

7/1/03

NAVAL W EAPONS STATION EARLE RAB MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY

Meeting Date: May 6, 2003

Meeting Time: 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Place: Wall Township Municipal Building, 2700 Allaire Road, Wall, New Jersey

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	Lester Jargowsky	RAB Member (Co- Chairperson)
	John Mayerski	RAB Member
	Carol Balmer	RAB Member
	Mary Lanko	RAB Member
	Merwin Kinkade	RAB Member
	Larry Burg	NWS Earle (Co-Chairperson)
	Gus Hermani	NWS Earle
	Nancy Eldredge	NWS Earle
	Michele DiGeambeardino	EFANE
	Russ Turner	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Chris Kerlish	EA Engineering and Science
	Jessica Mollin	U.S. EPA
	Bob Marcolina	New Jersey DEP

Larry Burg opened the meeting by welcoming those present and thanking them for coming. Mr. Burg introduced the other RAB Co-Chairperson (Lester Jargowsky of the Monmouth County Health Department) as well as others present and summarized the meeting agenda.

Mr. Burg discussed the construction status of the landfill cap installations at Sites 3 and 10. Work that had been stopped in winter due to bad weather was restarted in approximately the middle of April. Due to wet weather this spring, final placement of cap top soil and seeding is expected to be completed near the end of May. The installation contractor will then prepare final construction documentation and submit the long term Operations and Maintenance Manual for Navy review and revision.

There were no questions from the public, so Mr. Burg introduced Russ Turner to present the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Site 13.

Mr. Turner mentioned that Site 13 consists of a former landfill of approximately 1.7 acres used through approximately the 1970's to dispose of scrap metal, clothes, shoes, obsolete electronics equipment, batteries, and industrial equipment. The environmental features nearby were summarized as wetlands to the north, a perennial stream along the western side that discharges to the Hockhockson Brook approximately one half mile to the north, the Navy Defense Property Disposal Office (DPDO) yard to the south, and a railway yard to the east.

Following EPA site remedial investigation guidance/procedures and in cooperation with NJDEP, the Navy carried out investigations of site media including surface water, sediments, soils, and groundwater. Compounds of concern included silver and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) in sediments for potential risks to ecological receptors, and arsenic and vinyl chloride (from solvent degradation) in groundwater for risks to human receptors.

Following the EPA feasibility study guidance/procedures and in cooperation with NJDEP, the Navy developed three remedial alternatives: Alternative 1 included "No Action" consisting of long-term groundwater monitoring; Alternative 2 "Limited Action" consisting of long-term groundwater monitoring

and institutional controls to protect potential receptors; and Alternative 3 which consists of long-term groundwater monitoring, institutional controls, and installation of a RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act)-type regulatory compliant landfill cap.

Using projected slides, Mr. Turner explained the features and costs, estimated to be approximately \$1.6 million, related with implementation of Alternative 3. The Navy is requesting public comment on Alternative 3, the governments' proposed remedial alternative.

A member of the public asked if there was any indication of contaminant migration, and if there was no indication of migration why weren't the other less costly alternatives selected. Why was the more expensive alternative selected?

Mr. Turner replied that the groundwater contains contaminants that do not appear to be migrating beyond the wetland area to the north. Contaminated groundwater has not been found migrating to surface water bodies like Hockhockson Brook to the north. After discussions among the Navy and the regulatory agencies, the landfill cap was proposed and accepted in part to reduce the potential for continued (rain) water infiltration through the landfill contents. Ms Digeambeardino added that there was also the objective to cover the landfill to preclude human or ecological contact with landfill contents.

A member of the public asked what levels of arsenic were found. Were the levels significant? What is the New Jersey DEP standard?

Mr. Turner replied that the levels of arsenic (found at a range from 15.2 to 29.2 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)) in groundwater were above the NJDEP standard as well as background concentrations of arsenic in the area, so there was no choice but to propose a Classification Exception Area (CEA). Ms. DiGeambeardino and Mr. Marcolina added that the NJDEP standard is 8 mg/kg maximum.

A member of the public asked about the planned sampling of sediment/soil from the two "washout" areas indicated on the figure displayed in the presentation. One of the areas appears to be within about 20 feet of an existing fence in what appears to be a channelized stream. Is that the Hockhockson Brook or a tributary? Is it only sampling that is proposed, not removal of say 500 cubic feet of soil?

Mr. Turner replied that the channelized stream is a tributary to Hockhockson Brook. The Navy has prepared a work plan to sample sediment/soil in the two "washout" areas to delineate the extent of silver and other contaminants thought to be there. The Navy plans to obtain approximately 30 samples for analysis to identify the extent of contamination. Ms. DiGeambeardino mentioned that the Navy is in the process of preparing the sampling work plan. Depending on the results of sediment/soil sampling, an excavation of sediment/soil would be performed to remove contaminated materials. Any excavated areas would be restored to pre-excavation conditions, and the fence, if it would have to be removed for remediation, would be replaced in an equal or better condition in the same place.

A member of the public asked if the contaminated soil excavated from the "washout" areas would be used for the cap.

Mr. Turner replied that the excavated sediments or soils would be placed in an area on the existing landfill that will eventually be capped. The soils, although not hazardous, would be placed under the (to be constructed) cap for ease of disposal. Mr. Burg and Ms. DiGeambeardino clarified that the excavated materials would be under the cap so that there would be no future exposure to them.

7/1/03

Mr. Burg introduced Chris Kerlish to discuss developments at the Mine Battery disposal site (Site 48). Mr. Kerlish explained that Site 48 is essentially a small pond where electronic components containing mine batteries were disposed, actually just dumped, approximately 30 or 40 years ago. A few years later, the pond was partially excavated to remove the electronics devices and many of the components were picked up for disposal elsewhere, but some remain in or near the pond.

Last summer, the Navy performed soil sampling, sediment sampling, and groundwater sampling to check if there was any impact from the electronic devices. Preliminary results indicate that concentrations of metals found in sediment and groundwater were generally within the ranges encountered in the remedial investigation for background concentrations. The groundwater sample taken from the monitoring well installed downgradient of the area indicated that groundwater is not impacted from the electronic devices disposed at the pond.

Based on the findings of metals concentrations generally at the level of background, The Navy is discussing with NJDEP and EPA what actions, if any, they may take.

A member of the public asked if the data holds up, would the Navy recommend no further action at the site? Ms. DiGeambeardino replied that The Navy would like to perform "housekeeping" to remove the actuators from the pond and vicinity. Considering that the electronic devices are not naturally occurring, the Navy may propose to remove those that are visible and can be raked out or picked up. After the report of findings is available, the Navy will discuss alternative response actions with regulators.

A member of the public asked if the Navy would perform post-excavation confirmation sampling after the devices are removed. Ms. DiGeambeardino replied that no decision like that has been made yet. Sampling was just performed showing that further sampling may not be warranted. The current idea for removing these devices is more like hand picking them out of the pond one by one, rather than excavation of soil.

A member of the public asked where the pond discharges. Mr. Burg replied that the pond discharges to the Yellow Brook, and from there to the Hockhockson.

Jessica Mollin asked about the concentrations of lead and cadmium found previously, from sampling before this spring, and what levels of cadmium have been found in background sample locations? Mr. Kerlish replied that the lead and cadmium data presented today included the previous sampling data. Background concentrations of cadmium have been found in the 2 to 3 mg/kg range.

Mr. Burg mentioned that the Navy isn't proposing to perform extensive excavation in the pond and surrounding sensitive wetland areas because it appears that the site is a steady state, not doing a lot of harm to the ecological setting in the vicinity. Ms. DiGeambeardino added that the Navy would like to perform the housekeeping effort to remove the electronic devices, but it appears that an intrusive excavation could inflict more harm than warranted by the site conditions.

Mr. Burg asked if there were any remaining questions, thanked all in attendance for coming and reiterated contact persons (Michele DiGeambeardino, Larry Burg, Bob Marcolina, Jessica Mollin, and Nancy Eldredge) are available for submitting any remaining public comments or questions on the Proposed Plan presented.

No date was proposed or set for the next RAB meeting.