



Naval Air Station South Weymouth, MA Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes October 11, 2012

1. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

John Goodrich, RAB facilitator, opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. He requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, sign in. He noted that the meeting agenda, handouts, and the sign-in sheet were available on the table at the back of the room. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A. J. Goodrich asked if everyone had time to read the minutes from the August 2012 RAB meeting and if there were any comments. There were no comments.

J. Goodrich reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The meeting agenda and the action item tracking list are provided as Attachment B. In accordance with the agenda, the presentation and discussion would be followed by the updates and action items portion of the meeting. The minutes, agenda, and action items for the meeting are posted on the BRAC PMO website: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/>.

2. PRESENTATION

J. Goodrich introduced Dave Barney to give a brief introduction to be followed by Kayleen Jalkut who would give the presentation on the former Sewage Treatment Plant (STP). The referenced slides are included in Attachment C.

D. Barney stated that the STP was one of the initial sites identified in 1988. When the Base was constructed, the sanitary sewage was treated at this location. The original leach field system was expanded and the STP equipment added in the 1950s. The treated effluent discharged to French Stream. The system was decommissioned in 1978 and demolished in 1992. Most of the structures were demolished to approximately 2 feet below grade; the sludge drying bed was the only structure that was left. The Navy used the covered drying bed area for sand and salt storage.

K. Jalkut began with a review of the objectives (Slide 2) of the Supplemental Pre-Design Investigation (PDI) presentation and updates on activities completed since the last RAB presentation on the STP (September 2009). The STP is located in the northern portion of the Base and is partially surrounded by wetlands. Phase I and Phase II Remedial Investigations were performed. The Feasibility Study (FS) identified five areas that required remediation. The Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in 2008. The

selected remedy consisted of soil excavation and off-site disposal/recycling and a PDI to fully delineate the extent of the five remediation areas. Major milestones leading up to the ROD are summarized on Slide 3.

After the ROD was signed the post-ROD activities listed on Slide 4 were completed. A PDI and Remedial Design were performed; the Remedial Action was implemented in 2009. The Remedial Action was successfully completed in four of the five areas but additional delineation was needed in Area A-2 (Slide 5). During this time an Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) was completed. The ESD allowed the excavated materials to be used as a sub-grade layer in the West Gate Landfill cap, instead of being transported off-site for disposal.

A supplemental PDI was required to complete the additional delineation at depth in Area A-2. The supplemental PDI objectives were to characterize/delineate the lateral and vertical extent of subsurface contamination and determine if contamination existed at depth outside Area A-2 (i.e. the A-2 boundary needed to be adjusted) (Slide 6). Additionally, delineation of the material in the pipes that discharge from the STP to the drainage ditch was included in the supplemental PDI.

Soil boring (SB) and headwall (HW) samples were collected during the supplemental PDI. Drilling for soil boring advancement was difficult due to the remaining buried structures (Slide 7). The soil boring sample results are summarized on Slide 8. One surface soil and 34 subsurface soil samples were collected. The analytical results indicated that PAH, PCB, and pesticide concentrations exceeded the EPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) at SB-14, SB-15A, and SB-20A. Debris and petroleum was encountered below the water table at SB-14 (10 to 14 feet below ground surface (bgs)). Petroleum was also encountered at SB-15 (12 to 13.5 feet below ground surface [bgs]). The petroleum was most likely associated with debris and movement of materials during the STP decommissioning work.

There are three pipes in/near the headwall at the drainage ditch, but only pipe #2 is connected to the plant. Pipe #3 is a storm drain and pipe #1 is most likely connected to the original plant and is not part of the headwall. Headwall samples were collected using a 4-foot direct push technology (DPT) tube advanced horizontally into the pipe (Slide 9). The headwall sample analytical results were similar to the soil boring results; PAH, PCB, pesticide, and metals concentrations exceeded the RSLs (Slide 10).

A human health risk screening evaluation was performed using the analytical data from locations with RSL exceedances. The Site is zoned for commercial and open space. Therefore exposure scenarios and receptors were identified based on potential future exposures in the two zones. The receptors included: an industrial worker (in the commercial zone); a hypothetical resident (since daycare is an allowed commercial use); and a trespasser (in the open space zone). No residential land uses are

allowed in either zoning district. The Navy evaluated the hypothetical resident as a conservative alternative (daycare use) under the commercial scenario.

The western side of the Site is delineated wetlands. The SSTTDC zoning regulations require a 50-foot buffer around wetlands where vertical construction is not allowed. Sidewalks or walking paths would be allowed.

The conclusions of the risk screening evaluation are summarized on Slide 11. There was no unacceptable risk to the industrial worker exposed to surface soil and subsurface soil less than 6 feet bgs. Cancer risk was identified for industrial workers exposed to subsurface soil more than 6 feet bgs, adolescent trespassers exposed to the headwall soil, and hypothetical residents (e.g. day care center) exposed to surface soil and subsurface soil. The risk drivers for each exposure scenario were selected as COCs and included 6 PAHs, 2 metals, 3 pesticides, and 2 PCBs.

Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) were calculated for the COCs contributing to risk for each receptor exposed to site media. New PRGs were needed since the Supplemental PDI identified media and COCs which were different from those in the ROD (Slide 12). The soil concentrations were then compared to the PRGs. Slides 13 and 14 present the exceedances of resident PRGs and industrial worker/trespasser PRGs, respectively. As shown on the two slides, there was no pattern to the PRG exceedances. Chromium exceeded the PRG at a number of locations under the hypothetical resident scenario, but was conservatively evaluated as hexavalent chromium. If chromium had been evaluated as trivalent chromium there would have been no risk to human health. There is no evidence that hexavalent chromium was used on the Site.

J. Cunningham asked what PAH stands for. K. Jalkut stated that it stands for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon, which is an organic compound that results from incomplete combustion (ex. car exhaust).

The conclusions of the Supplemental PDI are summarized on Slide 15. Based on the re-evaluation of the human health risk there is contamination outside the previously defined excavation boundary for Area A-2. Contamination was found at depths up to 14 feet bgs; the remedial action excavation depth was 2.5 feet bgs. The Navy is discussing next steps with the BRAC Cleanup Team (Slide 16). More subsurface soil delineation and continuing the remedial action have been proposed. Portions of the pipes acting as potential continuing sources of contamination would be removed and other pipe sections decommissioned as needed. A ROD amendment or an ESD will be prepared to address the additional remedial actions that will be performed.

M. Brennan asked about the plans to further investigate the pipes. K. Jalkut responded that the pipes (or a portion of the pipes) will be removed. D. Barney added that the two pipes in the concrete wall are

connected to features of the former STP. The other pipe is connected to the effluent discharge point of the original STP. The drawings of the facility have been referenced to help evaluate the extent of the pipe removal.

M. Brennan then asked what work was done at Area D. D. Barney stated that Area D was part of the remedial action; sediment in the swale was excavated as far back as the headwall. The actual excavation work during the remedial action uncovered the pipes in the headwall.

M. Brennan asked whether excavation would be an option considering the contamination goes down to 14 feet. K. Jalkut responded that the first step is to better delineate the area and determine how large an area is impacted then options would be further evaluated. He asked about the depth to groundwater. K. Jalkut stated that groundwater is approximately 6 to 7 feet bgs.

A. Malewicz confirmed that the STP Site was zoned as open space and asked what the future use of the open space could be. S. Ivas stated that due to the fact that it is mostly wetland, the best future use would be a possible walking trail along the Area D berm. A. Malewicz asked why the child recreational user wasn't considered. K. Jalkut responded this wasn't considered a likely future use of the land.

A. Malewicz asked if you needed a land use control regarding residential/child care. C. Keating noted that the original ROD allows unrestricted use so it will need to be modified if land use controls are added.

3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

Action Items: There were no action items to address.

IR/EBS Program Site Update: The Building 82 ROD was completed at the end of September. The Remedial Design/Remedial Action is the next step.

The Feasibility Studies for Building 81 and SRA are both being worked on.

WGL, Small Landfill, and RDA (3 landfill sites) were all sampled in September as part of the long-term monitoring programs. Nothing unusual was observed. There is still methane present at the RDA, but it is not an issue at the WGL or Small Landfill.

There is a new MCP site with a new RTN related to a tipped over transformer on the Old Hangar 2 pad. A notification is being filed with the MassDEP Southeast Regional Office and an immediate response action completion report will also be submitted. As progress is made the appropriate parties will be notified.

The AOC 55C and WGL wetland inspections were completed in September. Invasive species control at AOC 55C is planned for the week of October 15th.

Work continues on RIA 11; the Decision Document has been finalized.

RIA 111 is on the back burner for now as other sites take priority based on available resources.

Finalization of FOST 5C is underway now that the RIA 11 Decision Document is completed. FOST 6A is in a holding pattern due the need to execute appropriate LUCs at the WGL.

M. Bromberg asked about the plan for a roundabout on top of the WGL. D. Barney responded that a roundabout at the WGL would require a lot of discussion before anything could move forward. The Navy is not aware of any specifics about this subject. S. Ivas added that he had not heard anything about it. M. Bromberg stated that J. Young had mentioned this to him.

Conclusion/Next Meeting

D. Barney stated that the RAB has been meeting every other month for years but there are now fewer topics and sites to discuss. He suggested finishing this year with a RAB meeting in December. Starting in 2013 there will be a February RAB meeting and then the frequency will change to RAB meetings every 3rd month (e.g. May, August, November). He added that in 2013 there will also be public meetings for the SRA and Building 81 Proposed Plans.

J. Goodrich wrapped up the meeting. The next RAB meeting will be the second Thursday in December (December 13, 2012). The meeting will again be held at the New England Wildlife Center, 500 Columbian St., Weymouth, MA. A potential topic is the mitigation approach for landfill gas at RDA.