional alternatives: hot spot dredging, reopening the cap (for disposing of dredged material), and using a combination of capping and dredging. In addition, the ecological significance associated with the different alternatives will be further explored. The Navy is also obtaining assistance from the Vicksburg office of the Army Corps of Engineers to evaluate capping and dredging logistics. Other issues usually considered during the post-ROD design phase are being evaluated now (such as off-shore construction windows such as when off-shore work should be restricted so as not to negatively impact ecological resources) to refine schedule and cost considerations.

Comment: When is the remedial action for this site scheduled to be implemented?

Response: The draft ROD is scheduled for March of 1999.

Diane McKenna from Brown & Root Environmental presented an overview of the draft McAllister Point FS. (A copy of the overheads she used to support her presentation were provided as a handout).

The feasibility study process, conducted using EPA guidance, consists of four elements: identifying media of concern, developing remedial action objectives, identifying potential remediation technologies and alternatives, and evaluating remedial alternatives. Media of concern are identified by reviewing site investigation results, the risk assessments (human health and ecological), and state and federal regulatory criteria. For each medium of concern, remedial action objectives are developed based on the risk assessments and the regulatory criteria. Then the universe of potential technologies is identified and screened. The promising technologies are evaluated and combined into comprehensive remedial alternatives. These alternatives are evaluated against EPA's nine criteria and against each other.

EPA's nine criteria are divided into three categories. Any alternatives that could be potentially selected for implementation must meet the two threshold criteria of overall protection of human health and the environment, and compliance with state and federal regulatory criteria. The five balancing criteria are long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness; implementability; and cost. The two modifying criteria, state and public acceptance, become apparent during the public comment period; they are assessed as part of the record of decision.

As Todd mentioned, the 1993 ROD required additional studies involving groundwater, landfill gas, and sediment. Review of risk assessments and regulatory requirements determined that there was no need to cleanup groundwater and landfill gas; however, the sediment may need remediation. The risk assessments revealed that nearshore sediment contained potential human health and ecological risks and the offshore sediment contained a potential ecological risk. The evaluation of potential remedial actions at these two locations was separated because each location poses different risks based on different exposures, the physical

characteristics of the areas (proximity to the landfill, depth of water) were different, and the nearshore sediment also contained landfill debris that needed to be addressed.

The human health risk assessment determined the nearshore sediment exceeded the acceptable cancer risk range for subsistent fishermen and children who consume shellfish harvested from that location. The ecological risk assessment revealed both intermediate and high probability of risks at different nearshore locations to the creatures that live in the sediment, and to shellfish, and the birds that prey on them.

Four nearshore alternatives were evaluated:

- No action - take no action and every 5 years conduct a review of the regulations to determine if cleanup requirements have changed. EPA requires including a no action alternative as a baseline against which all other alternatives can be compared. The no action alternative would provide no decrease in human health or ecological risks.
- Limited action - construct fences, signs, and buoys, and impose deed restrictions to discourage using the area for shellfishing and recreational activities. This alternative also includes long-term monitoring and 5-year reviews. This alternative would provide a limited reduction in health risks but no ecological risk reduction.
- Containment - install a multi-layer cap (comprised of sand, gravel, and large stones/boulders), provide long-term maintenance and monitoring, and conduct 5-year reviews. This alternative would reduce both human health and ecological risks. It would pose some short-term impacts to the aquatic environment that would be effected by cap placement. However, conditions would be stabilized eventually and new habitat would be created.
- Removal and off-base disposal - remove sediment and landfill debris, and dispose of the material off base. Removing the contaminated material would reduce both human health and ecological risks. Dredging would result in a significant short-term impact on the ecosystem, however, conditions would be stabilized eventually and new habitat would be created.

For the offshore areas, no risk to humans or shore birds was found. However, there is a low to intermediate probability of risk to sediment-dwelling creatures and shellfish.

Four offshore alternatives were evaluated:

- No action - take no action and every 5 years conduct a review of the regulations to determine if cleanup requirements have changed. EPA requires including a no action alternative as a baseline against which all other alternatives can be compared. The no action alternative would provide no decrease in ecological risks but the offshore risks are significantly lower than those posed by nearshore sediments.

Limited action - conduct long-term monitoring and 5-year reviews. This alternative would provide no reduction in ecological risks but monitoring would allow a review of risk levels.

- Containment - install a multi-layer cap similar to the nearshore cap alternative, provide long-term maintenance and monitoring, and conduct 5-year reviews. This alternative would reduce ecological risks by preventing contact with the sediment. It would pose some short-term risks to the aquatic environment that would be effected by cap placement. However, conditions would be restored eventually and new habitat would be created.
- Removal and off-base disposal - remove sediment and landfill debris by hydraulic dredging, and dispose of the material off base. The removal of the contaminated material would reduce ecological risks. Dredging would result in a significant short-term impact on the ecosystem, however, conditions would be restored eventually and new habitat would be created.

Comment: What mechanism will the Navy use to respond to FS comments? Will we get a chance to review those responses before the document reaches the draft final stage?

Response: The Navy will respond to all comments it receives through the comment/response letter procedure. These letters will be discussed at RAB meetings. The draft final FS is scheduled to begin its review cycle on April 30, which means there will be two more RAB meetings between now and then at which to discuss these issues.

Comment: Is public comment allowed at the draft final document stage?

Response: Kymberlee stated that that decision is up to the Navy. Todd said yes and suggested that if significant differences existed at the draft final stage, it would make sense to resolve these issues before proceeding to the final FS.

Comment: In reviewing EPA and DEP comments, a question arose as to whether the cap must be strictly a physical structure. Could it be a combination physical and chemical barrier?

Response: The Navy stated that the Corps of Engineers has some experience with encapsulation. Kymberlee Keckler stated, however, that that experience has not been with hazardous materials. The Navy will attempt to schedule a meeting with the Corps of Engineers at NETC to discuss these issues.

Comment: What are the short-term impacts from dredging? Are there any endangered species in the area?

Response: The Navy is investigating the impacts of capping and dredging in greater detail to better understand the short-term impacts of potential alternatives so we can build in mitigation efforts. Kymberlee stated that endangered species are present in the area.

Comment: What are the contaminants of concern in the landfill sediments?
Response: They were addressed in the risk assessment. They include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and PCBs. There are also some metals of concern, such as arsenic.

Comment: Will the entire ecosystem be taken into consideration when evaluating cleanup alternatives?
Response: Yes. To accomplish the ecological risk assessment, individual "indicator" organisms were evaluated that are representative of a wide variety of species. The entire ecosystem, however, will be taken into consideration when evaluating cleanup alternatives.

Comment: Can you cap sediment that is under water?
Response: Yes.

Comment: How will the cap stay in place during big storms?
Response: This cap design takes into account wave action that would occur during worst-case storms. The cap would also employ large stones to break up wave action. It is a very costly configuration.

Comment: How could the cap have been damaged (during the winter of 1995-1996)? We didn't even have a 100 year storm that winter.
Response: The cap was not damaged. There was debris in the water beyond the extent of the original cap. We now think we have a better understanding of the type and location of the debris through results from subtidal borings.

Comment: The presence of debris would play a significant role in selecting a cleanup alternative. How good a handle do you have on what kind of debris is there and where it is?
Response: The borings provided limited information but of sufficient quality and quantity to support some interpolation. Much of the debris can be seen at the surface of the ocean floor at low tide; we are also about to conduct an underwater laser study that will locate surface debris in deeper areas. Soil borings confirmed the presence of small debris such as ash, glass, and small pieces of metal. The borings tell us where the larger pieces are by the depth of the boring at refusal.

Comment: Won't it be difficult to dredge the submarine netting and cranes?
Response: Yes. The submarine netting is especially difficult because it is long, coiled, thick wire that acts like a spring. It will be difficult to remove by dredging. Todd suggested that this is another reason to why the Navy is obtaining technical assistance from the Corps of Engineers.

Comment: When were the most recent borings conducted?
Response: The summer of 1996.

Captain Wyman reminded the RAB that new name tags and name tents were available in the corner of the room. He also invited the RAB to a \$5 to \$7 luncheon at the Officers' Club at 11:30 on Wednesday, March 18, the day of the next RAB meeting. Andrew McLeod, the new RIDEM Commissioner, is the featured speaker.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 18, 1998. The RAB agenda will include presentations on the draft Derecktor Shipyard Human Health Risk Assessment, the RAB budget, and the TAPP grant; a summary of the results of the February 12 IR partnership meeting; a discussion of Dave Brown's review checklist; a review of how draft FS comment responses will be disseminated; and a discussion on electing a new Community Co-chair.

Handouts: RAB Review Dates Calendar
 Chutes and Ladders Showing Sites Cleanup Status
 David Brown's Comments on Draft McAllister Point FS
 Overheads from the Draft McAllister Point FS presentation

Enclosures: Dave Brown's Community Member Question Checklist (draft minutes)