NAS JRB WILLOW GROVE
RAB MEETING No. 30 MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 11, 2006
Meeting Time: 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Place: Horsham Township Public Library Meeting Room

	Name	Organization
Attendance:	Thomas Hibbs	Community Member
	Rick Meyers (R)	Community Member
	Eric Lindhult (R)	Community Member
	Jim Vetrini (R)	Community Member
	Michelle Sawyer	Community Member
	Jim Edmond (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove
	William Brown (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove Executive Officer
	Duane Maslowski (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Ellie F. Nix ???	USAFR
	Bob Lewandowski (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Charanjit Gill (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Lisa Bradford (R)	EPA
	April Flipse (R)	PADEP
	Jessica Kasmar (R)	PADEP
	Russ Turner (R)	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Kevin Kilmartin (R)	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Douglas Wright	INTEX

(R) Designates RAB Member

Jim Edmond opened the meeting and welcomed all in attendance to the 30th RAB meeting. Mr. Edmond thanked everyone for coming despite the rain, and reminded the group that the last RAB was abbreviated due to bad weather. As a result of a power outage at the Horsham Township Library, the 29th RAB meeting moved to the Air Station (Building 78) for those able to attend. Although the group was small, the meeting was held and meeting minutes were distributed. The Air Force has copies of their presentation from the last RAB meeting and will answer any questions in tonight's meeting.

There will be a Community Country Fair at the Air Station on October 28th. Mr. Edmond provided copies of a flier with details of games, entertainment and food. For those who sell crafts, there is space available to show and sell your wares.

The first Navy environmental update is on the soil removal action at Site 5, the former Fire Training Area. The Navy has removed the soil that contained the source of contamination. The remaining soil has been sampled to confirm that the contaminated soil has been removed. The Navy will have the contractor fill the excavation with clean soil to complete the project.

Mr. Edmond introduced Kevin Kilmartin, the project lead hydrogeologist, to provide an update on the groundwater monitoring results at Site 1, the Privet road Compound area. Groundwater at this site has been discussed frequently at previous RAB meetings. This latest monitoring is expected to lead to the next step in the decision making process.

Mr. Kilmartin used projected slides of the Air Station to point out the features he will be discussing such as the location of the Privet Road Compound waste transfer station, the Navy potable water production wells, and a cluster of buildings in a former industrial section off-Base. Historically, as the Navy conducted multiple phases of remedial investigation, the data generated indicated that the source of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), chiefly trichloroethene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE), in the

Navy supply wells is not due to contamination at the Privet Road Compound. The data indicated that the major source of these VOCs is not on Navy property, but is located upgradient (like "upriver") according to the regional groundwater flow pattern. Through the United States Geological Survey (USGS) we know that regional groundwater flow is to the northwest in this area. To test the conclusion (based on years of groundwater data collection) that the VOC source is upgradient of the Navy property, the Navy needed to know the quality of the groundwater as it enters Navy property. Using the data collected over these multiple investigations over the years and in accordance with a plan worked out by all parties (Navy, EPA, PADEP and USGS), the Navy selected two locations along the Navy property line at Route 611 and installed three new groundwater monitoring wells to sample the groundwater as it enters Navy property, between the Navy supply wells/Privet Road Compound area, and the off-Base former industrial suspected source area. Mr. Kilmartin explained the methods used and the participation by USGS in determining the new monitoring well construction details to ensure that the appropriate geological units were identified and sampled to resolve this issue. Results of analysis from the new perimeter monitoring wells confirmed that groundwater flowing onto Base property from off-Base source or sources does contain the VOC contaminants (TCE and PCE) as found in the Navy supply wells. A draft report of results that supports the previous data interpretation that the chemicals detected in the Navy supply wells (and beneath Site 1) are not originating on Navy property, but are flowing onto Navy property from an off-Base source, has been written and is currently under review by PADEP and EPA .

Mr. Lindhult asked about Site 1 monitoring well depths in relationship to the Navy supply wells and if the supply wells are an open borehole the entire depth to draw water in from various depths. Mr. Kilmartin replied that the Site 1 monitoring wells are much shallower, typically 120 or 150 feet, whereas production wells total depth are about 350 or even 400 feet. Unlike monitoring wells that generally are constructed to monitor a short target segment in the groundwater geology; the production wells are open boreholes that draw water in from various depths. Several years ago, The Navy replaced the existing old supply well pumps. At that time, the Navy contracted USGS to perform "packer testing" and geophysical studies to classify the various hydrogeologic units along with the water quality encountered in each. This investigation supplied another piece of the puzzle that all played into the interpretation.

Mr. Lindhult asked if there is a vertical gradient in bedrock up or down or neutral, or if the gradient is driven by pumping of the (supply) wells. Mr. Kilmartin replied that above a depth of about 60 to 80 feet, the gradient is generally down. Then, there is a transition zone below which you get at least semi-confining conditions, and there is usually an upward gradient below that zone and the shallower. But the confined zone, the deeper zone, is very strongly affected by the pumping of the Navy supply wells. If you were to place a water level monitoring transducer in those wells, the water level is never static. As the Navy supply wells are turned on and off, you can see the effect almost immediately in the nearby monitoring wells. Even in the new wells that were installed this year along Route 611, particularly the well further north – location 10, the USGS noted that while logging the well that the water level just kept dropping and rising over a three to four foot interval. That was due to the pumping influence from the Navy supply wells. Mr. Edmond added that the Navy matched the observed level variation with the record of pump operation of the Navy supply wells. The recorder on the supply wells indicated that while the supply wells were pumping, the level would drop in the new monitoring well. When the pumps were turned off, the water level would begin to rise.

Mr. Myers asked about the concentrations of TCE and PCE in the Site 1 groundwater in relation to concentrations found on the other side of the Base (at Site 5). Is there a higher concentration of the stuff (TCE and PCE) as it comes onto the Base compared to the other side or is it the same? Mr. Kilmartin replied that the concentrations are pretty comparable overall. However, during chemical analysis packer testing of the new boreholes, especially in borehole number 10, zones of higher VOC concentrations were found, although for other reasons they weren't the best zones to screen.

Mr. Myers summarized that what we are saying is that we can almost sit there and say to the Township, here it is, the proof is in the pudding, the stuff (TCE and PCE) is not here; it's coming on (Base). Mr. Edmond agreed, the data shows that the VOC contamination comes from an off-Base source. Based on the Navy's findings and recommendations, EPA and PADEP are moving to open

an existing (dormant) investigation at a former industrial site across Route 611. Also, this not only affects the Navy, there are implications for the Air Force Site 4 – Wash Rack in the same vicinity as the Navy Site 1. The Air Force at one time also had water supply wells (long since shut down permanently) that may have been drawing the same VOC contamination from across Route 611 into their property at Site 4. Discovery of the off-Base source should also help the Air Force document their Site 4 source. Mr. Gill mentioned that the Air Force appreciates that (assistance).

Mr. Edmond mentioned that the Navy and EPA with agreement from PADEP, have signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for Site 1 soils. The ROD basically states that Site 1 soils are clean, requiring no further action to protect human health or the environment. This is a big step toward cleaning up the Base according to the law. Now, the next step at Site 1 will be a ROD for Site 1 groundwater based on the results discussed by Kevin. That ROD will be written with land use controls (LUCs) to limit future uses of groundwater beneath the property.

At Site 2 - The Antenna Field Landfill, the remedial investigation report is pending that should be out soon. At Site 3 – The Ninth Street landfill, again we are in the remedial investigation report writing stage.

Status at Site 4 – The North End Landfill is pending. The Navy has felt that this is a no further action (NFA) site, but EPA and the Navy may agree on further investigation before an agreement is issued.

At Site 5, the Navy is completing soil backfill operations for the soil removal action, and the feasibility study for groundwater remediation is under review.

Status at Sites 6 and 7, two former rifle ranges, is the same as Site 4. The Navy has felt that these are NFA sites, but EPA and the Navy may agree on further investigation before an agreement is issued. One of these sites has a modern building that was constructed over the entire area.

Site 8 - Building 118 Abandoned Fuel Tank and 9 - Steam Plant Building 6 Tank Overfill have both received concurrence from EPA and PADEP for NFA.

Site 10 – The Navy Fuel Farm official site status is NFA for the current use. If the Horsham Land Reuse Authority keeps current land use unchanged for this site, then the property transfer can be executed as is. If there is residential use proposed, the future property owner would have to deal with the restriction currently associated with the land use.

Mr. Edmond mentioned that to comply with the Base Realignment and Closure law, the Navy, EPA and PADEP have set annual goals for milestone achievement. Goals for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 include:

- Final ROD fro Site 1 Groundwater
- ROD for Site 5 Soils
- NFA agreements for Sites 8 and 9
- Resolution of issues regarding status of Sites 4, 6 and 7
- Final RI report for Site 2
- Final Site Management Plan (2007)
- CERFA Determinations

The Site Management Plan is a document agreed upon by the Navy, EPA and PADEP saying how the Navy will manage these sites.

CERFA, the Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act was passed by Congress in 1992 and amended Section 9620(h) of CERCLA (the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act) which addresses Federal real property transfers. This act requires the Navy to identify any parts of the property where any hazardous substance or petroleum product or derivative was stored for more than one year, released, or disposed. As part of the BRAC process, the Navy has contracted Tetra Tech to perform the prescribed CERFA investigation of examining relevant sources of data such as

property deeds, aerial photographs, and other pertinent reports and records. The CERFA team was at the Air Station last week to perform the site inspection phase of this project. This investigation covers the Navy portion of the Air Station only, since the Air Force is not part of BRAC. One of the documents that has been useful for the CERFA determination is the Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) report that is in the Administrative Record at the Horsham Township Public Library. The CERFA report will help the Navy and the LRA in the BRAC process by categorizing parts of the property as totally clean (no history of storage or release) (Category 1); parts that have a history of contamination (Category 3); and areas where the history is unclear but there may have been a potential for contamination (Category 2).

Since there were no further questions on Navy status or BRAC issues, Mr. Edmond introduced Charanjit Gill to field questions on the Air Force Installation Restoration Program (IRP) status presented in the last RAB meeting. Mr. Gill provided copies of his presentation slides from the previous meeting and gave a short synopsis of the Air Force IR program discussed in full detail at the last RAB meeting. In addition, Mr. Gill provided a summary of work planned for this coming year, including biosparging operations and maintenance at the POL Site and an investigation in the area of the commercial natural gas pipeline that passes through and near Air Force property. The Air Force will present a status update for the POL Site remediation at the next RAB meeting.

There were no questions for Mr. Gill, so Mr. Edmond proposed that the next RAB meeting be scheduled for January 10, 2007. Mr. Lindhult mentioned that there could be conflict for that date for him and Jack Dunleavy. Mr. Edmond agreed to tentatively schedule the next RAB meeting for Wednesday January 17, 2007 pending confirmation from Mr. Lindhult.

Lisa Bradford mentioned that EPA wanted to make a correction to statements made by the Air Force at the last RAB meeting. In slide number 34 of the Air Force presentation, the first bullet states that “EPA has never provided comments on the Source I.D. Report. “ Actually, EPA has a copy of comments submitted to the Air Force via Certified Mail on August 23, 2004 and has the receipt confirming delivery. In addition, Linda Watson of EPA Region 3 also sent the same set of comments on August 17, 2004. Ms. Bradford requested that this correction be recorded in these meeting minutes.

Mr. Edmond thanked EPA for that correction and since there were no further questions from the RAB, announced that this 30th meeting of the NAS JRB/Air Reserve Station Willow Grove was closed. Mr. Edmond thanked everyone for coming and reminded everyone to drive safely in the rain.

The Next RAB meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 17, 2007. The meeting place will be the Horsham Township Library, 435 Babylon Road, Horsham, PA 19044 (phone: 215-443-2609).