RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD
KITTERY TOWN HALL, KITTERY, MAINE
June 2, 2009

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members at the meeting included the following:

- RAB community members – Doug Bogen, Peter Britz, Jon Carter, Diana McNabb, Mary Marshall, and Onil Roy.

- Navy RAB members – Linda Cole, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Mid-Atlantic, and Ken Plaisted and Lisa Joy, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNS).

- Regulatory representatives – Matt Audet, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and Iver McLeod, Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP).

- Community members Alan Davis, Michele Dionne, Jack McKenna, and Roger Wells were absent.

Guests at the RAB included:

- Robert Burley, Danna Eddy, John Gildersleeve, Jeff Hoyt, Frank Salantri, Herb Ueda, John Weyth, and Debbie White from PNS.

- Debbie Cohen and Tim Smith from Tetra Tech NUS, Inc. (TtNUS).

- Carolyn Lepage, Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) technical advisor to Seacoast Anti-Pollution League (SAPL).

- Carl Baxter, New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES).

INTRODUCTION

The meeting began with the announcement of the retirement of Ken Plaisted, Navy RAB Co-Chair. Mr. Plaisted retired after almost 40 years working at the Shipyard. On behalf of the Shipyard, Herb Ueda presented Mr. Plaisted with a plaque and thanked Mr. Plaisted for his commitment, dedication, perseverance, and patience for his work on the RAB. All present at the meeting thanked Mr. Plaisted for his support and leadership for the RAB.

Lisa Joy, the new Navy RAB Co-Chair, was then introduced. Ms. Joy grew up and went to college in Maine, and has a BS in Chemical Engineering. Ms. Joy began work at Loring Air Force Base until it closed in 1994 and then moved to the Compliance and Clean-Up Program at Naval Air Station Brunswick (NASB). Ms. Joy, the Environmental Director at NASB and Public Work Department (PWD)-Maine,, will be taking over as Navy RAB Co-Chair for PNS.

Doug Bogen, Community Co-Chair, introduced Carolyn Lepage of Lepage Consulting, who is returning as TAG technical advisor for SAPL. Mr. Bogen indicated that SAPL finally worked out funding and contractual issues, and Ms Lepage will continue as their TAG consultant.

STATUS OF WORK AND REGULATOR UPDATES

NAVY --- The Navy provided an update on the environmental activities related to Land Use Controls (LUCs) for Operable Unit (OU) 3 and activity relocation for Building 184 (Site 30).

Ms. Joy discussed some of the LUC issues that has come up at the landfill (OU3) and indicated that the Shipyard Commander is putting some operational controls into place. A policy letter will be provided that addresses the following items for OU3:

- Excavation controls
- Vehicle restrictions for grass areas (e.g., only maintenance vehicles will be allowed)
- Parking and vehicle restrictions for the asphalt area (e.g., rubber-tire vehicles only, except as approved by the Installation Restoration Program Manager)
- Equipment storage restrictions for asphalt and grass areas

Matt Audet indicated that USEPA was pleased to hear that the operational controls were being implemented. USEPA wanted these controls to ensure that the landfill is maintained in good condition, and USEPA appreciates the Navy's response to USEPA's concerns.

Ms. Cole provided an update on the progress of relocating the Welding School from Building 184 to a different location. As discussed at previous RAB meetings, the relocation of the school is a three-phase process. The first two phases were conducted in 2007 and 2008, and the third phase is expected to be completed by the end of March 2010.

USEPA --- Mr. Audet indicated that USEPA's biggest concern recently has been with the OU3 LUC issues. USEPA feels that LUCs are one of the primary tools to make remedies cost effective by allowing waste/contamination to remain in place with these controls. Therefore, it is very important to implement

and maintain LUCs to allow the continued protectiveness of a remedy. Mr. Audet said the operational controls the Shipyard is implementing will ensure that use of the capped area at OU3 will not affect the protectiveness of the remedy.

MEDEP --- Iver McLeod indicated that MEDEP was pleased with the operational controls that the Shipyard is implementing. Mr. McLeod also indicated that an important factor in getting LUCs in place is getting them documented, and MEDEP wants the Navy to complete the LUC Remedial Design (RD) to ensure that LUCs are documented for OU3. MEDEP and the Navy need to work out the details for the OU3 LUCRD. Mr. McLeod also mentioned the Navy's plans to construct an Emergency Command Control Center in an area adjacent to Site 32 (OU7) and mentioned that part of the construction work will extend into Site 32. MEDEP is reviewing the permit information for the construction work.

PROPOSED REMOVAL ACTION FOR OPERABLE UNIT 2 DRMO IMPACT AREA

Ms. Cole provided general information explaining the use of non-time-critical removal actions (NTCRAs) in the remedial action process. Ms. Cole indicated a NTCRA is appropriate when the Lead Agency (the Navy in this case) determines that a removal action is appropriate and when a planning period of at least 6 months is available before on-site activities must begin. A NTCRA is appropriate if the removal action can address priority risks and can move sites more quickly through the Superfund process. To support a NTCRA, an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is prepared to identify the objectives of the removal action and to provide an analysis of effectiveness, implementability, and cost of possible removal action alternatives. The EE/CA is similar to the RI/FS for remedial actions. The EE/CA is provided for public comment and then an Action Memorandum is prepared based on the EE/CA to document the selection of a removal action alternative.

Debbie Cohen and Tim Smith, TtNUS, provided a presentation on the Navy's proposed removal action for the DRMO Impact Area within OU2. Ms. Cohen provided background on OU2 and soil contamination the DRMO Impact Area. The DRMO Impact Area includes Quarters S, N, and 68. Quarters S and N were vacated in 2008 when the residents moved to another housing unit at PNS and to another Naval facility, respectively. The Shipyard is waiting to complete the removal action before moving new residents into these houses. Quarters 68 remains occupied.

During environmental investigations in the 1990s, soil contamination in the DRMO was found to extend to the DRMO fence line, adjacent to and south of Quarters S and N, but was not found in the samples collected within the DRMO Impact Area. However, sampling had not been conducted immediately north of the DRMO fence line. Additional samples were collected from the backyards of Quarters S and N, north of the DRMO fence line, in 2007 and 2008 to further define the extent of contamination adjacent to

the DRMO. The extent of lead and copper contamination in the backyards of Quarters S and N was delineated, as shown in the presentation figures.

The Navy is proposing a removal action to address contaminated soil in the DRMO Impact Area to provide interim action for contamination in the residential area before a final remedy is implemented for OU2. The removal action objective (RAO) is to mitigate human health and environmental risks associated with contaminated soil in the DRMO Impact Area in a manner such that the property can be used for unrestricted use/unlimited exposure.

Mr. Smith explained that only two removal alternatives were developed in the EE/CA, Alternative 1 – No Action and Alternative 2 – Excavation and Off-Yard Disposal. No Action is required to provide a comparative baseline for other alternatives. Excavation of contaminated soil was considered the only technology available that would meet the RAO, which includes leaving the site with no site restrictions when removal action is complete. Capping and in-situ treatment technologies were screened out because these technologies would not result in no site restrictions.

Mr. Smith showed the planned excavation areas and the areas where pre-excavation sampling will be conducted to better bound the extent of lead contamination and refine the excavation limits in several areas. Initially, surface soil from 0 to 1 or 0 to 2 feet below ground surface (bgs) will be excavated, except around the building perimeters. Verification samples will be collected to confirm that all contamination has been removed. Ms. Cole mentioned that if contamination is found below 2 feet bgs, the Navy will excavated deeper. Around building perimeters, soil will be excavated to 0 to 0.5 foot bgs, and the excavation lined with geotextile and backfilled with 0.5 foot of landscaping mulch. A small area west of Quarters S is included in the removal action to address a USEPA concern. Mr. Audet explained that USEPA was concerned that the extent of lead contamination west of the Quarters S backyard has not been bounded. The Navy will excavate soil in the identified area as part of the removal action.

Mr. Smith reviewed the next steps. The Navy anticipates submitting the draft Action Memorandum and EE/CA in June 2009. A 30-day public comment period to be held on the draft final EE/CA is scheduled for August/September. The Navy is anticipating conducting the removal action in fall 2009. Additional documents to support the removal action include the Removal Action Work Plan, which will include the pre-excavation sampling and analysis plan, verification sampling and analysis plan, and the Post-Construction Report.

Questions and discussions during the presentation included the following:

- Why is there a dense amount of sampling in some areas and sparse amount of sampling in other areas? Ms. Cohen explained that during the 2007 and 2008 sampling, additional soil samples

were collected to delineate the extent of lead and copper contamination; therefore, sampling density is greater in and around areas where contamination was found. Mr. Smith explained that pre-excavation sampling will be conducted around the areas, as shown on Figure 6, where additional data are needed to determine the extent of contamination to support excavation.

- Will verification sampling be field analysis or laboratory analysis? Laboratory analysis is planned. The excavation area will only be backfilled after receipt of laboratory results confirming that contamination has been removed.
- Will excavation and mulching around Quarters S and N affect drainage? The Navy is not anticipating any changes that would affect drainage around the buildings. The Navy will conduct pre-removal and post-removal topographic surveys and attempt to avoid changing the topography and drainage as part of the removal action.
- Will trees be removed as part of the removal action? Yes, some trees will need to be removed before excavation. Site restoration will be addressed in the Removal Action Work Plan and will include some replanting.
- What is the anticipated cost of the removal action? The estimated costs will be provided in the EE/CA; however, as a "ballpark" estimate, the Navy is anticipating the costs to be approximately $1 million.
- Could lead-based paint also be a source of lead in soil around Quarters S and N, especially adjacent to the houses? Ms. Cole explained that there appears to be some impact from lead-based paint to soil. However, because there may be commingling between sources (DRMO and lead-based paint), the Navy believes that a comprehensive remedy for the area will be more effective than trying to determine which contamination came from which source so that contamination from different sources can be addressed separately. Lead in soil adjacent to the houses is more likely a lead-based paint issue, so as Mr. Smith explained, the removal action will treat this area differently than the rest of the removal action area.

FUTURE MEETINGS

The RAB discussed the date for the next meeting. The Navy proposed Tuesday, September 15, 2009, for the next RAB meeting. Ms. Joy asked RAB members to contact her if there is any concern with the next RAB meeting date.

Post-meeting note: The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 15, 2009, and will be held in the meeting room at Kittery Town Hall, 200 Rogers Road, Kittery, Maine. Discussion topics will include presentations and updates on Installation Restoration Program activities at PNS.