

**NAS JRB WILLOW GROVE
RAB MEETING No. 31 MINUTES**

Meeting Date: January 17, 2007
Meeting Time: 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Place: Horsham Township Public Library Meeting Room

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	Mary (Liz) Gemmill (R)	Community Co Chair
	Thomas Hibbs	Community Member
	Rick Meyers (R)	Community Member
	Eric Lindhult (R)	Community Member
	Rich Peffall (R)	Community Member
	Michelle Sawyer	Community Member
	Ted Roth (R)	Community Member
	Jack Lebeau	EHRF
	Jim Edmond (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove
	CDR. William Brown (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove Executive Officer
	Bob Lewandowski (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Curt Frye (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Duane Maslowski (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Charanjit Gill (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	David Grasso	ARS Willow Grove
	Ed Kreibick	ARS Willow Grove
	Beverly Kreibick	ARS Willow Grove
	Lisa Bradford (R)	EPA
	Bruce Beach	EPA
	Jessica Kasmari (R)	PADEP
	Russ Turner (R)	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Don Whalen	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Douglas Wright	INTEX

(R) Designates RAB Member

Jim Edmond opened the meeting and welcomed all in attendance to the 31st NAS Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. Mr. Edmond thanked everyone for coming and reminded everyone to please sign in before they leave so there will be a complete list for the Administrative Record.

The Navy will present updates on progress since the last RAB meeting. The Air Force does not have a planned presentation, although there are ARS personnel here tonight available for questions. Mr. Edmond introduced Curt Frye the Navy Remedial Project Manager to present updates of the soil removal action at the former Fire Training Area – Site 5.

Mr. Frye explained that the Navy has removed about 400 cubic yards of soil, finishing up late last summer around August. The Navy recently received the draft soil removal report from the contractor. After some remaining revisions, the draft report will be submitted to the regulatory agencies and other parties. At this point, the Navy anticipates that no further action will be required for Site 5 soil. So the plan for Site 5 soil this year will be to develop the Record of Decision (ROD) for no further action.

Mr. Edmond introduced Don Whalen of Tetra Tech NUS, to present a summary of the Remedial Investigation Report being prepared for the Ninth Street Landfill – Site 3.

Mr. Whalen used a projected slide of the Air Station to point out the location of the Site 3 area in the western boundary of the Base near Horsham Road. Reportedly, there was a variety of wastes including

trichloroethylene (TCE), paint sludge, sewage sludge, and general refuse. Wastes were subjected to a variety of waste handling and disposal techniques in the area, reportedly including burning wastes in trenches and burial. Mr. Whalen summarized the phased sequence of investigation beginning with the Preliminary Assess (PA) and Site Inspection (SI) studies begun in the late 1980's through the Phase I and Phase II Remedial Investigation (RI) studies completed in 1997. Follow-up activities, including confirmation groundwater sampling of all Site 3 monitoring wells, were completed in 2006. All site media were investigated, including surface soil samples, subsurface soil samples, groundwater, surface water and sediments. The conclusion of these investigations is that groundwater is the main concern at this site. Contaminants of concern in groundwater include the volatile organic compound (VOC) tetrachloroethene (also known as perchloroethylene (PCE)), and the metals arsenic, chromium, iron and manganese. Using a projected slide showing sample collection locations from the various phased investigation events, Mr. Whalen explained that the Navy actively searched for a suspected PAH (petroleum-type contamination) in soil (that turned out not to be of significant concern) and the source of contamination in groundwater. The source of PCE in groundwater appears to be upgradient of the Ninth Street Landfill site in the vicinity of the Army Reserve Hangar, where there is an oil/water separator. However, soil samples obtained in the vicinity of the Army Reserve hanger and oil/water separator did not indicate VOC's in soil that could cause the groundwater contamination observed downgradient.

Mr. Edmond added a short history of the types of building uses and aircraft stored or maintained in and around the Hangar. Some of those aircraft, particularly the UH-1 "Huey" helicopters, were known for their oil leaks (that would require frequent degreasing) and were stored on the concrete pads along the side of the runway apron leading to the Army Reserve Hangar. Mr. Roth asked if PCE isn't primarily a (dry) cleaning fluid. Would the Military have used it at all? Mr. Turner mentioned that PCE was also used as a degreaser. Mr. Edmond pointed out that the Army may have used cleaning solvents containing PCE for cleaning helicopters. In this area of Bucks and Montgomery Counties, TCE and PCE are very common contaminants in groundwater. In many municipal wells, not just in the vicinity of the Air Station, these compounds are found in groundwater and the water is treated to within regulatory limits for use by residents. Mr. Roth asked if that is something we're drinking? Mr. Edmond explained that there is no pumping of the groundwater from Site 3 for any kind of use. Even so, the Navy, in cooperation with EPA and PADEP, has spent time and effort to find the source of PCE at Site 3, so far without success.

Mr. Lindhult asked if the iron and manganese is naturally occurring in the area. Mr. Turner replied that these compounds were found generally in the range of background, but some samples were above background concentrations, triggering a concern in the Human Health Risk Assessment performed. This risk issue is a matter to be worked out among the decision-makers, EPA, PADEP and the Navy following the EPA RI/FS process. Mr. Lindhult asked if anaerobic biological degradation of the PCE in groundwater is occurring at Site 3 similar to what is going on at Site 5. Do you find just strictly PCE? Mr. Whalen explained that we have not found evidence of degradation products of the contaminant (in this case PCE) like we did at Site 5. Most wells that have VOC's have only PCE.

Mr. Whalen used a series of slides of monitoring well locations and contaminant concentrations to describe the nature and extent of the contamination plume. Most concentrations of PCE in groundwater are very low, either below or not much higher than EPA Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) and the Army Reserve Hangar oil/water separator area is still the suspected "source" area, even though we haven't found soil contamination there. Mr. Edmond provided a brief history of the series of oil/water separators that have been in operation at the Army Reserve Hangar over many years. The original oil/water separator installed at the Hangar has been replaced twice since the 1990's. Maybe the reason we are having trouble finding the "source" of PCE we think should be in this area, is that during one of the oil/water replacement projects, the "source" (any contaminated soil) was removed with the obsolete oil/water separator.

Mr. Wright mentioned that it looks like the concentration does seem to be increasing downgradient. Mr. Whalen pointed out each of the concentrations by location and dept using the projected slide and used another summary slide to show that the trend of PCE concentrations in each well is generally a

significant decrease from the 1997 sample to the 2006 sample. Mr. Lebeau asked what are the reference levels for this. Some of these numbers look very low. What is considered safe? Mr. Whalen stated that the EPA regulatory limit (MCL) for drinking water for PCE is 5 parts per billion. CDR. Brown asked if we have any instances where the level of contamination shows an increase, and where that would be on the map. Mr. Whalen pointed to the location of monitoring well 03MW03S that went from 8 ug/l in 1991, to 5 ug/l (estimated) in 1997, to 14 ug/l in 2006 as the only concentration that increased over those years. Mr. Roth asked what is the range (of reported results from these laboratory analyses)? Mr. Whalen explained that there is always some degree of variation with samples that we can not quantify exactly. In this case the general observation is that concentrations have decreased and that it has been fairly consistent. The number of wells that show decreased concentrations and the amount of the decrease in some cases is strongly suggestive that the appearance of decrease is in fact real, but we can not say conclusively that is the case. Mr. Turner added that these (decreasing concentrations) tie in with the soil investigation performed in the vicinity of the Army Reserve Hangar where we were looking for the VOC source. No PCE was found in the upgradient potential source area soil which would be a continuing supply for the plume. So essentially, what seems to be happening is that the plume appears to be dying. Mr. Edmond reiterated that the Navy has performed a number of investigations looking for the source of PCE in groundwater at this site. In addition to the field samples collected and summarized in the RI report, in February 2006 the Navy and Tetra Tech NUS performed a records search/case history of the entire Army Compound, Hangar, vehicle maintenance activities and the Army Reserve building itself looking for any kind of clue to help find the "source." We investigated historical records and performed on-site inspections looking for evidence of underground storage tanks, oil/water separators, maintenance activities and storage of chemicals or anything like that. The field sampling of soils at the Army Reserve Hangar (finding no VOC/PCE) was the result. We think that either the source was removed with the replacement of the oil/water separators in the 1990s or that any source that may have existed is now so depleted that it no longer can support the contaminant plume and we may never find a "source". Mr. Roth asked if it is time to quit looking (for the source) then? Mr. Edmond replied that the Navy is in the process of submitting this information to the regulatory agencies. Depending on what is agreed upon; this site may be slated for land use controls to prevent any potential future use of the contaminated groundwater.

Mr. Roth asked if another Federal agency takes over the property, would they take it "as is" (with any environmental liabilities)? Mr. Lewandowski replied that if another Federal agency were to take it over, they would take over the property as is. At this point we do not know (what the disposition will be) so we're proceeding as if the property will be in the hands of the Land Reuse Authority or some other unknown final disposition. Accordingly, we will be trying to make the property as clean and useful as possible. There is the possibility that the property could be offered for sale; and the cleaner it is, the better the value of the property would be. Mr. Roth mentioned that at one time we (the RAB) talked about whether it gets cleaned up to industrial use, which is basically what it is now, or to some even cleaner level for residential use or maybe even so people could eat in it. Where does that (soil cleanup decision) get resolved? Mr. Lewandowski clarified that unlike soil that has a cleanup level corresponding to future land use such as industrial or residential, the EPA standard (MCL) for drinking water would apply to groundwater. In the case of soil, cleanup level decisions will be influenced by the eventual potential reuse of the property. According to the BRAC law, DOD is only required to clean up to whatever the current land use is. So if the current land use is industrial, the Navy would clean up to an industrial level, unless we believe we can realize a more valuable piece of property by cleaning to a higher standard. BRAC allows the option of doing that (cleaning up to a higher standard) if it makes good sense for DOD to do it. It would depend on what develops for potential future land use. Mr. Roth asked if DOD would get the funds. Mr. Lewandowski replied yes, in the past round of BRAC it was actually written into the law that DOD can realize the fair market value and ask a fair market value for the property.

Mr. Lindhult asked about the oxidation/reduction potential for the various zones at Site 3. They were negative at the Fire Training Area, and realizing that there are no PCE degradation products at Site 3, he assumes they would be positive at Site 3? Mr. Turner agreed that there doesn't appear to be any significant presence of PCE degradation products at Site 3, but based on the information available

couldn't say anything about the oxidation/reduction potential of the Site 3 geological units. At Site 5, the oxidation potential was a greater concern (for the pending Feasibility Study (FS)) and the Navy collected samples for Natural Attenuation parameters across the entire site. This issue has not come up as necessary at Site 3, so the Navy has not collected a lot of that type of (Natural Attenuation) parameters. We may have pH and the field-collected oxidation/reduction potential data.

Mr. Edmond asked if there were any more questions for Don (there were none). Some of the sites we called No Further Action (NFA) sites are in the process of reevaluation by the EPA. These include the two former rifle ranges – Sites 6 and 7, and the former North End Landfill – Site 4. The NFA decisions date back to the late 1980's or early 1990's, before the Base was placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) by EPA. Now, to be prudent, the EPA wants to have a look at recent sampling results for two of the sites to make sure the assumptions made previously were correct. The Navy is expecting the EPA to suggest samples and analytical parameters for investigation. Mr. Frye added that the Navy would like to prepare a short work plan for each of the Sites 4 – North End landfill and Site 7 – Rifle Range Number 7. The work plans will be delivered to the EPA for review sometime in the next couple of months with the intent to perform field activities this field work season (spring). If we don't find anything through the sampling, we should be ready to reach consensus with the regulators for NFA at those sites.

Mr. Edmond introduced Russ Turner to discuss plans for Site Screening Area (SSA) 12. Using a projected slide of the Air Station Mr. Turner pointed out the location of the two NFA sites for sampling as well as SSA 12. The issues at SSA 12 are similar to those at Sites 4 and 7. SSA 12 was recently identified between Site 5 – Fire Training Area and Site 2 – Antenna Field landfill. SSA 12 is an area where drums and debris were discovered and removed by the Navy. The Navy has written a work plan to obtain soil samples to confirm that this site screening area does not require further action. Site screening samples could be collected in the same time frame described by Curt Frye for the other two NFA sites. Mr. Edmond added that SSA 12 was first identified by the Navy in response to review of the EPA "EPIC" report. Ms. Bradford mentioned that EPIC stands for Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center. Mr. Lewandowski described the process EPA follows in evaluating historical aerial photos looking for signs of past activities like disturbed soil, removed trees, trenches or drums. The Navy in turn follows up on the ground by inspecting each suspected site.

Mr. Edmond asked if there were any questions. Mr. Myers asked if there is anything to mention this month about the wells along (Route) 611 about the contaminated groundwater coming onto the Base from off-Base? Mr. Edmond explained that the Navy is in the process of preparing Record of Decision (ROD) documentation. Mr. Lewandowski added that a Focused Feasibility Study will have to be prepared because under the CERCLA law the contamination coming on the Base will still require the Navy to place some kind of institutional control over that area so that people can't drill and extract the water. Institutional control is considered an action, so the ROD will not be a NFA ROD. Mr. Myers asked if either PADEP or EPA have the responsibility to cross (Route) 611? Ms. Bradford replied that EPA has begun. The issue has been turned over to the EPA Site Assessment Section and they are investigating it now.

Mr. Edmond introduced Bob Lewandowski to provide updates on the NAS JRB Willow Grove BRAC process. Mr. Lewandowski described that with BRAC there is a slew of special documents that have to be prepared. One report we talked about at an earlier RAB meeting is the Environmental Condition of Property Report. That document has been completed now, and a copy is available in the Admin Record in the Library. Another report we are working is required by an amendment to the CERCLA cleanup law, CERFA – Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act. CERFA was enacted after the second round of BRAC to try to help speed up the transfer and facility reuse process by identifying parcels of property that could be developed right away. Basically, the CERFA Determination Report identifies uncontaminated parcels. The draft CERFA Determination report was submitted to EPA and PADEP before the Holidays on December 19th. EPA is the approving authority for this document and this type of work is shared with PADEP for concurrence. The Navy has requested that review comments be received by March 1. BRAC law requires completion of the CERFA Determination within 18 months of closure determination. Closure determination coincided with the latest BRAC law that went into effect November 9, 2005. So, by May 9, 2007 we need to have this (CERFA) determination completed. Mr. Lewandowski

offered a copy of the draft CERFA Determination Report for meeting attendees to view. There is a map that shows the areas we think have no environmental restrictions right now on the property.

Mr. Roth suggested that it's like 90% (unrestricted) isn't it? Mr. Lewandowski replied that the unrestricted area is not that great, for instance because of the contaminated groundwater coming on Base near Site 1 and we have IR sites that are not completely closed out. CERFA doesn't ask what parcels may have had environmental issues that are being worked out, been cleaned or are NFA sites that could be transferred early; it only asks to identify locations where there's never been any type of storage or release of hazardous substance. So really, it kind of whittles down the areas that we're calling CERFA clean.

Mr. Kreibick asked if what has been talked about includes the Joint Reserve Base and the Air Station? Mr. Lewandowski replied that no, it's just the Joint Reserve Base. Mr. Kreibick added that when you mention BRAC law, BRAC law did not include the Air Station, they've (the Air Station) just been thrown into the mix. Mr. Lewandowski agreed that is correct. Mr. Kreibick asked are you planning to do that (CERFA Determinations) in the future for the Air Station? Mr. Maslowski explained that as of right now, we don't have a determination of what's going to happen to the property. We are waiting for direction.

Mr. Edmond mentioned that once the CERFA Determination Report is approved as final, it will be a public document. The LRA (Land Reuse Authority) can use it to help figure out development strategies. The surplus property release date is the ninth of February, 2007. Mr. Lewandowski added that that date may be extended sixty days again due to Pennsylvania governmental input and other issues that have played into this (delay) as well. Mr. Edmond summarized that the Environmental Condition of Property Report, showing status of "clean and dirty" property is already available in the Admin Record here at the Library and can be downloaded on-line, if you have a fast internet connection, to get a feel for what has happened and what is happening at (NAS JRB) Willow Grove. Its' Cousin, the CERFA Determination Report will be available when it is approved and will only show "clean" property. Mr. Lewandowski added that since the (NAS JRB Willow Grove) Base is compact, even though we've identified areas that probably could be developed right away, because operations are going to continue through 2011, there probably isn't going to be much opportunity to split off any property, even though it would be clean and available to be developed. Mr. Kreibick asked if that would be true about the Air Station though, saying I guess I have a vested interest. Mr. Lewandowski reiterated that he could not answer questions about (the future of) the Air Reserve Station. He works with the Navy BRAC office and really has not been involved in planning for the Air Reserve Station. CDR. Brown explained that one (the Air Reserve Station) is an (Air Force) program issue and the other one (NAS JRB Willow Grove) is under BRAC law.

Mr. Maslowski added that the Air Reserve Station is **expected** to be active another two years. Mr. Kreibick suggested that then you have all of the vacant buildings of the Air Reserve Station. How does that affect the runoffs and environmental issues, those vacant buildings? Mr. Maslowski replied that we don't know if they're going to be vacant or what is going to happen with the property right now. Mr. Kreibick asked if that decision is coming soon? Mr. Maslowski replied that possibly it would. Mr. Kreibick replied Thanks.

There were no further questions. Mr. Edmond suggested April 18 for the next RAB meeting, and after general agreement for the date, thanked everyone for coming and wished everyone a mild winter not full of shoveling snow.

The Next RAB meeting is scheduled for April 18, 2007. The meeting place will be the Horsham Township Library, 435 Babylon Road, Horsham, PA 19044 (phone: 215-443-2609).