



TETRA TECH NUS, INC.

600 Clark Avenue, Suite 3 • King of Prussia, PA 19406-1433
Tel 610.491.9688 • Fax 610.491.9645 • www.tetrattech.com

N60478.AR.000785
NWS EARLE
5090.3a

PHIL-18494

Project Number 2128

November 18, 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/lm

Enclosures

c: RAB Distribution List
Garth Glenn (TtNUS)
File

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE RAB MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY

Meeting Date: October 5, 2004

Meeting Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Attendance:	John Mayerski	RAB Community Member
	Mary Lanko	RAB Community Member
	Raymond Walton	Community Member
	Donald Olson	Community Member
	Hunter Kastkon	Community Member
	Alicia Hartmann	NWS Earle (Co-Chairperson)
	Gus Hermani	NWS Earle
	Jessica Mollin	EPA Region 2
	Michele DiGeambeardino	Navy EFANE
	Russ Turner	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc
	Bob Marcolina	New Jersey DEP

Michele DiGeambeardino opened the meeting by welcoming those present and thanking them for coming. Ms. DiGeambeardino introduced herself and others present and summarized the meeting agenda and purpose. The meeting purpose was to present the Navy's proposed remedial action plan for the Site 26 perchloroethylene plume (Operable Unit (OU) 7) and Sites 6, 12, 15 and 17 (OU 9).

Ms. DiGeambeardino introduced Russ Turner to present the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for OU 7 and OU 9 sites.

Mr. Turner explained that the goal for the meeting was to provide the public and all stakeholders the opportunity to understand and comment on the Navy's proposed remedial action plan for the OU 7 and OU 9 sites mentioned by Ms. DiGeambeardino. The Navy's Installation Restoration Program at NWS Earle began with about 28 Superfund sites about ten years ago. With decisions on these sites the Navy will have processed approximately 75% or more of the original sites identified. The process being followed is an EPA-prescribed program of site investigation, engineering assessment, selection of remedial action and the official record of the decision making process. This presentation to the public is being made within the context of the 30 day Public Comment Period required by the EPA-mediated process. The public is requested to take a copy of the PRAP's supplied and make comments in this meeting or later to the contact individuals mentioned in the PRAP documents. Mr. Turner provided a summary of the decision making process and the steps that will follow this public meeting. Jessica Mollin, concurred with the process described.

The OU 7 site consists of a volume of groundwater contaminated with perchlorethylene (PCE). Historically, operations in Building GB-1 resulted in solvent disposal below ground in a septic tank (vault). There is no reliable record of when, exactly where, or the quantity or mix of the solvents that may have been disposed. However, there was a pipe located in a former spray booth in Building GB-1 (thought to have been connected to some sort of receptacle (possibly a utility sink)) where the solvents appear to have been discharged to the vault. Mr. Turner used a series of slides to show the environs as well as the groundwater and surface water flow direction and mentioned the compounds of concern (mainly trichloroethylene (TCE) and PCE in groundwater). The concentration of PCE in the approximately 500 feet by 400 feet groundwater plume was found up to 77 micrograms per liter (equivalent to 77 parts per billion (ppb)), but most concentrations in the plume were lower. Surface water downstream of the site

does not contain measurable levels of the solvents of concern. There are two groundwater contamination plumes defined at building GB-1. IR Site 26 (also known as OU 3) is the TCE groundwater plume in the same area that has been under active remediation by a rather extensive air sparging/soil vapor extraction (AS/SVE) system since January 2002.

Mr. Turner discussed the three remedial actions considered by the Navy in the Feasibility Study (FS) following EPA site remedial investigation guidance/procedures and in cooperation with NJDEP. The Navy looked at three alternatives. Alternative 1 "No Action"; Alternative 2 "Limited Action" consisting of long-term groundwater monitoring; and Alternative 3 Limited 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 Exception Area (CEA) to ensure groundwater is not used until New Jersey groundwater quality standards are met. Using projected slides, Mr. Turner explained the features for each alternative. Although there are usually cost estimates prepared for each of the remedial alternatives, in this case since there is a remedial action underway, it was felt that costs for each of the alternatives could be covered within funds already budgeted for the OU 3 remediation.

Mr. Turner summarized the components of the Navy's Preferred Alternative, Alternative 3.

A RAB Member referred to a previous presentation slide and asked about groundwater. Did the Navy look at just shallow groundwater or also at the deeper (say 60, 100 or 300 feet deep) groundwater quality? Has the Navy checked groundwater quality to the south? Residents have private wells south of the site.

Mr. Turner replied that the Navy has considered deeper groundwater. Partially because of the other OU (3) at the site that has been under a remediation program for several years, the Navy has performed extensive investigations into the groundwater and local geology. A 15-foot-thick impervious clay layer at a depth of about 35 to 50 feet below the ground surface effectively limits contaminant migration to deeper depths. The Navy sampled groundwater from beneath the clay layer as well from all locations (north, south, east and west) in the upper zone (above the clay layer) to define the extent of the plume. Mr. Marcolina pointed out that the monitoring wells installed outside (including south) of the colored plume on the presentation slide indicate monitoring wells that were sampled but were found to be contaminant free.

A RAB Member mentioned a concern that the head of Shark River is right in the area of this site: Mr. Turner replied that the groundwater plume and surface water migrate toward a tributary of the Mingamahone creek southwest of the site. The Navy has sampled upstream and down stream from the site and found that there is no contribution of solvents from the site groundwater to surface water. Also, The Navy installed and sampled a monitoring well on the far side of the stream to be sure that contamination is not passing under the stream bed and migrating further south.

Mr. Turner mentioned that OU 9 sites (Sites 6, 12, 15 and 17) are located at the NWS Earle Waterfront area and presented a series of slides to show the Waterfront sites in relation to local landmarks like Sandy Hook Bay, the Navy pier, and Route 36. Site 6 is a former landfill adjacent to (north of) the Navy Gymnasium, tennis courts and basketball courts. Site 12 is a former battery storage area located in an area of paved parking lot in the middle of the Waterfront area. Site 15 is a historical oily bilge waste sludge disposal area located next to the old Security Building (and entrance gate) along State Highway 36 at the southern end of the Waterfront area. Site 17 is a former landfill at the south west corner of the Waterfront area extending into the salt marsh.

Site 6 is a former 4 acre landfill that was used from approximately 1943 through 1965. Deterioration of the landfill cover and contaminants (metals) in the groundwater were the concerns. A Navy contractor performed landfill maintenance consisting of additional soil cover, surface regrading, grass seed/matting and placement of fencing to limit access. A range of alternatives was considered. The Navy Preferred

11/18/04

Alternative is Alternative 2, institutional controls and long-term monitoring with implementation of a CEA. The estimated present worth cost estimate for Alternative 2 is \$214,000.

A RAB Member asked if the site is in an active area. Is the building being used? Mr. Turner replied that the Navy uses the building next to Site 6 for physical fitness training, the adjacent roads are used for transit to the active Navy piers, and there are maintenance activities. The whole Waterfront area is packed with maintenance work, administration work, all kinds of Navy needs.

Site 12 was an approximately 7,500 square feet forklift battery storage area in the paved parking area next to Building R-10, south of Building R-15. No groundwater sampling was performed because of the overlap with groundwater already in a CEA for a nearby (Underground Storage Tank (UST) program) site. Site 12 sediments and soil had been contaminated with lead and other metals, but the Navy performed a soil removal action followed by confirmation soil sampling and a closure report that was accepted by EPA and NJ DEP. Based on the successful clean up of Site 12, the Navy is proposing No Further Action (NFA) for Site 12.

Site 15, along State Highway 36, is essentially a small wetland area where there was a railroad siding right along the highway (indicated on a map on a projected slide) where some unknown amount of oily sludge was disposed. The area is an unused wet area isolated from access by a double security fence. The compounds of concern are polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's) and some metals. In this case, the concern is a surface soil issue. Exceedance of NJDEP direct contact residential soil quality standards is the key regulatory issue. The Navy is proposing Alternative 2, institutional controls (access restrictions) and long term monitoring as the Preferred Alternative. The estimated present worth cost estimate for Alternative 2 is \$51,000.

Site 17 is another former landfill area like Site 6. There are similar issues such as deterioration of the landfill edges with landfill contents protruding through. Vehicle parking and other heavy objects on the edge of the landfill caused deterioration of the edge and sloughing off into the marsh. At the same time the Navy performed work at the former Site 6 landfill; the contractor placed additional cover and heavy wooden barriers so that vehicles and other heavy objects could not be pushed up to the edge of the landfill. The remaining concern is once again metals, mainly arsenic, in groundwater at concentrations above regulatory limits. A wide range of alternatives and technologies was considered in the FS. The Navy Preferred Alternative is Alternative 2, institutional controls and long-term monitoring with implementation of a CEA. The estimated present worth cost estimate for Alternative 2 is \$214,000.

Mr. Turner reiterated that future events would include preparation of ROD's with Responsiveness Summary sections that will be based on public comments from this meeting and any comments received during the remainder of the Public Comment Period that ends October 30, 2004.

Ms. DiGeambeardino asked if there were any more questions?

A member of the public said that he was mainly concerned about how deep the monitoring went at the Site 26 (OU 7 and OU 3) area. How thick is the clay layer and is it impervious? Where could someone (there are two geologists in the family with Master's degrees) review details about the investigation? Mr. Turner mentioned that the Navy has looked into this issue carefully. Geologists have analyzed results from numerous studies above, within and below the clay layer. The chlorinated solvents have not entered or penetrated the clay layer. The clay layer is a typical coastal plain deposit between 15 and 25 feet thick deposited over geologic time and is continuous in the area beneath the OU 7 (and OU 3) contamination plume. Bob Marcolina added that if someone wants to review the geology in detail, the Remedial Investigation Report for this site is available at the County Library in Shrewsbury. That document gives the geology information for each site. A member of the public asked what is the title of the document and how can it be viewed? Ms. DiGeambeardino explained that the document is called the Remedial Investigation Report for Naval Weapons Station Earle (July 1996) (also see Remedial Investigation Addendum Report, January 1998). These documents are part of the Administrative Record maintained at

11/18/04

the County Library in Shrewsbury. Mr. Turner suggested speaking with Mary Jane Kehoe at the library to ask for the "Administrative Record for Naval Weapons Station Earle."

Michele DiGeambeardino asked if there were any further questions (there were none) and thanked everyone for coming.

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