

N90845.AR.001129  
NWIRP BETHPAGE  
5090.3a

LETTER REPLY FROM BETHPAGE WATER DISTRICT REGARDING U S NAVY LETTER ON  
GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION EMANATING FROM NWIRP BETHPAGE NY  
06/28/2011  
BETHPAGE WATER DISTRICT

# BETHPAGE WATER DISTRICT

OFFICE OF DISTRICT COUNSEL  
14 RUSSELL AVENUE,  
P.O. BOX 400  
BETHPAGE, NY 11714-0400  
(516) 939-0736

## COMMISSIONERS

---

WILLIAM J. ELLINGER  
CHAIRMAN

JOHN R. SULLIVAN  
TREASURER

GARY S. BRETTON  
SECRETARY

MICHAEL BOUFIS  
SUPERINTENDENT

SAL J. GRECO  
SECRETARY TO THE BOARD

ANTHONY J. SABINO  
COUNSEL TO THE DISTRICT

June 28, 2011

Department of the Navy  
NAVFAC  
9742 Maryland Avenue, Building Z-144  
Norfolk, VA 23511-3095  
Att. Mr. Timothy A. Reisch

Re: Bethpage Water District (BWD): Upgrades to Treatment Facilities to District Public Supply Wells Plants 4 and 6, Bethpage, New York

Dear Mr. Reisch:

Enclosed herewith you will find a CD of the information you requested in bullet points 1, 2, and 3 in your letter dated June 16, 2011. Due to the volume of the information requested, I believe the CD is the most efficient medium to transmit the data. With respect to your request for documents regarding the source of the contamination at Plant 6, I refer you the 20 year history of this site on repository at the Bethpage Public Library. The origins of the contamination are well documented and the Navy's is as culpable as Northrop Grumman Corporation (NGC). As a practical matter, if you are asking if the Bethpage Water District has any information independent of the public record of the NGC and Navy investigations, please be advised that we do not have any such independent information. If you are unaware of the history of this site, I respectfully request that this matter assigned to someone with knowledge of the facts or that you develop an understanding of the history of this site. The source of the contamination impacting BWD Plant 6 is well documented and beyond dispute.

With respect to the source of the contamination impacting Plant 4, the record is also clear that the contamination emanates from three sites. Those sites are the NGC site, the Navy site and the Bethpage Community Park (BCP), formerly an NGC disposal site. It is not currently possible to isolate or eliminate any one site at this time. In actual fact, the influence of the five BWD pumping wells located at Plants 4, 5, & 6 all located approximately 1,000 feet apart have caused the various plume fingers to mix and cross individual plume boundaries, assuming such boundaries ever existed. This fact is demonstrated by the realization that the relatively shallow discharges from the sites are now found at depths of 600 to 700, the same depths as our various well screens. Further, the contamination emanating from the NGC and Navy sites more than likely mixed before they ever left the NGC site due to decades of NGC onsite industrial pumpage. The same would

# BETHPAGE WATER DISTRICT

Page 2.

most likely hold true for the contamination that emanated from the BCP site. The homogeneity of the offsite plume constituents lends credence to the mixing scenario and renders it impossible to specifically isolate any one origin of the plume contaminants. In fact, the homogenous nature of the plume indicates there is one plume of varying concentrations fed from all three sites.

More importantly, the nature of your request concerning: "...any Navy connection to contamination migrating toward the BWD well site 4." shows a complete lack of knowledge of the publication of *Remedy Optimization Report for the Bethpage Groundwater Remedy*. (ROR). Your statement looks for certainty of contamination origin simply to provide certainty of liability for one PRP versus another. This attitude highlights your lack of understanding of the Bethpage plume. Please do not take my comments as an *ad homonym* attack, but rather, to illustrate the type of thinking that has endorsed two separate studies of the same plume spanning several decades. All persons involved in this process now agree that this bifurcated approach has been critically wrong and has wasted millions of dollars on disjointed studies that have failed to produce results worthy of scientific or public confidence. Recently, however, the New York State DEC and the Navy have been moving toward a more unified approach toward understanding and remediation of the Bethpage plume. They are to be commended for this realization and effort. Therefore, after your review the ROR, the Navy's connection to the contamination at Plant 4 should become apparent.

Based on the above it is folly to imply that the Navy has little or no connection to the contamination being experienced at Plant 4. Further, there is a vinyl chloride detection at Navy RW-1 adjacent to Plant 4. The only other vinyl chloride identified in the aquifer to date emanates from the Hooker Rucco site located to the northwest of the Navy site. Therefore if the vinyl chloride present at RW-1 is from Hooker, it is likely that the TCE at Plant 4 is from the Navy site having followed a similar trajectory as the Hooker contaminates.

As suggested in both of our letters, I would be happy to meet with your representatives as well as NGC to discuss the claims and demand made in this letter.

Very truly yours,

Anthony J. Sabino

cc:

Susan M. Bird, Asst. Counsel

Steve Scharf

Lora Fly

Dale Desnoyers

Hon. Charles S. Schumer

Hon Edward Mangano.