

N00210.AR.000632
NSTC GREAT LAKES
5090.3a

SUMMARY OF 17 AUGUST 2009 TELECONFERENCE ON THE CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS
FOR SITE 2 FORRESTAL LANDFILL AND SITE 3 SUPPLY SIDE LANDFILL NSTC GREAT
LAKES IL
8/17/2009
TETRA TECH

Teleconference

Date: August 17, 2009
Time: 1:00 CST
Subject: Supply Side and Forrestal Landfills Closure
Landfill Cover Requirements and Documentation
Naval Station Great Lakes

Attendees: Navy: Bill Busko
Blayne Kirsch
Howard Hickey
Shannon Bever
Illinois EPA: Brian Conrath
Tetra Tech: Bob Davis
Biff Cummings

Purpose: Discuss closure requirements for Supply Side and Forrestal Landfills. After reviewing all the reports, 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 Supply Side and Forrestal Landfills.

Discussions

Bill opened the meeting by stating the meetings purpose. Initial discussions focused on Supply Side Landfill and the plan/requirement 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.

Biff indicated that comparison of the most recent mapping (August 2008) to initial construction grading (Regraded Waste Elevations form Oct 2004) showed the constructed cover thickness over a portion (approx 3.0 acres) of the southern end of the Supply Side Landfill to be less than the prescribed 2 ft. However, he added that surveys performed by GASA 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). Biff added that the construction survey indicated that all but about 6 survey points (what amounts to about 0.6 acres in surface area) showed the clay layer to be at least 18 inches thick. He concluded that the construction surveys show that the clay layer was constructed as planned, for the most part, and that inadequacies in the overall cover thickness was related more to the lack of topsoil than the lack of clay.

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. It was added that the land use control plan (LUC) and an annual inspection report be included in the Remedial Action Closure Report (RACR) to identify and address issues related to cover erosion and repair.

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 place soil cover could provide an adequate impermeable barrier.

Discussions shifted to the adequacy of the Forrestal Landfill cover system. Biff indicated that neither the Work Plan, the construction drawings, nor the specifications defined the requirements for that landfill's cover system. Brian indicated that the cover was to meet Illinois landfill closure requirements and be similar to what was specified at the Supply Side 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 asbestos containing materials (ACM) in the original topsoil cover. Therefore, the total cover thickness at Forrestal was to be 30 inches.

Biff indicated that comparison of the original site topographic mapping and most recent (August 2008) showed the cover thickness across most of the site to be well less than the 30 inches expected. And unlike Supply Side, no construction surveying was immediately available so that alternative analyses could be performed. Although it wasn't immediately available, it was suspected that construction survey or, at a minimum, volume assessments were performed.

Follow-Up Activities

Supply Side: Biff is to evaluate and identify areas where the compacted clay layer and topsoil cover thicknesses are inadequate. He 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, Biff will evaluate the presence and thickness of underlying original soil cover as identified through past investigations.

Forrestal: Bill is to contact GASA and other contractors involved with the Forrestal cover construction and search for any available survey data that would document cover thicknesses.