



Brown & Root

Services

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

C-NAVY-5-98-1164W

May 5, 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 minutes from the April 15, 1998 RAB meeting. If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 978-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

Betsy Horne
Community Relations Specialist

BH:b

Enclosure

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)
Mr. Alfred Arruda, Jr. (w/enc.)
Ms. Anne Berman (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)
Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)
Mr. Richard D. Coogan (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
May 5, 1998
Page 2

c: Mr. Byron J. Hall (w/enc.)
Ms. Elizabeth Mathinos (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.)
Capt. Bogle, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. James Barden (w/enc.)
Hon. Paul W. Crowley (w/enc.)
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)
Mr. Joseph F. McEnness (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. 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.)
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
APRIL 15, 1998**

MINUTES

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

Twelve of the 17 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Al Arruda, Mary Blake, David Brown, Paul Cormier, Beth Everett, Mike Foley, Byron Hall, Liz Mathinos, Howard Porter, Paul Russell, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager; Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV's Remedial Project Manager; and Dave Dorocz, representing Captain Jon Wyman, Navy Co-chair. Kevin Coyle was present from the NETC Environmental Division; Pete DuBois represented the Public Affairs Office. Sarah White, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator, also attended. Tony D'Agneica, Joe McEnness, Tom McGrath, and Chuck Salmond provided notice of their absence. John Torgan was not present.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Dave Dorocz welcomed the RAB and explained that he was filling in for Captain Wyman, the Navy Co-chair. He asked if anyone had changes to the minutes; the minutes were adopted as written.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Membership Committee - Paul Russell announced that two new member candidates were present. Anne Berman [a Newport resident, will represent the Aquidneck Island Land Trust. She works for a non-profit housing developer] and Richard Coogan [from Middletown and a retired Navy Captain] were elected as RAB members. [Joe McEnness resigned on February 21.]

Public Information Committee - Claudette Weissinger mentioned that her committee met at 5:30 before the RAB meeting. They focused their discussion on the quarterly newsletter.

Planning Committee - Dave Brown read a piece prepared by Tom McGrath (enclosed with the minutes), who was not able to attend the RAB meeting. Tom wants to be sure that creative methods of addressing IR site hazardous waste are being considered. He suggested that if a new approach might be applicable at NETC sites, then a company that uses that technology should be asked to make a presentation to the RAB.

Dave also summarized an article from a newsletter of the International Association for Impact Assessment discussing how the Netherlands deals with stakeholders during long-term infrastructure projects (enclosed with minutes).

Project Committee - Kathy Abbass stated that Deborah Storti and Robert Driscoll from the Aquidneck Island Partnership spoke to the Project Committee at 6 pm. The video and discussion that ensued were impressive. Dave Egan, the TAG technical advisor, will address the committee at 6 pm before the May 20 RAB meeting.

SITE STATUS DISCUSSION

Old Fire Fighter Training Area - The on-shore investigation found only minor amounts of oil. The off-shore study (ecological risk assessment - ERA) is underway. URI and SAIC are collecting samples including sediments, clams, mussels, lobster, and fish. In a laboratory setting, they will expose sediment-dwelling creatures to a muddy mix of sediment to see how they fare. The study also includes determining the numbers and diversity of intertidal and subtidal populations. A draft ERA should be issued sometime next winter [the FFA date is February 23, 1999].

Derecktor Shipyard - The state water division requested more information on the area south of Pier 1 immediately adjacent to the shipyard (Stillwater Basin). Plates have been suspended in the water column to determine if life can grow in that environment. We will also be testing the outfalls along the bulkhead to determine if contaminants are introduced to the bay through that route. The results of these investigations will be available early this summer; they will be incorporated into the Derecktor feasibility study, due in September.

Jim Shafer reviewed the RAB Review Dates Calendar. The only date that will change is the McAllister Point Landfill draft final FS. The Navy has proposed holding a technical meeting with the regulators to review the FS cleanup alternatives; a new date for completion of the draft final FS will be determined after the meeting. Navy attorneys recommended the postponement to avoid another round of comment/response letters or initiation of the dispute resolution process discussed in the federal facilities agreement. The biggest potential problem involves whether or not a more stringent type of cap than the draft FS describes is required in the off-shore areas. The regulators contend that the nearshore sediment may be hazardous waste, as defined by RCRA. The Navy disagrees. This issue extends to which federal and state regulations (ARARs) must be complied with during the cleanup action.

Other changes to the draft FS include conducting biota sampling and more intense monitoring for the limited action alternative, and excavating in the nearshore area so the grade of the proposed cap envisioned in the containment alternative matches the existing grade in the nearshore area. The Navy has also been asked to consider reopening the existing cap and placing dredged material inside.

Comment: What is happening at Tank Farm Five?

Response: A public hearing is about to be scheduled so a blasting expert can explain the procedures they will use to protect the areas around the site when the tanks are imploded.

Comment: Two members who live near the site expressed concern about what affect the blasting would have on their homes. There are about 25 homes in the area, the nearest of which is approximately 300 feet from the site.

Response: The blasting contractor will conduct surveys of the nearby homes (including taking pictures) to establish a baseline in case damage should occur. The contractor for the Tank Farm Four implusions was able to ease the fears of residents near that site at that public hearing. Please encourage your neighbors to attend the hearing.

Comment: What will happen to the water that is now in the tanks when the tanks are imploded?

Response: The tanks will be drained before they are imploded and the water will be sent through the existing pump and treat system.

Jim mentioned that another Ecological Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for April 22 to discuss preliminary remediation goals for the Derecktor Shipyard FS. Dave Egan will be invited to attend.

PRESENTATION ON THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (TAPP) PROGRAM

Melissa Griffin, from NETC's Environmental Division, presented an overview of the TAPP program; view graphs illustrating the presentation are included with the minutes. A more in depth discussion of the TAPP program will be scheduled for a later date.

Final regulations for the TAPP program were published in the Federal Register on February 2, 1998. Like EPA's TAG program, the TAPP program provides funds to pay for technical assistance to interpret scientific issues so the public can better understand and participate in cleanup decision making. However, unlike the TAG program, which provides support to eligible community groups, TAPP funds can only be used by Technical Review Committees/RABs.

RABs must identify specific eligible projects and apply for the money through the activity command, and if approved, by NORTHDIV. If the \$25,000 grant (or 1 percent of cost to complete annual limit) is awarded, it is provided from the amount of money earmarked for IR cleanups. (There is a total limit of \$100,000). The Navy would support the TAPP by acquiring the technical advisor through purchase orders and handling administrative requirements.

Projects eligible for TAPP funds include interpreting technical documents, reviewing cleanup technologies, participating in relative risk site evaluations, understanding health and environmental aspects of site and remediation approaches, and training. Ineligible projects

include lobbying or engaging in political activity, initiating or underwriting legal action, generating new primary data, championing the reopening of final Navy decisions or initiating disputes with the Navy, conducting epidemiological or health studies, and conducting community outreach.

To obtain TAPP funds, a RAB must demonstrate that the existing players do not have the expertise to achieve the objective for which the technical assistance is to be obtained or demonstrate that the technical assistance will result in a more effective, faster restoration and is likely to contribute to community acceptance of IR site remediation.

A pilot program was conducted at NAS North Island [a site elsewhere in the country] last fall. Two of four projects (air toxics risk assessment, chemical waste disposal area, shoreline sediments recommendations, and slag contamination project) have already been delivered.

Comment: You state that the goal of the TAPP program is to enhance the public's ability to participate in the IR cleanup by improving their understanding of the process yet you list community outreach as an ineligible project.

Response: I cannot speak more definitively about that.

Comment: Can you provide an example of the type of project we might find useful?

Response: The third project listed under the NAS North Island pilot, a technical assessment of shoreline sediments, would certainly be an example of a pertinent study.

Comment: This program was originally begun to assist non-NPL sites because they were not eligible to apply for EPA's TAG program funds.

Jim Shafer stated that the budget cycle he meets each fiscal year to request cleanup funds for NETC begins in September. To the extent that coordination is feasible, he can increase his request to match the amount of funding this RAB might apply for. If TAPP project information is available by that time, it may end up increasing the dollar amount he has to cleanup NETC IR sites.

Comment: Who will write the application?

Response: The RAB must articulate the project; the NETC Environmental Division can take over from there.

It was agreed that the Project Committee would take the lead in exploring possible projects. Kathy Abbass offered a potential study: determining how bad the waste at Derecktor Shipyard is compared to other Narragansett Bay shipyards. If contamination at other yards is comparable to Derecktor, she wonders why the Navy should be singled out to remediate their site? Dave Dorocz suggested the Project Committee compile a list of potential projects. NETC will assist in determining whether they are eligible for funding.

PRESENTATION ON THE BACKGROUND STUDY WORK PLAN

Steve Parker of Tetra Tech NUS provided a presentation on the NETC soil background work plan. The draft report was forwarded to the regulators last week; committee chairs received copies with their handouts. The purpose of the study is to identify a range of background levels for all SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and metals contaminants potentially found on Aquidneck Island that can be used to compare against site-specific data collected from each IR site. Conducting this study NETC-wide as opposed to developing a range for each of the IR sites should reduce the time and cost for each cleanup.

Determining the background (or reference) level involves identifying both the naturally occurring contaminant levels (from rock breakdown and decomposition of organic matter) and those present from widespread industrial/human activity (such as atmospheric fallout, pesticide application, and roadway runoff). Once background ranges are established, they can be compared with IR site data to come up with logical site cleanup levels.

SVOCs include phthalates from plastics residue and PAHs, which are a component of fossil fuels. Pesticides are included because much of western Aquidneck Island once was farm land. PCBs may be present because they are widely found in industrial areas. Natural metals can be present from rock breakdown. Specifically, there seems to be an elevated level of arsenic on the Island that is significantly higher than the state's published average arsenic background level. We need to identify a level more accurately reflecting its actual presence on the Island.

The twenty potential background sample locations are represented by red dots on the view graph. These locations were chosen because these areas have the least amount of physical disturbance based on aerial photographs, a site walk, and discussion with the Navy War College museum curator. Each dot represents an area from 200 to 300 feet across. However, the actual sample will be collected from an area about the size of a fist. To ensure that the results will be accepted by the regulators, we anticipate conducting visits to each sampling area with representatives from EPA and RIDEM. Nearby pine trees can result in high PAH readings; oaks tend to make soil more acidic. Everyone needs to agree on the exact sample location. The precise spots can be marked with a stake after agreement is reached.

The samples will be analyzed and validated to ensure the laboratory analysis was performed correctly. The results will be evaluated to see if there is a normal distribution of data. The 95 percent confidence interval will be determined so we can use the data with a relatively high degree of confidence. The findings will be documented in a stand-alone report that can be used for each IR site.

Comment: What do the dots represent?

Response: They are mix of Navy and non-Navy property. For example, one is at the Melville Ponds Walking Area. Another is at Memorial Park, on town property.

Comment: When do you expect to undertake the project?

Response: The draft work plan was sent to the regulators last week and we anticipate a period for comments. After agreement, the actual sampling could be completed in 2 to 3 weeks. We could have the report a month and a half later.

Comment: Have you talked with entities such as the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service about soil types that may be present?

Response: Yes. We have lots of data on metals concentrations in soil. In addition, the state has released a list of background concentrations they established based on samples collected in the Providence area. The regulations allow us to establish more precise background levels for areas with different characteristics.

Comment: This is more than an engineering exercise. Soil types can effect drainage, and whether and how contaminant migration may occur. Aquidneck Island has clayey soils. In addition, contaminants can release metals formerly bound to native soil.

Comment: Why are you looking for naturally occurring concentrations?

Response: We need to establish the "upgradient" condition to IR sites to quantify how much contamination exists in the absence of any Navy IR site-specific influence.

Comment: How far are the sampling points from the shoreline? Are some on private property?

Response: They are approximately a quarter mile from the shore. Most are on Navy property.

Comment: Where is the sampling location at the Melville site?

Response: In the area of the ponds near the waterfall.

Comment: Are you taking any samples near the beach at Melville?

Response: No. We want to stay away from known contaminated areas.

Comment: Why aren't you doing a background study for each IR site?

Response: RIDEM's site remediation regulations allow studies to be conducted to better identify local background levels. We plan to use the proposed background analysis for upcoming work at Melville North Landfill. The state's arsenic background number (1.7 ppm) is very conservative, so it is important that we establish local background ranges when conditions here are different from the locations on which the state based its results.

Jim Shafer requested that Paul Kulpa send him a pamphlet the state prepared discussing how the RIDEM background numbers were derived.

Comment: Will you normalize your data to AVS/SEM and/or TOC (interpolate to assess whether contaminants that bind to soils make them less toxic)?

Response: No. This is not an evaluation of risk from those upgradient soils, so that type of information is not relevant to this study.

Comment: How many samples will you be collecting at Tank Farm Five?
Response: Four dots are present in that site area, but the samples for this study will be collected along the fence line.

Comment: Are you looking for the RAB's support for this study?
Response: The purpose of my presentation is to help the RAB understand how federal tax dollars are being spent. Paul requested that RAB members share any information they may have about activities that could have contributed to contamination in the proposed sampling areas.

Comment: Are the procedures you are using for this study considered standard procedures?
Response: There is nothing remarkable about these procedures. These types of investigations have been performed at a number of places. Jennifer Stump, EPA's consultant, stated that these kinds of investigations generally do not include any organics. Kymberlee offered that for the New London sites, they used an organics background level of zero.

Comment: How are you going to use these data? Will you average all the core results? What about analysis of discrete samples versus composite (mixed) samples.
Response: We expect to take one core per sample. Paul explained that RIDEM would not allow compositing in this case and why it would be counter-productive in a background study. If you composited the soil from five samples and the results showed elevated concentrations, you would not know whether all five sampling locations were contaminated or whether only one was; it could have been material from just one location that contaminated the clean soil from the other four locations when it was mixed. We are trying to locate areas to sample at which no spills or direct contamination has occurred.

Comment: I'm not sure your approach to sample collection is appropriate. Has anyone at Tetra Tech had any sampling theory courses?
Response: Yes. Sampling is specifically designed to find clean areas so it is not a random sampling approach. This is similar to the way we collect samples at a spill site, where we specifically design a plan to find the most contaminated areas. Paul Kulpa elaborated on this approach describing a hypothetical spill and stated that if samples from different locations were mixed, the result might be an inappropriate decision to not clean it up.

Comment: What will the background study cost?
Response: We anticipate it will cost approximately \$50,000. Since analysis of each sample costs about \$1,000, nearly half of the total is earmarked for laboratory analysis.

VISIT BY NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, AN ADJUNCT TO THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Jim mentioned that he lead a tour for the group that morning to McAllister Point Landfill and Derecktor Shipyard. He introduced two of the members, who were present at the RAB meeting. They had discussions about Tank Farm Five and Melville North Landfill. This afternoon they toured Davisville. The group will be meeting with EPA and RIDEM staff tomorrow. The state people they will interview work on brownfields projects; part of the meeting, at the Ocean Cliff Hotel, is open to the public.

One of the group members explained that their task is to recommend changes to the Navy's procedures to enhance its risk-based cleanup decision making. Their site visits will be complete after this leg of the assignment; a report should be issued in the October/November timeframe that will be sent to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Comment: Can you make any forecasts about your findings? Will it bear on the reauthorization of CERCLA?

Response: Until the council has met and made its recommendations, comment would be premature. However, there seems to be a general movement toward ensuring risk-based remedies.

Comment: How do Risk-Based Corrective Actions (RBCA) differ from CERCLA risk-based cleanups?

Response: RBCA was developed originally for leaking underground storage tanks. It uses a tiered approach. The first tier involves looking up the numbers that would apply to that type of site. If those numbers are deemed too conservative, site-specific risk-based numbers can be developed.

DISCUSSION OF ELECTION OF A NEW COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR

Dave Dorocz asked the community members how they wished to proceed with the election. Five names were placed in nomination: Kathy Abbass, Byron Hall, and Claudette Weissinger declined the nomination. The other two nominees were Dave Brown and Tom McGrath, who was not present. It was agreed that the election would be conducted at the May RAB meeting.

Because the meeting was running late, it was agreed to postpone the discussion of the RAB budget and the quarterly newsletter to the May RAB meeting.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 20, 1998. The agenda includes electing a new Community Co-chair, and discussing the RAB budget and the draft NETC quarterly newsletter.

Handouts:

- RAB Review Dates Calendar
- View graphs of the Soil Background study presentation
- View graphs of the TAPP program presentation
- Comments (NOAA, AICAB, and RAB) and Navy responses on the draft McAllister Point Landfill FS
- NETC RAB meeting comment sheet

Enclosures:

- NETC RAB Committee Member Roster
- NETC RAB Community Members
- Tom McGrath's recommendations for ensuring more effective cleanup methods
- Article from the Newsletter of the International Association for Impact Assessment offered by Dave Brown