

5/16/07

NAS JRB WILLOW GROVE RAB MEETING No. 32 MINUTES

Meeting Date: April 18, 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
	Jeff Dale	Community Member
	Kaye Maxwell Martin (R)	Community Member
	Ted Roth (R)	Community Member
	Jack Dunleavy(R)	Community Member
	Tina Fedorak	Horsham Township EAB
	Annette Glemser	Horsham Water and Sewer Authority
	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
	COL. Ellie Nix (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Duane Maslowski (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Charanjit Gill (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Richard Fratterelli	Air National Guard
	Mark Medvesky	ARS Willow Grove
	April Flipse (R)	PADEP
	Jessica Kasmari (R)	PADEP
	Russ Turner (R)	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Scott Saw	Tetra Tech
	Don Rose	CDTechno
	(R) Designates RAB Member	

Jim Edmond opened the meeting and welcomed all in attendance. Mr. Edmond mentioned that this was the 32nd meeting of the NAS JRB and Air Reserve Station Willow Grove RAB. The first of these meetings was held on August 29, 1996, quite a while ago. Some of the same faces are here today and some have changed. Mr. Edmond explained that this will be his last RAB Meeting. He will be moving on to FEMA, working in a Homeland Security function in Philadelphia. It has been a difficult personal decision to be leaving the Navy, but in preparing for eventual retirement in three or four years, it is the best move now. Mr. Edmond thanked all present and past RAB members for their balanced non-confrontational input, saying that it has been almost like a family working together.

There is no Air Show planned for this year. For runners, there is a Spring Fever 5 and 10 K run Saturday (April 21). Check-in time is 8:00 a.m. Tee Shirts will be provided to all runners, and you can run with the Air Station Executive Officer, CDR. Brown.

Mr. Edmond introduced Charanjit Gill to lead off for the Air Force. Before introducing Scott Shaw to provide a presentation on the one active Air Force site, the POL site, Mr. Gill provided a brief summary of background and updates on the other six sites with no further action planned. The Supplemental Site Investigation report was submitted to EPA and PADEP back in 2002. After meetings to discuss comments from EPA, the Air Force performed human health risk assessment and comparison of previous site investigation analytical data against the current soil limits. This report was submitted to EPA last

week. After the EPA review, there will be a meeting to discuss technical issues so that the Air Force can proceed to close those sites.

Mr. Shaw provided copies of his presentation slides (attached). In January, the Air Force completed a round of compliance monitoring at the POL site. There are 10 to 12 monitoring wells that are monitored quarterly for the presence of jet fuel. The latest results of analysis indicate that there was a minor detection of benzene in one well. The Air Force also recently completed installation of a Biosparge System in another treatment area. Using a projected map of the area, Mr. Shaw provided a short summary of actions in the '70s and early '80s that resulted in the leak, and described how the Air Force has pursued a two-phased approach to remediation. Using the projected map of the area, Mr. Shaw pointed out where in-situ chemical oxidation has been applied and where the Biosparge air injection operation to stimulate biological activity will follow to further degrade the individual components of jet fuel in groundwater. The Biosparge system began operation in January and there have been two rounds of sampling to confirm the operation of the system.

Mr. Shaw also presented a discussion of the natural gas line right of way that runs adjacent to the northern edge of the Base. There are three gas lines that pass near the Base boundary in the area shown in the slide. The Air Force performed studies consisting of soil borings, temporary monitoring wells and test pits to determine the surface of the water table in the area. Mr. Shaw again used a projected series of slides to demonstrate "perched" water table conditions after rain events that are caused by the local geological lithology composed of alternating layers of silt, sandy clay and silty clay. After the rain stops, the perched water starts to drain away, returning the water level gradient to normal. Some of these temporary perched saturated zones were found to contain the jet fuel components, and at times after a rain event, a well that is normally downgradient of another, is temporarily above (has a higher water level) because of the perched water. After time, water level conditions return to the baseline equilibrium relationship among the monitoring wells. The Air Force looked for signs of jet fuel, floating product, benzene in groundwater and soil, and naphthalene. Although there was visible evidence noted of a "sheen" at a number of sample locations, no measurable layer of floating petroleum conditions was encountered using the oil-water interface probe. Using projected slides Mr. Shaw pointed out the locations and concentrations of benzene and naphthalene found which were generally in the range encountered at the Base in the past.

Eric Lindhult asked where the utility lines are located in relation to the cross-sectional view of the gas pipeline traverse. Can you see them in the cross-section and are the pipes below the water table? Mr. Shaw showed on the projected slide that the utility lines run parallel to the gas company pipelines and mentioned that there are locations where the pipelines are below the water table and others where they are above. Mr. Lindhult asked if the pipeline has a gravel pack that could act as a conduit for flow along the pipeline. April Flipse mentioned that the installation of the pipeline did not include a gravel pack. Ted Roth asked if these pipes carry some product. Mr. Shaw explained that the pipelines carry natural gas.

In summary, Mr. Shaw explained that the study results revealed the need for more studies. Some limited soil excavation (and removal) is probably going to be necessary. The Air Force may need to perform a series of investigations to fill data gaps.

Mr. Roth stated that we're chasing sheen. Is this the same sheen he saw at Peace Valley Nature Center, about 15 miles up the road? What I saw looked like gasoline on water. The naturalist there said that the sheen was natural from the normal decaying process. It seems like we are coming closer to the fact that we're up against a law of diminishing returns. We don't know what the future land use scenario is. Most likely, if you read the newspapers, it (the Air Station) is going to continue to be just what it is. What standards are we trying to meet? Have we achieved those standards and are we going beyond that? Is this sheen percolating up from the groundwater or is it already there naturally from the decay process? Mr. Shaw explained that typically, our experienced field investigators using visual information and instruments can distinguish between what was seen at the Nature Center and the petroleum-related sheen here, but that it can be frustrating. Mr. Lindhult added that the big difference is that natural

5/16/07

degradation would not have benzene in it. Ms. Flipse added that this investigation is outside the fence line. So you're not talking about something that right now could become state property and remain military. It is private off-Base property that needs to be returned to whatever use the owner wants to have for it, not military industrial level.

Mr. Edmond asked if there were any other questions for the Scott or Charanjit (there were none), handed out copies of the Navy CERFA Fact Sheet (copy attached) and introduced Bob Lewandowski to discuss CERFA report status.

Mr. Lewandowski took a few minutes to personally thank Jim Edmond for the assistance he received from Jim over the past year and a half while Bob was becoming acclimated to this new position. Mr. Lewandowski added that this involved and interested RAB is a tribute to a lot of the hard work Jim has done for the benefit of both the Navy and Air Force Reserve. You will be missed. Thanks very much. The RAB indicated their agreement and appreciation by a round of applause.

Mr. Lewandowski mentioned that he had provided CERFA status updates in past meetings. However, some attendees at this meeting may not have heard the previous presentations, so some background information may be needed. CERFA was a modification to the Superfund laws that applies to federal property, which mandates the Services to identify uncontaminated property early in the BRAC (Base Realignment and Closure) property transfer process. By doing this, as soon as the Service's operational mission is complete, this process will provide a path to transfer those properties that are most readily transferable. That is the process the Navy is reporting on tonight. Referring to the CERFA Fact Sheet, Mr. Lewandowski reiterated that the CERFA process is to identify uncontaminated property. It is property where hazardous substance was never known to have been disposed or released. The Fact Sheet describes the procedure the Navy used to identify these uncontaminated sections of property. With the help of our contractor, Tetra Tech, The Navy searched records, reviewed aerial photographs for evidence of past contamination, performed a complete visual inspection of the entire facility, looked at adjacent properties for possible contamination coming onto Navy property from off-Base, and interviewed current employees involved in areas where hazardous materials could be generated or released. A final step in this process would be sampling and analysis, although we have not done sampling at this point for this activity. The CERFA report itself is several hundred pages in length. Referring to a projected slide (see attached Navy handout) of the Air Station, Mr. Lewandowski explained that the key piece from that document is the identification of various different categories of land parcels. The areas in white on the projected map, with the exception of the Air Force Reserve property that was not part of this study, were the areas the Navy calls "CERFA uncontaminated" after our investigation. These were areas where we found no evidence of any type of release or disposal. Using the projected map, Mr. Lewandowski pointed out other areas explaining the assignment of CERFA categories for sections of known or suspected past release or disposal. For Instance, Category 2 areas (in red on the projected figure) are generally where we have a known IR site from the Navy's Superfund program, or in one case, a groundwater VOC plume coming from off-Base. A Category 3 area is where we suspect that there may have been something released, or where we don't have enough evidence to say it's an uncontaminated area. Category 3 sites are areas such as older buildings or facilities where we suspect for instance that lead-based paint on the exterior may have resulted in a release of lead-based paint to the soil around the building or facility. This doesn't necessarily mean that the Navy will have to perform a clean-up at all Category 3 sites, but it is an area where we will have to do more investigation prior to making that declaration.

The draft CERFA document was provided to PADEP and EPA for review. Comments from both have been received and incorporated into the final document. Since this is an NPL site, EPA must concur with the document findings before the final version can be issued. The Navy is on track to meet the he statutory date for submission, May 9. So by the next meeting of the RAB, there should be a copy of the final CERFA report available right here in the Library. If anyone wants a copy, let us know. We can provide copies on a disk (CD). Summing up, Mr. Lewandowski explained that the great news for this activity is that there is a lot of property that, once the Base closes in 2011, will be readily available for redevelopment.

Mr. Meyers asked if the Navy will be ultimately responsible for the Air Force Reserve side? Because we (the Force Air Reserve) will be gone before 2011. Mr. Lewandowski replied that he can't say at this point. There has been no decision on that. Mr. Maslowski added that no one knows the answer to that question.

Mr. Edmond introduced Curt Frye to discuss plans for the Ninth Street Landfill and Site 5. Mr. Frye clarified that Russ Turner would do the Site 5 presentation, but for Site 3 he had a couple of quick slides to let the RAB know of work coming up at Site 3, the Ninth Street landfill. A couple of months ago, the Navy met internally with EPA getting ready to finish up the site investigation. Based on historical records this site was used as a landfill, but we really never found anything that looked like a landfill except from very early investigations. Because we have only borderline risk at this site, we had been heading toward a remedy of no further action for soil and long-term monitoring, probably at the most, for groundwater. However in looking at the data available, we decided that there were a couple of potential data gaps with the soil. If we were going to suggest no further action with soil at the landfill, we should make really sure. Using a projected slide Mr. Frye pointed out the locations of previous investigations including test pits and soil borings. Nothing found in these activities ever really looked typical of what you could say "aha, here's a landfill." Mr. Frye pointed out the locations where the group felt there were gaps in the data collection effort. The Navy decided to perform additional investigation this spring. Eight 50-foot long test pits will be excavated to take samples and visually inspect the fill material. If we find something that looks like a landfill we will have to deal with it. If we get basically no detection of waste or contamination, then we will be able with confidence to proceed to recommend no further action for soil.

There followed a general discussion among RAB members that maybe this site should be renamed something other than a landfill. Mr. Frye mentioned that one issue the Navy is very mindful of is that this site is on a BRAC Base with the presumption that the property will be transferred and possibly redeveloped. If there is a decision document for no further action, that means the site can be redeveloped for anything, including residential uses. Before we do that, we want to make sure of our findings so that there is nothing that is suspect. Historical documents and former employee interviews say it was a landfill. We have historical records, and we are going to discuss groundwater conditions next, but this (additional soil investigation) will give us some added confidence. Mr. Roth asked if there could be heavy metals. If it is ash, couldn't there be heavy metals in there? Mr. Frye agreed that there could be heavy metals.

Mr. Frye mentioned that he also wanted to talk about Site 3 groundwater. Referring to a projected slide of three rounds of groundwater sample analysis results, Mr. Frye explained that as discussed at the last RAB meeting, there is minor groundwater contamination, mainly PCE, in Site 3 groundwater. Also as discussed previously, investigation to identify the VOC contamination source implicates a location upgradient of the Ninth Street Landfill in the vicinity of the Army Reserve Hanger. No ongoing source has been found, but it is possible that a historical VOC contamination source at the oil water separator was removed when the old system was removed and replaced. It is likely that contaminated soil, if there was any, was removed. In any case, based on the low levels of VOC contamination in Site 3 groundwater now, we believe that at most the Navy will probably recommend long-term monitoring for this groundwater. Referring back to the projected table, Mr. Frye explained that the Navy planned to obtain another round of groundwater data to compare to the three rounds of data we have now. The new data will be used to help decide recommendations for the ROD (Record of Decision).

Mr. Lewandowski added that in addition to monitoring well samples on-Base, the Navy has obtained permission from the golf course to take a few samples beyond the Base boundary that will help fill out the status in that area. Jack Dunleavy asked if we have received permission for soil samples or existing wells. Mr. Lewandowski replied that samples will be obtained from one irrigation borehole and the pond. Mr. Myers asked a question about site features and where is the parking lot used to store servicemen's campers? Mr. Turner indicated the approximate location of the long-term storage lot that is not related to Site 3.

5/16/07

Mr. Edmond introduced Russ Turner to discuss plans for the Fire training Area. Mr. Turner stated that at the risk of seeming repetitious, he wanted to personally say that he is sorry to see Jim Edmond leaving NAS JRB Willow Grove. Jim, you will be missed.

Mr. Turner pointed out the location and site features of Site 5, the Former Fire Training Area, on the project slide, stating that the Navy is planning to perform groundwater remediation pilot studies there. This is the next step in the CERCLA process that entails remedial investigation followed by feasibility study. This RAB group reviewed the original feasibility study (FS) for Site 5 groundwater in 2002. The RAB was not satisfied with the range of alternatives considered. The Navy responded to this comment by reissuing the FS in 2004 with two additional alternatives suggested by the RAB, chemical oxidation and enhanced bioremediation. At this moment the most preferred alternative is enhanced bioremediation. It has the advantage of being pretty quick at cleaning up the groundwater, at least to the limits of the technology, in maybe just a year or two. The other advantage is that it is a little cheaper than the other treatment alternatives. Now, the Navy wants to perform pilot studies as proof of the technology before they decide on the preferred remedial alternative.

Using the projected slide of the site, Mr. Turner reminded the RAB that this is the same vicinity we've been talking about lately regarding the soil removal performed in the burn ring area, and that a No Further Action PRAP and ROD for Site 5 soil are expected to be completed this fiscal year. Mr. Turner also reiterated the site conceptual model for Site 5 historical operations and the resulting contamination. In the burn ring area the soil has been removed. In the drum storage area, as a result of spills or leaks, the groundwater plume, composed mainly of chlorinated solvents like TCE, PCE and TCA, originates. Using a projected slide of a cross-sectional view of the plume, Mr. Turner described a series of studies, beginning with collection of samples for laboratory-based treatability studies, followed by installation of injection and extraction wells in the concentrated heart of the plume for field proof of technology testing. The remediation contractor will determine which site conditions, bacteria, and nutrient amendments are suited for bioremediation in-situ at Site 5. A line of injection wells will be paired with extraction wells for the pilot testing in the field. The selected nutrient composition, augmented with active bacteria strains if determined necessary, will be injected under pressure into the geological formation via the new injection wells. Groundwater will be continuously removed from the extraction wells to draw the treatment materials through the test matrix. Additional monitoring wells will be installed throughout the test volume to monitor the results of this experiment. Kevin Kilmartin, well known by this RAB as the lead hydrogeologist on this program for Tetra Tech, will be the project manager for this bioremediation pilot studies project.

Mr. Edmond asked if there were any questions. Ms. Gemmill offered on behalf of the civilian side of the house, thank you. We wish you well, to Jim Edmond. Mr. Edmond said that it has been great working with Liz and this entire RAB, but at least now he won't have to drive the bus anymore for tours. Mr. Dunleavy asked if there is a replacement named to take his place? Mr. Edmond said his replacement has not yet been named, and thank you all again for your kind words.

Mr. Edmond closed the meeting by announcing the next RAB meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2007, wishing everyone a great summer and good luck with the next RAB meeting. CDR. Brown summarized everyone's sentiments, saying "Well done, Jim. Well done."

The Next RAB meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2007. The meeting place will be the Horsham Township Library, 435 Babylon Road, Horsham, PA 19044 (phone: 215-443-2609).