

*Urschel*

N00102.AR.000026  
NSY PORTSMOUTH  
5090.3a

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

---

**SUBJECT:** A/E Services for Feasibility Study/Design Services for Remediation of Hazardous Waste Site, NSY, Portsmouth, Kittery, Maine

Northern Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Building 77L, U.S. Naval Base  
Philadelphia, PA 19112-504

Contract N<sup>o</sup>: N62472-86-C-1283

**PURPOSE:** A "Task A" meeting with Navy Representatives was called by the Northern Division Project Manager (L. Resta) to discuss various issues related to the RCRA Facility Investigation Proposal (RFIP) and the related field work presently underway.

**LOCATION:** Northern Division Headquarters  
Building 77L, U.S. Naval Base  
Philadelphia, PA

**DATE:** February 27, 1990

**PREPARED BY:** Stephen J. Myers, Vice President  
HART Project Director  
February 28, 1990 

**ATTENDEES:** U.S. Navy  
Linda Resta--Northern Division Project Manager  
Franco LaGreca--Northern Division Technical Director  
James Tayon--Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Environmental Engineer

Hart Environmental Mgmt. Corp.  
Stephen Myers--Project Director  
Edward Kochem--Technical Project Manager  
Stephen Urschel--Field Team Leader

The attached agenda was prepared by the Northern Division Project Manager (L. Resta) and used as the basis for discussion at the meeting. The following minutes generally follow the agenda outline.

- Jim Tayon of the Shipyard indicated that he spoke with Ms. Jeri Weiss of EPA and we can expect EPA technical comments on the RFIP in approximately two (2) weeks. Assuming comments are received by Friday, March 16, a review meeting between HART and the Navy has been tentatively scheduled for the week of March 26 to be held at HART's Albany office or at Portsmouth. A subsequent meeting with EPA to discuss the comments will be scheduled, if necessary, once comments are received and reviewed. HART has assumed that approximately two months will be required to respond to the comments assuming some level of "reasonableness", however, a firm schedule can only be proposed once the comments are received.

■ Administrative

- (1) Reformat RFIP--Northern Division will issue an RFP to HART to propose on work to reformat the RFIP consistent with the final HSWA permit, incorporate the EPA checklist comments/U.S. Navy response and respond to EPA technical comments once received and reviewed.
- (2) Progress Reports--Northern Division will issue an RFP to HART to prepare progress reports for field work. It was agreed that progress reports will begin with the next phase of field work and will be prepared by HART on a monthly basis. Northern Division will submit progress reports to EPA on a bimonthly (i.e. every two (2) months) basis to comply with the permit requirements.

To assist in this effort HART will prepare a format for the monthly report consistent with any permit requirements as to content and will assist Northern Division in formatting a bimonthly report, if necessary.

The first monthly report will include a synopsis of all field work performed up to that date including the present field work now underway.

- (3) Equitable Adjustment--This item is resolved by the action of item (1) above.
- (4) Painting of Wells--HART (E. Kochem) indicated that painting of well casings is not a standard practice and may have the potential to introduce contaminants into the well if performed after installation. If the well casings are painted before installation there is no risk for contamination. The Shipyard (J. Tayon) prefers painted well casings because the paint reduces corrosion and makes the wells more visible. HART agreed that all future well casings will be consistent with one another using an approved color of paint or other suitable material to establish one standard. Previously installed wells will be retrofitted to meet the standard during the next phase of field work.

Northern Division (F. LaGreca) was concerned about locating flush-mounted wells under the ice/snow and whether dirt/water, etc. could enter the well upon opening. HART (E. Kochem/S. Urschel) responded that location is identified by a base map and siting in the field. Proper clearing and flushing procedures prior to opening the well will minimize the possibility of foreign material entering the well.

- (5) Meeting Budget--HART (Myers) indicated that a full evaluation of this modification must be made to determine the appropriate labor structure and rates, expense rates, number of meetings, etc. versus what is in the present amendment. HART (S. Myers) will work with Northern Division (L. Resta) so that a request for modification of any parts of the amendment deemed to require revision can be submitted, as necessary. This will be accomplished within the next three weeks.

■ Technical

- (1) Biota/Site Characterization/Risk Assessment--The following comments were made and agreed to:
- (a) The Navy should do its fair share to investigate and remediate those areas "off-shore" that are impacted by operations at the Shipyard.
  - (b) Justification must be provided to EPA for any actions deemed by the Navy, with HART's assistance, to be beyond that which the Navy considers its responsibility.
  - (c) A phased approach, as indicated in the RFIP, should be followed to assure that all steps are designed considering the findings of previous steps.
  - (d) The Navy's position on these items should remain unchanged until EPA comments are received.
- (2) Bedrock--HART has obtained some information on the bedrock as a result of the present field work. It was premature to discuss the findings at the meeting since the type and location of contaminants and the reduction of all data was not complete as of the meeting date. HART will provide its information on the bedrock in the field work final report.

Concerning the topography of the bedrock, HART (E. Kochem) indicated that direct (e.g. higher concentration of borings) and/or indirect (e.g. seismic) may be required for additional information.

The Shipyard (J. Tayon) will work to get approval for methods such as the use of dynamite as an energy source for seismic surveying if HART recommends such.

- (3) Soil Gas Characterization--Shipyard (J. Tayon) provided a "white paper" on passive system effectiveness and asked for HART's opinion. HART (E. Kochem) explained our recommended action and rationale. HART will review the "white paper" and be prepared to defend or modify our recommendation, as necessary.
- (4) Soil Samples @ SWMU #6 (DRMO)--HART (E. Kochem) indicated that analytical results have been received, however, results are still being reduced and evaluated. Thus, it is premature to speculate on conclusions at this time.

HART (E. Kochem) did indicate that the laboratory identified interference in some samples that appears to be DDT and in some cases PCB. HART (E. Kochem/S. Myers) asked the Navy representatives to try and ascertain whether there is any historical information to "explain" the finding of these compounds (e.g. an orchard where DDT could have been sprayed). This effort could help to avoid EPA elevating these concerns out of proportion.

The Shipyard (J. Tayon) requested that we try and focus on remedial measures at certain sites so that remediation could possibly proceed this year (e.g. capping the DRMO). HART (S. Myers) understands the impetus to proceed quickly but cautioned that implementation of remedial efforts prior to a full understanding of the problem could result in repeating work or choosing a totally different remedial method.

The Shipyard (J. Tayon) indicated that he was pursuing an evaluation of a computer program that models the Portsmouth Harbor. The program was prepared by the David Taylor Research Center in Annapolis. Tayon will keep all parties informed of the findings.

#### ■ Field Work

HART (E. Kochem) provided a synopsis of field activities that have been performed under the present amendment. A tentative schedule indicates that the final report for this field work will be completed by the end of the third week in March.

- (1) Clark Island Embayment--After discussion, the parties agreed that the Clark Island Embayment is an "off-shore" area, however, the area is not considered in the same off-shore category as the estuary itself. Therefore, investigation of the embayment will logically proceed right after all "on-shore" work is completed.

HART (E. Kochem) outlined the possible next steps of on-shore work as:

- (a) Groundwater sampling of existing wells.
- (b) Soil gas characterization.
- (c) Installation of additional wells as a result of groundwater data review with subsequent sampling.
- (d) Bedrock fracture pattern investigation.
- (e) Installation of additional wells, if necessary.
- (f) Seismic studies for bedrock definition.

All parties agreed that performance of additional field work should be as consistent as possible with the format of the RFIP. The Clark Island Embayment can be studied, and a program better defined, once the on-shore portions are completed.

Northern Division (L. Resta) and the Shipyard (J. Tayon) will investigate possible support services for HART in performing additional work (e.g. boats, divers, etc.)

- (2) Freshwater Ponds--The Shipyard (J. Tayon) indicated that these ponds are stocked with fish and could be considered a receptor. The Navy's response to the EPA checklist indicated that ponds will be investigated. The ponds may possibly fall under the characterization study identified on pg. 23 of the HSWA permit.

After discussion, all parties agreed that the ponds, if studied, should be studied outside of the HSWA permit process to focus the study and avoid some of the analytical requirements of the permit as well as proceed in a timely manner.

- (3) Next Phase of Work--Possible steps are indicated in item (1) above and focus on the "on-shore" effort first. A formal recommendation from HART must await completion of the present field work report and EPA technical comments on the RFIP submittal.

SJM/jsw

cc: Attendees (5 copies to Northern Division Project Manager--L. Resta)  
J. Balentine--HART  
D. Anné--HART  
File

# ATTACHMENT

MEETING - TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1990

Below I have listed the topics which I would like to cover today. I have organized the items into three categories so that we are able to cover each topic.

## A. Administrative Items

1. RFIP must coincide with the HWSA Permit so that we are able to address all Permit requirements. EPA has indicated we should implement the language of the Permit.
2. We will soon prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Progress Reports. The original plan was to wait until the RFIP was finalized and the field work began. Since we have begun preliminary field work it is necessary to have progress reports.
3. Request for Equitable Adjustment - Related to Item #1. Linda will discuss.
4. Monitoring Wells - Paint.
5. Future Meetings

## B. Technical Items

1. We would like to consider a review to discuss our methodology in areas such as: biota, site characterization and risk assessment.
2. Has the monitoring well installation provided us with any information regarding the bedrock? If not, what technologies do we need to consider to obtain more information on the bedrock?
3. Is the Proposed Subsurface Gas Characterization Methodology in the RFIP the most effective method for our conditions? What alternatives are there to this method?
4. Are the Soil Samples taken at SWMU #6 available?

## C. Field Work

1. Should the Clark's Island Embayment be considered in the next phase of work?
2. Should the fresh water ponds located on Seavey's Island be ~~added to the list of SWMUs~~? *sampled?* *Agrees* \*
3. Without EPA's comments what can we decide on today regarding the next phase of work?

\* Corrected at the meeting