

00698

N60921.AR.000465  
NSWC WHITE OAK  
5090.3a

**Former Naval Surface Warfare Center-  
White Oak (NSWC-WO)  
Sheraton College Park  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes  
April 8, 2003**

**RAB Members Present at Meeting**

Walter Legg – U.S. Navy, EFA Chesapeake, Navy Co-Chair and White Oak Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC)  
John Tino – Community Co-Chair  
Steven Richard – General Services Administration (GSA)  
Mark Callaghan – Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)/Superfund Division  
Bruce Beach – EPA, Region 3  
Paul Meyer\*\* – Prince George's County Health Department  
Paul DeLeo – Food and Drug Administration (FDA)/National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), Chapter 282  
Christopher L. Evans – U.S. Corps of Engineers  
Gary Irby

**RAB Members Absent from Meeting**

Richard Price – Community Co-Chair  
Hall Crannell\*  
Barbara Medina  
Matthew Amann – FDA  
Mark Symborski\*\*\* – Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC)

- 
- \* 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. Welcome/Introductions (John Tino)

Mr. Tino opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone. Mr. Tino called everyone's attention to the updated site chart, showing the completed sites at NSWC-WO; 100 sites now require no action. Mr. Tino requested all the attendees sign in and provide their e-mail address so the mailing list could be updated. Mr. Tino asked why the RAB is holding a meeting at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Callaghan reminded the attendees that the RAB had agreed to alternate meeting times, with times scheduled for afternoon and evening hours. The attendees introduced themselves.

## 2. RAB Minutes Discussion/Approval (John Tino)

Mr. Tino asked for comments on the recent RAB meeting minutes and updates. Changes were identified in the January RAB meeting minutes. Both Dr. Irby and Dr. DeLeo provided comments. The minutes were accepted with changes. Final January RAB meeting minutes will be distributed at the same time as the draft April minutes distribution.

## 3.0 BCT Update (Mark Callaghan, MDE)

Mr. Callaghan provided information on the following NSWC-WO activities:

**Site 11:** The Corrective Measures Study (CMS) is under review by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT). A Proposed Plan is being drafted; the public comment period is planned for May 2003. The ROD signature is planned for the middle of the year.

**Site 33:** The BCT discussed the documentation needed for the site to be closed as a No Further Action (NFA) site; the risk assessment is being updated.

**Area of Concern (AOC) 2:** A removal action is planned for:

- Solid waste management unit (SWMU) 29 – Building 308 Washdown System
- SWMU 47 – Former Wastewater Treatment Plant
- SWMU 56 – Building 327 Wastewater Tank

Plans for additional investigation are being developed for:

Sites near tributary to Paint Branch

- SWMU 8 – Building 310 Disposal Area
- SWMU 41 – Building 311 Oxidation Ditch
- AOC S – Outfall 018, Building 310A

SWMU 87 – Building 611 Storage Area

SWMU 45 – Building 613 Sump

**Explosive Survey:** Cleanup near drop towers is ongoing.

Mr. Tino mentioned that the shapes found during the survey might be projectiles. Mr. Ridgway clarified that they are inert bombs.

**Site 49:** Additional sampling is being performed.

**Sites 28 & 47:** The Records of Decision (RODs) are complete and undergoing final signature.

**Site 3:** Fish tissue and sediment sampling are being performed.

Mr. Tino asked when the samples will be taken. Mr. Nesbit explained that heavy rains are slowing the planned sample collection. Dr. DeLeo asked how the data will be used. Mr. Nesbit explained that the data will be used to update the ecological risk assessment for the site.

**Site 10 & 14:** The work plans developed for the removal action are undergoing BCT review.

Mr. Richard asked about the schedule. Mr. Nesbit explained that the removal action is planned for sometime this spring. Mr. Tino stated that he is pleased that the BCT is moving forward without further input from the Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO).

**Operable Unit (OU) 2 (Sites 1 & 2):** The fourth sampling event (groundwater and surface water) is complete (March 2003). The Land Use Control Action Plan (LUCAP) is being developed. The Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) is developed and undergoing review. Mr. Beach explained that review for these documents would involve additional reviewers, such as the Army.

**OU 1/Site 46:** A pilot study is planned for Site 9. The goal is to provide Proposed Plans and RODs for these areas within the next year.

Mr. Tino requested clarification on why a pilot study is being performed on Site 9. Mr. Callaghan explained that the target area has an increased level of contaminants. The plan for the pilot study is to install nine injection wells and inject sodium lactate. The injection should reduce the amount of trichloroethylene (TCE) in the groundwater. Mr. Callaghan also explained the location of the injection wells. Mr. Evans asked about the schedule for the study. Mr. Nesbit explained that the study will be performed after the test trenching; he expects it to begin within the month.

Mr. Tino requested background on the proposed technique. Mr. Callaghan explained that the proposed technique has been used at Egland Air Force Base (AFB). The study provided good results showing reduction of RDX and TCE contamination. Mr. Nesbit explained that the techniques were also used at a site in Idaho. This is an innovative technology, which should foster anaerobic degradation of the site contaminants. He further explained that the technique might be used across OU 1. The results of the pilot study will determine if the technology can be used at other sites with similar contamination.

Mr. Meyer asked if the technology could work as well in areas where the contaminant levels are higher. Mr. MacEwen explained that the pilot study should provide some insight about application of the technology. Mr. Nesbit stated that he expects the technology used in the pilot study to work better than the pump and treat technology.

Dr. Irby commented that the air strippers are not always working, and that when they are not working, he feels that the treatment becomes pump and dump. Dr. Irby also mentioned that a couple times he had to notify the Army that the system installed on his property had stopped working and the Army did not know the system was not working. Mr. Nesbit and Mr. Legg explained that the telemetry system used to notify the people who monitor the treatment system has been updated to use cell phones. Mr. Legg explained that even when the system is down, the TCE levels are declining in the wells. Mr. Legg explained that the "pumping" action associated with the "pump and treat" technology is to intercept the groundwater flow. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that even when the system is down, the TCE levels are lower than USEPA risk levels.

**Site 4:** Additional soil and groundwater sampling completed.

**Sites 5, 13, and 48:** The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation (RFI) report continues to be developed. A removal action is planned for Site 48.

Mr. Legg clarified that the removal action at Site 48 is more like a housecleaning measure because there are trash piles located at the site. Mr. Tino stated that when he walked the site several years ago it was clear that a dump truck had dumped trash.

**Site 7:** The groundwater sampling is completed. The Draft Proposed Plan for Site 7 is under review by the BCT. The ROD is scheduled for signature during 2003.

Dr. DeLeo asked about the preferred alternative at Site 11. In-situ bioremediation is planned for the site. Mr. Tino asked where the injections would occur because the plume appears to be moving. Mr. Nesbit stated that the BCT expects to inject a chemical to foster anaerobic degradation. He also stated that the leaching wells are gone. Mr. Tino suggested that the BCT work with the architect to locate the monitoring wells. Dr. DeLeo asked if the plume is located within the footprint of the FDA building. Several RAB members confirmed that the plume is located within the groundwater, which is deep underground. The group explained that when the building was excavated, groundwater was not encountered. Mr. Nesbit agreed that the BCT will work with the landscape design to make certain monitoring wells do not interfere with the building design or landscaping. Mr. Legg agreed to contact the building architects.

#### **4.0 Budget and Schedule (Walter Legg, EFA Ches)**

Mr. Legg explained that NSWC-WO is receiving more funding than originally requested because other facilities are not able to use funding.

#### **5.0 Thallium at White Oak? (Walter Legg, EFA Ches)**

Mr. Legg confirmed that thallium was used by the base. He contacted the base health physics officer and found that NSWC-WO used the isotope thallium-204. All of the thallium was disposed offsite. Mr. Legg reviewed the results of the questions posed by the RAB at the last meeting.

Q#1: Why were samples in the Round 6 sampling of OU-1 groundwater not analyzed for thallium in the unfiltered samples? Answer: Thallium was analyzed, but not detected.

Q#2: What was the nature of the USEPA sampling and analysis in August of 1999 and how were the results interpreted? Answer: Thallium results were below the risk-based levels.

Q#3: At the January 2003 RAB meeting, Dr. Kotun suggested that thallium analysis has systemic problems with false positives; could you provide or have Dr. Kotun/Tetra Tech provide some information beyond the anecdotal evidence? Answer: Office of Toxic Substances, U.S. EPA (OTS) Alert #2 of 01/31/2001, discussed false positives in water. Mr. Legg suspects that the false positive is probably the issue. Mr. Legg and Mr. Nesbit offered to provide a copy of alert to interested RAB members. Mr. Nesbit stated that it does not appear that thallium is a problem across the base. Mr. Nesbit explained that the laboratory that performs the chemical analyses uses the Inductively Couple Plasma (ICP) technology to analyze the samples for metals. The alert cautions people to use another method if it is suspected that thallium is present.

Dr. DeLeo asked about the risk-based values, stating that the proposed cleanup values were slightly lower than the actual cleanup values. Mr. Legg explained that the guidance document for thallium is an interim guidance. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that out of 1,000 records, there were only 40 thallium detections; of these 40 detections, none were above the risk-based criteria. In addition, the background level for thallium in Maryland soils is four parts per million (ppm). Mr. Legg explained the thallium values in soil at NSWC-WO were lower than the Maryland soil background levels.

## **6.0 Site 11 Progress (Scott Nesbit, TtNUS)**

The Corrective Measures Study (CMS) is being developed. The four alternatives include:

- Alternative 1 – No action
- Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls and Monitoring
- Alternative 3 – “Hot Spot” In-Situ Bioremediation, Source Removal, Institutional Controls, and Monitoring [Preferred Alternative]
- Alternative 4 – Extraction, Ex-Situ Treatment, Surface Discharge, Institutional Controls, and Monitoring

Dr. DeLeo clarified that the actions for Site 11 are for shallow and deep groundwater.

Mr. Nesbit stated that the Proposed Plan is scheduled to be distributed in early May. A 30-day public comment period will be held with a public meeting scheduled for mid-May. The ROD is scheduled to be signed in September 2003.

Mr. Tino stated that anyone who wants to review the CMS should send Mr. Nesbit an e-mail.

## **7.0 Site 7 Removal and Groundwater (Scott MacEwen, CH2M Hill; Scott Nesbit, TtNUS)**

Mr. MacEwen reviewed the Site 7 location. The site contained a trench where the Navy burned explosives. Because of this activity, elevated levels of TNT and RDX were found in the soil and

groundwater below the trench. HMX was also present, but not at levels above the risk levels. Mr. MacEwen explained that two wells in the middle of the trench had the highest levels of TNT and RDX.

Shaw Environmental removed about 2,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil. The field crew performed field tests on the removed soil, which showed no TNT or RDX was present. TtNUS performed confirmatory sampling and confirmed RDX was not detected. TNT was present but at concentrations that were below risk levels. Any remaining contaminants were determined to not provide a continuous source to the groundwater.

Groundwater at the site is about 40 feet below the surface. Mr. MacEwen explained that the field crew backfilled the site and placed some vegetable oil throughout, that is, they applied the treatment technology. Mr. MacEwen stated that the Navy installed two new wells to narrow down the area requiring treatment. Results from wells #201 and #202 came back with contaminant levels below risk-concerns.

Mr. MacEwen explained that the Feasibility Study (FS) report is being finalized. The Proposed Plan is expected this summer. The most attractive alternative is a biological remediation option, using either sodium lactate or hydrogen release compound as the proposed treatment. The plan is to inject the treatment into the wells so that it degrades the RDX and TNT at the site.

Mr. Meyer asked what disposal site the Navy used for the contaminated soil. Mr. Legg agreed to contact Mr. Meyer with the disposal location.

Mr. Tino asked where soil contaminated with explosives could be disposed. Mr. MacEwen and Mr. Nesbit clarified that explosives must be found in very high concentrations in soil to be considered hazardous waste.

Mr. MacEwen presented pictures of the site after excavation and backfilling was complete. He clarified that the ROD for Site 7 will address both soil and groundwater at the site

## **8.0 Administrative Record on CD-ROM (Kate Landkrohn, TtNUS)**

Ms. Landkrohn provided a demonstration of how to access and use the Administrative Record on CD-ROM. The Administrative Record on CD-ROM contains those documents issued by September 30, 2001. The documents were converted to an electronic format that allows them to be viewed and searched using the computer program, Adobe Acrobat. At this time, about 500 documents are contained on six (6) CDs.

Once the CD is loaded, the user should open the "Welcome" file. The "Welcome" page will display several buttons that allow the user to access the files. To view the complete instructions, click on the button entitled, "Getting Started." A User's Manual has been developed and contains hard copies of the instructions and the supporting documents. Ms. Landkrohn reviewed the search capabilities provided using the Administrative Record on CD-ROM. She also

explained that some documents are not contained on the CDs because they are pages of data. These records can be reviewed by contacting Mr. Legg.

Ms. Landkrohn explained that the White Oak Public Library no longer has a CD reader for public use, so the Administrative Record is not available for use at the library at this time. Mr. Legg agreed to contact the library and discuss the options to make it available to RAB members and other interested public. In the meantime, people can view the documents contained on the Administrative Record on CD-ROM by contacting Mr. Legg and Ms Landkrohn; they will arrange for people to view the documents at their respective offices.

#### **9.0 RAB/Public Discussion (John Tino)**

Mr. Tino asked the team to review the Base Cleanup Plan handout provided by Mr. Nesbit. Any comments or questions should be provided to Mr. Tino and he will address them in the update. The RAB update is expected around May 20, 2003.

#### **10.0 Closing and Wrap-Up (John Tino)**

Mr. Tino thanked the attendees for coming. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The team talked about meeting at the Center for the Handicapped or possibly Cresthaven Elementary school (the local elementary). Ms. Landkrohn offered to investigate the availability of these locations for future RAB meetings.

**NEXT RAB Meeting:** July 8, 2003, 7:00 p.m.

**Meeting Location:** TBD

**Future RAB Meetings:** October 14, 2003  
January 13, 2004