



TETRA TECH NUS, INC.

55 Janspin Road • Wilmington, MA 01887-1000
Tel 978 658 7899 • Fax 978 658 7870 • www.tetrattech.com

N62661 AR.002064
NAVSTA NEWPORT RI
5090.3a

3776

C-NAVY-06-06-2134W

June 21, 2006

Project Number GN1611

Mr. James Colter
Remedial Project Manager
EFA Northeast, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-03-D-0057
Contract Task Order No. 008

Subject: RPM Meeting Minutes - May 17, 2006
NAVSTA Newport, Newport Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Colter:

Attached for your information are minutes to the RPMs meeting held on Wednesday May 17, 2006 at NAVSTA Newport, in Newport, Rhode Island. Per your request, copies of this material have been provided to those on the transmittal list below for their review and or records.

If you have any questions on this material, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Stephen S. Parker, LSP
Project Manager

SSP/rp

Enclosure

- c: K. Keckler, USEPA (w/encl.)
- P. Kulpa, RIDEM (w/encl.)
- C. Mueller, NAVSTA (w/encl.)
- J. Trepanowski/G. Glenn, TtNUS (w/encl.)
- File GN1611-3.2 (w/o encl.) File GN1611-8.0 (w/encl.)

Meeting Notes
RPMs Meeting, May 17, 2006
NAVSTA Newport, Newport Rhode Island
Building 1

Meeting Convened at 1530

Present: J. Colter, EFANE
K. Keckler, USEPA
P. Kulpa, RIDEM
C. Mueller, NAVSTA
S. Parker, TtNUS

J. Colter opened the meeting and stated that he requested the meeting to bring himself up to date on each site regarding current status and next steps. He also noted that his intention is to make sure everybody has proper scopes to keep things moving along while his office moves and during the associated disarray this summer.

K. Keckler reiterated her priorities for the sites as follows – OFFTA, Derecktor, Gould. She stated that it would be helpful if a basewide schedule was developed, but these three sites should have schedules in particular. Progress on these sites needs to be made. J. Colter noted that next steps for OFFTA will be scheduled soon, as the Tiger Team completes their work. Others can be discussed as needed today or in separate meetings.

McAllister Landfill

Elgrass replanting contract was awarded to Battelle with end of year FY05 funds. The final planting work plan has been completed and submitted, and the field work is scheduled for the next few weeks. P. Kulpa said that he had comments to the final work plan (emailed last week). C. Mueller noted that Battelle provided a response and they seemed to think these issues had already been addressed. P. Kulpa stated that he still had three concerns:

1. The southern area may be impacted by sedimentation (from Deerfield Creek outfall) – C. Mueller stated that they were aware of this and had determined that the planting area could be shifted slightly to avoid sedimentation from this outfall. P. Kulpa said OK.
2. P. Kulpa asked if the eastern planting areas was in a cobble area or trench previously identified, and was the cobble area growing due to currents in this area? Paul provided two suggestions – either drop 2-3 turfs in this area and see if they take, then if they do, complete the planting next year – or – first determine if the cobble area is growing by monitoring it for a year then plant turfs where they are most likely to take. After some discussion it was stated that the contract and the effort was too far along to be revised to this extent now – the agreement last year had been to conduct one more round of planting using the best methods agreed on by the lead scientists involved, and this is what is reflected in the work plan.

3. P. Kulpa also stated that the density of planting seemed inadequate. This was also discussed, and it was noted that density of shoot planting was to be a field decision based on the materials and currents encountered by the field scientists.

J. Colter stated that P. Kulpa's concerns are known to the contractor and the field scientists and they will be addressed in the field.

The Final Work Plan for Long Term Monitoring submitted October 2005: There was correspondence from EPA and RIDEM requesting clarification on the decision process to terminate the monitoring after the data showed acceptable conditions as described in the work plan. It was noted that the Navy intends to respond to that correspondence with an addendum (statement) for the work plan as clarification. However, in the meantime, the monitoring will be ongoing in accordance with the final Work Plan.

Summary of Landfill Gas Data was sent to the regulators on July 26, 2005, comments were received from RIDEM dated August 24, 2005, and from EPA dated August 18, 2005. A second, more detailed summary was provided 11/11/05 with responses to these comments. This detailed data summary was prepared in response to the request from RIDEM to break out the monitoring data graphically for each monitoring point. P. Kulpa stated that RIDEM responded to that submittal. S. Parker stated that he was not aware of any correspondence on this matter since November 11 2005, but would check his files.

POSTSCRIPT – C. Frye reviewed correspondence and agreed that the Navy had received no correspondence from RIDEM on TtNUS' data submittal November 11, 2005. The next step is to receive any additional comments from EPA or RIDEM on the Navy's desire to run an air model.

Former Melville Landfill

S. Parker noted that there is RIDEM correspondence outstanding on the Melville North Landfill, and the Navy intends to respond to that correspondence. To summarize, the work there is considered complete by the Navy, since two rounds of groundwater data does not exceed State criteria (State lead cleanup). P. Kulpa stated that the Navy needs to show 8 quarterly rounds of data to show the criteria are met. In addition, if there is a quarter that shows conditions worse than the other, four rounds during that season would be required, and available data to date can be used to help make this determination. S. Parker inquired what regulations state these requirements, P. Kulpa stated it is in the UST regulations. S. Parker noted that the Remediation Regulations were used to clean up the site and there are no exceedances of groundwater criteria as cited in those regulations (clarification for these minutes: compliance has been demonstrated in accordance with 8.10B of those regulations).

Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area

C. Mueller stated that the fence has been partially completed and the frontage along Coddington Highway will be completed by June. The next step for this site is an SASE work plan currently planned for 07 or 08.

NUSC Disposal Area

RI Work Plan - S. Parker stated that the responses to comments on the Draft RI work plan for NUSC disposal area are being completed and will be sent out within the week. The Draft Final RI work plan will be forthcoming estimated July 1.

NUSC Background Soil Report – S. Parker stated that the background soil investigation report had been submitted, comments had been received from EPA dated 5/9/06. P. Kulpa stated that the state would be submitting comments on the report.

Removal Actions – C. Mueller stated that the removal action reports would be out by the end of May. K. Keckler noted that these are important, because EPA tracks closing out the removal actions as a completion of one step and beginning the next step. Final reports will be completed by the end of the year, as long as the comment period does not get drawn out. It was requested that the reports be titled as “interim removal actions”.

Old Fire Fighting Training Area

Sediment and Groundwater Report – S. Parker noted that comments on the final report were received from RIDEM (4/24/06) and that those comments may be responded to, but there doesn't seem to be much point in revising the report, as it is a secondary document noting conditions as of 2005. The larger matter is next steps for the site and the Tiger Teams recommendations.

Tiger Team review – Minutes to the meeting April 13 are being drafted and will be released soon. Comments to the Conceptual Site model have been received from RIDEM and EPA and a response letter will be sent out. It is unclear as to whether the Tiger Team will issue a report of findings or what format that report will be.

The Removal Actions will be continued as modified by the teams recommendations, and the FS will be revised. The FS revision will include the revised Conceptual Site Model, additional risk evaluations as discussed at the meeting 4/13/06 and other alternatives identified by the Tiger Team. Responses on the comments to the CSM received from RIDEM and EPA would be submitted. K. Keckler requested no delay on the next phase removal action work plan. J. Colter noted that funding is limited now and beginning the removal action may have to wait until the the next FY, but first the Navy needs to determine what contract vehicle will be used for the next phase construction work.

Tank Farms

Tank Farms 4 & 5 Removals - C. Mueller stated that the piles at the site will begin to be moved off site. P. Kulpa asked if the excavations around the switch houses had been completed, what the results in the soil were (lead below 150 mg/kg?). C. Mueller said she was not sure, and would check for Paul. It was noted that Janice McIntosh was leaving TtEC and Chuck Collett would be taking over for her (talking at the RAB tonight). The close out report for the removals would be drafted soon and finalized by January 2007. The excavation areas would be smoothed out and seeded to retain the soil and prevent erosion, but not with permanent or wetland vegetation.

Next steps are to do an RI to document risks associated with the site. P. Kulpa requested the southern end of the excavation may still contain some petroleum, so please don't bulldoze that area. It was agreed to not do further earthwork other than to remove the waste piles and smooth the excavation cuts.

Tanks 53 and 56 – K. Keckler stated that a ROD is needed, but whether it is a ROD for the two tanks alone or for the whole of Tank Farm 5 is up for discussion. If a ROD for Tank Farm 5 as a whole is not far away, we can wait. But if it is far away, a NFA PRAP and ROD for the two tanks is appropriate. J. Colter stated that after the removal report for Tank Farm 5 (TtEC) is in and he sees what funding is available for that site he will know which way to go.

Gould Island

S. Parker stated that the Draft RI Report was completed and submitted May 12. P. Kulpa and K. Keckler noted they had received their copies.

Derecktor

S. Parker asked P. Kulpa if he had made progress on the action item regarding mapping the areas of Coddington Cove that RIDEM feels need to be dredged (original request was made by the Navy and the EPA April 2004). P. Kulpa stated that he had made up some maps and would copy them and send them out soon. K. Keckler requested a separate meeting be held on this site after those maps had been issued.

C. Mueller updated the group on the status of the aircraft carriers at Pier 1. The Forrestal (south side of Pier 1) completed the cleanout for "Sinkex" and is now undergoing a second, more thorough effort for "Reefex", which is a more thorough cleaning, anticipated for one year. There is still no plan for disposal of the Saratoga, located on the north side of Pier 1, although a group is trying to secure funding for acquiring it as a museum. She noted that even after the cleaning of the Forrestal is completed there is no immediate plan for sinking it, but if a site comes available it would be ready. She also noted that a bathymetric study was conducted to determine if the ships were bottoming on the sediment, and this study shows that they are not, but they are afloat through the tide cycle. The bathymetric study report is in preparation.

Building 62 – S. Parker noted that the Navy intends to provide a letter on the subject of Building 62, stating that it was not part of the IR Site 19. P. Kulpa stated that, the state just wants the Building 62 site cleaned up.

SWOS

S. Parker stated that the Navy believes that the SWOS site is part of OFFTA and should be combined and addressed as a single site. Concurrence on this recommendation was received from EPA, but RIDEM disagrees per their comment letter 4/24/06. P. Kulpa stated that RIDEM believes that there are two source areas and should be separate sites. S. Parker stated that the Navy will respond to their comments on the Draft Final RI Report, but the recommendation to combine the sites and address them under a single ROD currently stands.

Melville Water Tower

C. Mueller described a new IR program study area, the Water Tower on West Main Road, Portsmouth Rhode Island. The Site is to be added to the IR program because elevated concentrations of lead appear to be present in the soil, under the tower - not from flaking and degradation but from a previously conducted uncontrolled scraping and painting operation. K. Keckler stated yes, the EPA will need to be involved, and requested a letter to add the site as a Study Area. J. Colter stated that a draft soil investigation work plan would be made available in June, and as soon as the current encapsulation project is completed and the scaffolding is removed, the soil sampling will be conducted. A fact sheet will be prepared to notify abutters and parents (& community as a whole) of their intention to do the soil investigation, and an open house will be conducted when the data is compiled.

Basewide Background Work Plan

S. Parker stated that the responses to comments to the basewide background work plan were sent recently, and the final work plan was in process to be issued this week. Field work is planned for this summer.

Carr Point

Next step is to add the site to the FFA by letter identifying it as a Study Area. A site investigation is budgeted for FY06.

The meeting adjourned at 1745