

N00210.AR.000628
NSTC GREAT LAKES
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 17 AUGUST 2009 CONFERENCE CALL ON CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS
FOR SITE 2 FORRESTAL LANDFILL AND SITE 3 SUPPLY SIDE LANDFILL NSTC GREAT
LAKES IL
8/17/2009
TETRA TECH

CONFERENCE CALL MEETING MINUTES
NAVAL STATION GREAT LAKES
August 17, 2009

Attendees:	<u>TtNUS</u>	<u>Navy</u>	<u>Illinois EPA</u>
	Bob Davis	Bill Busko	Brian Conrath
	Biff Cummings	Blayne Kirsch	
		Howard Hickey	
		Shannon Bever	

1.0 Meeting and Introduction

1.1 Greeting and check-in

1.2 Agenda - discuss closure requirements for Site 2 -Forrestal Landfills and Site 3 - Supplyside for finalization of their Remedial Action Completion Reports (RACR). After reviewing all the RACRs, there appear to be some gaps in the data. We need to identify any data gaps and prepare a game plan to address these concerns. We appear to be missing some historical information that delineates and documents the thickness of landfill cover on Supplyside and Forrestal Landfills.

2.0 Site 3 – Closure

2.1 The meeting opened with discussions focused on Supplyside Landfill and the plan/requirements that a 2 ft thick cover system was to be constructed on top of the landfill. The cover system was to consist of an 18 inch thick layer of compacted clay overlain by 6 inches of top soil. It was indicated that initial analysis suggested that the overall thickness of the cover was inadequate.

2.2 Final cover thicknesses in the northern portion of the Supplyside landfill exceeded 4 ft at most locations due to the placement of asbestos containing materials (ACM) on that end of the site hauled in from Camp Moffett. This material was used to cover ACM impacted topsoil that was discovered in the constructed cover. (As document in the Final Delivery Order Closure Report – Relocated Stockpiled ACM Soils from Camp Moffett Area to Supplyside Landfill, no ACM was encountered in the topsoil at the southern end of the landfill.)

2.3 TtNUS indicated that comparison of the most recent mapping (August 2008) to initial construction grading (Regraded Waste Elevations from Oct 2004) showed the constructed cover thickness over a portion (approx 3.0 acres) of the southern end of the Supplyside Landfill to be less than the prescribed 2 ft. However, they added that surveys performed by GASAI as part of construction QA/QC, showed partially different and more favorable results. The construction surveys indicated that the area covered by less than 2 ft was less (approx. 1.6 acres). TtNUS added that the construction survey indicated the clay layer to be at least 18 inches thick at all but 12 survey points (what amounts to about 0.6 acres in surface area). TtNUS concluded that the construction surveys show that the clay layer was constructed as planned, with these minor exceptions, and that inadequacies in the overall cover thickness was related more to the lack of topsoil than the lack of clay.

CONFERENCE CALL MEETING MINUTES
NAVAL STATION GREAT LAKES
August 17, 2009

- 2.4 Reasons for the lack of topsoil cover were discussed including the possibility of soil erosion and settlement. Solutions such as the placement/replacement of topsoil in areas that were lacking adequate cover thickness as part of on-going maintenance were also discussed.
- 2.5 It was added that the land use control plan (LUC) and an annual inspection report be included in the RACR to identify and address issues related to cover erosion and repair.
- 2.6 As for the areas that lacked 18 inches of compacted clay; it was recognized that a past investigation had shown that landfill waste had previously been covered with soil of varying thickness. It was suggested that the combination of the compacted clay layer and the previously placed soil cover could provide an adequate impermeable barrier.

Action Item: TtNUS is to evaluate and identify areas where the compacted clay layer and topsoil cover thicknesses are inadequate at Site 3. TtNUS is to determine the amount of topsoil required to establish a minimum of 24 inches of cover across the site. In areas where there is insufficient clay thickness, TtNUS will evaluate the presence and thickness of underlying original soil cover as identified through past investigations, specifically the Existing Conditions Investigation and Proposed Modifications To Landfill Cover System report from August 2003.

3.0 Site 2 – Closure

- 3.1 Discussions shifted to the adequacy of the Forrestal Landfill cover system. TtNUS indicated that the Work Plan, the construction drawings, nor the specifications defined the requirements for that landfill's cover system. Illinois EPA indicated that the cover was to meet Illinois landfill closure requirements and be similar to what was specified at the Supplyside Landfill. In addition, under a separate agreement between the Navy and Illinois EPA, 6 inches of additional topsoil was to be placed at Forrestal to address issues created by the discovery of ACM in the original topsoil cover. (Placement of the 6 inches of cover, along with a layer of geotextile, over the ACM impact soil was documented in the Final Delivery Order Closure Report No. 0117– Relocated Stockpiled ACM Soils from Camp Moffett Area to Supplyside Landfill.) Therefore, the total cover thickness at Forrestal was to be 30 inches.
- 3.2 TtNUS indicated that comparison of the original site topographic mapping and the most recent mapping (August 2008) showed the cover thickness across most of the site to be well less than the 30 inches expected. And unlike Supplyside, no construction surveying was immediately available so that alternative analyses could be performed.
- 3.3 Although construction survey data wasn't immediately available, it was suspected that a survey was performed as part of the cover QA/QC efforts or, at a minimum, to assess earthwork amounts..

Action Item: The Navy is to contact GRAEF (former GASAI) and other contractors involved with the Forrestal cover construction and search for any available survey data that would document cover thicknesses.