



Naval Air Station South Weymouth, MA Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes March 11, 2010

1. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

John Goodrich, RAB facilitator, opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. He requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, introduce themselves. He noted that the meeting agenda, handouts, and the sign-in sheet were available on the front table. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A to this meeting summary. J. Goodrich asked if everyone had time to read the minutes from the January 2010 RAB meeting and if there were any comments. There were no comments on the minutes.

J. Goodrich reviewed the ground rules for the meeting and reminded the meeting attendees that the focus of the meeting is cleanup issues. Any issues and/or comments not related to base cleanup will be noted and referred to the appropriate agency or organization. He reviewed the guidelines for the meeting and reminded the participants when asking questions to wait to speak until they are acknowledged, to state their names and affiliations, and to speak clearly or into the microphone when they have questions.

He then reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The meeting agenda and the Action Item Tracking List are provided as Attachment B to this meeting summary. In accordance with the agenda, the presentation and discussion would be followed by the Updates and Action Items portion of the meeting.

2. PRESENTATION

Dave Barney introduced the presentation on the capping design for the West Gate Landfill (WGL). Selected slides from the presentation are provided as Attachment C. The design for the WGL is about 60% complete. Navy's objective is to get this site into a condition that is protective of human health and the environment per CERCLA. The work is funded and the contractor is onsite and ready to move forward. The 30% design has been submitted, comments have been received, and modifications have been made based on those comments. D. Barney introduced Ron Kenyon of Shaw Environmental, Inc. to give the presentation.

R. Kenyon stated that they are at the 60% design stage, and the comments from the 30% design stage have been useful and incorporated into the design effort. Background information on the WGL is provided on Slide 2. The ROD for WGL was signed in 2007 and the selected remedy includes an

impermeable cap, long-term monitoring, and institutional controls (fencing, signage, etc.). Pre-design activities were completed in early 2009 by Tetra Tech and the 30% design drawings were released based on some of this work. The majority of the comments on the 30% design concerned the infringement of the landfill along French Stream and the limits of the landfill in the southern wetlands. Preserving the French Stream attributes was the main concern in the comments. Following an evaluation of how to address the concerns, additional data were collected by excavating test pits from the embankment back into the landfill to help revise the design of the landfill cap (Slide 3). Eleven test pits were excavated in January. Waste was not encountered until approximately 10 to 15 feet back from the embankment. This allowed the landfill cap to be set back from French Stream. Slide 4 shows the test pit locations perpendicular to French Stream. The test pit excavation ended when debris was encountered and then all locations were surveyed to help set the new limits of the landfill. Slide 5 shows that the test pits were excavated right up to the silt fence along the embankment of French Stream. One of the test pits is shown on Slide 6.

Based on the information gathered during excavation of the test pits, the revised design was able to preserve a wider area along French Stream. The limits of the landfill were moved back from the embankment approximately 10 to 35 feet north to south. They also wanted to maximize the amount of wetland area restored on the southern side of the site. Delineation of the waste was already completed, but the design was updated with regard to removing the waste from the wetland and then restoring the wetland. Slide 7 shows cross sections from the 60% design. The cross sections show a slight elevation increase, it will not be a big "bump." The design will include a small road around the perimeter for maintenance access.

The cap construction details are shown on Slide 8. On top of the waste, a layer of common fill will be rolled, graded, and compacted. There will then be gas venting layer (approximately 6 inches of sand) with vents. An impermeable HDPE (high density polyethylene) liner (approximately 40 mm thick) is being used, rather than clay. This is due to the cost and lack of available clay in this area; clay can also be permeable. The impermeable liner will also be thinner than the clay layer. Select fill will then be placed on top. The select fill includes no stones so there is no impact to the liner. The final layer is approximately 8 inches of topsoil, which is then seeded.

Another concern expressed in the comments on the 30% design was the storm flow and flooding that could impact the wetlands and French Stream. The latest design shunts the rainfall away from French Stream into the wetland and minimizes the flow of storm water runoff going into French Stream (Slide 9). The limits of the cap were pulled back out of the southern wetland. The height from the toe to the top of the landfill is approximately 10 to 15 feet (total height).

Construction of the landfill will begin by removing existing vegetation and undesirable materials in the area. The debris will be excavated and consolidated and then a 6-inch lift of common fill will be placed over the debris and graded. A 6-inch sand layer, serving as the gas collection layer and geomembrane bedding, will be installed. The geomembrane layer and impermeable liner will be installed, along with the toe drainage system. Then 16-inches of select fill and 8-inches of topsoil will be added, both of which will be graded. The last steps include completing the gas vent stick-ups (installed in the sand layer to allow ventilation) and an access road around the landfill. Then wetland and site restoration will be completed and a fence will be installed around the perimeter of the landfill.

Slide 10 shows the project schedule. The 60% Design and Remedial Action Work Plan will be submitted in April 2010; the Final Design and Remedial Action Work Plan will be submitted in June 2010. The construction is planned to start in July 2010 and is estimated to take 3 months. The construction is expected to be complete in October 2010.

R. Kenyon noted that at this point the final design will be very similar to the 60% design. The original 30% design had the toe of the cap along the bank of French Stream. This left no access and resulted in concerns about flooding and runoff. Pulling the toe of the slope back allows access around the perimeter of the landfill and addresses the concerns about preservation of French Stream and runoff.

D. Galluzzo asked how far the test pits were from French Stream. R. Kenyon stated that when they encountered waste they were about 10 to 15 feet away from French Stream at the north end of the landfill and approximately 35 to 40 feet away from French Stream at the south end. The test pits started at the top of the embankment.

D. Galluzzo asked how deep the test pits were. R. Kenyon responded that they were about 4 to 5 feet deep (test pits were above the groundwater table). D. Chaffin added that the stream bank is a steep slope and is about 12 feet above the water. The whole idea of the new design is to preserve this embankment and move the cap back from French Stream.

D. Galluzzo asked what is stopping the water from flowing from French Stream under the cap. D. Barney noted that groundwater flow on the site is towards French Stream and discharges into the stream. D. Galluzzo stated that his concern is groundwater moving contaminants from the WGL. D. Barney responded that the groundwater has been tested and does not need to be remediated. A groundwater monitoring program will be in place once the cap is completed.

M. Bromberg asked if the roadway was inside or outside the fence. R. Kenyon responded that the road will be within the rock swale and the fence will be outside of this road/rock swale and along the embankment.

M. Smart asked how they planned to connect the HDPE. Shaw explained that the pieces of HDPE are fused together using a heated welding iron and then they are tested with air pressure to make sure there is no leakage. M. Smart asked if this is similar to what gas companies use with their gas lines. Shaw noted that it is a similar process - they are both welded together. M. Smart asked if the compaction and density of the sand and soil lifts are 100%. Shaw responded that the compaction and density of the soils only have to be between 80 and 90%. M. Smart asked if this is done for a specific purpose, like to allow drainage. Shaw responded that the landfill is fairly shallow, with no real loads, so based on the structural purpose it doesn't need 100%.

M. Smart asked about a layer of soil seen in the test pit photographs and if the origin and thickness was known. D. Barney stated that there is bottom layer of sand, and then maybe there is an old road and then fill. He was unsure of the origin of the soil on top of that; most likely it is from offsite but it could have come from dredging of French Stream.

D. Galluzzo asked who would perform the long term monitoring activities. D. Barney responded that in the foreseeable future it would be the Navy. He indicated that most likely monitoring will take place quarterly for the first few years, and depending on the results the frequency could be modified from there. Long term monitoring has to be conducted at least once a year for 30 years. R. Kenyon stated in addition there is a 5-year review process that reviews the remedy every 5 years to ensure that the remedy in place is still functioning and protecting human health and the environment.

A. Malewicz stated that at the RDA there were problems with seeding in late fall, and asked if precautions be taken to avoid this at WGL. R. Kenyon stated they may have to delay the seeding until spring and would put out jute mats for the winter, or they may seed and then put coconut mats down to hold the seed in place until the spring depending on the weather and schedule.

M. Bromberg asked how deep the swale is going to be. B. Siebecker stated that it would be about 18 inches deep and will contain gravel material. It will generally be a flat swale.

M. Smart asked if there was a formal schedule yet. R. Kenyon stated that the formal schedule is not completed yet, and it will be included in the 60% submittal. M. Smart stated that it is important to try and seed no later than Labor Day and suggested looking at accelerating the schedule to take that into consideration. R. Kenyon responded that accelerating the schedule is a possibility but safety has to be

considered as well. The WGL is a small site and having too much equipment in operation could be dangerous. As of now there will be two bulldozers, a compactor, and an excavator on the 5-acre site.

A. Malewicz stated that they want to avoid erosion as well with regard to seeding.

T. Pries asked if the sequence is French Stream, then the fence, berm, and then the roadway/swale, what is the shortest distance between French Stream and the fence? R. Kenyon responded that the fence will be about 3 to 4 feet from the woods along the top of the slope at the shortest distance. There will be no construction performed on the bank. The slope of the bank to the stream is pretty steep. The fence will be constructed out of pressure treated wood.

3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

Action Items: J. Cunningham stated that he put a notice about the RAB meeting in the Ledger. He noted that there were no new faces at the meeting. D. Barney stated that RAB now functions in an informal manner and people attend but aren't "official" members.

P. Call described research that was completed to address concerns from the RAB about metals leaching from trees left at AOC 55C. This was in response to the request from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, which Navy agreed to, that the trees cut down during the AOC 55C removal action be left for site restoration instead of chipping and removal. A handout was provided which summarized the research. The research indicated that red maples, that were the predominant species at AOC 55C, do not readily accumulate metals. Therefore leaving the trees for habitat enhancement purposes should not adversely impact the environment or human health.

RAB Administrative Actions: D. Barney stated there were none.

MassDEP Update: D. Chaffin stated there was nothing to report (no active sites).

IR/EBS Program Site Update: D. Barney stated that more field work will be conducted at the Building 82 site for additional groundwater sampling. The Building 81 field work has been completed. The SRA Draft Final RI is coming out soon and the FS is underway.

The excavated soil at the STP will be shipped off site in April and more characterization work and removal needs to be conducted. The long-term monitoring program continues at the RDA. The Small Landfill closure process is beginning soon. Site prep work has started with vegetation removal and installation of

a turtle barrier. The Navy is working with the SE Regional office to complete the review of the final design.

The Public Hearing for the AOC Hangar 1 Proposed Plan is being changed to April 8th. There will be a notice in the local newspapers. The Proposed Plan will be mailed to the community mailing list.

The Main Gate EE/CA is complete and the Action Memorandum is being prepared. Shaw will perform the removal action. The excavation work is continuing at AOC 55C based on confirmatory sample results. The Navy has proposed increasing the size of the vernal pool based on findings at the site. This proposal was well received. RIA 10C is complete. A field report is being developed for the old hangar slab (RIA 111) and Navy will discuss the next steps with the EPA and MassDEP.

About 700 acres are ready for transfer. Work and FOSTs for approximately 125 acres remain.

M. Bromberg asked if they will be notified when FOST 5C is available for comment. D. Barney said it will be in the paper and he will send an email if he has your email address.

SSTTDC Update – J. Young stated that both he and Steve Ivas will continue to support the Navy actions with site access, etc.

Conclusion/Next Meeting

J. Goodrich wrapped up the meeting.

Suggestions for topics for the next meeting include:

- Small Landfill design
- Update AOC 55C
- STP

The next RAB meeting will be the second Thursday in May (May 13, 2010). The meeting will again be held at the New England Wildlife Center, 500 Columbian St., Weymouth, MA.