



N00102.AR.001132
NSY PORTSMOUTH
5090.3a

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, NORTHEAST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
10 INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY
MAIL STOP, #82
LESTER, PA 19113-2090

IN REPLY REFER TO

5090
Code EV23/FE
May 20, 2002

Ms. Meghan Cassidy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I
1 Congress Street
Suite 1100
Mail Code HBT
Boston, MA 02114-2023

Mr. Iver McLeod
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
State House Station 17
Augusta, ME 04333-0017

Dear Ms. Cassidy/Mr. McLeod:

SUBJECT: MAY 10, 2002 OPERABLE UNIT 3 MEETING MINUTES;
INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM, PORTSMOUTH NAVAL
SHIPYARD

Enclosed are the draft May 10, 2002 technical meeting minutes on the Operable Unit 3 Phase I work plan and design. Comments on the minutes are requested on or before June 4, 2002.

If additional information is required please contact Mr. Fred Evans at (610) 595-0567 x159.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK J. EVANS
Remedial Project Manager
By Direction of the
Commanding Officer

5090
Code EV23/FE
May 20, 2002

Copy to:

MEDEP (D. Hallowell)
National Marine Fisheries Service (J. Catena)
NOAA (K. Finkelstein)
US Fish & Wildlife Service (K. Munney)
ME Dept. of Marine Resources (Don Card)
NH Fish & Game (C. McBane)
Mr. Doug Bogen
Mr. Peter Britz
Mr. Jeff Clifford
Mr. Alan Davis
Ms. Michelle Dionne
Mr. James Horrigan
Ms. Carolyn Lepage
Ms. Mary Marshall
Mr. Phil McCarthy
Ms. Diana McNabb
Mr. Jack McKenna
Mr. Onil Roy
Dr. Roger Wells
COMSUBGRU TWO (A. Stackpole) (w/out encl.)
PNS (Code 106.3R, M. Raymond)
ROICC (G. Wallace)
PNS Code 100PAO (w/out encl.)
Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (C. Tippmann)
TtNUS, Inc. (D. Cohen)

**Jamaica Cove
Technical Meeting Minutes**

May 10, 2002

LOCATION

Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp.
133 Federal Street, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
617-457-8200

ATTENDEES

Name	Representing	Position	Telephone #
Jim Briggs (JB)	EFA-NE NAVFAC	Design NTR	610-595-0550
Dave Ray (DR)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Supervisory Civil Engineer	402-221-4493
Tom Fowler (TF)	Foster Wheeler	Project Engineer	617-515-9984
Carl Tippmann (CT)	Foster Wheeler	Project Manager	214-702-4044
Marty Raymond (MR)	PNS	IR Coordinator	207-438-2536
Carolyn Lepage (CL)	SAPL Tech Advisor	Hydrogeologist	207-287-2651
Harrison Bispham (HB)	MEDEP	Project Engineer	207-287-2651
Jean Choi (JC)	EPA	Engineer	617-918-1437
Dan Sullivan (DS)	Foster Wheeler	Site Manager	Cell 617-834-7211

PURPOSE

Comment resolution on draft final Operable Unit #3 Phase I work plan and design.

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- USEPA, MEDEP, and SAPL Comments on the Draft Final Design Package (Drawings, Specifications, and Work Plan) and Responses
- Section 7 Excerpts
- Federal Register, Vol. 57, No. 160, Tuesday, August 18, 1992, Rules and Regulations, pg. 37237

DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM 1. Design QA

- For definition purposes, Design Package = technical specifications, drawings, and Work Plan.
- General concern expressed regarding discrepancies and inconsistencies between documents - are the parties communicating adequately? (EPA, USACE, Foster Wheeler, MEDEP):
- Some examples of inconsistencies in documentation are as follows:
 - Different symbols used on the figures: triangles on some, rectangles on others
 - General frustration of inconsistency in documents; not knowing what the answer really was, for example SAPL Comment 2; wetlands judging when/how would be monitored. Two responses were not consistent. As reviewer, was unsure if left and right hand are in sync. Do those comments indicate a conflict? Concern was that there was a breakdown in

communication, jeopardizing quality of the project. How will quality be checked when construction unfolds? How is the public assured that the results will be equal to purpose?

- Surcharge pile location (triangle, rectangle discrepancy in drawings).
- MEDEP should interface with the EFANE Design NTR (Jim Briggs) and RPM (Fred Evans) for all questions and comments.
- This project is being handled in more of a Design/Build fashion; this is very different from what the MEDEP is used to.
- Phase I was accelerated, trying to meet all the dates. Documentation was compiled under time pressure. The project was restructured due to financial considerations. Dredge spoils, for example, fell into Phase II.
- Weekly conference calls have been held regularly with the designer (USACE), customer (PNSY), and contractor (Foster Wheeler) since the beginning of the design effort. EFA-NE NAVFAC is in charge. Questions should be referred to them. Under the current contract, the contractor (Foster Wheeler) is involved during design to provide constructability input.
- A lesson learned from Phase I will be implemented for Phase II submittals which will be staggered so that Work Plan information can be updated to most recent design.
- Primary concern for MEDEP is having a problem after the fact. Best situation is to avoid/prevent construction problems before they happen.
- Summary of discussion: Maine DEP is used to seeing hard/fast design, competitively bid, handled in the typical manner. This project differs from the standard three-step process. The documentation includes both prescriptive information and performance requirements. There is a thorough design, but also some performance-related information. The specifics are the performance-related items, filled in by Foster Wheeler. As required in Foster Wheeler's contract, they must comply with federal government procurement guidelines: minimum of three bidders, etc. Foster Wheeler and EFANE use specific workflow and documents to report day-to-day issues and changes:
 - Request for Information (RFI) – addressed by EFANE's construction NTR at local level for items needing clarification
 - Change Request Form (CRF), also known as Field Change Request (FCR) – Submitted by Foster Wheeler for scope change simultaneously to EFANE construction and design NTRs. Review and recommended action are issued by Contracting Officer, via the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative.
 - Design Change Notice (DCN) – is used when major elements of the design need revision. EFANE Design NTR coordinates resolution with USACE providing revised documentation.
 - Letter of Technical Direction – EFANE initiated scope changes to Foster Wheeler to address individual tasks
- MEDEP asked for a Navy overview of their construction quality assurance procedures for this project. Not a direct requirement by MEDEP, but is highly recommended to improve the channels of communication.

ACTION

- EFANE will provide appropriate information to the USACE for inclusion in the project documentation for a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) defining the roles and responsibilities for Quality Assurance.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Construction Work Plan Contingency Language

- This comment was received as an email 4:00 PM 5/9/02 from MEDEP to EFANE, pertains to a discussion of "hot spot" hazardous waste contingency, i.e. removal of drums and other buried containers.
- Intact drums will not be disposed of in Jamaica Island Landfill.
- Intact drums will be overpacked and stored at the PNSY TSDF, which is immediately adjacent to construction site, following protocols from prior drum removal efforts by Foster Wheeler at PNSY. More information will be included in the Work Plan.

- Portion of the Work Plan describing drum removal procedure (Section 4.7) was identified and shared with meeting attendees. This will be supplemented with greater detail. Foster Wheeler is an environmental contractor with procedures in place for many hazardous work duties, including drum handling.
- Contaminated soil will not be managed independent of other waste removed from Jamaica Cove. Only intact containers such as drums will be managed separate from other waste.
- MEDEP concurs that some soil may cause a sheen on water surfaces, but it is the “drum cache” type hot spot that is of concern in this case.

ACTION

- Foster Wheeler will insert more information on drum removal and handling to the Work Plan.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Turbidity Curtain

- MEDEP (Harrison Biphams) does not have familiarity with the turbidity curtain application and is looking for some more detail on its use.
- Foster Wheeler (Dan Sullivan) identified several projects of similar scope to Jamaica Island, including Allen Harbor Landfill and McAllister Point Landfill in Rhode Island and Tabbs Creek in Virginia. In these environments the curtain was extremely effective. EPA noted this success. The selection of the curtain is based on a maximum apparent opening size (AOS) of the #70 sieve (approximately 0.20 mm). Dave Ray said his design team recommended AOS based on the geotechnical information from the pre-design investigation package.
- In the rocky shoreline environment, the up and down motion has wearing effect. Impermeable curtain will be placed on the ends at the shore because of its greater durability. The center section of cove will be permeable curtain. This will be the first of the two turbidity curtains being used.
- Additional measures of protection are the silt fence for the flow at low tide and the second, inner turbidity curtain in the area of excavation.
- Daily and after significant rainfall events, inspections will be performed by Foster Wheeler craft and supervision to verify that curtain still intact and functioning. Maintenance will be performed from a flat deck work barge equipped with a winch to pull up curtain for replacement or repair.
- Procedure is to stop in-water work if there is a problem with the turbidity curtain and not start again until turbidity curtain is repaired and problem resolved.
- The Navy’s ROICC office has overall QA responsibility for construction projects. The ROICC, with supplementary help from PNS Environmental Department, will perform QA on the use of the curtain.

ACTION

- Foster Wheeler will provide a plan view drawing showing the outer curtain in a fixed location, the silt curtain in a fixed location, and the mobile inner curtain.

Note: Agenda items #4 and #10 were addressed together.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Surcharge Pile

- MEDEP is concerned about erosion and stormwater runoff. Also concerned about some infiltration into stockpiles picking up some contamination. Would like it to infiltrate (mostly will), but concerned about stream of liquid leaving the stockpiles. Not concerned with a little dribble but a bigger stream.
- Plan is to maintain a silt fence and hay bale barrier around the stockpile as it grows. This barrier will filter out sediment carried from the stockpiles. Because the topography is relatively flat, this perimeter around the stockpiles will be at a consistent contour.
- Confirmed that the area is flat and that there are currently no drainage ditches, therefore all flow is sheet flow.
- Erosion controls will be improved at an existing outfall on Clark Cove.
- EPA thought that the design for stormwater control from the surcharge piles was acceptable.

- The Navy has committed to a year-round presence to monitor erosion controls over winter. This is addressed in the Work Plan, but will be supplemented with further detail.
- Work Plan will also address any discolored discharge of liquid from the stockpiles; primarily that it will be re-introduced to the piles to promote infiltration.

ACTION

- Note on drawing – silt fence will be placed parallel to the contours.
- Add further information to Work Plan on erosion control maintenance over winter and discolored runoff from stockpiles. Also make clear that the area of the stockpiles is within the exclusion zone and off-limits for non-authorized personnel.

AGENDA ITEM 10. Surcharge pile footprint and height

- MEDEP requests clarification on the intent of the surcharge stockpiles.
- USACE design theory is to reduce differential settlement and maintain grades after landfill cap placement. This should ensure minimal O&M.
- While final placement is contingent upon completion of the Phase II design, an exact footprint is not critical nor required for Phase I work.
- Placement will be in smaller piles within the surcharge footprint rather than in one lift. Material will only be placed in the surcharge area after decanting back into the excavation.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Sampling And Analysis

- Use of off site source dredge spoils as backfill in Jamaica Cove is no longer under consideration.
- Two materials will be used in backfill of Jamaica Cove
 1. 2" minus stone on bottom layer
 2. Silty sand material to final grade
- These materials will be imported from clean quarries and have to meet the geotechnical criteria of the specifications and the chemical criteria provided by EFANE. The chemical criteria apply to the soil materials only (not stone) and will be included in the Work Plan.
- There will also be a USACE Tier review (Tier 1) on the borrow site. The Tiered review process primarily applies to re-use of dredge material, however it will provide an extra layer of confidence in the material to be used for backfill in Jamaica Cove.
- Determine that MEDEP Section 418 for beneficial reuse of dredge spoils does not apply.
- The Responses to SAPL Comment 3 will also clarify that the Navy does not intend to reuse material to fill in Jamaica Cove.

Note: The agenda did not include an item #6 nor #7

AGENDA ITEM 8. Depth mudflat excavation with minimum 2-foot clean cover

- MEDEP expressed concern regarding the depth of the overall excavation into the underlying pre-existing mudflats.
- EFANE has committed to excavating the underlying pre-existing mudflats sufficiently to provide a minimum of 2 feet of clean cover in Jamaica Cove, with the exception of areas where bedrock will not allow excavation below 2 feet of finished grade.
- The survey layout, excavation, and backfill will be concurrent.
- As-built drawing will show (grid system) project baseline: station and off-site 50 foot grids. It will show finished elevation when excavation is concluded. When completed, paper documentation will indicate that the backfill will have at minimum a 2-foot cover. Foster Wheeler will identify this in the Work Plan.

AGENDA ITEM 9. Recycling plan

- Primary concern from MEDEP and SAPL is how recyclable materials such as large stone and scrap metal will be handled during excavation.
- Excavation and landfill procedures will follow regulatory and compliance guidelines. (reference one page from Federal Register / Vol. 57, No. 160 / Tuesday, August 18, 1992 / Rules and Regulations, pg. 37237. Center column.) This regulation allows for brush cleaning of scrap metal. This promotes recycling steel so that it doesn't go back into the landfill.
- EPA concerned regarding placement of boulders (greater than one lift thickness) in the landfill.
- USACE uses 3-4 lifts as a standard for appropriate material size. Plate compactors will be used to achieve proper compaction against large stones in landfill placement.

ACTION

- Incorporate further detail about the placing visibly stained rocks into the landfill and use non-stained rocks for landscaping features.
- Add more information to Work Plan to constitute a recycling plan for large rocks and scrap metal.

AGENDA ITEM 11. Construction quality program

- A general discussion of the quality control and quality assurance roles on the EFANE Remedial Action Contract (RAC) was held. Foster Wheeler maintains a government approved quality control program, with approving authority on certain submittals, and EFANE maintains the QA role through on-site supervision by the ROICC and the Shipyard's Environmental office.

ACTION

- Include further details around QC roles/responsibilities in the Work Plan. EFANE will define QA roles.

AGENDA ITEM 12. Overview explanation of how Foster Wheeler's construction contract works

- The award fee (profit) drives Foster Wheeler's profit. Navy approves what level of fee will be paid at project completion based on the following criteria: schedule, cost control, and quality of work. Up to four people associated with the project within EFANE submit assessments to establish the approved level of fee on Foster Wheeler's work.
- MEDEP reiterates that primary concern is QA roles, and this will be handled as stated above in Agenda Item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 13. How lessons learned from Phase I are being incorporated into Phase 2

ACTION

- Design NTR coordinate and lock in actions to keep documentation from two sources consistent
- Maintain separation of planning documents for Phase I work from the planning documents for Phase II work.
- Stagger pre-submission completions of design plans/specs and work plan for improved document communication.
- Check illustrations and maps for clarity
- Provide Submittal Register along with the Work Plan in the form of an attachment, also describing how it works to answer the concern of how the submittal process works.
- Indicate in the submittal register that the Work Plan is government approved.
- Clean up the appendices so they are easier to reference (i.e., Appendix D contains QCP)
- Clarify that the Work Plan contains components of Environmental Protection Plan and Quality Control Plan.

ACTION ITEM 14. Parking lot drainage discharging to Jamaica Cove

- USACE still finalizing the drainage from the JILF parking lot to Jamaica Cove. Discharge will be through an energy dissipating stone layer then onto a vegetated layer for filtration.
- SAPL concerned with the impact of fresh water on the new vegetation in the salt marsh and on the number of drains.
- Impact of fresh water will be minimal because of the temporary nature of the stormwater discharge. Drains have been designed based on peak flows from the parking lot area.

AGENDA ITEM 15. Cross –sections of excavation

- EPA requests pre-excavation cross-section and final cross-section drawings.

ACTION

- USACE will provide a drawing that shows pre-excavation and final cross-section.

AGENDA ITEM 16. Protection of existing trees, shrubs and facilities

- The original issue prompting this agenda item was unclear. No discussion took place.

DECISION POINTS/RECORD ITEMS

- How to handle the comments/responses and supporting documentation.
 - EFANE proposes that the Work Plan not be resubmitted for another round of reviews.
 - Blend the two iterations of comments together to eliminate another round of response/comments.
 - Consensus required because of the aggressive schedule to break ground on June 24

COMMENTS/RESPONSES

The following lists the remaining comments not addressed by the primary topics discussions.

EPA

Comment 4. Reference USACE drawings. Will not have drawings in the Work Plan, but will make reference to them.

Maine DEP

Comment 3a: This comment was covered during the agenda of the meeting.

Comment 3b: Over winter – QAPP. Add detail about runoff in Work Plan. Reference winter mulch.

Comment 3c: Covered during agenda.

Comment 15: Will not do chemical stabilization of any material.

Comment 16b: Additional information provided in H&S Plan

Comment 17: No decontamination of solids. All material with the exception of recyclable metal and stone will be transferred to the stockpile.

Comment 18: No sampling of stormwater is anticipated. Include a statement that includes the assumption that if there is contamination, it is linked to particulates.

Comment 26: This comment was covered during the agenda of the meeting.

Comment 36: Change numbering on the stormwater drawings to eliminate conflict with USACE drawings.

Comment 43a: VOCs added. Originally did not include VOC on the list. Will include complete list in Work Plan.

Comment 47: Function of the settlement monument explained and will be included in Work Plan.

SAPL

Section 5.6.2

Comment 3: The dust monitoring level has been changed to 2.5 mg/m³. This change will be incorporated into the Site Specific Health and Safety Plan.

Construction Quality Control Plan – Appendix D

Section 2.0

Comment 2: The response will be revised to include information on third party oversight. Given clarification of QA/QC and that the USACE is involved with design (internal QA), modify the response to take into consideration USACE's internal QA procedures. (refer to other comments/responses) see response to appropriate MEDEP comments.

ACTION ITEMS

Topic/Concern	Action Item	Responsible Group
Overall QA Quality Assurance Coordinating U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Foster Wheeler contracts	Provide something in writing to MEDEP that describes the contract relationship between EFA-NE, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Foster Wheeler as it pertains to quality assurance.	EFANE
Design QA Quality Assurance (Technical specs, Technical Drawings, and Work Plan)	Provide a brief QAPP describing the roles, responsibilities, and lines of communication and authority for Phase I of this project to reassure MEDEP that quality assurance is taking place.	USACE
Construction QC quality control program - roles and responsibilities	Flesh out further details around roles and responsibilities in construction quality program.	USACE