



N62661.AR.000566  
NAVSTA NEWPORT RI  
5090.3a

55 Jonspin Road  
Wilmington, MA 01887

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

C-52-5-5-2288W

Project Number 1703

May 11, 1995

Ms. Deborah Carlson  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
10 Industrial Highway, Mailstop 82  
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113-2090

Reference: Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298, Navy (CLEAN)  
Contract Task Order No. 0173

Subject: Final Minutes to the Thirtieth Technical Review Committee Meeting,  
SASE Work Plan, Derecktor Shipyard

Dear Ms. Carlson:

The final minutes of the thirtieth Technical Review Committee Meeting for the SASE Work Plan for Derecktor Shipyard are enclosed.

I understand that you are going to distribute these minutes to the meeting attendees with your cover letter, and so at your request, I have not included attachments.

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Stephen S. Parker  
Project Manager

SSP/gmd

Enclosure

c: J. Trepanowski, M. Turco, Halliburton NUS (w/encl)  
File 1703-3.3 (w/encl)  
File 1703-3.2 (w/out encl)

5/13/95 CC: PROJECT FILE  
CONTRACT FILE

1015

**THIRTIETH TRC MEETING MINUTES  
NAVY INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM  
NAVAL EDUCATION & TRAINING CENTER (NETC)  
NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND**

**April 18, 1995**

**HALLIBURTON NUS CORPORATION  
CONTRACT NO. N62472-90-D-1298  
CONTRACT TASK ORDER NO. 0173**

**Prepared By:  
Stephen S. Parker  
Project Manager**

**Prepared For:  
Ms. Deborah Carlson  
Remedial Project Manager  
U.S. Navy, Northern Division**

## **MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

---

**APRIL 18, 1995**

The thirtieth Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting for the Naval Education and Training Center was held in Building 1 of the Naval Education & Training Center in Newport, Rhode Island on April 18, 1995 at 10:00 am to discuss the Draft Site Assessment and Screening Evaluation (SASE) Work Plan for Derecktor Shipyard. Attachment A presents a list of meeting attendees. It should be noted that no community representatives were at the meeting and EPA Region I was represented by the oversight contractor (CDM Federal). Attachment B includes the meeting handout distributed by Ms. Deborah Carlson, and Attachment C includes the meeting handout distributed by Mr. Stephen Parker. The minutes of the meeting follow.

### **OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTION - Deborah Carlson, U.S. Navy, Northern Division**

An introduction and overview of Derecktor Shipyard was provided by Ms. Deborah Carlson. This overview can be found in Attachment B and was based, for the most part, on the findings of the Preliminary Assessment performed by ENSR in January 1993 under subcontract to Halliburton NUS (HNUS). The following is a summary of the presentation.

#### **History of Derecktor Shipyard**

- Derecktor Shipyard, a 41 acre site located at NETC, Newport along Coddington Cove, was leased to the Rhode Island Port Authority (RIPA) in 1979 and subleased to R. Derecktor for industrialized repair, maintenance, and construction of private and military ships until 1992.
- R. Derecktor filed for bankruptcy in January 1992 and abandoned the site in October 1992. Derecktor Shipyard was added as a Study Area to the Federal Facilities Agreement in November 1992.
- A Preliminary Site Assessment was conducted in January 1993, and the final report was issued in May 1993. A bankruptcy auction was conducted in February 1993.
- NETC conducted a sediment study and prepared an underwater video during the fall of 1993, and performed surface cleanup in the fall of 1994. \$ 1 M has been allocated by Senator Chafee for environmental cleanup at Derecktor Shipyard during FY 95. The Navy and RIPA are currently discussing cleanup liability, and performing an investigation of the bermed material at the south waterfront.

#### **Preliminary Site Assessment**

- A Preliminary Site Assessment was completed by ENSR in May 1993, the purpose of which was to determine the presence and nature of hazardous materials used and/or disposed of at the site, the nature of the materials present, and the potential for past and current releases of hazardous substances to the environment.
- The scope of the PA involved a detailed site inspection of the shipyard, records searches at Derecktor Shipyard, NETC Newport, Public Works, RIDEM, and EPA Region I, and personal interviews of Derecktor employees.

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

- General findings indicated use of large quantities of waste oils, paints, solvents, thinners, sodium hydroxide and other waste liquids and solids, improper housekeeping and hazardous material handling practices, onsite disposal of waste materials including spent sand blast grit and oily liquids, and the presence of sand-blast grit and metals-contaminated marine sediments in the Bay around Pier I.

### **Building 2**

- Concrete masonry building built in 1942 and used for warehouse and office space had a low potential for impact to the environment, but asbestos containing material should be confirmed through testing and abandoned drums and debris should be removed.

### **Building 3**

- Concrete masonry building built in 1942 and used for warehouse space had a low potential for impact to the environment, but asbestos containing material should be confirmed through testing and abandoned drums and debris should be removed.

### **Building 4**

- Concrete masonry building built in 1942, used by the Navy for warehouse and shipping space and used by Derecktor for shop space, had a low potential for impact to the environment, but containers of oil, solvents and other products should be properly collected and disposed, and asbestos containing material should be confirmed through testing.

### **Building 4 1/2**

- Constructed by Derecktor by enclosing the areas between Buildings 4 and 5 with a roof and a southern wall and used by Derecktor as a machine shop and by the Navy for a railroad spur. The area had a low potential for impact to the environment.

### **Building 5**

- Concrete masonry building built in 1942, used by the Navy for warehouse space and by Derecktor for office and warehouse space with one section of the building used for fiberglass molding and curing. The building had a low potential for impact to the environment, but exterior debris should be cleared, abandoned drums should be removed and disposed, and asbestos containing material should be confirmed through testing.
- LTCMDR Borowy confirmed that the 10,000 gallon steel underground storage tank has been removed by NETC in accordance with UST regulations, and no leaks were found.

### **Building 6**

- Concrete masonry building built in 1942, used by the Navy for warehouse and storage space and by Derecktor as a pipe shop, warehouse, electric shop and storage space. The building had a moderate to significant potential for impact to the environment and warrants further investigation.

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

### **Building 40**

- Quonset metal hut constructed by the Navy in 1951 and disassembled by Derecktor and reconstructed into 3 smaller sections used as vehicle maintenance garages and an employee locker room. A significant potential for impact to the environment exists and further investigation is warranted in addition to removal and disposal of abandoned drums and debris.

### **Building 41**

- Quonset metal hut constructed by the Navy in 1951 and disassembled by Derecktor and reconstructed into 2 smaller sections apparently used for storage. A low potential for impact to the environment exists, but debris and abandoned containers should be removed and disposed.

### **Building 42**

- One story brick and masonry building built in 1954 and used as a cold storage warehouse by the Navy, and used by Derecktor for hazardous waste storage, paint mixing and dispensing, solvent recovery, electric wire and cable storage, and prefabrication of duct work for ships, and storage of shipboard insulation. A significant potential for impact to the environment exists, and recommendations include further testing of sandblast grit, investigation of impacts to the marine environment, removal and disposal of debris, abandoned containers and drums, testing of asbestos containing material, and further investigations in building interior.

### **Building 234**

- Built in 1956 possibly on fill materials was used by the Navy for assembly and stockpiling of materials prior to loading, and enlarged by Derecktor by enclosing the structure with a new building and used for ship fabrication and assembly. A significant potential for impact to the environment exists, and recommendations include further testing of sandblast grit, investigation of impacts to the marine environment, removal and disposal of debris, abandoned containers and drums, removal of two 10,000 gallon USTs, and investigation of floor drains.

### **Building 18**

- Wooden structure built in 1943 on the pier near the Yard Patrol Berthing Area and used by the Navy for a coal barge offloading facility, and by Derecktor as doctor's office, central control/operator area, office space and various workshops. A low to moderate potential for impact to the environment exists, and abandoned containers should be removed and disposed, and the drain system should be investigated for possible discharge to the cove.

### **Building 62**

- Concrete block building built in 1957 and used by the Navy as a gasoline/service station, and by Derecktor as a security office and fire station. A low to moderate potential for impact to the environment exists, and the number of removed tanks should be further investigated.

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

### **Waterfront Area**

- Area located between Building 234 and Pier II used by the Navy for mooring of patrol boats and as a parking lot, and used by Derecktor for storage of equipment, hazardous waste storage, and mooring of support boats and barges. A significant potential for impact to the environment exists warranting removal and disposal of debris, trash, abandoned drums and tanks, treated pilings and transformers, and investigation of subsurface soils and storm drain outfalls.

### **Pier I**

- Constructed by the Navy in 1955 of reinforced concrete pilings and wooden fenders, the pier was used by Derecktor ship repair, sandblasting, painting, hull inspection and flushing of shipboard piping systems. Six buildings located on the pier were used by the Navy as garbage stands and transformer stations. A significant potential for impact to the environment exists warranting investigation of impacts to the marine environment and removal and disposal of debris, drums, and cylinders.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

- The PA recommended a general cleanup of the facility which has already been completed by NETC Newport including surface cleanup in Areas 1, 2, and 3, and Buildings 6 and 42 (refer to Attachment B for a map indicating locations of areas); interior cleaning of buildings 2, 3, and 4 including MERCVAC of Building 4; removal of creosote poles, sonar dome, tires, PCB transformer, and ammonia cylinders; installation of a fence; limited study of groundwater flow around building 42; and removal of underground storage tanks at Buildings 5 and 234.
- Survey, inspection and/or removal of USTs and ASTs, storm drain evaluation, and building interior sampling will be addressed by the SASE.
- Asbestos containing material and lead paint should be confirmed and removed prior to renovation/demolition.
- No further investigations are necessary at Buildings 2, 3, 4, 4 1/2, 5, 41, and 18.
- Areas warranting further investigation include Building 6, 40, 42, 234, 62, the waterfront area, and the marine environment.

### **OVERVIEW OF GROUNDWATER STUDIES - Todd Bober, U.S. Navy, Northern Division**

A summary of the results of a groundwater study performed by TRC Corporation around Building 42 was presented. Varying groundwater flow directions indicated that tidal flushing is occurring around Building 42. Water level in the area ranges from approximately 10 feet to 12 feet.

Analytical results of the 3 shallow wells around Building 42 showed elevated levels of chlorides and metals including arsenic, chromium, lead, and nickel. Reasons given to explain these elevated levels were the inability to develop these wells to clarity, the fact that metals are naturally occurring, and the possibility that metals could be leaching from buried sandblast grit. Volatiles and semivolatiles were not detected at elevated levels as expected.

## **MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Soil results also indicated that metals were the primary contaminants of concern. High SVOC concentrations from 0 feet to 2 feet were found in one sample and may be the result of surface discharges of paint and other materials being mixed with the sandblast grit.

Ms. Mary Pothier (CDM) inquired about the depth of the bulkhead (sheet piling) located near Building 42 as it was not reported in the TRC Corporation report. The general consensus was that the depth of the sheet piling is unknown, and that sandblast grit or other materials may have been stored in that bulkhead thereby masking the true depth if measured.

A question was asked as to why Building 42 was selected for the groundwater study. Mr. Brad Wheeler (NETC) explained that the history of the building as a solvent recovery shop and storage building, as well as the existence of the sand blast material on the outside of the building provided a worst case scenario. In addition, an underwater video taken in the cove between piers 1 and 2 revealed significant impact to the marine environment.

Ms. Mary Pothier (CDM) asked about the sand blast grit and the use of the name "Black Beauty". Mr. Wheeler explained that Black Beauty is a trade name for a specific type of sandblast material which has been used at the site. Reference to Black Beauty with respect to this site indicates used sandblast grit which may be mixed with paint chips as a result of it's use.

### **PRESENTATION OF THE SASE WORK PLAN - Stephen S. Parker, Halliburton NUS Corporation**

Mr. Stephen Parker introduced his presentation by emphasizing that this work plan includes work on the terrestrial portions of the facility, and that off-shore activities are currently underway under a separate task. The handout presented is Attachment C of this document.

#### **Objectives of the SASE Field efforts**

The purpose of the SASE is to determine if the site is a threat to human health and the terrestrial environment, to provide data to be used to determine contaminant presence, make preliminary determinations of contaminant mobility, and make preliminary determinations of risk to human health; to provide data regarding former and current contaminant release points; and to assure data of adequate quality for inclusion in a baseline human health risk assessment.

#### **Descriptions of the SASE Field Efforts**

The work will focus on the North Waterfront Area, the Central Shipyard Area, the area around Building 234, and the South Waterfront Area, and involves the following six tasks:

- Task 1 - Mechanical Pits and Trenches Inspections - Involves pumping out and containerizing water, visual inspection, instrument inspection, and covering to prevent future water intrusion.
- Task 2 - Underground Drainage Systems Clearing and Tracking - Involves clearing debris, and locating and recording connections, discharge points or termination points of storm drains and floor drains.
- Task 3 - Test Pit Excavation and Sample Collection - Involves excavating 24 test pits to determine the extent of fill, to collect samples of sandblast and below sandblast fill, and to determine the nature of the material below the sandblast fill. Sample analysis

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

includes screening of 3 samples per pit for metals and VOCs, and random selection of 20% for laboratory analysis. Test pits will be backfilled.

- Task 4 - Geologic and Hydrogeologic Investigation - Target areas include site specific background target areas, target areas identified in the PA, and secondary target areas. Samples will be collected continuously at 24 inch intervals using hollow stem augers. All samples will be screened using XRF and a field GC. It is expected that 2 samples per borehole will be collected for laboratory analysis including VOCs, SVOCs, TAL metals, TCLP metals, Pesticide/PCBs, and Butyltins.

A groundwater elevation survey, hydraulic conductivity tests, and groundwater sample collection will all be performed under this task. High turbidity in groundwater may dictate the use of low-flow sample collection. None of the samples will be filtered, and turbidity will be monitored.

Mr. Todd Bober (NORTHDIV) expressed his concern regarding the fact that turbidity and salinity as well will fluctuate across the site, so how will we proceed? Mr. Stephen Parker (HNUS) stated that no samples are expected to be filtered regardless of the turbidity. Filtered samples could be collected, but there are data quality implications with that procedure. Mr. Brad Wheeler (NETC) added that the land classification for the area is industrial, and will never be residential, and therefore it shouldn't matter. Ms. Mary Pothier (CDM) stated that she recalled TRC had pumped some of the wells dry during their sample collections, and emphasized that proper use of low-flow should decrease the high turbidity problems without drying the well. Mr. Parker added that the method of the well installation might also be altered to help to alleviate the problem, but it is another manner of filtration which would then be a permanent function of the well.

- Task 5 - Catch Basin and Sump Sampling - Three samples per location will be collected from catch basins and mechanical pits with unconsolidated bottoms only using hand augers or hammer drills at 0.5 foot intervals to a maximum depth of 1.5 feet. Samples will be screened for metals and VOCs and 20 % will be selected for laboratory analysis.
- Task 6 - Floor Drain Discharge Area Sampling - Three to five borings will be advanced to a maximum depth of 6 feet below ground surface at discharge areas identified by subsurface utilities information. Samples will be collected continuously at 24 inch intervals. Samples will be screened for metals and VOCs and 20 % will be selected for laboratory analysis.

### Field Screening Techniques

#### XRF Screening

- Involves the use of a Spectrace or X-met 880 direct read X-ray fluorescence detector as an on-site analytical device similar to that used in Stratford, CT by EPA Region 1 when assessing properties for removal actions.

Ms. Mary Pothier (CDM) asked if there was ever a correlation made between the screening data and the laboratory analytical data. Mr. Stephen Parker stated that he could not remember if the results corresponded, but would look into it.

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

*Since the meeting, Mr. Stephen Parker checked with Mr. Scott Clifford at the USEPA ESD laboratory in Lexington, Massachusetts. Mr. Clifford reviewed XRF Screening data with CLP laboratory data and found excellent correlation for lead and copper in soils. Mr. Clifford also indicated that other parameters have not been vigorously examined but there is no reason to believe zinc and nickel should not correlate well.*

- QC procedures to be followed when using XRF include multiple reads from each sample and a QC standard run for every 10 field sample. No calibration standards apply.
- Target metals include copper, lead, nickel and zinc. Mr. Stephen Parker stated that chromium could also be added to that list based on the elevated results from the TRC report.

### GC Screening

- Involves the use of the Photovac 10S50 Field GC (photoionization detector) or its equivalent as an on-site analytical device.
- QC procedures include running calibration standards at startup, after every 10 samples, and at shutdown, zero air blanks run every 10 samples, duplicate samples run every 20 samples, and reagent water blanks run once every 20 samples.

### Laboratory Analysis

- Samples sent for laboratory analysis will be analyzed for TCL VOCs, TCL SVOCs including BNA compounds, Pesticides/PCBs, TAL metals, TCLP metals for sandblast materials, and butyltin compounds. Mr. Stephen Parker explained that butyltin compounds have been associated with bottom paints on ships, however, he does not believe that these paints are currently manufactured in the same manner.

### WRAP-UP

Mr. Todd Bober had a general comment indicating that once work begins, findings may indicate that no risk or no significant risk exists at certain portions of the study area which would allow for some areas to be re-utilized with Navy operations and more focused efforts on the remaining study areas.

Ms. Deborah Carlson presented a project status update.

Ecorisk and sediment sampling for McAllister Point is finishing up and a meeting will be set for some time in June to present the preliminary results.

The Phase II RI Investigations and Removal Action at Melville North Landfill will start in June.

Navy funding cuts may have an impact on work scheduled for Sites 4, 8, and 17.

The Navy is in the beginning stages of incorporating a risk ranking system to evaluate sites. The risk ranking is based on contaminants, migration pathways, and potential receptors. Currently McAllister Point Landfill and the Firefighter Training Area are ranked high, the Study Areas are ranked medium, and Tank Farms 4 and 5 are ranked low. Placement on the NPL

## MINUTES OF THE THIRTIETH TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

does not play a role in the ranking, (i.e. a site not on the NPL may get ranked higher than a site on the NPL).

The Navy is still-in the process of getting HNUS on board for assistance in transitioning the TRC to a Restoration Advisory Board. LCDR Borowy stressed that this action is a priority action.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 P.M., and the committee departed for a tour of the pump and treat system at Tank Farm 5.

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT SUMMARY HANDOUT**

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**SASE WORK PLAN HANDOUT**