

00315

NSWC WHITE OAK RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

January 22, 1997

Present: Deanna Zook, Irene Boezi, Bridget Keegan, Rita Thompson, Bob Ridgway, Sharon Hemstreet, Barbara Medina, Laura Bachle, Betsy Bretz, Harry Debes, Harold Call, Richard Price, John Tino, Dorn Carlson, Kim Bellis, LCDR Dave Pearson, John Woodburn, Yazmine Yap-Deffler, Donna Lynch, Jim Ng, Bob Craig, Arnold Collier, Steve Sorgen, LCDR Paul Fuligni, Toni and Gary Irby, April Perry, Mary Sheridan, Lionel Shapiro, Barbara Hurst.

John Tino called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. He had all present introduce themselves. John commented on the unique nature of our RAB. There are many issues associated with closure that RAB is interested in, which are not found at most bases with restoration programs. He passed out a list of events taking place at White Oak that he thought the RAB might be interested in. Asked RAB participants to comment on or add to the list.

John Tino reported that the proposal to extend explosive work at White Oak beyond 31 July was recently denied by the Navy. Now all explosive work is to cease by 31 January; everything is to be cleared out by May or so.

Richard Price made some opening remarks. He and John Tino are sharing the duties of RAB community co-chair. Tonight, John would preside over the meeting. He and John Tino meet with key Navy people about a week before meetings to assure the proper issues are addressed at the meeting. Richard noted a possible gap in community representation on the RAB from the Powder Mill.

John Tino suggested that because minutes from the last RAB meeting were not passed out in advance, discussion of them be deferred until next meeting.

Dorn gave the Navy co-chair report. He apologized for lateness of the minutes from last meeting, which he said was due to the loss of the note-taking contractor. He asked for any suggestions or volunteers for minute-takers.

Dorn said that a representative from Maryland Department of the Environment had asked that a statement be made about the closure of some storage buildings at White Oak. Dorn passed out a fact sheet on the closure of these buildings. He explained that because these particular buildings had a permit to store Hazardous Waste, there is a specific process called closure that must be done to assure the buildings are clean and safe. Part of this process is to assure that the public is notified that this closure is taking place.

Dorn also passed out a memorandum from the Assistant Deputy Undersecretary of Defense, asking for comments on a new proposed Federal rule describing how participants in RABs can request technical assistance.

Dorn reported that a small indoor spill had occurred since the last meeting, when an old container of an acid-containing solution started to leak as it was being loaded onto a truck to be removed from the base. The solution spilled on the truck and the floor of the loading area. This happened indoors, none of the solution got released into the outdoors, nobody was hurt, and the mess was cleaned up except the stain on the floor, which will be cleaned shortly.

Dorn said that although he was still the Navy co-chair of the RAB, he was no longer the Navy's BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC). He presented John Woodburn from EFA Chesapeake, who was the acting BEC. John Woodburn introduced himself. He said he was working BRAC environmental issues at White Oak and also some at the other nearby closing base in Annapolis.

John Woodburn presented his initial impressions of the remediation task that lay before him, and the RAB. It was important to focus on the property GSA is developing for FDA. There are over 40 SWMUs and IR sites in that area, and a plan with schedules and milestones for addressing them will be one of his top priorities. He would be meeting tomorrow with the regulators of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) and with GSA, on this topic. John said another high priority issue was the investigation of the off-site contamination which Bob Craig had reported on. He said this was now formally in the Navy's IR program as "site 46".

John Woodburn said that a few weeks ago, his headquarters NAVFAC had pulled back all unspent money from EFA Chesapeake's BRAC program, and from all Navy BRAC programs in the country. The money was still there, it was just back in a central pot. EFA Chesapeake had had about \$200,000 pulled back. He said that given the relatively small amounts of money EFA Chesapeake needs to perform the next steps of the cleanup at White Oak, and White Oak's very high priority based on rapid redevelopment, he thought it would be easy to get back from NAVFAC all the money needed to continue the program, perhaps even more than was originally budgeted.

Betsy asked if there was anything she or the RAB could do to assure the money is available to White Oak. She noted a *Washington Post* article on the cleanup at the Washington Navy Yard, and asked if they were getting White Oak's money. LCDR Fuligni said that right now, we just have to let the process work. He wasn't worried yet, and didn't need any community assistance.

Dorn showed a timeline for explosive decontamination of the buildings on the base. He said all buildings would be decontaminated before GSA got the property.

Kim Bellis passed out and discussed the IR timeline.

Bob Craig asked when will groundwater investigation start? When will the ROD start? Kim said they were reprioritizing to make sure GSA sites and site 46 get done.

Betsy asked about a big parking lot to be built at ARL. Should the land be sampled first? Bob Craig noted that the parking lot is on Army property, so the Navy is not responsible for it. Betsy asked how to raise this issue with the Army, since there is no Army RAB? Bob Craig said he'd connect her to the right people at ARL.

Barbara Medina gave subcommittee 2 report: the subcommittee met on January 14 to review and discuss comment on the plan for landfill sites. When the subcommittee met, the State and Federal regulators had not yet submitted their comments. The subcommittee decided to discuss only those comments that could change the direction of the design.

The following were discussed:

-Concept of drilling into landfill to better characterize the contamination.

- Cost tradeoff of further study of contaminants vs. current worst-case assumptions.
- Use of native plants, grasses and legumes to minimize need for fertilizing and watering.
- Fugitive plants.
- Need for up gradient wells, to investigate the possibility of lateral groundwater flow that could threaten the integrity of the cap--probably the most important comment.
- Possibility of coordinating sites 1 and 2 remediation.

Barbara said she found it disturbing that some of the questions were only being raised now. A concern was expressed about any delays this current discussion on the landfill remediation comment would cause. Kim responded there's no delay--the landfill schedule includes time to seek and respond to comments. She said that one thing we're doing differently this time is sending up money so the design contractor can work now with the performance. A concern was expressed about the effect of drilling in the landfill to sample might have on any buried ordnance there.

Arnold Collier asked when will regulator comments be in? The State's comments are in. Yasmine Yap-Deffler said that EPA's comments are being reviewed by their landfill expert--they'll be a couple of weeks yet.

Barbara also passed around pictures from the stream walk.

John Tino suggested that Subcommittee 2 and 3 continue; Subcommittee 1 become a Groundwater subcommittee. He proposed to select new members (if any), then Subcommittee 1 and 3 meet one more time, and the Subcommittees select new chairs. Betsy said she thought John Tino and Richard Price should continue in their Subcommittee chair spots.

John Tino continued a discussion from the previous RAB meeting on the need for new community members from the PG County side of the base. The procedure for adding members calls for nominations from the RAB, and final selection by the co-chairs.

Betsy nominated Gary Irby. Gary accepted the nomination. Bob Craig moved that the co-chairs make Gary a member immediately. Dorn, John Tino, and Richard concurred, and appointed Gary to the RAB.

Gary spoke briefly: "I live right next to Paint branch and ARL. I'm very concerned with the environmental state of the creek and my property. I run a school called Earth Center for the Arts. We do a lot of environmental arts and work with environmental materials."

Gary reported he had seen people at ARL dumping. Bob Craig responded that one of the incidents was a contract electrician cleaning rainwater out of an electrical manhole. He disposed of the water in the wrong way. ARL is assessing these events.

Richard gave the Subcommittee 1 report: Subcommittee 1 will give a final report on the site 8, 9, 11 after the contractors OHM and Brown & Root have both submitted their final reports. From the OHM report, work at these sites took place from 11 September to 26 November.

Site 8- Heavy metals (mercury, lead, arsenic), and solvents (toluene, chloroform) were found. A total of 53.7 tons of Hazardous soil and 51.9 tons nonhazardous soil were removed.

Site 9- Solvents (TCE, toluene, trichloroethane); 81 tons hazardous soil, 21 tons nonhazardous removed.

Site 11- Heavy metals (Cadmium, Chromium, Nickel, Copper, Lead), solvents (chloroform, tetrachloroethylene, methylchloride); 179 tons hazardous and 1382 tons of nonhazardous soil removed.

The nonhazardous soil went to USA Waste Services Charles City, VA. The hazardous soil went to ChemWaste, Model City, NY.

We don't have a final analysis report from Brown & Root yet. Kim said the Brown & Root report was expected in a couple of weeks. Betsy asked, what about the materials left in the soil? Richard said that that question leads into the presentation on Risk Assessment.

Kim introduced Steve Sorgen, Environmental Health Scientist at Naval Environmental Health Center (NEHC), Norfolk, VA., who gave a presentation: Introduction to Risk Assessment for Restoration Advisory Boards."

Steve described what a Risk Assessment was and why it was done. He told how a Risk Assessment includes and Exposure Assessment, a Toxicity Assessment, and an Uncertainty Assessment. He described the assumptions that are made when doing these assessments, where the data comes from, and how an assessment is calculated from this data. He pointed out that at every step, assumptions are made to make sure that if there is any uncertainty, the results will always err on the side of safety.

Betsy asked if NEHC would be reviewing our risk assessments. Dorn said that if the RAB had concerns about our risk assessments, NEHC could be brought back to review the assessments or to talk to the RAB.

Gary said that Steve's comments about Risk Assessment seemed to be talking directly to him and his family. They play in the stream, and eat garden vegetables. He said it made him a little worried. Dorn and Bob Craig offered to meet off-line with Gary.

Bob Craig said that he is preparing a Work Plan, due to regulators 1 February, for continued investigation and a Risk Assessment.

Bob Craig also said that ARL had decided not to form an Army RAB at this time. John Tino said that the Navy RAB will not include Army issues in its discussions unless they relate to the Navy's restoration program .

The next RAB meeting was set for February 27th, 7:00 pm, in the Ticonderoga Room (the same meeting room). The meeting was adjourned 9:25 p.m.

-notes taken by Dorn Carlson, Jan 22, 1997. Approved by the RAB on Feb 27, 1997