



TETRA TECH NUS, INC.

600 Clark Avenue, Suite 3 ■ King of Prussia, PA 19406-1433
(610) 491-9688 ■ FAX (610) 491-9645 ■ www.tetrattech.com

PHIL-17745

Project Number 2128

January 26, 2004

Engineering Field Activity Northeast
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway Mail Stop No. 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113-2090

Attn: Ms. M. DiGeambeardino, Code EV21/MD

Reference: Contract No. N62467-94-D-0888
Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 843

Subject: Distribution of RAB Meeting Minutes
NWS Earle - Colts Neck, New Jersey

Dear Ms. DiGeambeardino:

Tetra Tech NUS, Incorporated (TtNUS) is pleased to provide copies of the subject document. Copies have been sent to individuals listed on the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) distribution list.

Thank you for this opportunity to submit the documents. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require other assistance.

Sincerely,

Russell E. Turner
Project Manager

RET/vh

Enclosures

c: RAB Distribution List
Garth Glenn (TtNUS)
File

[Faint, mostly illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly bleed-through or a second page of a letter.]

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE RAB MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY

Meeting Date: December 10, 2003

Meeting Time: 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Place: Colts Neck Library Meeting Room, 1 Winthrop Drive, Colts Neck, New Jersey

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	John Mayerski	RAB Community Member
	Mary Lanko	RAB Community Member
	CDR. Steven Steuer	NWS Earle
	Larry Burg	NWS Earle (Co-Chairperson)
	Gus Hermani	NWS Earle
	Nancy Eldridge	NWS Earle
	Michele DiGeambeardino	EFANE
	Russ Turner	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Chris Kerlish	EA Engineering and Science
	Bob Marcolina	New Jersey DEP

Larry Burg opened the meeting by welcoming those present and thanking them for coming. Mr. Burg introduced himself and all others present and summarized the meeting agenda and purpose.

Mr. Burg passed out a site summary sheet for Site 11, explaining that the Navy wants to use this type of "annual report" summary sheet to share important information about the restoration program for each site. Information in the summary document includes a photo to display the setting, historical/background information, current status and expenditure of federal funds over time. Stake holders, such as RAB members, former employees, regulatory personnel and Navy employees, are encouraged to comment on this document if they would like to see any other specific information or to change the format.

Mr. Burg introduced Russ Turner to present the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Sites 1 and 11:

Mr. Turner explained that the purpose for meeting was to provide the public and all stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the Navy's proposed remedial action plan for Sites 1 and 11, collectively referred to as Operable Unit 8 (OU 8). Site 11 consists of a former ordnance demilitarization site of approximately 6 acres near the Mainside Administration area, adjacent to the Navy Family Housing area and Youth Center. Burning operations occurred at the site over a period from approximately 1943 to 1974. When the Navy was through burning nitrocellulose in the area, they made two applications of fuel-soaked hay and ignited that to remove any residue of nitrocellulose from the soil. After 1974, the Army constructed and maintained a communications tower at the site. The communications tower was completely removed in the mid 1980's. Now the site is an empty sandy soil lot in the process of returning to the natural vegetative state. The Navy investigated soil and groundwater at this site, performing a wide range of analysis for metals and organic compounds. Mr. Turner used a series of slides to show the environs as well as the groundwater flow direction and mentioned the compounds of concern (mainly arsenic and other metals in groundwater) for potential human consumption. The concentration of contaminants in soils was found not to be of concern for ecological receptors, so the remedial investigation report concluded no action was necessary to protect potential ecological (plant or animal) receptors.

Mr. Turner discussed the three remedial actions considered by the Navy following EPA site remedial investigation guidance/procedures and in cooperation with NJDEP, for Site 1: Alternative 1 "No Action"; Alternative 2 "Limited Action" consisting of long-term groundwater monitoring; and Alternative 3 "Limited

1/26/04

Action" with long-term groundwater monitoring and institutional controls. Alternative 3 includes periodic monitoring of groundwater conditions beneath the site, and implementation of a NJDEP Classification Area (CEA) to ensure groundwater is not used until New Jersey groundwater quality standards are met. Using projected slides, Mr. Turner explained the features and costs for each alternative (Alternative 1 - \$000; Alternative 2 - \$149,000; Alternative 3 - \$175,000). The Navy is requesting public comment on Alternative 3, the governments' proposed remedial alternative.

Mr. Burg asked if the classification exception area has been determined already.

Mr. Turner replied that no, it has not. The CEA would be described on an actual surveyed map to be prepared for the purpose. At this point this is just a proposed alternative that can change. Based on comments from the public or any other stakeholder, in consultation with the EPA and NJDEP, the Navy could change the recommended alternative.

Mr. Turner mentioned that Site 11 (the second OU 8 site) is known as the former Contract Ordnance Disposal Site. This site is a little further out from the Mainside Administration area and is surrounded by undeveloped land. The land surrounding Site 11 is virtually all classified as wetlands. Site 11 is approximately 2 acres with an unknown history of ordnance burning operations – no dates or quantities are available. The site was used for fire training exercises from 1974 through 1977, which lead to fuel spills in the area of the training activities. An endangered species of vegetable/grass, Knieskern's beaked-rush, was found at Site 11 and is believed to be present still. After following the EPA procedures for remedial investigation and feasibility studies for all site-related media, the Navy concluded that no actions are needed for protection of the environment or human health. No remedial actions were developed for Site 11 and none are proposed. The Navy is proposing no action at Site 11.

Mr. Burg introduced Chris Kerlish to discuss developments at the Mine Battery disposal site (Site 48) and explained that the red lines visible on the "annual report" summary sheets represent Township limits (e.g., Colts Neck and Howell).

Mr. Kerlish explained that his presentation is an update of the Site 48 information presented at the last RAB meeting. Site 48 is essentially a small pond near the northwest corner of the NWS Mainside area where electronic components containing mine batteries were 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.

In 2001 the Navy performed soil sampling, sediment sampling, and groundwater sampling to check if there was any impact from the electronic devices. Metals, mainly arsenic and cadmium, were found at concentrations above regulatory limit criteria. However, additional sampling and analysis performed in May of 2003 indicated that concentrations of metals found in sediment and groundwater were generally within the ranges encountered in background samples. 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. Probably some sort of "housekeeping", removal of the actuators by hand, will be recommended to prevent any future impacts, minimal as they might be. Most of the area out there is wetland, and to disturb it may do more damage to the ecology than just leaving the devices in place.

A member of the public asked if the arsenic found in sediments or soils could result in an impact on wells in the area. Since Colts Neck has no water plant, many of the homes in the area rely on individual wells, including some shallow hand-dug wells. Does the Navy see any potential for contamination traveling or any threat at all?

Mr. Kerlish replied that groundwater samples were not collected in any community private wells because surface water and sediments were collected in the pond and downstream, which leads to a tributary downstream that eventually flows into the reservoir miles downstream. The only significant concentrations of metals were found in the pond, or right outside of the pond. Nothing was found where the tributary flows off site (of NWS Earle). This confirms previous findings of the remedial investigations performed (in 1995). The contamination doesn't seem to be moving

1/26/04

downstream to affect potential receptors.

Mr. Burg passed out copies of the site "annual report" summary sheets. These reports were initiated by Greg Goepfert when he was the IRP coordinator at NWS Earle. The reports include a timeline of activities and studies performed at each site. This is an effort to provide up-to-date information stakeholders need to participate in the decision-making process. Bob Marcolina mentioned that he finds the summaries to be a helpful tool that he can refer to if he receives a call from public individuals who may be buying a home in the area for instance. Mr. Marcolina mentioned that he has a copy of the 1999 update but not the year 2000 version.

There was a general discussion of meeting frequency and attendance. Public participation seems to be dropping. It was agreed that meetings will be held in concert with public review periods stipulated under CERCLA protocols for the remaining IR sites being remediated. Meeting locations will continue to be selected based on the theoretical township in which the subject IR site lies. No fewer than 2 meetings will be held in any calendar year.

Michele DiGeambeardino provided an update of other projects underway. The Navy is in the process of design for the Site 13 landfill cap. Approximately 30% of that design is complete and the Navy is looking for small business concern contractors who can do landfill cap construction.

At Site 26, where the groundwater remediation air sparging system/soil vapor extraction system (AS/SVE) is in operation, the Navy feels it may have reached capacity of that technology because of diminishing returns. An optimization study has been awarded to consider the AS/SVE at Site 26 as well as the Bio Slurper groundwater remediation system at the Building C-16/17 site. This study should make recommendations for both Site 26 groundwater and the Building 16/17 fuel spill site.

There was a general discussion about groundwater monitoring frequency, optimization of sample collection and the desire to not waste (limited) government funds.

Mr. Burg asked when the meeting minutes could be ready. Mr. Turner mentioned that the stenographer generally needs two weeks to prepare the official transcript, then, considering the holidays, another two weeks would be needed to prepare the summary meeting minutes. About one month in total.

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