N91571.AR.002147
NIROP ABL ROCKET CENTER
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING DATED 2 FEBRUARY 1989
FOR INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM ABL ROCKET CENTER WV
2/9/1989
NAVFAC MIDLANT

ABL-00154-9.03-12/15/92

AGENDA

February 9, 1989

Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting

for the Installation Restoration Program

at Allegany Ballistics Laboratory

Meeting Location

Holiday Inn, Cumberland, Maryland

9:00 A.M.	Welcome and Introductory Remarks	D. A. McBride (Hercules)
9:15 A.M.	IR Program Overview	S. Ashton (LantDiv)
9:45 A.M.	Site Summary and IR Status	R. McAlister (Roy F. Weston Inc.)
11:00 A.M.	Community Relations Philosophy/ Strategy	L. B. Ringler (Hercules)
11:30 A.M.	Lunch	
12:30 P.M.	Travel to ABL and Tour Sites	
2:30 P.M.	Return to Holiday Inn and Wrap-up	

0005.81S

WESTON ABL-00005-9.04-2/9/89

ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LABORATORY
MINERAL COUNTY, WV
MINUTES

Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting
9 February 1989

D NR → RIAD TAMNR
356 Hansford St.
Charleston, WV 19
23 2550 1

Participants

Dave A. McBride, ABL
Don W. Pfeiffer, ABL
Sue Ellen Moody, ABL
Terry J. Winder, Hercules Corp. Env. Affrs.
Eva J. Timmer, R.F. Weston, Inc.
Randall McAlister, R.F. Weston, Inc.
Andrew R. Kissell, Atlantic Div. NavFac Eng.
Ken Walker, Atlantic Div. NavFac Eng.
John E. Peters, Atlantic Div. NavFac
Janet Wolfe, West Virginia-DNR Waste Management
Tom Blake, West Virginia - DNR Waste Management
Stephen Hoffmann, NAVSEA, Washington, D.C.
Russell Livengood, City of Cumberland, MD
Dennis McGann, Mineral County OES
Gary A. Rice, City of Keyser, WV
Robert J. Avers, City of Keyser, WV
Bob Creter, MD Dept. of Environment

Minutes

Dave McBride started off the meeting by giving an overview on the purpose of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting. The EPA has designated TRC meetings as a necessity, and he believes that it will be advantageous to

the community, as well as the Navy and Hercules. This is the first TRC meeting and there will be more in the future. The purpose of the meeting is to give an outline of where the project stands.

Mr. McBride provided a brief history on ABL. ABL was built in 1942 by Kelly Springfield and called Allegany Ordnance, producing ammunition during World War II. In 1943, George Washington University assumed management of the site and conducted research on solid propellant rockets. The Army was the owner at this time. In 1945 the property changed ownership to the Navy, and Hercules took over the operations. Hercules started making larger rockets in the mid 40's and today has developed into producing boosters on space vehicles at some of their other plants. In the 1940's the site was only 425 acres. In 1952 there was an expansion of the plant. In 1962 the Navy bought another 1200 acres. Hercules has 60 to 70 acres. In 1964 a new office building was built, and in 1967 the Hercopel plant was built. A lot of the land is not usable. Hercules early mission at ABL was to build rockets, but they have expanded into other operations since. ABL employs approximately 1000 people. Later in the day there will be a tour of ABL in order to see the sites.

At this time, Ken Walker began speaking about the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). He provided a four page handout which reviewed acronyms, terminology, and agency responsibilities. He provided a brief overview of the IRP. He mentioned that the TRC is a requirement of Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA). SARA established TRC so that the public, the EPA, and the state

would have a closer review process on Navy facilities. In 1980, the Department of Defense (DOD) started a program which looked at past hazardous waste procedures (NACIP). NACIP conducted initial assessment studies (IAS) in which a contractor was selected to investigate facilities and determine the potential for pollution. The IAS for ABL was completed in January 1983. Copies are available for those who are interested. IAS is part of the former terminology as shown on the handout.

The next step in the IRP (after the IAS) is a Confirmation Study, which evaluates in greater detail what was found in the IAS. The final phase is the cleanup. SARA has changed the program so that it is consistent with EPA terminology in the Superfund Program. Mr. Walker reiterated that the purpose of the TRC is so that the state, the EPA, and the public can become involved and participate in decision making. There will be another meeting in late spring or summer. There will be a public health evaluation which will assess risks to people potentially exposed from the site. This project is funded by the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA). DERA is only used for the clean-up of past hazardous waste sites and Navy Installations.

Mr. Walker reviewed the tasks of those involved. The Engineering Field Division is responsible for administering the IR program, managing IR contracts, and providing technical and legal assistance. The contractor (Hercules) responsibilities include managing community relations, the review process, and long term monitoring costs. The TRC will review and comment on studies to date, and resolve technical issues. Again, the public and the federal and

state governments will all take part. Mr. Walker introduced Mr. Randy McAlister from WESTON, the contractor. Mr. McAlister is the project manager at WESTON and will talk on the technical aspects of the project.

Mr. Creter asked which step the project is currently in. Mr. Walker stated that the project is currently in the RI/FS phase. Mr. McBride mentioned that there are no representatives from EPA present, although they were invited. However, he believes they will be active down the road. Also, the names and phone numbers of all participants will be provided.

Mr. Randy McAlister said that he will discuss what WESTON has done at the plant, but also would like to hear ideas or questions from the participants. He provided a brief summary of each of the sites which included what has been done and found, and any remaining questions. The purpose of the IAS (1983) was to evaluate the history, use, and quantity of hazardous materials. Originally, there was a list of 21 or 22 potential sites. A number of these sites were not of concern, which left 7 sites that were investigated. Highlights of each site were provided using overheads which outlined the location of each.

Site 1 - Northern Riverside Waste Disposal Area.

This site is located next to the Potomac River. It has been used for waste disposal since the 1940's. Presently it is used for burning explosive contaminated wastes. This may include paper, rags, and explosive products. Mr. McBride mentioned that about 1000 lbs. are burned at 3:30 pm every

day, and Hercules is in the process of obtaining a permit through the EPA. They burn bulk material, containers, etc. Mr. McAlister said that construction debris has been disposed of along the river bank, including some metal debris. One section was used as a past hazardous waste storage area. Now its stored in another area which is RCRA permitted. In the past, liquid waste was put into pits to be evaporated. When it was dry, it was burned. However, it appears that instead of evaporation, infiltration occurred. These pits are of primary concern. There is one area where inert burning occurred. There are a number of shallow monitoring wells, and one deep well on the site. The groundwater flow is toward the river. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have been detected in all the wells. The site summary reports distributed to the committee provided measured concentrations of contaminants as well as comparison values which provide a frame of reference. If no standards were available, the detection limits were given as the comparison value. Mr. McAlister pointed out that trichloroethene (TCE) was measured at 130 ppm, and the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for TCE is 0.005 ppm.

Soil gas samples were collected along the boundary of Site 1. TCE was found all along the boundary. The highest levels were found near the old solvent disposal pits. Upgradient samples were clean. Surface water and sediments were sampled in the Potomac River. No organics were detected. Metals were detected in the sediments, but at naturally occurring levels. Nickel was measured in one water sample, during one sampling round, slightly above detection. However, this does not appear to be a site contaminant.

Mr. Hoffman asked when the RI/FS will be done. Mr. McAlister answered that probably within the next couple months there will be a draft document of the RI/FS. Mr. Hoffman asked when the study will be completed. Mr. McAlister said that there will be more investigation at the site, and so this is a tough question to answer at this time. If pressed, he said the RI would probably take another year. Mr. Kissell agreed that it would probably take another year.

Site 2 - Previous Burning Ground

This is a smaller area than Site 1. It was used as a burning ground for about 7 years (1942-1949). Its further from the river than Site 1. There are no waste disposal practices at the site today. The exact boundaries of the burning area is not known. There are a number of wells at the site. Low levels of TCE have been measured, as well as low levels of fluorocarbons. Soil gas samples were taken by Building No. 100 and in the field, and nothing was found. This implies that there is no source area at the site. Site 2 is of minor concern.

Site 3 - Previous Burning Ground

Site 3 has a similar history to Site 2. It was a burn area from 1950 to 1958. There was no disposal of liquid waste or debris. There were a number of wells and soil gas samples at this site. The wells had low levels of TCE, the highest of which was 0.012 ppm which exceeds the MCL. Soil gas samples were negative. Thus, it appears that Site 3 is not an ongoing source of contamination.

Mr. Creter asked if there are any fuel tanks used to aid in burning. Mr. McBride then explained the burning method. Fine granulated powder is used to ignite the material to be burned. Wires are hooked up and taken back a safe distance with a blasting machine and used to ignite the material. Occasionally kerosene is used on granulated materials. However, there are no tanks in the ground. At Site 1 there is a 250 gallon tank above ground which contains fuel oil (diesel, kerosene) which aids in ignition.

Site 4 (A & B) - Photographic and X-ray Developing Solutions Disposal Sites

There are two areas where x-ray and photographic developing solutions were discharged onto the ground through french drains. Site 4A has a gravel filled hole used for liquid disposal. Soil samples from Site 4B showed elevated levels of silver. Soil samples were analyzed for EP toxicity, and the results were negative. This shows that there is low leaching potential.

Site 5 - Inert Landfill

This site is south of Plant 2. This area was used for the disposal of construction rubble and large items. Mr. McBride added that this area was used for the disposal of scrap from machining, grit from sandblasting, tires, and empty drums. Anything nonsanitary, nonputrifiable, nontoxic, and nonreactive was disposed of here. It was never permitted. It was used in the 1960's, and West Virginia Dept. of Health checked it over periodically. Hercules ended use of the landfill in 1988, and now use a municipal landfill (Allegany County Landfill). Mr. Creter

asked whether a formal closure for the landfill will be needed. Mr. McAlister said that would be decided by the State of West Virginia. He continued describing Site 5. There are 3 shallow wells at the site - one upgradient and two downgradient. Low levels of TCE were measured. These levels were greater than the MCL. More work is needed to ensure that there is no concern for contamination in the river or drinking water supplies. On-site there is a drinking water supply about 2000 feet upgradient, so the statement on pg. 5-2 of the handout is not completely accurate.

Mr. Blake questioned the statement in the handout which said that ground water is used as a drinking water supply during dry periods. Isn't ground water used for the whole area? Mr. McAlister said there are a series of wells and springs from which water is collected and pumped into tanks on the hillside. In dry periods in the summer, a certain water level is needed for fire protection, so Well A (on Plant 1) is used to supplement the supply. It is pumped into the tanks and mixed with the other water. Well A contains low levels of VOCs. It is not a threat on site since it is treated and points of use are sampled periodically to see that nobody is drinking contaminants.

Site 6 - Sensitivity Test Area Surface Water Impoundment

This area is used for sensitivity tests for small quantity explosive testing. There is a pond in this area used for emergency fire protection. There was a concern that residues from the testing may affect the pond. A number of samples were taken from the pond and were negative except for low values of explosive residues. Only RDX was

confirmed at 0.0016 ppm. This is below the guideline, therefore there has been no recommendations for further sampling. Sediment samples from the pond were non-detect for the parameters analyzed.

Site 7 - Beryllium Landfill

This site is located off Route 956. It is a small hole in the ground, about 5 feet deep. It was used for the disposal of lab waste when a lab was closed out. It was investigated with a backhoe. Three test pits were dug. In so doing, 2/3 of the waste was dug out. They found plastic, glass, and laboratory containers. Soils were analyzed and very little contamination was found. Mercury was greater than background in two samples. Silver in one sample was 12 ppm. EP Toxicity Tests were run and were negative. Thus, there is little likelihood of contaminants moving out of the pit. It is recommended that the landfill be closed. Closure plans include capping and perhaps ongoing monitoring.

Mr. Blake pointed out that the elevations on the map on page 7-4 of the handout were wrong. It should be 800s rather than 300s. Mr. Avers asked what was tested for in the analysis. Mr. McAlister said that initially all common analytes (priority pollutants) are looked at. Mr. McAlister said that testing included VOCs (solvents), semi-VOCs (slightly heavier organics, oils, and tars), metals (standard scan of heavy metals), TCDD (Dioxins), explosives, and the standard indicator parameters (chloride, sulfate, and nitrate). Mr. Avers mentioned that Westvaco is upstream from Hercules and asked what would happen if high levels of contaminants are found upgradient that someone else is responsible for. Mr. McAlister said that it would be reported to Hercules/NAVFAC who would decide what to do and

who to contact. Mr. Creter described a past similar situation in which the responsible company was notified. Mr. Winder mentioned that all analysis at the site is EPA approved. Mr. McAlister said that all the data is reviewed by chemists at NAVFAC.

Mr. John Peters spoke on community involvement, and mentioned that it was a big part of the IRP. Hercules and NAVFAC will assess community wants and desires. This includes an information repository, which will include persons who will serve as points of contact. Any suggestions to be included in the community relations plan are welcome. Mr. Creter asked if there will be a public meeting. NAVFAC said that this is not mandatory until there is a Record of Decision.

TOUR OF ABL

Joining the meeting after the tour are Mr. Robert Heltzel, ABL Plant Manager and Mr. Mark Stewart, ABL contracts.

Mr. Rice mentioned that he will be reporting to the Mayor and the council of Keyser. He wanted to know what to do about a press release. Mr. Heltzel said that Mr. Peters, Mr. Winder and himself had worked on a press release. This was handed out to the participants. He mentioned that 14 out of the original 21 sites considered were not sampled for contamination. Mr. McAlister said that they were not chosen due to a lack of potential for handling or release of hazardous substances. Mr. Peters said that the press release explains the program, and explains that all Navy installations are doing this. The purpose of the investigation is to find out what is there, and what needs

to be done. Mr. Winder asked participants whether any one feels they are not the right person to represent their particular agency. Janet Wolfe said that she normally deals with the RCRA program, and not the Superfund program. Mr. Blake did mention however that their department was the right department to be represented. Mr. McBride identified those people invited who did not attend the meeting. These included a representative from Allegany County (Gerald Arthur), the City of Cumberland, representative at large, and the EPA (Drew Lausch). Mr. Creter said that Gerald Arthur would be the right person for this committee. Mr. Rice said that he needs to read the press release to the Mayor, and representatives from the newspaper will be there. Thus, the release will be put into final form. It will be sent to each group represented at the TRC meeting. Mr. McBride will be the point of contact for the TRC, and will take any questions, suggestions, or comments.