

**FORMER NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER -
WHITE OAK (NSWC-WO)
FEDERAL RESEARCH CENTER AT WHITE OAK (FRC-WO)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
May 18, 2000**

Section: 10.08
Site 20903-5640 (White Oak)
Doc. #: 0060

00353

N60921.AR.000289
NSWC WHITE OAK
5090.3a

RAB Members Present at Meeting

Walter Legg - U.S. Navy, EFA Chesapeake, Acting Navy Co-Chair and
Acting White Oak Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC)
Charles C. Miller - U.S. Navy, EFA Chesapeake
Marshall John Tino - Community Co-Chair
Jeff Thornburg - Maryland Department of the Environment/Superfund Division
Robert Craig - U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL)
Yazmine Yap-Deffler - USEPA Region III
Edward Herbert - Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection
Barbara Medina
Paul Meyer** - Prince George's County Health Department
Betsy Bretz
Matthew Amann - Food Drug Administration (FDA)
Paul DeLeo - FDA/National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU)
Chapter 282

RAB Members Absent from Meeting

Richard Price* - Community Co-Chair
Arnold Collier
Hall Crannell
Kenneth Caudle***
Gary Irby
Gary Brown
Steven Richard - General Services Administration (GSA)
Brenda Sandberg - Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPP)

* Subcommittee 1 - Groundwater, Chairperson
** Subcommittee 2 - Landfills and RI/FS, 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.]**

1.0 WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. John Tino (Community Co-Chair) opened the meeting at about 7:05 p.m. He made several announcements. Mr. Tino prepared a paper on the topic Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and a copy was available for those interested in reviewing it. The FY 2000-2004 Department of the Navy Environmental Restoration Plan will also be available at the White Oak public library. An updated RAB member information list was distributed. A tour of the base was open to the public at 4:00 p.m. today. Mr. Tino thanked the Navy and Mr. Walter Legg (Navy) and complimented Mr. Scott Nesbit (Tetra Tech NUS) on his informative overview of the sites. The Fact Sheets distributed were especially helpful, which included a brief history and status of each site. Mr. Tino was particularly pleased with the remediation progress at Sites 3 (Landfill) and 4 (Chemical Dump). The Site 4 landscaping and grass were incorporated nicely and he looks forward to seeing the Site 3 work completed. All were asked to sign in for the record and mailing list. Those who asked questions/made comments were requested to identify themselves for the minutes.

2.0 RAB MEMBERSHIP UPDATE

RAB member announcements included Marian Davenport's resignation (moving to Iowa) and Ms. Yap-Deffler's (USEPA representative) temporary replacement, Don McLaughlin. Mr. McLaughlin will attend the next few White Oak RAB meetings. Paul Meyer (Prince George's County Health Department) announced that James Ng is no longer in his department and will no longer be his alternate. Ms. Ann Williams will be his new alternate for White Oak efforts. All in attendance at the RAB introduced themselves.

At the last RAB meeting there was discussion between Mr. Tino and Mr. Legg regarding the addition of new stakeholders to the RAB, Mr. Matthew Amann (FDA-Safety and Occupational Health) and Mr. Paul DeLeo (FDA-NTEU). Mr. Tino explained that resumes were requested from the new stakeholders because this had been done during the initial formation of the RAB. Mr. Tino briefly reviewed Paul DeLeo's resume with the RAB. His background is in chemistry and environmental engineering and he should make a good addition to the RAB from a technical viewpoint. Mr. DeLeo added that FDA employees are represented by the NTEU and a number of them plan to move to the former White Oak base. Mr. Amann added that as the Manager of Safety and Occupational Health, he is very interested in the safety and health of all FDA employees. His safety office is also part of the division of facilities management engineering and safety. A move was made and accepted by the RAB members to add the two gentlemen as RAB members. Mr. Tino described the three subcommittees having various levels of activity: 1) groundwater, 2) landfills/RI/FS, and 3) BRAC Environmental Study Team (BEST). Each subcommittee has a chairperson, reports are distributed for review, and e-mail is typically used to communicate. The new RAB members were invited to join any of the subcommittees.

3.0 RAB MINUTES DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

Mr. Tino made a motion to approve the March RAB meeting minutes. The motion was accepted. The April RAB Meeting Update was also accepted. Mr. Tino added that the meeting between the Navy, Irby and Charlton families, and WSSC did not occur. Mr. Legg will provide an update on this later. Clarifications on the April RAB minutes were provided to Mr. DeLeo

regarding the use of site groundwater. Mr. Dinuno inquired if a timetable was available for the Site 11 corrective measures. Mr. Nesbit explained that the Draft Corrective Measures document is currently under review by the BCT and it should be completed this summer. Mr. Tino added that this document would typically be reviewed by either the groundwater or BEST subcommittees.

4.0 BRAC CLEANUP TEAM (BCT) UPDATE

Mr. Jeff Thornburg (Maryland Department of the Environment) indicated that the next BCT meeting is scheduled for early June to address scheduling and work progress at White Oak. The tour provided coverage of the sites. The Site 3 removal will be completed in approximately 2 months. The BCT is currently working on the stream restoration details with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Fish and Wildlife Service. The restoration plan will include the repair of the riparian zone (adjacent to stream) including restoration of trees and grasses. Mr. Tino added that Ms. Barbara Medina (RAB member) was concerned about possible erosion of the landfill in the pipe area, bringing contaminants to and through the culvert within the stream. It was explained that the pipes were installed not only to bypass the water during construction but also to prevent sedimentation from flowing down stream. This is usually a concern for class 3P streams (tributaries to Paint Branch-natural brown trout habitat). Ms. Medina indicated that most of the trout are in the upper part of Paint Branch. Ms. Medina inquired if the stream that abuts the base had been tested. Mr. Thornburg replied that all the upstream and downstream waters that cross the base have been tested. Mr. Nesbit indicated the golf course stream had been tested down through the Hillandale Park and culvert at Green Acres last year. Ms. Bretz added that tests had been performed in previous years in addition to last year's testing per the RAB's request.

Mr. Legg provided an update on the Irby/Charlton waterline topic. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) recently completed its review of the Navy's report on the proposed waterline route. The Navy and Army will meet with WSSC tomorrow to discuss their review comments. A meeting between the Navy and Irby/Charlton families will be scheduled after this review meeting has taken place. Mr. Tino and Mr. Price will also be included in the meeting. Mr. Legg agreed to contact Senators Rubin and Dorman after the Navy/WSSC/Army meeting.

5.0 ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT

Ms. Yap-Deffler (USEPA) introduced Bruce Pluta, USEPA's Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG) leader. Mr. Pluta reviewed his educational and work experience background. He recently joined USEPA 2 months ago. Mr. Pluta coordinates the BTAG (responsible for environmental evaluation of sites). Mr. Pluta provided a presentation (Attachment A) on Ecological Risk Assessment process and the progress of the Ecological Risk Assessment at the former NSWC-White Oak.

Ms. Medina asked who performs the fieldwork (not site specific) to determine the levels of toxicity. Mr. Pluta responded that the values come from a number of different literature sources (e.g., universities, national research laboratories [Oak Ridge, Argonne, USEPA, etc.]). For example, a common source used for soil screening numbers is from the Netherlands. The

selection made is typically representative of the site/trophic levels/whole food chain effect (e.g., fish eating bird, mammal eating fish, etc.).

Mr. Tino asked how the background levels are treated. Mr. Pluta responded that background levels are a risk management decision. When evaluating compounds onsite, an assumption is made during the first screening level that anything seen is site related. At Step 3, the background concentrations are evaluated. Site-specific background samples will be used in a qualitative manner.

Ms. Medina asked when evaluating the invertebrates, are numerous species being considered. Mr. Pluta replied that the population and community level studies are normally performed but were not performed as a part of this investigation at White Oak. Ms. Medina said that the county has performed extensive surveys that produced collected data that can be used if site-specific problems exist. Mr. Nesbit added that data have been used from sources such as the original Remedial Investigation data from the early 1980s and 1990s (macroinvertebrate sampling was performed along Paint Branch and Westfarm Branch) and GSA's Environmental Impact Statement (sampling in the streams). The data were collected directly within the limits of the property and therefore had the most relevance. Ms. Medina suggested using data north or south of the boundary to identify any data variations. Mr. Pluta added that a risk assessor would typically consider this type of data (outside the property boundary) in an evaluation. Mr. Nesbit added that Ms. Sandberg (Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission) has been helpful with identifying existing data for this area.

Mr. DeLeo asked about the different chemicals detected that included dioxins. Mr. Nesbit explained that at the Building 108 incinerator (central part of base) tests were positive for dioxins but were less than the limits for human health concerns. The ecological risk sampling proposed further delineation of the positive detections for dioxins around the incinerator. Sampling at Site 4 (waste excavation) also identified dioxins in the ash disposed of at the site but he did not recall whether the detects were at excessive levels for human health. Mr. Thornburg added that the ecological screening evaluation was being performed basewide. The cluster of hits will be localized to rule out the contaminant as a basewide problem.

Mr. Bob Craig (ARL) commented that one full year's worth of sampling has now been completed at seven major sites on the property. Mr. Craig asked Mr. Nesbit how this data would be incorporated into both human health and ecological risk assessments. Mr. Nesbit explained that a baseline human health risk assessment and ecological risk assessment will be completed incorporating all four quarters of data. Human health risks will be the focus of the RFI. Risk management recommendations by the BTAG will be incorporated in the Ecological Risk Assessment. Mr. Tino added that it is significant that both efforts converge. There was further discussion between the audience and Mr. Nesbit regarding the sampling areas. Mr. Nesbit and Mr. Pluta stated that it is not uncommon that separate efforts be performed for ecological and human health; however, the two investigations do meet up at some time during the process.

Mr. Bob Young from the audience inquired about the seven discrete areas that had been sampled in 1999. Mr. Nesbit replied that a large number of sites were investigated in the past. The first seven sites have involved more work but are not the only sites being tested. Mr. Meyer asked

about the use of chronic toxicity levels and if they had ever used acute toxicity levels. Mr. Pluta replied that their preference is to use chronic toxicity levels at each step to enforce safety factors. The safety factor process is discussed at Step 3 in the process.

Mr. Tino added that although the Ecological Risk Process is a long process, understanding the process is important and knowledge gained can be used later on.

6.0 SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Groundwater Subcommittee

Mr. Tino stated that lots of data documents have been made available for review. It would be nice to get a report from this subcommittee.

Landfill Subcommittee

Mr. Meyer would like the Navy to send any updates to the subcommittee on the landfills. Mr. Legg indicated that the tour showed the progress at the Site 3 landfill. The pipes are in place and about 14,000 tons of soil were removed. Mr. Meyer asked about the kinds of contaminants that were found. Mr. Tino replied that a lot of shapes and 35 tons of lead hazardous soil (low concentration levels) have been found. Mr. Legg agreed to forward the reports to Mr. Meyer for review.

7.0 RAB/PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Mr. Tino asked to clarify the use of the term nuclear "simulation" (used during the tour). A nuclear simulation test is like a nuclear affect but only a fraction of a second in time. Because a lot of radiation is created during this time employees wear protection gear. The radiation ends when the test ends.

Mr. Craig reported that the Army is currently performing its semiannual sampling of the 500 area. The January sampling data showed low concentrations of TCE. The levels in the wells downgradient of the centrifuge (wells C7 and C8) are down by an order of magnitude. Evidence shows that the extraction wells and air stripper are having a positive effect. Mr. Tino added that a report like this is really encouraging.

Mr. DeLeo reviewed the Site 11 RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI). Two elevated arsenic concentrations. The RFI from 1999 identified background concentrations for arsenic in soil but not in sediment. Mr. Legg replied that the arsenic concentrations in soils were in the range of background levels (Maryland and this area). Mr. Nesbit explained that if the arsenic level exceeded the Risk-Based Concentration (RBC) then it would be carried into the risk assessment. Mr. Nunno explained the conclusion for human health in the Site 11 RFI was that PCBs were determined "no action" but the fact sheet, as well as individual discussions, have indicated PCBs will be removed. Arsenic was found in a ditch not far from the PCB contamination. He asked what will be done with the arsenic. Mr. Nesbit indicated that even though there is an exceedance to the RBC, the risk process most likely determined that no adverse risk was present from exposure to arsenic in the sediment. Therefore, no remediation will be required. The PCB

contamination is being remediated to eliminate concerns in the future and to address ecological risk assessment issues. This remediation will eliminate the need for posting signs, restricting future land use, etc. Mr. Tino suspects the contamination may be from pesticides. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that the arsenic contaminant decision would be documented in the Record of Decision.

Mr. DeLeo asked for clarification regarding the naturally degrading volatile organic compounds (VOCs) identified in the Site 3 Fact Sheet as well as any long-term studies that may be planned for the TCE-contaminated groundwater. Mr. Nesbit explained that through a quick evaluation of the groundwater data, evidence indicates that the TCE is breaking down. To further address this issue, the BCT recently proposed that additional sampling be performed to determine how quickly the TCE is breaking down. Mr. Tino recalled that a presentation on TCE was made to the RAB in the past. The information showed that the human body can deal with TCE and the animal is more likely to be affected. Mr. Nesbit explained that data on the breakdown of TCE will be used by the BCT to reevaluate the corrective measures applicable to the site. Mr. DeLeo asked if there will be potential long-term movement of the plume. Mr. Nesbit explained that long-term monitoring should not be confused with the term "no action." Substantial costs are associated with monitoring (natural attenuation) and a more aggressive treatment may be best. Mr. Tino is concerned that once the Site 3 cap is in place, it will need to be maintained (e.g., grass maintained, kept dry, etc.). Mr. Nesbit added that construction of the CDER Laboratory will require a dewatering system to keep the basements dry. Mr. Tino explained a number of sophisticated techniques are used to keep the water out. Mr. Nesbit added that the dewatering system in the proposed FDA buildings may provide the infrastructure needed to facilitate the removal of contaminants more quickly.

Mr. Tino asked the RAB to think about whether meeting on Thursday is the best day for the majority of the RAB members.

8.0 CLOSING AND WRAP-UP

Mr. Tino adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:50 p.m.

Next RAB Meeting - Thursday, July 13, 2000 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Location - Federal Research Center, Use South Gate Entrance or Main Gate
to Room Number 1-173

Future RAB Meetings - September 14, 2000
November 9, 2000