



NAVAL AIR STATION JOINT RESERVE BASE (NAS JRB) WILLOW GROVE Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes RAB Meeting No. 39

Meeting Date: August 5, 2009

Meeting Time: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Place: Horsham Township Public Library

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	Mary (Liz) Gemmill (R)	Community Co Chair
	Rick Meyers (R)	RAB Member
	Jim Vetrini (R)	RAB Member
	Kay Maxwell-Martin (R)	RAB Member
	Bill Bertholf	Resident
	Joe Donnelly (R)	NAS JRB Willow Grove Executive Officer, RAB
Co Chair		
	Lisa Cunningham	U.S. EPA
	Bob Lewandowski (R)	Navy, BRAC PMO
	Patrick Owens (R)	Navy, RASO
	Bill Heil (R)	Navy, Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen (R)	Navy, Willow Grove
	Richard Frattarelli (R)	Air National Guard
	Charles Clark (R)	PADEP
	Jessica Kasmari (R)	PADEP
	Russ Turner	Tetra Tech
	Lawson Bailey	Tetra Tech
	(R) Designates RAB Member	

Bob Lewandowski welcomed everyone to the NAS JRB Willow Grove Restoration Board (RAB) meeting number 39. Mr. Lewandowski thanked everyone for coming to this RAB meeting and gave a brief introduction of each of the speakers presenting tonight's RAB meeting agenda items, including Pat Owens from the Navy's Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO), Lawson Bailey of Tetra Tech who will assist Pat, and Russ Turner of Tetra Tech to give updates on the Ninth Street Landfill and Site 12, the South Landfill.

Referring to a projected slide from the CERFA (Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act) document, Mr. Lewandowski summarized the intent of the CERFA determination of property status categories. Category 1 includes the white areas on the map where the Navy was confident that there had been no known release or disposal, so these would be environmentally ready for transfer. At Category 2 areas, in red, we knew there had been previous storage or release (of hazardous material) that was already under investigation. Category 3 areas, in yellow, were areas that could not be characterized either way. No investigations were underway, but the Navy didn't feel confident to say that a potential future property user could just go there and begin construction with no potential issues. Potential

unidentified issues included asbestos, lead-based paint, tanks and historical spills. The Navy felt that it needed to do some follow-up work at these parcels in yellow because of the possibility that there may have been an issue at some of them in the past.

Referring to the next projected slide Mr. Lewandowski explained the process the Navy used to investigate each area. Areas were tabulated according to similarities in their environmental situation, lead-based paint, septic systems, spills, storage tanks, the old flight line and miscellaneous areas. The first step was reviewing Base records. A lot of the credit goes to Bill Heil and the Base Public Works department working with Don Whalen of Tetra Tech to investigate existing records. Also helping was Charles Clark of PADEP who reviewed PADEP records of tank status, finding that the above ground tanks were not regulated and required no further investigation. All of this investigation work was summarized in the CERFA area of interest fieldwork matrix (projected slide) and consensus for field sampling is indicated in the matrix. Many of the areas, like the area outside of the fence line along Maple Avenue were discussed extensively. Liz Gemmill mentioned that years ago there was a shopping center there they called the “Bazaar” on what is now the runway clear zone. Easter Sunday a plane went into it. That was way back. Mr. Clark agreed that he remembered the “Bazaar” from a long while ago also, and added that the team had met and spent a day-long meeting discussing this and other Category 3 areas. That is what led the team to the decision for no action there. Some of the team members knew the area historically, there had been a lot of construction, movement of soil and all that over the years, so even if at one time there had been a car or truck parked there leaking something, you couldn’t pinpoint where it happened. Based on the information at hand and the known history it was determined to be of low enough risk not to warrant further consideration. Mr. Lewandowski agreed that those activities didn’t really have a major impact. So basically, after all of this investigation and sharing of ideas, there remained about five different areas of interest noted in the projected chart and in the handout that will undergo sampling.

Mr. Myers asked if there is going to be action on any of these Category 3 items that you know of yet, or are they waiting for these questions to be answered first before any action? Mr. Lewandowski explained that with the exception of the paint shop soil, where we have enough evidence to be confident there is need for some sort of action (or use restriction) we will wait for the results of analysis to decide what to do. Mr. Myers asked if there is a possibility of a future owner could ask the Navy to overlook potential risks, saying they will take care of it, would that be all right? Mr. Lewandowski replied that this team will be investigating these areas before turning them over to anyone. The Navy is obligated by law to turn the property over to the Air Force. If we haven’t completed the investigation or cleanup if it’s necessary, that responsibility will be transferred over to the Air Force. It won’t get dropped somewhere in between.

Mr. Lewandowski introduced Pat Owens to discuss the radiological assessment underway. Mr. Owens provided a brief history of his Navy office and the services they provide to Navy units regarding “GRAM,” general radioactive materials, everything except nuclear propulsion reactor related things. The reason we are performing a historical radiological assessment (HRA) at NAS JRB Willow Grove at this time is due to finding radiological materials at other closing or closed bases in the past. The Navy has found this work can be performed more effectively if the base is

still in operation, before everyone with a historical perspective of base operations is gone and the future owners, caretakers or redevelopment authorities take over. The HRA process is like the preliminary assessment in CERCLA terms to take a pulse check, to see if there are any concerns. The HRA will look for any indications of permitting and use or disposal of radiological materials at the Base. RASO maintains records of radiological permits and practices, but there may have been activities that occurred historically here that may contribute to the overall picture of radiological material history at NAS JB Willow Grove. So to be 100% sure, the Navy is performing this HRA. Mr. Owens mentioned that the Navy uses a contractor for this work, represented by Lawson Bailey of Tetra Tech. Rich Fratterelli added that to put this into perspective, historically they're not going to necessarily uncover drums of radioactive materials. For example, smoke alarms have a radiological source. There used to be radio luminescent, glow in the dark, exit signs, and certain life support equipment used by aircraft pilots in life support gear and radioactive coatings on mechanisms that glow in the dark on aircraft. Then there are various chemical detectors and general equipment on Base such as soil density meters using isotope sources. Mr. Bailey added that radiant dials on aircraft, uranium counterweights, old electronic tubes, spark cap resistors and a whole list of potential items are just the "needles in the haystack" they are looking for. Investigations will include review of historical records at the Base, records found in the Philadelphia archives, the National Archives, the Naval Historical Center in Washington, DC, and the files at RASO headquarters. We are just starting out. There is a lot of paperwork. We will find out about every building that ever existed or still exists at NAS JRB Willow Grove and develop a map of overlapping footprints to determine potential for recent as well as historical impacts. One of the things we will do is to speak with current and former workers from those buildings. Mr. Owens added that the Navy has set up a hotline for callers wanting to provide information. There have no serious calls yet, only from telemarketers.

Mr. Owens discussed the anticipated schedule. A lot of the work is going on all at the same time. The Navy is filling up a couple of computer hard drives with all of this information coming in. This fall the Navy will publish a public notice in the local newspaper requesting more information and comment. We will go through records and notes building by building to determine if it is potentially impacted, not impacted, or no further action, or to investigate further. Hopefully we'll wrap it up in the spring of 2011. Then there will be a draft report people can look at to make comments.

Mr. Myers asked if the RASO people will be at future RAB meetings? Mr. Owens replied that he, someone from his office or the contractor will be at some future RAB meetings to help answer questions, but not 100% of the meetings. Mr. Bailey added that in the process, if they find anything that really needs to be looked at, they will identify it and follow-up right away, otherwise, the work entails compiling data and methodical analysis leading to issuance of the report.

Mr. Lewandowski thanked Pat and Lawson, and introduced Russ Turner to give updates on Site 3 and Site 12. Mr. Turner then presented an update on the Site 3 investigation. Site 3 – the Ninth Street Landfill is in the western part of the Base. Referring to figures handed out to meeting attendees as well as projected slide, Mr. Turner reviewed the Site 3 location, nearby features recognized by the public, the history of suspected operations at Site 3, and the history of investigations of the groundwater plume. Site 3 has been on a lower level of priority for

investigation than some other sites, like Site 5, that the RAB has considered greater risk. After the latest round of base closure, there are no lower priority sites. In 2007, the site was revisited by the Navy because of suspicions Curt Frye and Bob Lewandowski had about the appearance of certain observable irregularities on the site surface. Test pit excavations confirmed the existence of buried waste in areas not identified by the earlier remedial investigation. In 2008 the Navy performed a geophysical electromagnetic (EM) survey to identify the extent of buried waste. Pointing to the projected slide, Mr. Turner summarized the findings of the EM survey that found several areas of suspected buried wastes. In January 2009, the EM survey was followed up with a second test pit landfill delineation field investigation. The test pits confirmed excellent agreement with the EM survey and we were able to prepare this map of the site. At the time of planning the landfill delineation, the team realized that this site was a little bit more involved than we had been thinking before. After speaking with the EPA and what they call the BTAG (Biological and Technical Assistance Group), they advised that we had to look more into the ecological sampling end of the investigation. As a result, the Navy also obtained quite a number of surface soil samples, sediment samples and surface water samples at the same time as the landfill delineation test pit activities. In test pit 25, ethylbenzene was found in soil at a concentration of about 7,000 micrograms per kilogram. That was greater than the RBC (risk based concentration) for that compound. An RBC is a regulatory concentration limit that corresponds to expected human health degradation. So it is the concentration in the soil that would lead to health degradation in people exposed to it. Test pit 25 was the only place we found VOCs (volatile organic compounds). We also found petroleum hydrocarbons and lead in some test pits, and asbestos in one test pit. After meeting with EPA and PADEP team members, we agreed that there is enough information to proceed with the remedial investigation report. Future planning includes the internal draft RI report to the Navy in fiscal year '09, followed by the Feasibility Study report in '09/'10 and the Record of Decision in fiscal year 2010. There were no questions or comments on Site 3 and no objections to moving on to Site 12.

Mr. Turner mentioned that Site 12, South Landfill, is another landfill, and referring to the projected slide, summarized the site location along with surrounding features in the southwest corner of the Base. Similarities to Site 3 include the irregular ground surface where you see the occasional aircraft part protruding from the ground. Site 12 apparently is the landfill identified as Site 2 in the mid 1980's during early site investigations consisting of document searches and interviews. Now we are in the early remedial investigation for Site 12. Clearing of six or eight acres of brush and an EM survey were performed here at the same time we performed the EM Survey at Site 3. Referring to the projected slide Mr. Turner stated that Based on the EM survey results, we think certainly this is an old disposal area here. The Navy intends to install test pits and obtain soil samples, sediment samples and surface water samples as part of the remedial investigation. We are writing the work plan for the field investigation sampling and analysis now. The Uniform Federal Program (UFP) Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) is in the Navy chemist's hands for review. We expect to have a final UFP-SAP in October. We want to perform field test pits and sample collection before cold weather in November and have the RI report in the spring of 2010.

Mr. Lewandowski added that with recent experience investigating past landfill disposal practices, we're going to be able to move through the Site 12 investigation quite a bit faster than we did at Site 2 or 3. It is possible that we are going to have to do a Phase II

remedial investigation to sharpen up our understanding of the nature and extent of contamination based on results of the Phase I. If we see contamination trending in a certain direction, then we may have a follow up investigation, but we certainly don't expect this to go on like in the past for 10 or 15 years. We are hoping for a fairly quick resolution and getting to the point that we have right now at Site 3 within a year at Site 12.

Mr. Vetrini asked about the difference between the federal level of remediation and acceptability as compared to commercial or residential. If this (property transfer) goes as our Governor wants, if you look at some of the stuff that's been put in the newspapers and if you believe what Horsham Township's put out, there will be buildings all over this place. Is that going to be clean enough for commercial supportive people to be there and work there? Not live there necessarily, other than the Naval Base people. Mr. Lewandowski replied that the Navy follows the standards of EPA and PADEP, so those are the same standards others (future users) will be required to follow. Depending on what the land use is, there may be a difference. Obviously, if the future land use will be residential, the cleanup would be to a higher standard than it would be for commercial or industrial land use. There is no separate standard. Even if this Base never closed, we would still base our work on the EPA and PADEP standards. However, it just might be that new users will want different land use.

Mr. Vetrini added that based on reports discussed about two meetings back, it was kind of fuzzy or questionable what use some areas could be used for in the future. If you look at Township statements, this area will be loaded with buildings all over the place with certain firms coming in here (to build). So there's a concern about the different levels (of exposure under future use scenarios). I guess the commercial levels are different than residential. And I want to make sure that if we put buildings in here that people aren't going to be exposed. Or if there are areas that are questionable, that nobody builds on those, which I assume wouldn't be allowed anyway. Mr. Lewandowski replied that there could be areas that the remedy will include placement of land use control on that particular property. Say there is a site with a soil cover on it right now. There is no exposure to someone walking across that site, but if you were to remove the cover, there would be (an exposure). As part of the remedy for that site, we might put a control, a land use control saying this is an area where you shouldn't build because it is capped, and it's safe the way it is. On the other hand if there are areas that are discovered where the Navy unknowingly has left contamination, there will be covenants that go along with the deed for the transfer saying that the federal government will come back and take care of this. For instance, consider one of those white areas in the CERFA report that we said was clean based on everything we knew at the time. Ten years from now, if someone goes over there to build and starts digging, and encounters the classic example, say drums and whatever, it would be the Navy or DOD's obligation to come back and address that cleanup. It doesn't let us off the hook just that we've transferred the property.

Mr. Vetrini pointed out that there's a difference if you put a slab down there then put a building (on the slab), that's one thing, but if somebody wants to put a two-level basement, then you have something else to worry about and you may run into things that

no one knew were there. Charles Clark explained that those possibilities are all taken into consideration when the government places land use controls and enters into covenants (for land transfers). All of those things are considered and put into the land use controls when they're written. Mr. Lewandowski added that there have been other (property) transfers the Navy has completed where the property was being transferred for an industrial use where the Navy said it (the land) is suitable for industrial use, but also informed the new owners that if they decide to change the land use they need to go back and perform any further investigations and possibly cleanups necessary to use it for residential land use. The new owner would have to verify with regulatory agencies that they have cleaned to residential standards. Mr. Turner mentioned that in this scenario a future landowner might say yes there is waste in the ground, but it is worth it to me to remove the contents of the landfill so I can build the two-level basement there. It just may be very expensive. Mr. Lewandowski added that it would be similar to one of those development costs where you have rock near the surface, but for some reason you want to put in buildings with basements. It's going to cost the developer a lot of money to remove the rock, but its part of the development cost.

Mr. Lewandowski mentioned that Lisa Cunningham requested time to give an update on Site 1 progress by EPA. If you recall Site 1 groundwater, we believe that there is an off-site source that is contributing to or causing the groundwater plume that comes under the Base and under Site 1.

Ms. Cunningham explained that the EPA has a site assessment manager, Charlene Creamer, working with the EPA hydrogeologist for NAS JRB Willow Grove, Bernice Pasquini, working on this site which they think is the former Kellett Aircraft facility. Ms. Creamer has met with the current owner of the property and visited the site with Ms. Pasquini and a contractor for EPA that has been selected. EPA has completed a sampling plan, but they are having problems gaining access to the property to take samples. Meetings are underway within EPA to discuss access difficulties and develop a plan to gain access. Funding is available, the current owner appears to be cooperative, and the team is in place with a sampling plan. Ms. Cunningham stated that she will keep the RAB informed of progress in future meetings. Mr. Lewandowski added that if the owner is uncooperative, EPA has the authority to issue an order allowing the sampling as a last resort. Ms. Cunningham agreed, stating that she does not expect that. After EPA receives permission to go on site for the samples, things should go smoothly and rapidly. They know where they want to take the samples. It is a matter of taking the samples, having them analyzed and preparing the report.

Mr. Lewandowski announced that the presentations were finished and requested questions from RAB members or suggestions for the next RAB meeting date.

Mr. Lewandowski confirmed that the next RAB meeting will be held on December 9, 2009 and thanked the faithful community members for coming out tonight. The meeting adjourned.