

N62269.AR.000512
NAWC WARMINSTER
5090.3a



TETRA TECH NUS, INC.

600 Clark Avenue, Suite 3 • King of Prussia, PA 19406-1433
(610) 491-9688 • FAX (610) 491-9645 • www.tetrattech.com

C-51-8-8-15

August 6, 1998

Project Number 5838

Mr. Lonnie Monaco
Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFACENGCOM)
Northern Division
Environmental Contracts Branch, Mailstop No. 82
10 Industrial Highway
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 225

Subject: Revised Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes of June 11, 1998
Former Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) Warminster, Pennsylvania

Dear Mr. Monaco:

Enclosed please find the revised minutes from the RAB meeting held on June 11, 1998. Copies of the minutes are being sent to the individuals identified on the distribution list. Please discard the minutes submitted on July 6, 1998.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Neil Teamerson".

Neil Teamerson
Project Manager

ANT/nfs

Enclosure

c: Thomas Ames (NAVFACENGCOM)
Timothy McEntee (NAVFACENGCOM)
Christine Porter (NAVFACENGCOM)
Garth Glenn (TINUS)
RAB Members

NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER (NAWC) WARMINSTER MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING NO. 67

REFERENCE: CLEAN CTO NO. 225

1. Meeting Date and Time: June 11, 1998. 9:15 to 10:55 a.m.
2. Location: Conference Room, Building 1, Former NAWC Warminster, Pennsylvania
3. Attendees: See Attachment I (attendance list)
4. Summary of Meeting Minutes:

Introduction and Review of Minutes

Tom Ames, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental coordinator (BEC), opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and providing an agenda for the meeting. A copy of the agenda is included as Attachment II. Mr. Ames announced that the Navy is having another public sale of equipment and offered an informational pamphlet regarding the sale. Comments were solicited in regards to the May 7, 1998 meeting minutes; none were voiced.

Base Transition Coordinator Update

Mr. Ames reported that Warminster Municipal Authority has submitted an application for public conveyance for Supply Well 10 (SW-10) and the wastewater treatment plant. The application is under review and will go to the Department of Health and Human Resources for action.

Dick Lander, of the Northampton Municipal Authority, reported that he had not heard anything on the authority's application for the 2 acres of land east of Jacksonville Road. Mr. Ames indicated that he will make a telephone call to check on the status of the application.

John Geyer, of Northampton Township, reported that the application to the Department of Health and Human Resources for the Geriatrics Center had been officially withdrawn. Mr. Ames commented that the Navy assigned that property to the Department of Health and Human Resources and was no longer involved with the parcel. Mr. Geyer responded that the township still had a claim right on the property but is not sure what direction they will go with the claim.

Mr. Ames reported that the Navy had been contacted by General Services Administration (GSA) regarding the Council Rock School District request to obtain 32 acres of the Northampton park lands parcel. They are requesting a reassignment of the property to the Department of Education and the Park Service. Mr. Ames indicated that the Navy's position is that they had assigned the property to the Park Service and that

further assignments should not involve or include the Navy. Congressman Greenwood is aware of the issue and has sent a request to the Department of the Navy asking that the Navy get involved in the reassignment of the property.

Mr. Geyer reported that the Northampton Firehouse property was officially transferred and legally recorded.

Mr. Ames reported that the Federal Lands Reuse Authority (FLRA) had presented the economic development conveyance (EDC) application to the Navy on May 21, 1998. He reported that the EDC was generally well received. The appraisal figures and cost figures contained in the package still need to be resolved between the two parties. Darius Ostrauskas, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) remedial project manager, asked if the boundaries of the EDC had been established. Carolyn Wallis, of FLRA, responded that the boundaries are being surveyed now. She indicated that the portion of the property requested by Warminster Municipal Authority will be excluded from the EDC. She indicated that this area included most of Area A. Mr. Ames clarified that the Warminster portion included Sites 1 and 2, but not Site 3. He indicated that the actual line is being discussed but anticipated using the existing access road as the dividing line. Ms. Wallis stated that the survey is being done to support the EDC but that additional surveys to define metes and bounds will be performed at a later date to support the actual transfer. Mr. Ames added that a similar situation exists for the Navy housing area along Jacksonville Road. He indicated that meetings are taking place to determine where that line should be drawn.

Dave Fennimore, of Earth Data, asked if there will be deed restrictions placed on the property requested by the Warminster Municipal Authority. Mr. Ames responded that restrictions associated with any environmental responses will be placed on the property as needed. These will be included in the assignment and transfer of the property to the Department of Health and Human Resources. He did not anticipate any other restrictions regarding the ability to perform construction or conduct other activities. Mr. Fennimore asked if the Navy retained responsibility for environmental contamination after the transfer. Mr. Ames responded that the Navy retains the responsibility if they are the cause of the problem. Ms. Wallis asked if there will be a covenant restricting digging on the property in the areas of Sites 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Ames answered that there will be a restriction in those areas necessary to preserve the environmental restoration program and to protect an easement necessary for the transfer lines, piping, and electrical lines, to support the extraction well network. In addition, if waste is left in-place these areas will be included in that restriction. However, if a full removal is performed, as is planned for Site 1, no such restriction will be necessary.

Mr. Ostrauskas suggested that one of the alternatives being considered by the Navy is to contain the contamination in certain areas using a cap, such as asphalt paving. He indicated that the potential

property owners need to be aware of this and that they should provide input into the decision process as to the selection of the alternative. He indicated that a portion of Area A being considered for paving is within the EDC area and asked if the FLRA had specific plans for this area. Ms. Wallis responded that the existing parking lots will remain as parking lots but that she wanted to meet separately with the Navy to discuss the locations of Sites 1, 2, and 3 and to review the plans for possible paving.

Mr. Fennimore indicated that, if the containment alternative is selected and future land owners want to dig and/or build in the area, this could result in delays and additional costs associated with sampling and legal concerns. This may cause some construction problems. Lonnie Monaco, Navy remedial project manager (RPM), responded that, if capping is selected, restrictions on digging and construction will be in-place and everyone needs to be aware of this before they take ownership. He further indicated that restrictions and easements will be necessary anyhow to protect the groundwater extraction and treatment system.

Mr. Ostrauskas further clarified that, if the planned containment is performed according to the proper procedures, it will be protective and meet EPA requirements. Mr. Ames added that any future construction will be required to comply with zoning and township ordinances and that the area in question is close to the property line and the stream.

Federal Lands Reuse Authority (FLRA) Update

Ms. Wallis reported that Hangar 4 is completely leased. She also reported that there has been a recent increase in tenant inquiries regarding large portions of Buildings 1 and 2, as well as continued interest in smaller areas. Ms. Wallis indicated that the FLRA shortly will be working on lease agreements for two or three homeless groups approved by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Mr. Ames reported that the lead-based-paint (LBP) survey conducted at Quarters A resulted in the positive identification of LBP. He reported that the Navy had the RAC contractor performing abatement through removal and encapsulation and this work is nearing completion. Mr. Ames indicated that the possible presence of LBP in soils around the foundation is an issue that is being discussed with EPA and should be resolved shortly. He indicated that the radon abatement work being performed at Quarters B is nearing completion also. A passive venting system and a new concrete floor are being installed in the basement. This work should be completed next week. Mr. Ames concluded that the remaining building designated for HUD group use is Building 80. He indicated that this building was inspected by the Needlework Guild of America (NGA) and needed improvements were identified for inclusion in the finding of suitability to lease (FOSL).

Removal Actions Update

Mr. Monaco provided an update on removal actions. He indicated that the Navy had received all comments on the Site 6 action. He added that the Navy had received verbal comments from Steve Fennimore and Tony Sauder indicating that their clients cannot force complete removal of the material. Mr. Sauder explained that he is satisfied with the approach for establishing non-residential land use clean-up standards for Site 6. However, he remarked that Warminster Township prefers the Navy to use residential clean-up standards for the site. Mr. Fennimore clarified his position, stating that the township should take the lead in commenting on an alternative but that, if Earth Data is given the opportunity to select an alternative, they will prefer complete removal. He stated that Earth Data is deferring all decisions and comments to the township.

Mr. Monaco reported that EPA has indicated that the Navy-preferred alternative, to leave the remaining waste in place, is acceptable but EPA has some concern over safety issues associated with surface debris and holes. Mr. Ostrauskas confirmed this position but further clarified the EPA position by stating that EPA is of the opinion that the preferred alternative is protective as long as the cover material is maintained. He stated that groundwater contamination from the waste is not a concern and that the risk assessment supported the position of leaving the waste in-place. However, he indicated that, before a final decision is made, the agency responsible for maintaining a cover and the enforcement of covenants and restrictions on excavation must be addressed.

Mr. Monaco reviewed the history of Site 4 and indicated that a Consensus Document had been distributed for review. He indicated that the Navy wanted to reach closure on this site and have the Consensus Document signed. Mr. Ames added that the Consensus Document was prepared as an interim document to allow for public input now and that this document will be used to support a record of decision (ROD) at a later date. The plan is to document the public input and resolution of issues as actions are taken and to present several sites (Sites 4, 6, and 8) together under one Record of Decision (ROD). Mr. Monaco asked for a status report on the document from EPA.

Mr. Ostrauskas responded that all are in agreement that a ROD will be issued at a later date and that the necessary input into the actions at Site 4 has occurred; however, he stated that, with other priorities, he does not think it is appropriate to divert resources to complete a review of the interim document to attain signatures. He is not convinced that this document added to the process and has not asked his legal department to conduct a review of the Consensus Document.

Mr. Monaco responded that the Navy thought that there had been concurrence on the plan to prepare and sign the document as a means to solicit and document input on decisions as they are reached because of the possible long period of time that may pass before the ROD is actually issued. Mr. Ostrauskas stated that Sites 1, 2, and 3 are more critical at this time and that he did not want to divert his attention from those sites to address this issue. Mr. Ames confirmed that Sites 1, 2, and 3 remained the current priority but restated Mr. Monaco's concern that the plan is to document the actions on sites as they occur in order to reduce the administrative burden of issuing separate RODs for each site as actions are complete.

Mr. Ostrauskas stated that it is more important to get public input into the decisions being made on Sites 1, 2, and 3 than it is to document the completed actions at Site 4. He indicated that there is consensus on the actions taken at Site 4 but pursuit of the Consensus Document may overburden the system. He indicated that DOD provides funds to EPA to provide resources for federal facilities work but he does not think pursuing the Consensus Document is a good use of those resources. Mr. Ames asked who had the authority to sign the document. Mr. Ostrauskas responded that he thought that it will be signed by either a Division Manager or Branch Chief. The discussion concluded with Mr. Ames suggesting that further review of the issue be taken up by the BCT.

Mr. Monaco provided a brief presentation on the status of supplemental sampling plans at Sites 1, 2, 3, and 8. He indicated that the BCT had met with the Navy and EPA consultants and that the Navy had prepared a plan for conducting supplemental sampling in these areas to address any comments on the Phase III RI. He indicated that an additional meeting and site walk will occur that afternoon with the regulators. He also indicated that the remedial alternatives selected for Sites 2 and 3 may affect the number and location of samples. Mr. Ostrauskas clarified that the actions being contemplated are actually removal actions, not remedial actions. He emphasized that, even if these are final actions they are removal actions, and that the removal process does not include such stringent requirements for public meetings and documenting public acceptance. He stated that this is the reason he feels that it is very important that the Navy and the BCT solicit comments from the public during this process.

Ms. Wallis asked for a clarification of the decision process and specifically wanted to know what the FLRA's role will be. Mr. Ames provided a brief explanation and stated that the Navy will provide the FLRA with a copy of the Area A Removal Site Evaluation Report. He also indicated that the Navy could solicit comments directly from the FLRA and the Warminster Municipal Authority as potential future land owners. Ms. Wallis responded that she will appreciate that and that she is mainly interested in the locations of the sites as they relate to the property line.

Mr. Monaco reported that the Navy had a final conceptual design for the Area D groundwater extraction system and that Foster Wheeler is as working on a detailed design and construction work plan. Mr.

Fennimore indicated that Earth Data will submit comments on the Area D Source EIS. Mr. Ostrauskas asked what the FLRA schedule is for the transfer of the area, including Buildings 1, 2, and 3. Ms. Wallis responded that they are still looking at April or May 1999. Mr. Ames pointed out that at least 6 months of operational data are needed from the pump and treat system before a complete transfer can take place. Mr. Ostrauskas added that the pump and treat being designed is only for the interim remedy and that final remedy has to be selected and a final ROD issued for the site. He indicated that this may be long process. Garth Glenn, of TINUS project manager, responded that this does not have to be a long process if the final remedy is the same as the interim remedy. The operation of the interim remedy and the data collected during that operation could support the selection of a final remedy even if it involved just adding additional wells. This process may not require explanation of significant differences but will only need to support the continued operation as a final remedy.

Ms. Wallis stated that the FLRA is working on schedules now and will consider accepting a lease in furtherance of conveyance if the Navy will provide some funding for caretaker status. She indicated that the FLRA had these discussions with the Navy and that they were not negatively received. The FLRA will submit a written proposal to the Navy when they determine the need. As part of this process, the FLRA will be requesting that EPA define the covenants that will be issued on the property.

Mr. Ostrauskas responded that EPA will not be placing any covenants on the property. He stated that the Department of Justice (DOJ) issues those to the Navy and that EPA only comments on them. He further stated that the Navy is the lead agency for this facility and that EPA is a support agency, providing only comments on the documents and decisions reached by the Navy. It is EPA's role to document whether they concur that the appropriate and required actions have been taken.

Mr. Ames indicated that the purpose of the BCT is to identify those controversial areas during the process and to resolve those issues to avoid a stand-off at the end of the process. He also indicated that the Navy had sent a letter to the FLRA indicating several concerns regarding the EDC and the transfer. Ms. Wallis confirmed this and stated that one of those concerns deal with the covenants that may be placed on the property. The FLRA will ask to see those covenants before the transfer paperwork is prepared. She also indicated that she is aware that the environmental impact statement (EIS) ROD must be in place before the transfer can take place. She will follow up on the status of that document.

Mr. Geyer asked if the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) and their restrictions on groundwater withdraw could affect the selection or operation of the pump and treat systems. Mr. Fennimore responded that the DRBC has jurisdiction over RCRA corrective actions and permitting requirements for supply wells but has no jurisdiction or control over CERCLA actions.

Installation Restoration Program Update

Mr. Glenn provided an update on the status of IR Program activities. A copy of his handout is provided as Attachment III. Mr. Glenn discussed activities related to installing new monitoring wells at the base, the Phase III remedial investigation (RI) report, upcoming groundwater investigations, and the status of reports awaiting review. He also discussed the status of activities leading toward the implementation of interim remedies for Areas A and D groundwater.

Mr. Ames asked if EPA had plans to continue monitoring activities in Casey Village. Mr. Ostrauskas responded that the recent United States Geological Survey (USGS) report will be reviewed by the EPA Site Assessment Branch, along with other data to determine what action is required in the area. He indicated that the township will be consulted before the final decision is made. Mr. Sauder asked if this is a different branch of EPA than had been working on the NAWC issues. Mr. Ostrauskas confirmed that this is a different branch. He indicated that they will have access to the previous studies done in the area and that they will have access to the Area B data if they need it. He also indicated that Kathy Davies, EPA hydrogeologist, will be consulted during the evaluation.

Mr. Sauder indicated that he will have comments on the USGS Village report and asked who to forward the comments to. Mr. Ostrauskas responded that, although USGS did the investigation for EPA, it does not necessarily represent the EPA position. He indicated that comments could be forwarded directly to USGS and copied to EPA. He stated that EPA had not requested comments but will take them into consideration during its evaluation of the data.

Mr. Ostrauskas indicated, during the discussion of ongoing actions at Area A, that no matter what actions are taken by the Navy, future property owners need to be informed of the nature and extent of the contaminants if they remain on site. He indicated that some sampling will still be required in this area to address this need even if capping is performed.

Mr. Ames asked if the planned well cluster HN-51 is still needed, considering the availability of the existing Warminster Municipal Authority open borehole on the far side of WMA-26. It was stated that the Technical Evaluation Group had discussed this and that the open borehole had been logged and sampled. Mr. Sauder requested that, in addition to this borehole, a well closer to WMA-26 should be installed. He indicated that trace levels of trichloroethane (TCE) were found in the open borehole.

Mr. Lander also said that the Northampton Township Authority is still waiting for a well to be installed by the Navy between the Navy property and the Northampton property or proposed supply well location. Mr. Ames responded that the Navy had installed wells adjacent to that area. Some discussion then ensued regarding the conclusions presented in the USGS report about the possible influence of pumping wells in the Village area. Mr. Sauder and Mr. Fennimore stated that someone needs to study the possible interconnections between the Village area, Area B, and the Northampton well fields.

Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) Follow-On Work Update

Amy Winkler, of EA Engineering, reported that responses to EPA contractor comments on the report for Work Plan Areas 1 and 3 are being prepared. She indicated that they are awaiting EPA comments on the risk evaluation report. She reported that the draft report of findings discussing the results of implementing Work Plan No. 2 was submitted to the Navy for review on May 29, 1998. This report includes the risk evaluation. She also reported that the third quarterly groundwater monitoring report for Area C is being finalized for distribution on June 15, 1998. She indicated that the fourth-quarter sampling is scheduled to begin on June 29, 1998.

Mr. Ames reported that the groundwater treatment plant had suffered damage during a recent electrical storm and that the plant had been shut down for a week or more. He reported that the Navy's contractor is hoping to have the plant operating today or tomorrow. Mr. Sauder commented that the plant is completely automated and that the Navy should consider a back-up system that allows for manual operation during system malfunctions. Mr. Ames acknowledged the comment and indicated that he will pass this along to the design department at NORTHDIV. Mr. Sauder expressed appreciation to Mr. Ames for an opportunity to tour the facility with his staff. He indicated that it was an informative tour and thanked the Navy for extending the courtesy.

Environmental Business Plan Update

Mr. Ames reported that the environmental business plan is being updated to include all actions necessary to complete property transfer and that the revised plan will not be limited to addressing just one fiscal year. He said that he is working with NORTHDIV to identify critical milestones and is developing a schedule for implementation. He further indicated that he had updated the existing business plan to show the status of FOSLs and other actions. He distributed copies of the updated plan (Attachment IV).

Mr. Ames reported that the asbestos survey report was submitted to the Navy and that it had identified several areas where pipe covers containing asbestos had become damaged. The Navy is currently addressing these areas and will identify the areas to the FLRA and share the findings of the report with

them as appropriate. The report does present cost estimates for additional asbestos abatement and these portions will be provided to the FLRA.

Comments Discussions

Ms. Wallis asked about the status of FOSLs for Quarters A and B. Mr. Ames responded that they are both in draft form awaiting review by EPA. He also indicated that the radon and lead-based paint abatement projects are nearing conclusion. Ms. Wallis wanted to confirm that Building 80 is next on the schedule. Mr. Ames confirmed this and reported that he is reviewing historical drawings and records to accurately document the status of a former underground storage tank.

Mr. Ostrauskas indicated that EPA had received a plan from the Navy to address potential lead contamination around the foundation of Quarters A. He asked what the plan addressed. Mr. Ames responded that the plan had been prepared by Foster Wheeler for the Navy and that it is a conceptual plan for addressing the potential presence of paint chips containing lead in the soils around the foundation. Mr. Ostrauskas indicated that he had not read the plan but that he is aware of the need and is reviewing the national policy on exterior lead-based paint. Mr. Ames and Mr. Ostrauskas agreed to discuss the issue after the meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

ATTENDANCE SHEET
MEETING: RAB MEETING 06/11/98

NAME	REPRESENTING	PHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Garth Glenn	TtNUS	610/491-9688	glenn@ttnus.com
Tom Ames	BEC	215/441-1112	tames@efdnorth.navyfac.navy.mil
Lonnie Monaco	Northern Division	610/595-0567	
Amy Winkler	EA Engineering	908/665-2440	aiw@eaest.com
Carolyn Wallis	FLRA	215/957-2310	
Dave Fennimore	Earth Data/WTMA	610/524-9466	earthdat@chesco.com
Al Wills	Bucks County Health Dept.	215/345-3325	wills.albert@al.dep.state.ps.us
Darius Ostrauskas	EPA	215/566-3360	ostrauskas.danus@epamail.epa.gov
Richard Lander	Northampton Municipal Authority	215/357-8575	
Tony Sauder	Pennoni	215/222-3000	
Norm Kelly	RAB/FLRA	215/675-1157	
John Geyer	Northampton Township	215/357-5322	

NAWC WARMINSTER
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

11 June 1998

MEETING AGENDA

- WELCOME ABOARD
- REVIEW OF MINUTES
- BASE TRANSITION COORDINATOR UPDATE
- FEDERAL LANDS REUSE AUTHORITY UPDATE
- REMOVAL ACTIONS UPDATE
- INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM UPDATE
- EBS FOLLOW-ON WORK UPDATE
- ENVIRONMENTAL BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE
- COMMENTS/DISCUSSION
- NEXT MEETING: 2 July 1998
(Former NAWC Center Conference Room)
(Bldg 3 - 2nd Floor)