

410.5



11350
Ser 410/54
23 /MAY 1989

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

FROM: 400

Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Encl: List of attendees

1. Date: 2 May 1989
Time: 9:30
Place: Admiralty Village Housing Office Conference Room

2. The third meeting of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) was chaired by Kenneth Plaisted, and opened with introductions of all members present. Gerri Falco, from USEPA, was at another location and participated via speaker phone.

Not at the last meeting, and present today were: Jim Tayon, an environmental engineer, recently employed by Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNS) Environmental Division of Public Works, Onil Roy, a high school science teacher from the town of Kittery, and Pat Ferrebee, a geologist with USN Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) North Division. A list of attendees is attached.

3. Ken Plaisted stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss unofficial comments to the draft RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Proposal (RFIP) which was distributed at the last TRC meeting. USEPA was asked to start the discussion with their comments.

4. Gerri Falco began with her observations:

(1) There is no Initial Facility Characterization report as required in the Hazard and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA) permit. There should be (a) specifics on the Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs), and other topics listed in the permit on pages 14-29 and (b) references detailing any existing wells.

An important factor is how contaminants travel within the estuary. This is a critical issue and must be addressed adequately. The Navy should characterize the shipyard's contribution both past and present and develop transport patterns for contaminants.

Ed Kochem responded by expressing his concern that the PNS position be qualified with the potential impact other industry in the area may have had on the environment.

(2) The Navy's scheduling should not be dependent upon the delaying calendar of any other particular industry in the area



Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

which may have research data to contribute relating to their impact on the estuary.

Ken Plaisted indicated the Navy's concern was to have the boundaries well defined for their area of responsibility in the estuary.

Joel Balmat offered that the Navy has historically done its part in characterizing its involvement in the estuary and that USEPA does not expect the Navy to perform the entire estuary study--but only its part. It is not expected that the Navy will, for example, establish a numerical model, but USEPA wants PNS to make the argument that the sediments are a result of a mix and to justify the sampling plan. He informed the committee that Dr. Ken Finkelstein, a NOAA oceanographer, is doing a review of past study data and that it is hoped he will be available to contribute at the next TRC meeting.

5. Ed Kochem inquired to what extent it was considered necessary that shell fish be studied.

Pam Parker advised that the state was available for shell fish studies, and indicated that the state is looking for a justification in the modeling plan, for example, not to sample where the water current scours down to bare rock, i.e., to establish a bonafide sediment-generation plan. It is expected that background data from upgradient and/or untouched areas be compared with data derived from downgradient areas and thereby quantifying environmental impact.

6. Joel Balmat commented on the need for professionals such as oceanographers to be included on the research team. USEPA recognizes that this is a complex environmental problem and that they themselves intend to engage that level of expertise.
7. (3) USEPA expects a Preliminary Investigation of Corrective Measures as required in HSWA Permit Part II Paragraph A.2 detailing past and future investigations, data and proposed corrective measures. Joel Balmat informed the committee that the old Superfund policy went along with a remediation schedule, but that the new process looks at remedies during the exploration process.
8. (4) Proposed geophysical investigation methods relate only to SWMU 8, Jamaica Island Landfill (JILF), and SWMU 9, Mercury Burial Sites. HSWA Permit Part II Paragraph A.2., pp. 19-20, requires surface geophysical investigation at SWMU 6, DPDO, and SWMU 27, Fuel Oil Spillage Area South East of Berth 6, as well.



Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Ed Kochem indicated that geophysical studies may be most applicable when dealing with burial sites and also that Hart anticipates some aspects of the geophysical exploration to be hampered by interferences such as electrical from overhead wires. Hart will be alert to using other methods such as bore-hole studies.

Joel Balmat interjected that USEPA has gotten more into the use of geophysics seeking identification of ground water pathways, major discontinuities and fractures, and changes in soil types. Also, if the Navy requires changes to the permit--and USEPA decides there is good justification for permit modification--that could possibly reopen the permit to the public.

9. (5) The soils investigation contained in the RFIP is sketchy. References to soil investigations should be described consistently. Plans to study volatiles below DRMO should be spelled out. Joel Balmat commented that the USEPA Technical Enforcement Document describes the grid spacing necessary and the interval depends on the heterogenous/homogeneous nature of the findings.

Pam Parker said the fractured nature of the bedrock should be described due to the potential penetration of mercury and lead, for example. Don Robbins asked if plans were to stop at five feet for a boring depth if the bedrock is fractured. Ed Kochem stated that that depth was initially arbitrary to determine the competency of the rock. Joel Balmat indicated he would prefer more descriptive proposed test procedures.

10. (6) A surface water sampling plan is absent. Joel Balmat proposed limited surface water sampling initially, conceivably at slack tide--such as after a storm to detect any concentrations of contaminants in the run-off. It is up to the Navy to establish a worst-case existing condition.

~~Ed Kochem made the point that any surface impoundments on the Shipyard (fresh water ponds) were well beyond the boundary limits of the GWHU and therefore also beyond the intent of Surface Water/Sedimentation Characterization (see page 23 of HSWA permit).~~

11. (7) It was agreed that the final RFIP format should fit that of the permit, and that a project management plan as per page 29 of permit would be included.
12. Joel Balmat remarked that their next review would be as swift as possible in order to launch a quick startup on field work.



Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

An USEPA peer review group will study the final RFIP submittal and recommend changes.

13. Joel Balmat announced his plans to leave USEPA and take a position with a private concern.

Ken Plaisted expressed his personal pleasure in working with Joel Balmat and the Navy's appreciation for his contribution in keeping the project moving efficiently.

14. Don Robbins and Pam Parker advanced some issues:
(1) A discussion developed about the reliability of the data resulting from the proposed geophysical techniques. They expressed apprehension as to whether it would be possible to detect and segregate any pertinent material from the tangle of debris that has been deposited during the long life of the landfilling operations.

Ed Kochem responded that there were no options but to try state of the art methods and attempt to compile supportive and worthwhile data.

(2) The reported buried chlorine and acetylene cylinders were discussed. Were these cylinders shock sensitive, and would they be affected by seismic or other geophysical activities? Ed Kochem responded that Hart was concerned about this, as well, and assured that all safety precautions would be exercised.

(3) There may be some lack of agreement between the text and the grid coordinating system of some drawings. Acronyms should be explained at the bottom of each page. Hart acknowledged the comment.

(4) The state of Maine requires a ~~Registered Professional Geologist~~ to approve, stamp and seal all work. It is the law, a class C crime, and Maine does not have reciprocity with other states. Hart acknowledged the comment.

15. Chris Mitchell offered the name of Ken Hardcastle as a reference for some extensive geological research performed in the state of Maine--including Kittery--for regional fracture traces. He also stated that the comments from the local citizens indicate they would like to see an accelerated pace in RFI headway.

16. The Navy stated its intention to try and meet the previously targeted date of May 30 to submit the final draft of the RFIP for approval.



Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

17. The meeting was adjourned and Ken Plaisted, Jim Tayon, Ron Springfield, Pat Ferrebee, Pam Parker, Don Robbins participated in a site tour of the shipyard.


THOMAS M. HAGGE

Distribution:
Attendees
Town of Kittery
Phillip McCarthy
Cdr. T.M. Hagge
Jim Fender
Hank Aho
Ruth Dow, Code ~~684~~ 864
File Code 441.01



Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD
ADMIRALTY VILLAGE

2 MAY 1989

TRC MEETING

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE
<u>ATTENDEES</u>		
Springfield, Ron	North Division	(215) 897-6431
Roy, Onil A.	Kittery	439-9488 (h) 439-1121 (work)
Parker, Pamela A.	MEDEP <i>State House Ste 17 August 04333</i>	(207) 289-2651
Robbins, Donald	MEDEP	(207) 289-2651
Mitchell, Chris	Kittery <i>IEP Inc 39 Bow St P.O. Box 1136 Port. NH 03801</i>	(603) 433-5800 439-5172
Tayon, James E.	PNS	438-1752, 1218
Ferrebee, Patricia	North Div.	(215) 897-6432
Balmat, Joel	U.S. EPA <i>HPR-CAN I JFK Fed Bldg Bldm 02203</i>	(617) 573-5790
Flaisted, Kenneth	PNS	438-1218
Kochem, Ed	F.C. HART Assoc. <i>28 Med. Av. Ext 12203</i>	(518) 869-6192
Falco, GERALYN (Speaker Phone)	U.S. EPA	(617) 573-5790

*1 OK PT. DR
REZ BX 65
Kittery, ME 039*

Phillip M^cCarthy

439 1633