

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 11, 1991
TRC MEETING

DRAFT

TO: NSB-NLON TRC Members

FROM: Paul Burgess, Project Manager
Atlantic Environmental Services

SUBJECT: Technical Review Committee Meeting - April 11, 1991
Installation Restoration Study
Naval Submarine Base - New London
Groton, Connecticut
N62472-88-C1294
Atlantic Project No.: 1256-10-90

ATTENDEES:

The following people signed the attendance sheet for the meeting:

Adrienne Townsel	NORTHDIV, Project Manager
Eileen Neilands	NORTHDIV
Commander Nelson Goddard	NSB-NLON
William Mansfield	NSB-NLON
Richard Massad	NSB-NLON
Norman Richards	Consultant to City of Groton
Robert Fromer	LEAF
Fritz Smith	COMSUBGRU TWO
Ron Ochsner	Pepe & Hazard
Paul Marchessault	USEPA
Paul Arnold	Alliance Technologies
Tony Bobowicz	CTDEP
Paul Jameson	CTDEP
Paul Burgess	Atlantic Environmental Services, Inc.
Lynn Metcalf	Atlantic Environmental Services, Inc.
Charles Menzie	Atlantic Consultant

Commander Goddard initiated the meeting and welcomed all attendees.

Paul Burgess, Atlantic Project Manager, provided a handout summarizing the results of Offsite Residential Well Sampling and Sampling at Area A, DRMO, and Goss Cove Landfill.

Mr. Burgess summarized the status of the Installation Restoration study. The field work has been completed and the Remedial Investigation Report is scheduled to be released by the Navy in August of 1991.

Mr. Burgess supplemented the information provided in the handout with a slide presentation. The following site-specific questions and comments were discussed during the slide presentation.

Residential Well Sampling Results: The discrepancy between the cadmium levels at OSW-6 during the first and second round of sampling was discussed. TRC members asked if a reason for the discrepancy had been found. Possible explanations were discussed and included changing patterns of water quality in the subject well and nearby wells. Mr. Burgess explained that, prior to sample collection, each well was run continuously for twenty minutes. This procedure was used consistently on both sampling rounds. Atlantic will examine CTDEP Well Completion Records to determine physical characteristics of the offsite residential wells, as well as home plumbing types.

Mr. Paul Jameson, CTDEP, asked if the owner of OSW-6 had been notified of the second round of results. It was explained that owners will be notified at tonight's public meeting.

Area A: The results from sediment sampling at Area A were presented and questions about the results of biota sampling in this area were deferred to a later discussion of the risk assessment by Dr. Charles Menzie.

Following the slide presentation, Charles Menzie, an Atlantic consultant, provided an overview of the Risk Assessment. Dr. Menzie provided a handout which detailed Risk Assessment activities. The following questions and comments were discussed by Dr. Menzie and the TRC members.

Biota Sampling: Laboratory analyses of bird tissue from birds collected in the Area A Wetland showed low levels (below Contract Required Detection Limits) of DDE. Laboratory analyses of sediments from the same area showed low levels of similar pesticides, however, laboratory analyses of sediments from the Area A Downstream water courses showed elevated levels of DDD, DDE and DDT. No biota sampling was done in this area. Dr. Menzie explained that biota sampling was completed before the analytical results of sediment sampling were available, and thus was conducted in the areas where they suspected that pesticides had been applied, i.e., the Area A Wetland. Given the low levels of pesticides detected in the Area A wetland, it is not surprising that biota living and feeding there should exhibit only very low levels of pesticides. Another explanation for the low levels of pesticides may be that the Area A Downstream area is only a small part of the habitat of the birds that were collected in the Area A Wetland. A better indicator of the effect of high levels of pesticides in sediments would be organisms that live in the ponds and streambeds in the Area A Downstream area.

Mr. Fromer suggested that in the future, sampling in the Area A Downstream area should start at the bottom of the food chain and should include both organisms that live there as well as those that go there to feed. Dr. Menzie explained that the present approach of sampling predators at the top of the food chain was the best way to assess whether bioaccumulation of pesticides was a problem. Future studies of biota will most likely be concentrated in areas such as the Area A Downstream Watercourses where contaminants were detected in elevated concentrations.

Dr. Richards asked where the river sediment samples were collected and from what depth they were collected. Lynn Metcalf, Atlantic, reported that the samples were collected directly in front of the outfalls within the Thames River, from a sediment depth of 0 to 6 inches.

Dr. Menzie reported that he had compiled a list of potential receptors. The list was provided in the Risk Assessment summary handout.

Dr. Menzie reported that he was doing risk calculations using both a lifetime exposure scenario and a short term (five years) exposure scenario. The five year exposure scenario is more typical of conditions at the site. Paul Marchessault, USEPA, commented that at another military base in the region, a two year exposure scenario was being used for risk calculations. It was agreed that the calculations should be performed as Dr. Menzie had planned. The question was asked, what if there is a risk under one scenario and not another. This issue will be decided later if necessary.

Questions were raised about what exposure scenarios the risk assessment model considers. Dr. Richards was concerned about the cumulative effects of occupational and incremental exposure to persons working on the subbase but living in the nearby community. Dr. Menzie indicated that although the comment was valid, it is not included in USEPA's risk assessment guidelines, which are being used for this study.

Paul Marchessault, USEPA, asked if ground water results from 2DMW16S and 2DMW16D were available yet and if discharging of ground water to North Lake was a problem. Mr. Burgess replied that the unvalidated analytical results showed 30 to 40 ppb of volatile contaminants in the bedrock well. In response to the second question, he reported that shallow ground water appears to seep into the lake especially when the water levels in the lake were low, however, the bedrock aquifer does not appear to discharge to the lake.

Mr. Marchessault asked what kind of access there is to the area of highest pesticide concentration. Mr. Burgess replied that the area with the greatest concentration of contaminants is located approximately 300 feet upstream from the public recreation area at North Lake.

Several committee members asked if Atlantic planned to do any ground water flow mapping in the bedrock aquifer. Mr. Burgess replied that Atlantic is assessing ground water flow direction in the bedrock aquifer, based on the available data.

Mr. Burgess asked Paul Jameson, CTDEP, if future CTDEP soil cleanup standards would be the same as current CTDEP soil cleanup guidelines. Mr. Jameson replied that the state was still in the process of establishing the standards.

Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Jameson about the CTDEP cleanup guidelines for PCBs in soil and ground water. Mr. Jameson reported that the guidelines were 1 ppb in ground water and that soil was decided on a site specific basis.

Mr. Marchessault reported that the Interagency Agreement had been delayed for at least a month. The parties involved will start working on it again around May 1, 1991.