6/20/05 - 01372

Norfolk Naval Shipyard
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary: June 20, 2005

RAB Members Present	
Janette Whitley	Community Co-chair
Tim Reisch	LANTDIV
Greyson Franklin	USEPA
Morris Roberts Jr.	VIMS
Ann Reed	Community Rep
Lyle Jackson	Community Rep
J. Brewer Moore	Community Rep
Fred Brusso	City of Portsmouth

RAB Participants	
Paul Landin	CH2M HILL
Jan Nielsen	NNSY
Frederick House	Community Guest
Steve Milner	NNSY
Pete Clifford	NNSY
Billy Boggs	Community Guest

RAB Members Absent:	
Adriane James	ACOE Norfolk
Debra Miller	Virginia DEQ
William Copeland	Community Rep
Raleigh Harsley	Community Rep
Ross Worsham	Community Rep
Mike Host	NNSY Co-chair
Maureen Boshier	Community Rep
Anne McGowan-McGlynn	Community Rep

FROM: Paul Landin/CH2M HILL

DATE: June 27, 2005

LOCATION

Holiday Inn Olde Towne Portsmouth, Virginia

Meeting Summary

Opening Remarks

The meeting commenced at 5:00 pm. Ms. Janette Whitley and Mr. Pete Clifford welcomed members. Mr. Clifford explained that he was acting as the NNSY Co-chair for this meeting since Mr. Mike Host was unable to attend. As there were community guests present for the first time, each person was asked to introduce themselves.

RAB Membership

Mr. Pete Clifford presented a summary and update of current RAB membership. Mr. Clifford noted that Mr. William Copeland recently renewed his membership. In addition, Mr. Fred Brusso is now a member of the RAB as the official representative for the City of Portsmouth.

Two new RAB members have been added since the last meeting. In addition to Mr. Brusso replacing Mr. Robert Baldwin from the City of Portsmouth, Ms. Anne McGowan-McGlynn and Ms. Maureen Boshier have joined as community representatives.

There are currently 16 RAB members (2 new members), with a maximum of 20 allowed per the by-laws. There are currently 4 openings.

Currently 16 RAB members.

9 Members Representing the Community:
William Copeland
Raleigh Harsley
Lyle Jackson
J. Brewer Moore
Ann Reed
Janette Whitley
Ross Worsham
Anne McGowan-McGlynn
Maureen Boshier

7 Members Representing Government Organizations:
Fred Brusso – City of Portsmouth
Debra Miller – VDEQ
Mike Host – NNSY
Adriane James – US Army Corp of Engineers
Tim Reisch – NAVFAC
Morris Roberts – VIMS
Greyson Franklin – EPA

It was noted that there was an article on Mr. Raleigh Harsley in The Virginian-Pilot recently. The article was about his gardening. Ms. Whitley distributed photocopies of the article.

Building 195 and Vicinity (Site 17)

Presenter: Tim Reisch/NAVFAC – Mid Atlantic
Objective: Discuss Proposed Remedial Action Plan

Mr. Reisch provided a handout of his presentation. Site 17 is referred to as "Building 195 and Vicinity". Building 195 was a former electroplating shop. Site 17 is currently concrete or asphalt covered, like much of the Controlled Industrial Area (CIA) of NNSY. Previous investigations indicated one surface soil sample contained arsenic concentrations that drove

the human health risk concerns. As part of basewide maintenance efforts and railspur replacement for NNSY, this location was excavated and removed from the site. In addition, further samples were collected from underneath Building 195 to assist in future planning for the demolition of the building. Based upon the revised human health risk assessments completed on the soil data under current Site 17 conditions, no risk is present to current on-site worker or future construction worker. Residential risk to soil was not calculated in the initial assessment since the site is within the CIA of NNSY and there are no plans for the construction of a residential nature. Groundwater does not pose an unacceptable risk under any exposure scenario. The selected remedy for the site involves implementing land use controls to restrict residential development.

Remedial Actions evaluated in the Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) were:

1. No Action (required for baseline comparison)
2. Land Use Controls
    a. Prohibit residential development
    b. Notice of restrictions filed with deed
    c. Annual inspections conducted and provided to USEPA and VDEQ
    d. Complete five-year reviews to ensure the remedy is protective

Following completion of the FFS, a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) will be prepared. This document will be made available to the public for review and comment at the Information Repository at the Main Branch of the Portsmouth Public Library. The current schedule for the document is:

- Finalize document
- Place a public notice in the Virginian-Pilot to announce the public comment period
- 30-day public comment period
- The Navy will respond to comments and coordinate any necessary changes with VDEQ and USEPA. Comments received will be included in the Responsiveness Summary which is included in the Record of Decision (ROD).

Mr. Clifford asked Mr. Reisch to explain the risk scenarios and how they are evaluated. Under a residential scenario, it is assumed a human lives on the site 365 days per year. For the child exposure, it is assumed the child ingests a certain amount of the soil (and groundwater, if applicable), including contaminants present. An on-site worker is assumed to be present at the site for an 8-hr work shift, with exposure pathways considered. A construction worker is assumed under a short term exposure to perform site activities, such as utility maintenance.

Scott Center Landfill (OU1 Site 2)

Presenter: Pete Clifford/NNSY
Objective: Present Removal Action Completion Results, Discuss Proposed Remedial Action Plan, and Establish Site Tour

REMOVAL ACTION COMPLETION RESULTS

Mr. Clifford provided a brief history of the landfill, including the type of wastes that were disposed there. He also described the original plan for the site, which was to pave the site and convert it to a parking lot. The pavement would act as a cover to prevent the potential for future exposure. This alternative, however, would have required the Navy to perform long term monitoring at the site to ensure contaminants are not migrating off of the site. It was later determined that the site could be excavated to remove the waste and a tidal wetland created in its place. This was a suggestion from the Elizabeth River Project with reference to a similar circumstance at New Gosport, where a former disposal area was excavated and tidal wetlands was established in its place.

Analytical testing was performed on the landfill materials to determine disposal characteristics as non-hazardous or hazardous. If the waste were deemed hazardous, the cost associated with transport and disposal would have prevented the Navy excavation of the waste. Test results indicated non-hazardous waste, and it was determined the excavation, off-site disposal at a permitted facility, and restoration as a tidal wetland was a feasible alternative.

Mr. Reisch asked Mr. Clifford to describe the sample approach to determine how far to excavate adjacent to the landfill when determining the extent to which the landfill had impacted the sediments along Paradise Creek. Samples were collected in 1/12-acre areas, combined from six different points at each depth within the gridded areas, and analyzed for specific inorganic constituents (metals) that had been identified for Paradise Creek. The samples were compared to site-specific toxicity test results, and "background" concentrations that were established for Paradise Creek. Not including the marsh sediment area affected by the landfill would have required the Navy to perform monitoring on the sediments to make sure contaminants were not migrating from the marsh area. This would have required 5-Year Reviews under CERCLA.

Mr. Clifford explained the perimeter ditch around the newly constructed wetland serves to help prevent invasive wetland species from migrating to the area, along with providing more flushing to the site as the tide fluctuates.

At the last RAB meeting (February 2005) the Navy was dealing with waste materials present in a lens along the road and water line. Subsequent to the meeting, the Navy worked out a modification to the contract and the remedial action contractor proceeded to excavate the waste around the water line. Waste was not discovered underneath the waterline and thinned out before the road was reached.

In April 2005 construction was completed, and new wetland plants were planted within the site as part of restoration. Mr. Clifford summarized a few key quantities for the project:

Excavation:

- 25,000 tons of landfill material
- 475 tons of mixed landfill and marsh sediment
- 3,300 tons of marsh sediment

Recyclables:

- 9 – 60 cubic yard containers of trees
- 6,700 tons of soil usable as daily cover at the landfill
- 905 tons of concrete

Wetland Restoration:

- 12,000 plugs of Saltmarsh Cordgrass (Spartina Alterniflora)
- 6,000 plugs of Saltmeadow Hay (Spartina Patens)
- 2,000 plugs of various wetlands species
- 450 uplands plants (Wax Myrtle, Groundsel Tree, Marsh Elder)
- 5,400 square yards of Waterfowl Exclusion Fence

Final Project Numbers:

- 1.6 acre wetland creation/mitigation
- 2.0 acre wetland and upland creation/mitigation
- Total cost of $1.8 million

Questions from the RAB included an inquiry about using volunteers to plant the wetland species. Navy volunteers had helped at the riparian buffer/uplands at New Gosport, but the effort was done after all the CERCLA actions had been completed. Mr. Clifford explained that by having the planting subcontracted, the Navy gets a guarantee for survival.

SITE TOUR

Mr. Lyle Jackson asked about a site tour to see the newly constructed wetland. Mr. Clifford said yes, and suggested the week of July 18th, 2005. The site tour was scheduled for Tuesday, July 19th at 1pm. Mr. Clifford will send a notice to the RAB in advance to confirm requirements for security to access the facility.

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN

The Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for Site 2 is being completed to provide a public document that presents the possible future actions at the site. Because the Navy and regulatory agencies (as the Project Management Team – PMT) agree the landfill excavation with restoration as a tidal wetland leaves no unacceptable risk in place, provides for unlimited use under unrestricted exposure scenarios, and requires no further cost under CERCLA, the only alternative investigated was No Further Action (NFA).

The document is going to be reviewed by UESPA legal, and comments will be incorporated prior to making the document available for public review at the Information Repository at the Main Branch of the Portsmouth Public Library. A notice will be placed in the Virginian-Pilot to state the document is available for a 30-day comment period and include a notice for a public meeting (time/place) during the comment period. The PRAP may be modified, if necessary, based upon comments. Comments received by the Navy during the public comment period will be addressed in a Responsiveness Summary, which will be included with the Record of Decision to document comments/responses for the PRAP.

Mr. Reisch clarified on signatures for the ROD. The Navy and USEPA approve the document with signature. VDEQ approves the document with a letter stating the agency concurs.

Mr. Morris Roberts asked a question about lifespan/expectations for the newly constructed wetland, specifically the "moat" around the wetland. Mr. Clifford explained that monitoring and maintenance of the wetland will be turned over to Navy Natural Resources. Mr. Steve Milner, Ms. Jan Nielsen, and Mr. Clifford briefly explained the ownership of Navy property (annex properties such as Scott Center Annex are owned by the Commander Navy Region Mid Atlantic).

Ms. Ann Reed stated the Navy should be proud of its accomplishment at the site.

Mr. Jackson inquired about the contractor who performed the work. ECOR Solutions performed the excavation and construction of the wetlands. Mr. Reisch briefly explained the EMAC (Environmental Multiple Award Contract) that was used to contract with ECOR for the project. He also stated he was very happy with ECOR's performance on the project. Six modifications were issued; of these four were no cost modifications. Ms. Reed asked whether or not this contract requires competitive bidding. Mr. Reisch confirmed that competitive bidding is required.

Paradise Creek Landfill (OU 2, Sites 3 – 7)

Presenter: Tim Reisch/NAVFAC Mid Atlantic
Objective: Discussion of Wetlands Mitigation Plan and Status of Removal Action

Mr. Reisch explained the Wetlands Mitigation Plan for Paradise Creek that was completed to document impacts to wetlands as part of on-going construction projects. While permits are not required under CERCLA, the regulatory framework must be followed. This document is completed to ensure applicable or relevant and appropriate (ARAR) laws are followed. It provides a comprehensive plan regarding wetland impacts.

There are two processes that are followed in developing the Mitigation Plan: a Net Environmental Benefit Analysis (NEBA) and a Habitat Equivalency Analysis (HEA). The NEBA provides a comparison of benefits for alternate land use for remedial actions that affect the environment. It is completed in support of the Installation Restoration (IR) program to help in the decision making process to avoid habitat injury and provide compliance with ARARs. The NEBA establishes a level playing field to define future land use, evaluate remedial alternatives, and define ecological service value of different habitat types.

A HEA is used to compare various types of habitat (say forested wetlands versus salt marsh wetlands) with units consisting of Discounted Service Acre Years (dSAYs).

The Navy is using this approach for impacts at Scott Center Annex (OU1, Site 2) and Paradise Creek (OU2, Sites 3 through 7) but not for New Gosport since that project was completed prior to the use of the NEBA/HEA.

Mr. Reisch provided figures in the presentation demonstrating the impacted wetland areas (total of 4-8 acres). Completing mitigation at these sites within the ARARs will include no net loss of wetland area once construction activities are complete.

Mr. Clifford asked if the Wetlands Mitigation Plan was available for review. Mr. Reisch explained the document is currently being finalized to correct minor discrepancies and will be available for review at the Information Repository at the Main Branch of the Portsmouth Public Library when finalized.

Mr. Brewer Moore inquired about the 70 acres referenced in the presentation, but much smaller compensated areas. Mr. Reisch explained the compensation is only for impacted wetland areas. It would not be cost effective for the Navy to consider removing the landfill at Paradise Creek due to size and volume of material. The intent of the remedial action at Paradise Creek is to stabilize potentially unstable side slopes and provide appropriate stormwater control measures.

Mr. Roberts inquired about stormwater from surrounding areas. Mr. Reisch explained the 72" outfall pipe at Paradise Creek carries considerable stormwater flows from other areas within the City of Portsmouth and that while the original plan was to create a stormwater wetland to include flow from the outfall, the elevation of the pipe made this impossible from an engineering perspective.

Ms. Whitley asked if there were no engineering controls that could be implemented. Mr. Reisch confirmed several alternatives were evaluated, but none were feasible.

Mr. Jackson inquired about removing all forested areas. Mr. Reisch confirmed that trees will be removed from the side slopes of the landfill to provide for stabilization, but the restoration of the site will include wildflower plantings in accordance with Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) guidance. He further explained that Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations (VSWMR) do not allow trees on the cover of a landfill.

Mr. Roberts inquired if the inlets within Paradise Creek contribute to the outfall. Mr. Reisch confirmed, yes, the inlets from the landfills direct flows to the outfall. Ms. Whitley asked what was in the water (contaminants). Mr. Reisch explained the water was typical of urban runoff. Ms. Whitley then asked if the area could be re-contaminated following clean up efforts. Mr. Reisch confirmed yes, but there are measures being implemented with new construction projects to reduce runoff, such as Low Impact Development (LID). Mr. Jackson confirmed that new developments are required to reduce runoff impacts.

The outfall at Paradise Creek carries considerable stormwater runoff from the City of Portsmouth and Mr. Jackson explained this includes all the way to the I-264/Frederick Boulevard interchange. To limit runoff contributions to the outfall, measures have to be implemented at the source.

Mr. Moore inquired as to whether there was any chance of utilizing Paradise Creek as a park or making it accessible to the public, such as what was completed at the Portsmouth Naval Hospital, where a former site is now part of the History Trail. Mr. Reisch and Ms. Nielsen explained the liability the Navy accepts by making the site accessible is too great. This is due to potential damage to the cover. Also, the property is owned by CNRMA, not NNSY. Environmental experts have noted limiting access minimizes interference with wildlife.

Group Discussion and Questions

Much of the group discussion and question time for the meeting was used discussing Paradise Creek (see above). During the group discussion, however, Mr. Clifford advised that Mr. Larry Johnson (Outreach Coordinator for USEPA Region III) was interested in obtaining feedback from the NNSY RAB to provide assistance regarding the on-going work at the Atlantic Wood site, which is a Superfund site. The RAB agreed to receive information. Response to Mr. Johnson will be on an individual basis.

Next Meeting Schedule

The next meeting date is targeted for August/September and will be coordinated with Ms. Whitley.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:00 PM.