

6/15/95-01968

June 15, 1995
WPNSTA Yorktown
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

This page contains sensitive information which is protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a. To see the page, please contact

Public Affairs Office
NAVFAC Atlantic
6506 Hampton Blvd.
Norfolk, VA 23508-1278

757-322-8005
NFECL_PAO@navy.mil

Mr. Jeff Harlow - Began the meeting by presenting the agenda. Introduced the RAB Co-chairmen, Captain Delaplane and Mr. Dewing.

Captain Steve Delaplane - welcomed RAB members on behalf of WPNSTA Yorktown. Also talked about the impending change of command at WPNSTA.

Mr. Jay Dewing - Discussed the mission statement of the RAB. Also stated that Mr. Coxton had resigned from the RAB and that Mr. Story had contracted Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever and was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Greg Hatchett - presented information on CERCLA and Remedy Selection as part of the Feasibility Study (FS). The presentation was focused on WPNSTA Yorktown and Installation Restoration (IR) Program activities including Removal Actions. Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) and the nine criteria for the selection of a remedy as part of the FS process were also discussed.

After Mr. Hatchett's presentation, the Removal Action video was shown to RAB members. The video covered topics including the removal action process at WPNSTA Yorktown and confirmational sampling conducted subsequent to the removal action.

Mr. Rich Hoff - introduced Baker Environmental and discussed the Results of the York River Basin Background Report. Study design, environmental media, sample numbers and general content of the Background Report were presented. Comments by the Commonwealth of Virginia and USEPA Region III on the Background Report have been received by LANTDIV and are very positive. Additional statistical interpretation has been requested by USEPA.

Mr. Don Shields - discussed the results and conclusions of the Site 16/SSA 16 Remedial Investigation (RI) Report and Proposed Action Plan (PRAP). The scope of the investigation, geology and risk assessment results were presented which support the proposed no further remedial action alternative discussed in the PRAP.

RAB members asked questions concerning the ecological risk assessment and results of the shrew modeling effort. The results of the shrew model suggest that this potential terrestrial receptor is at risk because of constituents detected in Site 16/SSA 16 soils. It was explained by Mr. Don Shields and Mr. Rich Hoff that the shrew model is highly conservative in that it tends to overestimate potential risks. Risk to the shrew was also derived when background constituent concentrations were used in the modeling effort.

A question was asked about the quality and useability of shallow groundwater at Site 16 /SSA 16. In general, the shallow groundwater at WPNSTA is not of potable quality and may not provide sufficient yields for potable use. RAB members would like a discussion of shallow groundwater useability to be added to the risk assessment. Mr. Don Shields agreed that a more detailed discussion of potential future use of the shallow aquifer would be added to the human health risk assessment.

A question was asked about vertical and horizontal components of groundwater at Site 16/SSA 16 and where contamination might now be found as a result of past site/SSA practices. Mr. Don Shields discussed the potential vertical flow directions of groundwater and how groundwater flow changes with depth. A good first order approximation for shallow groundwater at Site 16/SSA 16 is toward the tributary of Felgates Creek located in the southern portion of the study area. Deeper aquifer groundwater flow direction would likely be toward Felgates Creek proper and the York River.

Mr. Shields explained that contamination could have migrated away from the study area in the past but models would likely not give a good indication as to how far a contaminant could move with time. The study indicates that soil and groundwater contamination remaining at Site

16/SSA 16 has been defined both vertically and horizontally. Furthermore, a continuing source to groundwater was not identified in surface or subsurface soils at Site 16/SSA 16 during the Round Two RI.

Another question was asked about cost and how much they are considered in the remediation process. Cost is considered as one of the criteria for evaluating a remedial alternative in the Feasibility Study when risks are likely to be unacceptable. However, no further costs should be incurred for remediation at this site/SSA because risks fall within the generally acceptable range indicating that the removal action was sufficient.

Captain Delaplaine asked about the conclusions of the risk assessment and how they might change if the mission of the WPNSTA were to change. Mr. Shields explained that future residential scenarios were evaluated in the risk assessment to address this question. Risks to future residents would be within the target risk range unless the shallow groundwater zone is used for potable purposes. However, the likelihood of using shallow groundwater for potable purposes is limited given the relatively low yields produced by the aquifer.

The target risk range of 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} is the range of risk considered to be generally acceptable in most instances by USEPA. A risk of 10^{-4} indicates that one additional cancer case could occur in an exposed population of 10,000. A risk of 10^{-6} indicates that one additional cancer case could occur in an exposed population of 1,000,000.

Mr. Shields concluded his presentation.

Break

Ms. Tammi Halapin - presented the results and conclusions of the Sites 4 and 21 RI Report and the Site 21 soil PRAP. Results of the RI Report indicated that soils at Site 21 were remediated by the removal action and that additional data were needed at Sites 4 and 21 to define the extent of contamination in groundwater, surface water, sediment and Site 4 soils.

No questions were asked and Ms. Halapin concluded her presentation.

Mr. Jeff Harlow discussed the RAB mission statement and the RAB adopted the statement by consensus. Also, the monthly RAB meeting day and time was discussed. It was decided that the RAB meeting would be held every first (or third) Wednesday of the month, on a quarterly basis, unless a scheduling conflict arises.

Mrs. Brenda Norton discussed the funding issue at WPNSTA. Because of LANTDIV's ability to award scheduled projects early in the fiscal year, additional WPNSTA projects were added such as Sites 1 and 3 Round Two RI/FS field work and report writing and Round two RI/FS/PRAP and ROD writing at Sites 6 and 7. Two small projects were not funded as a result of congressionally mandated funding cuts. These projects involved SSAs having limited human health and environmental risks from a semi-quantitative perspective. These projects will likely be awarded early in the next fiscal year. Mr. Greg Hatchett added that the funding mechanism is

likely to change in the next fiscal year and that the current funding problems could be solved when the new mechanism is in place. The mechanism should be in place for the Fiscal Year 96/97.

The meeting was adjourned.