

00322

**NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER - WHITE OAK
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 16, 1997**

RAB Members Present at Meeting

Armalia Berry - EFA Chesapeake, Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC)
Betsy Bretz
Gary Brown
Randi Vachon (for Robert Craig) - Army Research Laboratory
Marian Davenport
Steve Richard (for Harold Debes) - General Services Administration (GSA)
Edward Herbert - Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection
Gary Irby
Donna Lynch - Maryland Department of the Environment/Superfund Division
Barbara Medina** - Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin
Paul Meyer - Prince George's County Health Department
James Ng - Prince George's County Health Department
Brenda Sandberg - Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning
Marshall John Tino*** - Community Co-Chair
Yazmine Yap-Deffler - EPA Region III, General Federal Facilities Section
George Young

RAB Members Absent from Meeting

Kim Bellis - Navy, White Oak Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
Kenneth Caudle - Navy, Base Transition Coordinator (BTC)
Arnold Collier
Sharon Hemstreet
Richard Price* - Community Co-Chair
Cathy Strasnick
Ed Wolff

Interested Parties in Attendance

Jag Bhargava - General Services Administration (GSA)
Irene Boezi
Bob Catineau - Montgomery County D.E.D.
Robert H. Cohen - Hillandale resident
Joseph Delasho - EFACHES-Navy
John DiCola - LaSalle Partners
ENS Sabrina Durant - ROICC, Bethesda/White Oak
LCDR Paul Fuligni - EFACHES-Navy
Rosalind Kilman
Alan C. Lovell - CHI Centers, Inc.
Richard Marion - NSWC, Indian Head
Scott Nesbit - Brown & Root Environmental (BRE)
Herbert Randall - Hillandale Citizens Association
Bob Ridgeway - GSA/Anadac
Rita Thompson - FDA
Bob Catineau - Montgomery County Office of Economic Development

- * Subcommittee 1 - Groundwater, Chairperson
- ** Subcommittee 2 - Landfills, Chairperson
- *** Subcommittee 3 - Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Study Team (BEST), Chairperson

**[WHITE OAK RAB AND PROGRAM-RELATED DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE AT THE
WHITE OAK COMMUNITY LIBRARY IN SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND]**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Mr. Tino (community co-chair) opened the meeting at 7:04 p.m. He indicated that Colonel Price, newly retired from the military, was now a senior research scientist with the Texas A&M University. Ms. Armalia Berry (Base Environmental Coordinator - BEC), stated that two sign-in sheets would be circulated: one for RAB members and a second for interested parties.

Discussion ensued about whether everyone who wished to be on the mailing list was receiving RAB-related material. The mailing list needs to be updated.

Draft Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes for the months April, May, and June were adopted without change. After minor changes were made on pages 3 and 4 of the July draft minutes, they, too, were adopted.

As the new BEC, Ms. Berry shared some of her background with the RAB: she graduated from Florida A&M with a degree in civil engineering and worked at the Army Corps of Engineers before coming to EFACHES two years ago. She confirmed that EFACHES was continuing to use a team approach for work at the base. Players include Kelly Kozak, acting Remedial Project Manager; Natasha Rocheleau; Krista Gregg; and Ryan Mayer. Two weeks ago both Kim Bellis and Donna Jordan had babies, a girl and a boy, respectively.

STATUS OF RCRA CORRECTIVE ACTION ORDER

Ms. Berry confirmed that EPA issued the draft order to the Navy on June 30. After the Navy reviewed it, informal technical negotiations occurred by telephone, principally to ensure the document reflects the Base Closure Plan. Elsie Munsell, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, was briefed on the draft in early September. EPA is revising the draft (it is being reviewed by their attorneys); once the Navy reviews the amended draft, formal negotiations will commence.

Ms. Betsy Bretz took issue with the fact that the RAB, GSA, and the RAB co-chairs particularly, were not part of these negotiations. Yazmine Yap-Deffler stated that this is an enforcement issue between two federal agencies; once both parties are comfortable with the terms and language in the order, the draft document will be presented for public input. Mr. Tino indicated he was not concerned about being left out of the negotiations at this point since the order is based on the one issued to the Navy Yard, which he has read. Mr. Joe Delasho emphasized that a public meeting would take place to receive public comment and that all comments would be addressed before the order was finalized, and that it would be EPA, not the Navy, which would make the final decision about the order's content. Yazmine added that GSA's comments (via Barry Steinberg) had been solicited on the draft.

Ms. Bretz asked if the delay in issuing the order had slowed the base cleanup. Ms. YapDeffler Yazmine indicated that although the schedule for the order has slipped one to two months, it has not effected base cleanup activities. Ms. Bretz and the Mr. Catineau asked what the RAB was for if it was excluded from participating in these kinds of issues. The concern was that the RAB thought the cleanup was going along all right until EPA decided to issue the order. Mr. Tino suggested that Ms. Yap-Deffler brief Ms. Bretz about the order.

DECONTAMINATION REPORT

Richard Marion, NSWC, Indian Head, summarized the decontamination action his group began last January. Any building at the base that had been the site of explosives operations was added to the list, by default, for complete internal decontamination. The analysis examined from eight to ten explosive compounds. Only two buildings remain that need to complete chemical analyses to confirm their cleaned condition. To date, approximately 90 buildings have been cleaned: 69 to the highest standard; 8 cleaned

to a lesser standard since the buildings will be removed or reused; and 12 had minor cleaning since they are being removed.

A report was prepared for each building; a total package will be forwarded to EFACHES, which will, in turn, forward the material to GSA. EFACHES will be responsible for investigating the presence of explosives in areas outside the buildings, as well as in drainage ways and utilities. Richard will ensure that the report highlights those buildings that had confirmatory detections, so EFACHES can focus on cleaning their drains and utilities. Ms. Bretz recommended that GSA identify areas it wishes to reuse so EFACHES can prioritize its investigation. Mr. Marion's report and an infiltration/inflow study report will assist EFACHES in scoping its study. EFACHES's plan to address Building 30 as a high priority site will be added to the next RAB meeting agenda. In addition, Mr. Marion stated that the Department of Defense required that White Oak identify areas of concern that should be addressed for explosives. There are five areas: the two landfills, the Ordnance Burn Area (Site 7), and Sites 9 and 11.

TEST POND CLEANUP NEEDS

As prospective lessee of the golf course, the Maryland National Planning and Parks Commission, has undertaken a screening study of the pond. Ms. Brenda Sandberg explained that three water samples and one sediment sample were collected and analyzed by Certified Environments, Inc. (CEI), with excessive hydrocarbon concentrations identified in the sediment sample only. Page 2 of the CEI report contains an error. 100 parts per million is not a total petroleum hydrocarbon regulatory limit. The State of Maryland uses 100 parts per million as cut-off for determining whether additional cleanup is necessary at underground storage tank sites. Since only one sediment core was taken, they really do not have an understanding of the extent of the problem.

M-NCPP has two concerns: the possibility that sediments may escape if the pond is somehow breached, impacting downstream areas and the fact that the pond's outlet control mechanism is not functioning properly.

Mr. Delasho stated that at the last RAB meeting Captain Sabbatini indicated any location that contains contamination that poses a risk or that will be reused will be included in the Navy's clean-up plan. The CEI report will be turned over to the BCT, which will determine how the pond should be handled. The Navy may decide that it should be filled in. Pond water comes from run-off from New Hampshire Avenue and the base parking lot, which may contain petroleum; if the pond was cleaned, the hydrocarbons may simply return.

The pond, originally approximately 25 feet deep, was used by the Navy to study the reaction of ordnance in the water. The dam is currently 6 feet high. M-NCPP intends to use it as a storage area and irrigation pond for the golf course. The BCT will report on its review of the CEI report and recommend how the pond data should be addressed.

TRANSITION TO GSA

Steve Richard indicated that GSA now has a presence on site, in the form of both a property manager and a contractor, OHM. The transfer documents are on their way to Navy Secretary Cassidy for signature. The RAB was reminded that a transfer ceremony has been scheduled for October 18.

CLEAN-UP PLAN 1997 ACTION STATUS

Storage Tank Status - Ms. Berry stated that 14 tanks have been removed (closeout reports have been prepared; no soil contamination was found); 5 others have been transferred to GSA.

A time-critical removal action was completed with the installation of an air stripper at the Adelphi site to remove TCE at an oil-water separator. OHM has been testing it; TCE levels in the incoming water were

130 parts per billion; after treatment, no TCE was detected (less than 5 parts per billion). The water will be sampled monthly to determine how long the treatment system will need to operate. A Site Investigation will be conducted at Site 46 to help identify the source of the TCE.

A lengthy discussion ensued about the Irby residence, which has been effected by the TCE contamination. Because Mr. Irby feels he has been caught between the two military branches, Ms. Berry will schedule a meeting with him and the Army, and report at the next meeting on a plan to address the TCE and heavy metals problem on his and the Charlton property. The Army is quantifying the amount of oil captured by the oil-water separator to determine how long it needs to be operated. Randy Vachon (representing Bob Craig from the Army) stated that the Army Corps of Engineers will conduct an ecological risk assessment using the Army's data. A first sampling round was conducted a year ago; a second sampling round occurred on September 4 on the Irby and Charlton properties and the stream. The most recent round of samples have not yet been validated.

Mr. Irby expressed concern that his and his children's health may have been effected by the TCE. In addition, the Prince George's County Health Department water collected a sample from the Army "manhole" adjacent to the Irby property. A report on their findings will be added to the next agenda.

A question was asked about when wells would be installed (for the Site 46 Site Investigation) under the centrifuge at Site 46. Mr. Nesbit stated that he expected to have a driller on site in about one month. Soil samples will be screened on site to provide maximum flexibility in conducting the investigation. Mr. Tino requested that a review be made of the possibility that Site 9 may also be contributing to the Irby property contamination.

One interested party requested that the RAB minutes reflect that the Irby problem had been discussed four or five times over the life of the RAB. She asked that community members be able to look back to confirm that these issues had been aired.

RAD Licenses - Four areas (Sites 10 and 14, the Southern Perimeter Road, and Building 343 septic tank) will be investigated and the data sent to Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO).

RCRA Closures - Building 501, 508, and 700 were decontaminated the end of July. EFACHES received the OHM report today. It will be forwarded to the state; closure letters should follow. Building 362 remains a concern. Although the Indian Head team decontaminated it, the state wants an independent contractor to do confirmatory sampling. OHM will be tasked with the work.

Revised BCP Tables - Revised Tables 4-1 and 4-2 were provided as handouts. The BCT met on August 4 and 5. Changes to the tables were made as a result of their discussions. A column has been added to reflect estimated costs. In addition, the schedules were determined to be aggressive, particularly in light of the fact that no time had been scheduled to prepare the Proposed Plan or complete the Record of Decision.

A question was asked about the difference between the Master Work Plan and the Base Cleanup Plan. Mr. Nesbit explained that the Master Work Plan spells out all the sampling protocols. The BCP identifies all the authorities dealing with contamination on the base and how and when these areas will be addressed.

Budget Status - Ms. Bretz requested that the difference between the estimated \$1.9 million (that White Oak thought it had) and the \$1.76 million (we now have) be earmarked to address the golf course and Mr. Irby's property. Mr. Delasho stated that there was no money left over. The additional \$900,000 has been used to address the FDA footprint, begin a Site Investigation for Site 46, and cover costs at Annapolis. The agenda for the next RAB meeting will include a report on how this additional money was spent.

Groundwater Model Review Briefing - Mr. Nesbit met this afternoon with the BCP and Mr. Tino to discuss the groundwater model. Groundwater was collected in May and June from nearly 90 wells, using the low-flow technique. Most samples were analyzed for the full TCL/TAL list. The results were compared to federal maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) but the BCT may want to make other comparisons on a site-by-site basis. General findings were that aluminum, iron, and manganese are present across the site but no pesticides or PCBs were found at levels above MCLs. The results of the site-by-site analyses are included in the handout. The BCT will review Brown & Root's data to determine what further action is required.

Mr. Tino's preliminary reaction to the model briefing is that he had assumed it would be more like a mathematical model. In fact, it is a manual system. The model needs more data, but Mr. Tino is satisfied that the people who are working on it know what they are doing. Mr. Tino's Groundwater Remediation Model Review report is enclosed.

Open Discussion - Ms. Bretz requested that the Navy provide people who live near the site a certificate stating that the cleanup has resulted in "clean property". People cannot sell their homes for their full value with the contamination present. Mr. Delasho will discuss Navy policy on this matter with Navy attorneys and provide the results of those talks at the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Tino expressed concern that we know little about contaminant presence to the east of Sites 9 and 46; no known industrial activity occurred there so these were not deemed priority areas. However, probably something is there that is contributing to the Army/Irby problem.

Ms. Sandberg mentioned the tour of the landfill sites Mr. Nesbit lead on September 12. Actually walking on the sites provides a very different picture of the problem. It was very useful.

Ms. Bretz requested that the partnering agreement be changed to include Ms. Donna Lynch. The agreement will be changed to include both Ms. Lynch's and John Fairbank's names. She also stated that the Community Co-chairs should be members of the BCT. Mr. Tino disagreed, stating that it is not appropriate for them to be part of that group.

Ms. Bretz introduced John DiCola from LaSalle Partners, hired by GSA as part of the public-private partnership. She would appreciate it if all concerned would cooperate in sharing base information with him. Mr. DiCola said he had received lots of information from GSA and would appreciate a briefing from Brown & Root Environmental. Mr. Tino recommended that Mr. DiCola work through Mr. Bob Ridgeway to access the base library.

A citizen asked whether air monitoring occurs during removal actions. Mr. Nesbit stated that air monitors were present during the removals at Sites 8, 9, and 11. Contractors typically install monitors to ensure their workers are protected.

As a final note, Mr. Tino mentioned that he and Colonel Price would meet with Ms. Berry during October and will send a summary of the results of their discussions to the mailing list.

CLOSE

Future RAB Meeting dates:

November 18 - White Oak Base - Ticonderoga Room
January 20 - to be determined

GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION MODEL REVIEW

by BEST Chairperson

Assumption: Subject model would be computer-based engineering model which used correct algorithms to represent surface of land, including buildings; structure of rock/soil; groundwater location, flow rate, etc; hazardous material status (concentration, risk, agreed safe level); and background material in White Oak soil. Model would be used to project location of groundwater hazardous material "plume".

Issues:

- Description of algorithms
- Data requirements
- Status of available data
- Current output (groundwater plume profile)

Findings:

- A model does not exist, as stated by assumption.
- Contractor has engineering tools to define the groundwater plume in a "manual" process.
- Contractor has model-like tools to "project" in chart form topography and soil/rock structure.
- Navy has just begun to collect background data so no database exists.
- Navy has new validated set of data from enhanced set of wells. No database exists to state trends of groundwater materials (previous well samples compared to current samples); and sufficient data do not exist to define "plume" limits.
- BCT has not agreed on "clean-up level" standards for White Oak.
- Contractor has the ability to define "plumes" by a manual, engineering-judgement process. This includes structuring a profile of groundwater at White Oak and using understanding of groundwater flow to define the vector of hazardous material plume. They cannot define the limit of the plume.

For example: Site 9 was implied to be flowing south. While some is, most flows east toward a small stream bed. Also, the previous definition of the plume extent appears to have been quite arbitrary and incorrect.

For example: TCE is found at all major chemical sites and landfills. It appears that the flow of TCE in the "300 area" needs a significant analysis to understand the issue from a systems perspective, i. e., that is interaction of TCE re sites 4, 9, 46, and the Army site.

- More data and significant analysis are required to model groundwater at White Oak.

Conclusions:

- The lack of a system engineering, agreed, process is quite a concern, particularly after approximately 3 years of clean-up study and discussions.
- Contractor can probably use "manual" engineering techniques to develop a groundwater assessment; the confidence and accuracy is unknown at this time.

- New data and current understanding of White Oak's soil, rock, and water are sufficient to develop a groundwater update for BCT/RAB use. This should be done now!
- Significant additional data are required to map the "300 area" for TCE and other hazards. This should be given high priority by the BEC.
- The BCT needs to determine acceptable levels of White Oak cleanup. This should be done now, as it is important to groundwater modelling and decisions.

John Tino
BEST Chairperson