

N62661.AR.002825
NS NEWPORT
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING HELD 20 MARCH 2013
WITH ATTACHMENTS NS NEWPORT RI
3/20/2013
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD



MEETING MINUTES

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

Wednesday, March 20, 2013, 6:30 – 8:15 pm
Officer's Club, NAVSTA Newport

CALL TO ORDER

The NAVSTA Newport Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at the Constellation Room in the Officers Club at Naval Station Newport, Newport, RI for their bimonthly meeting on Wednesday, March 20, 2013. The meeting started at approximately 6:30 pm. Refer to the attached meeting agenda and attendance list.

David Dorocz, the Navy Co-Chair, opened the meeting and welcomed the group.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The meeting minutes from the January 16, 2013 meeting were approved.

SITE PROGRESS UPDATE

Mark Kauffman (Resolution) presented a brief overview of the Site Progress Milestone Chart (enclosed), which provides an update of site progress. Thurston Gray (RAB) suggested that the dark green color doesn't contrast well with the black ink. M. Kauffman agreed and indicated it would be updated.

Melissa Cannon (Resolution), M. Kauffman and Steve Parker (Tetra Tech) provided an update on specific sites on the Document Review Status list (enclosed).

D. Dorocz suggested the "T" on the Site Progress Milestones be defined below. M. Kauffman agreed and indicated it would be updated. D. Dorocz questioned whether the state-driven projects (i.e., the petroleum sites) should be included. A brief discussion followed. Maritza Montegross (Navy) indicated that she would check on whether the state-driven projects should be a RAB agenda, but would remain CERCLA-based for now.

Margaret Kirschner questioned why sometimes the dates on the Site Progress Milestones chart have been pushed out and/or missed. S. Parker indicated that sometimes there are delays in order to address all parties' issues associated with a document; however, that does not change the path forward.

PRESENTATION: Coddington Cove Rubble Fill (CCRF) Area Groundwater Sampling Program

M. Kauffman presented the material contained in the presentation handout (attached).

Manny Marques (RAB) questioned how high the concentrations of the metals are at the site. M. Kauffman clarified that the concentrations aren't very different from most areas of New England, but do require further scientific review.

Dave Brown (RAB) questioned whether this investigation would provide for alternative remedies rather than hauling off soil, for example. M. Kauffman clarified that it's a possibility or possible that no action may be necessary. D. Brown questioned whether the concentrations are a concern to human health. M. Kauffman clarified that the current risk screening evaluation shows potential risks, but the planned scientific review will provide more clarity on whether the metals are site-related and whether the potential risks are realistic.

Kathy Abbess (RAB) suggested that next presentation be in black ink, not gray, for legibility.

Margaret Kirschner (RAB) questioned prior PAH impacts and why they aren't included in the planned study. S. Parker clarified that although PAHs were detected, they did not pose a potential risk. M. Montegross added that the metals concentrations posed a slight risk and Navy intends to demonstrate if the metal concentrations are site-related or naturally occurring so that it can be determined how the site will proceed under CERCLA.

M. Kirschner questioned what site-related sources would be available at the site. M. Montegross indicated that if concrete or rebar were buried at the site, for example, that would be an example of a source. K. Abbess clarified that this site has changed over time and does have a wetland aspect. D. Brown and M. Montegross indicated that it is possible that contamination could be from an off-site source.

REPORTS

Membership Committees

T. Gray indicated that there are currently 17 members. T. Gray indicated that one member has resigned partly due to the timing being too early and the meetings being held on the base. There was discussion regarding moving the RAB meeting earlier to 6:00 and the possibility of moving the meeting off base. After some discussion and no clear consensus, D. Dorocz suggested discussing the timeframe of the meetings at a later date.

EPA News

There was no EPA news.

RIDEM News

No RIDEM news from P. Crump. D. Brown mentioned that there is an initiative to move agriculture under a separate entity within RIDEM.

OTHER BUSINESS

D. Dorocz mentioned potential government spending cuts. Discussion ensued on possible impact to future (e.g., less Navy presence at RAB meetings, reduced hours, etc.). D. Dorocz mentioned this as introduction to *Ideas to Increase Membership* since it may be difficult to fund an off-base RAB meeting.

Ideas to Increase Membership

K. Abbess suggested that the RAB meetings rotate through the communities (via public library or city hall, for example). K. Abbess suggested inviting the town councilmen, etc. from the surrounding towns. M. Marques asked if Building 8 (just off-base by NUSC) would be a possibility. Claudette Weissinger suggested it would be nice to have the meeting at a consistent location. D. Brown suggested and provided a handout (attached) to conduct some meetings via webinar and suggested the use of the public library being a positive/constructive environment.

K. Abbess suggested getting local professors/students involved in the RAB meetings; possibly an internship for a student. D. Dorocz suggested an intern could develop a web page for the RAB. M. Kirschner suggested we be sensitive to the sequestration and not ask for more when the Navy will have fewer resources. D. Brown suggested getting a student journalist involved. D. Brown will look into local college and see if there are any project needs.

M. Kirschner questioned what the ideal size of the RAB is and if this is primary to the purpose of the RAB. D. Brown read some information from a RAB Fact Sheet. According to the fact sheet, the RAB should not be more than 20 members and there should be community outreach. Former community outreach has dwindled and that is what the RAB is trying to rejuvenate.

D. Brown asked if the 2005 information under the federal register is the most recent regulations for the RAB. M. Montegross and S. Parker were unsure. D. Brown suggested that the URLs in the newspaper ad be shortened and/or verified. T. Gray suggested posting links on the website.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the RAB will be held on May 15, 2013 at 6:30 pm. D. Dorocz is to look into a location of the next RAB meeting, but will remain at the Officer's Club unless we hear otherwise.

C. Weissinger inquired about the planned divestment of property on the west side of the Naval Station. D. Dorocz indicated that property transfer is being handled by another division.

D. Brown suggested better land use connections with property owner's off-base. Discussion pursued; may be outside of the RAB.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 pm.

/S/
D. D. Dorocz

Enclosures:

Meeting Agenda

Attendance Sheet

Site Progress Milestones

Document Review Status

Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area (CCRF), Expanded Investigation and Evaluation of Metals in Groundwater Presentation

Interactive Webinar Suggestion Handout



MEETING AGENDA

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

Wednesday, March 20, 2013, 6:30 – 8:00 pm

Officer's Club, NAVSTA Newport

- CALL TO ORDER
- APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES
- SITE PROGRESS UPDATE
 - Site Progress Milestone Chart
 - Document Review Status Table
- PRESENTATIONS
 - Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area (CCRF) Groundwater Sampling Program
- REPORTS
 - Membership Committee
 - EPA News
 - RIDEM News
- OTHER BUSINESS
 - Ideas to Increase Membership
- NEXT MEETING
 - May 15, 2013
 - Upcoming topics and presentations
- ADJOURN



RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) SIGN-IN SHEET

Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

	Name (Printed)	Organization/Affiliation
1	Mark Kauffman	Resolution / Navy
2	Melissa Cannon	Resolution
3	MANUEL MARQUES	CIV. MIDDLETOWN
4	David Dorocz	NSW
5	Dave Brown	Newport - Land Trust etc.
6	Margaret Kirschner	PAD.
7	THURSTON GRAY	PORTS MOUTH
8	Darlene Ward	NSN
9	DEB More	NSW
10	Pamela Crump	RIDEM
11	Stephen Paker	Tetra Tech
12	Kathy Abbas	RUM AD
13	Maritza Montegross	Navy (NAVFAC)
14	Claudia Olesing	Ports Cons. Comm.
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

SITE PROGRESS MILESTONES
Environmental Restoration Program
Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island



Updated: 03/20/13

Site	Site Name	USEPA Operable Unit (OU) Designation	Navy RPM	Navy Newport Facility Contact	EPA RPM	RIDEM RPM	Preliminary Investigation		Work Plan		Full Investigation			Removal	Technology Evaluation		Site Response Decision				Remediation					
							Final PA Report	Final SI or SASE Report	Draft SAP or WP	Final SAP or WP	Completion of Field Program	Draft RI Report or SIR	Final RI Report or SIR	Final CCR or RACR	Draft FS Report	Final FS Report	Draft PP	Final PP	Draft ROD or CAP	Final ROD or CAP	Completion of Design	Completion of Construction				
Site 1	McAllister Point Landfill	Onshore	OU 1	MM	DW	GL	PC	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
		Offshore	OU 4					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Site 2	Melville North Landfill	NA	NA	MM	DW	--	PC	X	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
Site 4	Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area	NA	NA	MM	DW	GL	PC	X	04/03/15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8/1/2015	2/12/2016	5/12/2016	10/9/2016	1/7/2017	6/6/2017						
Site 8	NUSC Disposal Area	OU 7	NA	MM	DM	GL	PC	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	X	X	X	X	X	10/12/13	11/17/15				
Site 9	Old Fire Fighting Training Area	OU 3	NA	WJ	DW	KK	PC	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Site 7	Tank Farm 1	Cat 1	TBD	RP	DW	KK	PC	X	NA	X	X	X	03/12/13	09/23/13	TBD	3/21/2014	10/2/2014	12/31/14	05/30/15	09/30/15	02/27/16					
		Cat 2	NA					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Cat 3	TBD					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Site 10	Tank Farm 2	Cat 1	TBD	RP	DW	KK	PC	X	X	X	3/13/2013	5/12/2013	12/10/13	06/23/14	TBD	10/21/2014	5/4/2015	08/02/15	12/30/15	03/29/16	08/26/16					
		Cat 2	NA					NA	NA	X	06/13/13	08/12/13	03/25/14	10/21/14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD				
		Cat 3	TBD					NA	NA	X	06/13/13	08/12/13	03/25/14	10/21/14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD				
Site 11	Tank Farm 3	Cat 1	TBD	RP	DM	KK	PC	X	03/13/13	X	X	X	X	05/22/14	TBD	9/19/2014	4/2/2015	07/01/15	11/28/15	02/26/16	07/25/16					
		Cat 2	NA					NA	NA	05/24/13	12/05/13	02/03/14	09/16/14	04/14/15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD					
		Cat 3	TBD					NA	NA	05/24/13	12/05/13	02/03/14	09/16/14	04/14/15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD					
Site 12	Tank Farm 4	Cat 1	OU 11	RP	DM	KK	PC	X	NA	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	03/10/13	X	07/11/13	10/09/13	03/08/14					
		Cat 2	NA					NA	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD					
		Cat 3	TBD					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD				
Site 13	Tank Farm 5	Cat 1 T53&56	OU 2	RP	DM	KK	PC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
		Cat 1 Other						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	03/15/13	X	07/15/13	10/13/13	03/12/14					
		Cat 2 T50						NA	NA	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
		Cat 2 Other						NA	NA	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD				
Cat 3	TBD	NA	X	X	X	X	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD										
Site 17	Gould Island	OU 6	NA	MM	DM	KK	PC	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	05/14/13	04/29/13	09/26/13	12/25/13	05/24/14	01/28/14	08/16/17				
Site 19	Derektor Shipyard	Onshore	OU 5	DOC	DW	KK	PC	X	X	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	X	07/14/13	06/14/13	11/14/13	12/11/13	05/10/14						
		Offshore	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	NA	X	10/11/13	X	10/29/13	11/25/13	04/24/14						
Site 22	Carr Point Storage Area	OU 10	NA	MM	DW	GL	PC	X	X	X	05/19/13	07/18/13	01/14/14	07/28/14	NA	11/25/14	06/08/15	09/06/15	02/03/16	05/03/16	09/30/16					
MRP Site 1	Carr Point Shooting Range	OU 9	NA	MM	DW	GL	PC	X	X	X	05/19/13	07/18/13	01/14/14	07/28/14	05/30/13	11/25/14	06/08/15	09/06/15	02/03/16	05/03/16	09/30/16					
Site 23	Coddington Point Debris Sites (5)	TBD	NA	DOC	DM		PC	X	X	X	08/09/13	10/08/13	04/06/14	10/18/14	NA	02/15/15	08/29/15	11/27/15	04/25/16	07/24/16	12/21/16					

Completed or not applicable
Resolution is scoped
Tetra Tech is scoped
Not yet scoped

Notes:
Category 1 - Includes non-petroleum impacts; managed under CERCLA; lead regulatory agency is USEPA
Category 2 - Includes only petroleum impacts; managed under RIDEM regulations; lead regulatory agency is RIDEM
Category 3 - Nature of site impacts is not yet defined; will be placed in either Category 1 or 2
Site investigation for Tank Farm 5 consisted of pilot study report for Cat 2 TF50, and characterization report for Cat 3
X = Completed; NA = Not applicable

PA = Preliminary Assessment
SI = Site Inspection
SASE = Study Area Screening Evaluation
SAP = Sampling and Analysis Plan
WP = Work Plan
CAP = Corrective Action Plan (RIDEM)
RI = Remedial Investigation
SIR = Site Investigation Report (RIDEM)
RACR = Remedial Action Completion Report
FS = Feasibility Study
PP = Proposed Plan
ROD = Record of Decision



Document Review Status

**NAVSTA Newport
RAB Meeting 03/20/13**

Site Name	Phase	Status
McAllister Point Landfill	Long-Term Monitoring	LTM program is ongoing.
Melville North Landfill	Closed	No documents in review. This site is closed.
Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area	SASE Report	Revised Draft SASE is on hold pending further groundwater sampling and evaluation.
NUSC Disposal Area	Remedial Design	Final ROD was completed 09/17/12. Remedial design is in progress.
Old Fire Fighting Training Area	Remedial Construction	Construction on revetment is complete. The 100% design submittal for the cover system is complete, and construction is planned for early 2013.
Tank Farm 1	RI Report	Field work and chemical analysis is completed. The draft report was issued March 12 for review.
Tank Farm 2	Work Plan (SAP) For RI	No specific update this month.
Tank Farm 3	SASE	Final issues on the sampling plan are being worked out. There was resolution on all issues on the SASE report.
	Work Plan (SAP) For RI	
Tank Farm 4	FS	Final FS was submitted as a redline 02/08/13, no comments to date.
Tank Farm 5	FS	Final FS was submitted as a redline 03/05/13, no comments to date.
Gould Island	FS	Navy received comments on the Draft Final FS report, issues are being resolved, and we anticipate a Final FS in late March/early April.
Derecktor	SASE Addendum (On Shore)	The Final SASE Addendum has been issued, which completes this item.
	On Shore FS	Navy received comments on the Draft FS, and these are in discussion.
	Off Shore FS	A revised FS report is in preparation for submittal on 03/28/13.
Carr Point Storage Area	Removal Action, RI Work Plan	Removal Action: Removal action anticipated for completion by 04/30/13. Remaining Site: Draft Final Work Plan is planned for submittal in April 2013.
Carr Point Shooting Range	RI Work Plan	Draft Final Work Plan is planned for submittal in April 2013.
Coddington Point	RI Work Plan	Draft Work Plan was submitted to the regulatory agencies on 01/26/13. Regulatory discussion is pending.



Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area (CCRF)

Expanded Investigation and Evaluation of Metals in Groundwater

NAVSTA Newport RAB Meeting
March 20, 2013



Regulatory Phase



- Study Area Screening Evaluation (SASE) was implemented and an initial report was drafted
 - SASE included a site investigation to collect soil, groundwater, sediment and surface water samples, and to analyze them for the presence of chemical parameters
 - SASE included a risk assessment to quantify potential risks to human health and ecological receptors
 - SASE is designed to determine whether site conditions and potential risks warrant either:
 - Remedial Investigation (RI) under CERCLA
 - No Further Action (NFA)



SASE Results to Date



- Identified soil and groundwater impacts and quantified potential risks
- Identified 5 specific metals in groundwater that could pose potential risks (if verified as realistically representing site groundwater conditions)
- ***Draft Final SASE Report*** was produced and placed “on hold” pending the verification that the 5 specific metals in groundwater realistically represent site groundwater conditions



5 Metals of Interest



- Arsenic (As)
- Chromium (Cr)
- Cobalt (Co)
- Iron (Fe)
- Manganese (Mn)



Unanswered Questions



- Are the metals really site-related, are they naturally occurring environmental conditions, or are they the result of common materials?
- Is their presence in groundwater (solubility) caused by naturally occurring conditions such as chemical conditions or biological conditions?
- Was the risk assessment realistic or overly conservative?
- Do the metals warrant the initiation of an RI under CERCLA, or is NFA necessary?



Possible Answers (Hypothesis)



- All of these metals are naturally occurring, particularly in New England groundwater, and many are components of common materials
 - As is the 48th most common element in the ground, present in more than 245 minerals, used in pesticides, herbicides, wood treatment, and other applications
 - Cr is the 20th most common element in the ground, used in many materials such as stainless steel
 - Co is the 29th most common element in the ground, used in magnetic alloys, ceramics, and other materials
 - Iron is the 4th most common element in the ground, common in most rocks and minerals, used in many metals such as rebar
 - Mn is the 12th most common element in the ground, most common in sandstone and other rocks



Possible Answers (Hypothesis)



- The solubility of these metals (preference to become dissolved in groundwater) could be increased by several possible causes
 - Low oxygen conditions, common in wetland areas, convert metals into their soluble forms, such as Fe^{+3} to Fe^{+2}
 - Organic matter, common in residential soil, fertilized soil, and wetland areas frequently contains iron-reducing bacteria that thrive on organic carbon and convert metals into their soluble forms, such as Mn^{+3} to Mn^{+2}
- The SASE risk assessment was most likely overly conservative in assuming all Cr detected was the toxic form of Cr^{+6}
 - In actuality, most Cr is typically present as Cr^{+3} , particularly in reduced, low-oxygen conditions



Planned Approach



- Evaluate available data from the existing monitoring well network (8 wells)
- Review available geologic and geochemical data in the immediate vicinity of where groundwater samples have been collected
 - Soil type from geologic logs, geochemical conditions from groundwater sample collection records
- Review nearby information that could provide additional evidence of possible contributions
 - Land use, wetland areas, low-groundwater recharge (hydrogeologically stagnant) areas



Planned Approach



- Prepare a Work Plan (SAP) Addendum for groundwater sampling
- Conduct the field investigation
- Re-develop, purge, and collect fresh groundwater samples from existing monitoring well network (8 wells) for laboratory analysis
- Record field geochemical conditions through low-flow sampling techniques
 - Dissolved oxygen, oxygen-reduction potential, pH



Planned Approach



- Analyze groundwater samples for metals of interest and key geochemical and biological indicator parameters
 - Target Analyte List (TAL) metals, which includes As, Cr, Co, Fe, and Mn
 - Hexavalent chromium (Cr^{+6})
 - Chloride, sulfate, alkalinity (bicarbonate and carbonate), total dissolved solids (TDS), total organic carbon (TOC), ammonia, and nitrate/nitrite



Next Steps



- Prepare a Technical Memorandum to present the results and conclusions relative to whether the metals in groundwater are site-related
- Finalize the SASE Report based on the Technical Memorandum with a clear conclusion
 - If site-related, conduct an RI under CERCLA
 - If not site-related, conclude that NFA is necessary
- Attach the Technical Memorandum as an Appendix to the ***Final SASE Report***



*Just an idea from Dave Brown, 21 March 2013
For NSN Restoration Advisory Board consideration...*

Let's "meet" by interactive webinar most (but not all) of the time

Situation

- Few community members and leaders are coming to our RAB meetings. The RAB is supposed to be a public forum that includes diverse community interests along with Navy, EPA, RIDEM and other agency reps.
- As NSN cleanups wind down, there will be need for people with local government, planning, development, and land- and coastal-stewardship groups to mesh with NSN-site follow-up management. They may be readier to take part if no need to travel to RAB meetings and not after working hours.
- Now it's harder for interested persons to get base access on short notice.
- Agency budgets are very tight and staff very busy. Unless here for other work, to come to our meetings from Boston, Norfolk, etc. drains money and time. And agency reps have to be away from their families.
- More and more groups, including Fed and state entities, are using the webinar approach.

The idea

- Use webinar hookups for most of our regular briefings and discussions. Can take part in our homes, offices or small meeting places (e.g., local libraries), using laptops (best with headsets) and easy website access and helps.
- Still might be good to have 1-2 in-person meetings a year. One might be an annual RAB-Fest that attracts key officials, the press, etc. Include virtual tour of recent cleanup "milestones," remaining tasks, etc. Celebrate the progress, urge nearby land and coast users to use complementary practices, and thank the agency folks who have helped clean up our surroundings.
- If Fed regs permit, could use webinars to strengthen participation in public hearings and comments for proposed NSN cleanup steps and related NSN environmental actions.
- When announcing RAB materials and meetings, webinar or otherwise, use plain-English key words for web links, and not convoluted Navy-type URLs.

Our libraries seem ready to help

Today I talked with Ref & IT staff at Newport, Middletown, Portsmouth and Jamestown libraries. They will try to help RAB members who are new to webinars, if they bring laptops with wireless and headsets. Portsmouth has extra laptops, when not being used for classes. Some libraries have alcoves for 1-3 persons. Groups can sign up ahead for meeting rooms with wireless. An LCD projector is available at Jamestown, and probably elsewhere.

I talked with two (Debra Homer at Jamestown, and Sue Conner at Middletown) who are tech specialists for their libraries. They think that interactive webinars have much to offer, and seem very ready to help the Navy and RAB members get started. They mentioned *GoToMeeting* [see also *GoToWebinar*] as services that seem to work well. [One of my public-funded webinar groups uses *Blackboard Collaborate*.]

Even if we don't use webinars, one of the libraries, or a rotation among them, might be a good site for RAB meetings? As one person has said, libraries are seen as neutral, quiet space ... meetings seem calmer there than on some group's turf ... not often used as a place to get on a soapbox.