

## NAS JRB WILLOW GROVE RAB MEETING No. 33 MINUTES

Meeting Date: July 11, 2007  
Meeting Time: 7:00 p.m.  
Meeting Place: Horsham Township Public Library Meeting Room

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	Mary (Liz) Gemmill (R)	Community Co Chair
	Ted Roth (R)	RAB Member
	Kaye Maxwell Martin	RAB Member
	CDR. Jones (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove Executive Officer (acting for)
	Bob Lewandowski (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Curt Frye (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Marge Johnston (R)	Navy, Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen (R)	ARS Willow Grove
	Lisa Cunningham (R)	US EPA
	Bruce Beach (R)	US EPA
	Jessica Kasmari (R)	PADEP
	Russ Turner (R)	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Don Whalen	Tetra Tech NUS. Inc
	Gary Brown	RT Environmental Services
	Jack Tarman	Develcom
	Steve Detwiler	Not provided
	(R) Designates RAB Member	

Bob Lewandowski welcomed all of those present and thanked them for coming to the RAB meeting. The first item on the agenda was a summary of the recent field activities performed by the Navy contractor, Tetra Tech, at Site 3, the Ninth Street Landfill. Those present at the last RAB meeting may recall that the Navy had been concerned with the investigation coverage at Site 3, where wastes had been reportedly burned and buried in trenches, but no significant buried wastes had been found in physical investigations. Mr. Lewandowski introduced Don Whalen to fill the RAB in on preliminary results from test pits installed and soil samples obtained at the site.

Mr. Whalen began by reviewing the site location on a projected slide and providing a brief history of reported landfill operations over the years. Previous investigations consisting of records searches and personnel interviews indicated that significant landfill waste burning and fill operations were performed. However a subsurface remedial investigation consisting of test pits and soil borings carried out in the 1990's did not discover quantities of waste. So the Navy decided to go back and install more test pits to find out exactly what were the site conditions. Mr. Whalen indicated on projected slides the location of the previous four test pits and soil borings, and pointed out where the eight proposed test pits were to be installed in May 2007. Based on the actual conditions (buried waste) encountered, the Navy decided to extend the investigation to include a total of 14 new test pits as well as analytical samples from each test pit to delineate the extent and nature of the material encountered. Mr. Whalen indicated the location of the actual 14 test pits. Soil (sometimes mixed with waste) samples were analyzed for a full scan of metals and organics. A series of photos were projected to demonstrate first the test pit installation process, followed by photos showing the clean soil and waste fill encountered in the excavations. In the area of the ball field, the test pits demonstrated the history of fill to level out the surface. Only light debris (not landfill-type waste) and dirt fill was found. At test pit number five, in the wooded area identified as Area B from the document/personnel interview investigation, and also where some holes were observed with debris unearthed by groundhogs, buried waste was encountered in the test pit excavation. The range of debris excavated included metal scrap, maintenance shop waste like engine parts, and general refuse like bottles, cans, broken china plates, and eating utensils. This waste appeared charred, showing evidence of burning before burial; even some of the bottles were partially melted.

Mr. Roth asked if they poured fuel on the waste to help it burn? It probably would have burned better. Mr. Turner replied that he didn't recall reference to use of fuels to aid waste burning mentioned in any of the early site investigation information gathered from former employee interviews or old records. They probably had their tricks to get the waste to burn, but we don't know what they were. Mr. Lewandowski mentioned that one of the things the Navy is doing is sampling for those types of constituents like fuel to see if there is any evidence.

Mr. Whalen then presented a series of photos showing each of the test pits. The range of material excavated included from clean soil to construction-type debris, metal scrap, maintenance shop waste, automotive or truck parts, and more general refuse like bottles, cans, broken china plates, and eating utensils.

Mr. Roth asked if any heavy metals were encountered? Mr. Whalen replied that preliminary laboratory data shows chromium, lead, manganese and PCB's (among other compounds). Mr. Detwiler asked if you said PCB's. What was the level of the PCB's. I can't read that (projected slide of preliminary laboratory results). Mr. Whalen replied that yes, PCB's were detected and also PAH's were found in test pit 12. Referring to the location on the projected slide, Mr. Whalen mentioned that the level of PCB's was 620 parts per billion.

Mr. Whalen finished his presentation by stating that the Navy found the landfill evidence that was not found previously, so the next step is to evaluate the information gathered so far, and then try to determine the extent of the buried landfill debris. The Navy may perform something like an electromagnetic survey of the areas because there is so much buried metal. That would be a straightforward approach to delineate the extent of buried mass.

Mr. Roth asked if the Navy would use ground-penetrating radar or something like that? Mr. Whalen agreed that GPR could be a possibility. Mr. Roth added that if they disposed of everything on-site, that's not much for 60 years of operation from the total Base. Mr. Whalen clarified the issue, stating that this landfill is reported to have been operational from approximately 1960 through 1967. There were other landfills operating on the Base at other periods. This landfill started operating when another landfill closed down, so we'll have to delineate how much is there; now that we know there is something there.

Mr. Frye explained that there are clearly commercial shop waste and truck parts. We also found broken dishes and soda cans, that sort of food service type waste that appears to be inert. Based on the laboratory sampling we did, the compound that jumps out as a concern is lead. The preliminary results for lead concentrations are up to around 1,500 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), or somewhere in that neighborhood. Those concentrations of lead above screening standards are a concern. Mr. Whalen pointed out sample locations with lead results of 569, 2010 and 1370 mg/kg and mentioned that no VOCs (volatile organic compounds) were detected in the soil. Mr. Lewandowski added that this is probably a good time to mention that the Navy has been performing groundwater monitoring along the road and is planning a round of groundwater sampling there. Mr. Frye explained that based on these preliminary results, the evidence tells us that these wastes and debris are fairly inert, but we do observe reasonably high lead levels which could be coming from used batteries or paint or other sources in the waste fill.

Mr. Detwiler asked if the Navy has sampled for TCLP (Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure)? Mr. Turner replied that total constituent metals analysis was performed, so we know the concentration of each metal in the soil samples obtained. The TCLP result can be built up (calculated) from the constituent metals concentrations.

Mr. Brown expressed concern with the Navy's use of the words "fairly inert." The state soil to groundwater standard is 450 (mg/kg). We have numbers 4 times that limit and we have no separation because it's all the way down to bedrock. It is presumed in Pennsylvania that when you hit rock, you have a discharge to groundwater. It may be that the groundwater is fine, but I

don't think fairly inert is a fair comment. People may not understand as much as you and I. 450 is the soil to groundwater number you use and it's got to be dealt with. I'm glad to hear there's groundwater monitoring. Mr. Frye thanked him for the comment, while wishing to clarify his prior statement referring to debris that was found, metal, dishes and soda cans. He didn't mean to say that the site is inert. Mr. Lewandowski added that the Navy is not saying we are done with this site. This is a case where the Navy has taken the initiative and it is excellent that the project team has gone out there and finally found the area where debris was located. The Navy sees this as a first step in the process. Mr. Brown stated you may also find as you do ground-penetrating radar that there also were trenches laid out. The trench filling was a very common method used in the '60s and it was very common just to burn the trash. They didn't necessarily do anything to accelerate it (the burning of wastes in the trenches). They actually had trench layouts.

Mr. Lewandowski introduced Russ Turner to give a brief update of work at Site Screening Area (SSA) 12.

Mr. Turner mentioned that this presentation would be short since it is an update of activities discussed at the last RAB meeting. Since not everyone in attendance this evening was at the last the RAB meeting, a brief background of location and history of SSA 12 was provided. Referring to a projected slide of the SSA 12 area and planned soil boring sample locations, Mr. Turner described the location in the south west quadrant of the Air Station not far from Horsham road where a Navy internal road is located. SSA 12 was identified from EPA aerial photo analysis, and then confirmed by inspection of the site. Discarded materials included some rusted and decomposed old drums as well as debris scattered on the surface. The Navy contractor (RMC) removed the drums and debris and disposed of all off-site. Confirmation sampling by the RMC included soil samples obtained at each drum location and at each EPA anomaly noted. The contractor however did not correctly specify the methods of analysis for the laboratory, resulting in ambiguous results reported that do not serve the purpose of decision making. Consequently, the Navy has prepared a new work plan to collect samples from all of the same locations and depths for reanalysis. Tetra Tech has prepared the work plan that is in the hands of EPA and PADEP for review. If the samples can be collected in approximately August or September, we can then have preliminary data to share in about a month after that. Mr. Turner offered to field any questions. (There were no questions from the RAB).

Mr. Lewandowski asked Hal Dusen if there was anything the Air Force wished to add. Mr. Dusen introduced himself as the chief of the Air Force environmental office, and stated that he had nothing new since the last RAB meeting, but would have a presentation for the next RAB meeting. The Air Force is shutting down operations effective 29 September, but Bill Downs from headquarters will be available to represent the Air Force at the RAB meetings. Mr. Gill, who was the Air Force RPM, has moved on to a position with McGuire Air Force Base.

Mr. Roth asked if the Air Force is shutting down. Is that the A-10s and the C-130s? Mr. Dusen replied that only the C130s are included. The A-10s belong to the Air National Guard. They'll be here until at least 2010. Mr. Lewandowski asked that Mr. Dusen supply contact information for Bill Downs in case we need to contact him about RAB meetings.

Mr. Lewandowski asked the meeting attendees if there were any suggestion to improve the RAB meeting or if they would prefer to keep things as they are.

Ms. Gemmill mentioned that there might be an issue about timing. Mr. Roth added that he thinks it might be better for the community at large to move the meeting until later. Many can not even get here by 6:00 because of traffic. Most meetings start around 7:00. For most people 7:00 would be a better time. There was general discussion to the merits of beginning later, why 6:00 was chosen in the first place, and if the room could be available for social time to those arriving at 6:00 because of commuting constraints. Mr. Roth added that in the past he suggested moving the meeting to 7:00 and got nowhere, suggesting we just try the later meeting time to see how it goes. A discussion of conflicts with the Sewer Authority meeting ensued and it was agreed that

it would be best to poll RAB members at the next meeting before changing the meeting start time, but be sure the next RAB meeting is better attended by not scheduling it for an evening in conflict with the Sewer Authority meeting.

Name tags or name plates and/or self introductions were discussed next. It was felt that this would help the Stenographer identify those speaking. Mr. Lewandowski suggested that the Navy will supply a stack of cards and markers that can be used to make name tags that can be folded and placed on the table with the RAB member name. If these are used, the Navy will collect them after the meeting and bring them to the next meeting for reuse.

Someone requested doughnuts, but no one offered to bring them.

There was general agreement that, at least for security reasons, the Library meeting room is a fine place to meet, but several members wish that there could be a "site tour," maybe by bus once a year. Marge Johnston offered to check with Captain Remington to see if a bus tour could be arranged and to see what information would be needed from each participant.

The topic of how the RAB is kept informed of meeting times and receives meeting minutes was discussed. Some people rely on the newspaper, but most seem very satisfied with the blue paper meeting notices mailed out by the Navy two weeks before each RAB meeting.

Mr. Lewandowski asked if there was any other business to mention or discuss.

Mr. Roth mentioned that at Graeme Park, volunteers have been instructed not to drink the water. Mr. Lewandowski asked for more information about Graeme park, what is the source of the water in question, and if PADEP knows anything about it? Graeme Park is a County park located north east of the Air Station off of County Line Road. Reportedly, the water is from an on-site well. No description of the source of the water or if testing has been performed or what problems or contamination may be in the water was available. Jessica Kasmani added that she is not familiar with that issue right now, it is not something she has heard of though. Does anyone know if a complaint has been filed with DEP? If there has been a complaint filed it could possibly have been through another Section, maybe Water Quality Section. She will check to see if there is any record of this issue available in DEP. Ms. Johnston mentioned that sometimes water does look rotten because of the turbidity. Often it looks bad but there's nothing wrong with it but appearance. Mr. Roth explained that the water looks fine but someone said not to drink it. Mr. Lewandowski suggested that we should look into it.

Mr. Lewandowski asked if we should set our next meeting date. Someone suggested that the 31<sup>st</sup> of October be removed from consideration, since it is Halloween. Mr. Turner mentioned that the sewer authority meetings planned for October are slated for the 10<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>. Kaye Maxwell Martin asked what time the sewer authority meetings are held. Mr. Turner replied that he did not have that information. Mr. Lewandowski summarized the discussion, saying that the next RAB meeting will be at 6:00 PM on October 17<sup>th</sup> here in the Library community meeting room.

Mr. Lewandowski adjourned the 33<sup>rd</sup> Restoration Advisory Board meeting.