87-11

STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF SENECA

MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

HELD AT: Seneca Army Depot
Romulus, New York

HELD ON: March 15, 1995

REPORTED BY: MARY GRASEK

Tiro Reporting Service
536 Executive Office Building
Rochester, New York 14614

MR. STRUZIK: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to welcome you to our March Technical Review Committee meeting. On behalf of both Lieutenant Colonel Roy Johnson and the Depot, thank you for coming. My name is Tony Struzik. I am the Chief of Installation Management Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Johnson is out of town on business; as is Steve Absolom who normally attends these meetings, and is the regular Chairman.

We welcome you here. I hope the meeting will be fruitful. I ask you to please speak up so that the recorder can hear the comments that are being made. And if you are in the backdrop, away from the table, if you ask a question, please identify yourself clearly so the stenographer can pick up your name and question.

With that, I'm going to ask the people at the table to introducing themselves.

MR. HEALY: Kevin Healy. I am the lead engineer for the Huntsville Division on all the section RIF work.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Mike Duchesneau. Project manager in Parson Engineering Science.

MR. CHAPLICK: Jim Chaplick. Engineering

Manager for Parsons Engineering Science.

MS. FALLO: Janet Fallo. Engineer for Seneca Army.

MR. STRUZIK: Tony Struzik, I. M. D.

MR. JOHNSON: Bruce Johnson. Civilian Executive Assistant.

MR. GERAGHTY: Dan Geraghty. New York State Department of Health.

MR. SCHANTZ: Program Manager New York District Corp of Engineers.

MR. ENROTH: Tom Enroth. Environmental Engineer, Seneca Army Depot.

MR. SCOTT: Robert Scott. New York State Environmental Conservation Permit Administrator.

MR. DOMBROWSKI: Brian Dombrowski, Seneca County Health Department.

MR. GUPTA: Kamal Gupta, project manager for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

MS. STRUBLE: Carla Struble, USEPA.

MR. NELSON: Bruce Nelson, Malcolm Pirnie.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Randy Battaglia, Seneca Army Depot.

MR. COOL: Bill Cool, Town of Varick.

MR. STAFFORD: Ken Stafford, Supervisor Town of Varick.

MR. BATTAGLIA: At this time we are going to talk about the Restoration Advisory Board. Janet Fallo.

MS. FALLO: Good afternoon. My name is Janet Fallo. I am a chemical engineer. I work at the Seneca Army Environment Office.

Today I'm going to give you an introduction on expanding the Technical Review Committee to a Restoration Advisory Board, also called RAB.

That -- the information that I'm going to present to you is based upon Department of Defense policies. And when a RAB is formed it will replace the Technical Review Committee.

Right now we are going to take the first steps to determine how much community interest there is to start a RAB. If the base is going to be closed, which we should know around July, then starting a RAB will be mandatory.

I'm going to pass around some copies of my handouts. There is not enough; if you could share. If somebody would like some more after, just talk to me after the meeting.

Now, I'm going to go over some changes that will make the TRC -- how it will reach out to the community and some responsibilities of the Restoration Advisory Board.

We are going to expand the TRC by adding a community co-chair, with making the agendas and getting the community more involved.

We are going to recruit additional community representatives to be a part of the Advisory, Restoration Advisory Board. And publish the meeting minutes as a concise summary so they are easier to understand and mail those out to a mailing list.

Some of the ways that we are going to try to increase the community involvement are: We are going to be mailing out surveys to poll the interest. Interviewing community members, and advertising notice in the local newspapers.

Some additional responsibilities of the Restoration Advisory Board will be to review and an evaluate documents to get the community more involved earlier on in the process. Recommending priorities among the sites or projects, and conducting the meeting at convenient times and

locations.

The transition to Restoration Advisory Board has been successful at other installations including closure installations; as well as bases that are remaining open where there is more community interest.

If you would like to know the status of the Restoration Advisory Board, you contact myself or Jerry Whitaker, who is the Public Affairs Officer, at the phone numbers right here.

And are there any questions?

MR. JOHNSON: Janet, just to clarify what you mentioned to us yesterday, the RAB is mandatory if we are officially on base closure?

MS. FALLO: Right. It's an option until then so --

MR. JOHNSON: But until we find out for sure that these are the directions we are going to be going, we are going to be planning, we are going to close. Official notification would be sometime in mid-September. We have a pretty good indication now, but mid-September would be the actual official date.

MS. FALLO: Okay. That's it.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: I have got handouts, presentations prepared here so you can follow along.

My name is Mike Duchesneau. I am the Project Manager of the Seneca Army project. I work for Parson's Engineering Science. We work through the Huntsville Division at Seneca. We have been fairly active over the last few years at the Depot in regards to the CERCLA work that's being performed here. I'll be providing you today an update on the status of a lot of these projects.

I see we have a few out of order here.

MR. COOL: That's all right. We never understand it anyway.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Bear with me.

MR. COOL: Just a joke.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: We are going to begin here with a kind of layout of the organization here for the projects that I'm involved in. Just a brief description. Many of you have seen this before.

We have two regulatory -- three regulatory bodies that are involved. In the EPA, which Carla Struble is project manager. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation,

otherwise known as NYSDEC, whom Kamal Gupta is the Project Manager representing them.

The Department of Health is represented by Dan Geraghty. And that provides, of course, the regulatory review, people that review our documents, provide us any input in terms of workplans, and the direction of where we are going.

Representing the Army, also providing regulatory review, several agencies. I have outlined the ones that have been most active. The Army Environmental Center represented by Doctor Kathleen Buchi. The AHA provides health risk evaluation. That is Keith Hoddinott.

The Depot System Command, John Biernacki. North Atlantic and New York District. Blair Schantz represents the New York Division. Jack Pickett represents the North Atlantic Division; all provide us army comment.

And the last one, the Corps of Engineers, the Omaha Division represented by Andrew Winslow who are involved in the interim remediation that is taking place at the ash landfill.

Myself, the Project Manager for Parsons. And

we have technical staff that provides us the capability of performing all the RI/FS work that includes unexploded ordinance support, laboratory support, as well as drilling support.

What I'm discussing today is pretty much an update on the areas of concern and CERCLA practices that we are going through. Essentially the four areas I would like to discuss today, those being the SWMU investigation or classification status, the RI/FS's work where -- what we have been very active on, and also a portion of the federal facilities agreement process called removal action or completion report, to take some of these sites out of the investigation loop.

The final thing will be a description of interim remedial measures that are currently ongoing at the ash landfill.

To begin the process of my presentation we will be looking at the SWMU investigation or classification status update. What I have done, I have prepared a description or a flowchart outlining what the requirements are in the Federal Facilities Agreement. That agreement was signed

between the Army, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the EPA.

And there is basically three phases to this process. There is a SWMU identification and classification stage, which is pretty much completed. Following that stage of work, a SWMU is either identified as a no action SWMU or an area of concern.

If it's an area of concern, there has to be a reason why it's an area of concern. We want to look at that a little bit further. Which moves to the site investigation phase to answer a critical question: Is there a threat? If a threat does exist, then generally we will move into the RI/FS phase for a lot more in depth and thorough analysis. Which the end of which would be project completion close out or a ROD.

In between the SWMU identification and classification, we go through a process of evaluating the site in terms of, can the site threat be eliminated by performing a removal action. Every site isn't totally contaminated. There might be instances where the small expedite removal action would be the best way of

eliminating the threat. And so the IAG accounts for the possibility. The end of that process is the completion report which would then be followed by the completion report finalized in a ROD.

The ROD is an acronym for Record of Decision, which is really all contracts between EPA and the State and the Army in terms of implementing some kind of remedial action.

The SWMU classification report all 72 SWMU's, Sold Waste Management Unit, have been identified and classified as either a no action or area of concern.

That report was issued final in mid-September and it is the first primary document identified in the Federal Facilities Agreement. So, we are pretty happy that we got at least that one finalized and we are moving on.

The summary of that SWMU classification report is, as I depicted here, we have 24 no action SWMU's. We have 12 that we believe can be evaluated, completion report prepared, and a ROD prepared.

The removal action completion report/ROD process, we believe, is appropriate for 8 SWMU's.

And there are 28 that are currently planning going the RI/FS root.

We are getting at a critical point in time in the process where we need to make some decisions in terms of what sites and what criteria we apply for determining how the sites are classified and evaluated and move through this Federal Facilities Agreement flowchart or process as I depicted earlier.

I'm not going to give you a detailed description of each of the SWMU's and mainly because you probably can't read them. Here is a listing of the SWMU's we believe no further action is required. And they include scrap wood piles, the sewage treatment plants, the waste oil burners, the columbite ore storage pile; those type of things.

The next group are AOC's. I believe we can perform -- we performed investigations or have some information we can evaluate. We will prepare completion reports and RODs from that information that will close out the sites.

The third group, of which there are 8, we would be proposing to perform removal actions,

prepare completion reports, and finalize that with RODs. And they include sites that are basically impacted with petroleum products, volatiles, BTEX, are benzene, tioluene, ethylbenzene, xylene; typically constituents of gasoline, as well as a group that impacts from metals.

A tank farm is the site that comes to mind right away, SEAD 50. That was a place where a lot of metals or ores were stored back in the 60s and 70s. Some of that material has been discharged or found it's way onto the ground surface.

So, we think that if we can go in there and scrape of some of the soil and dispose of that material properly, that we can close out those sites.

AOC's we are planning on performing RI/FS and eventual RODs, grouping them into what we call operable units. So, we've grouped the ones that are similar, have similar problems, similar types of impacts so we can evaluate them at the same time. And try to conserve our energies into not having to do continual reports and feasibility studies.

There are several here that come to mind. We

are actually involved in performing two of them. The ash landfill which we are currently performing a remedial action, expediting remedial action, and IRM, interim remedial action. The open burning ground, former open burning ground. We completed the RI/FS.

We grouped the fire training areas, high security area where mixed waste was held, deactivation furnaces, out house facilities, landfills, IRFNA, which is inhibited red nitric acid areas, and the like.

We have been actively involved in investigating seven, several high priority SWMU's or real AOC's. We completed the field work in February. The report has been issued to EPA/NYSDEC in early July. Our recommendation and the Army's recommendation are for performing RI/FS at six of these and removal action and a completion report process at the -- one of them SEAD 24 which is the abandoned powder burning pit.

We have received NYSDEC's comments and we are currently awaiting EPA's comments. But I believe those are in now.

MS. STRUBLE: Yes.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: The Army prioritized all of the sites to try to provide the level of effort required at the worst -- what we thought would be the worst sites. So, I just described to you the seven high priorities SWMU's or AOC's.

The three moderate priority, we have completed site investigations at each of these three. Our draft report was submitted in August. We have received NYSDEC comments and we were currently awaiting EPA comments on these. The Army is recommending RI/FS at all three of these sites.

What we call the 8 moderately low priority AOC, we have completed the investigations at each of these 8 sites. This was done in mid-July. The pre-draft report has been submitted. The Army -- we have received Army comments. And we will shortly be preparing our regulatory review what we call the draft site investigation report for these 8 sites.

Our recommendations, at this point, or the Army's recommendations at this point is three of the sites are expected to go in RI/FS process.

Four -- five of these sites would go with completion reports and RODs. And then one of the sites would be a candidate for removal action and a completion report, followed by a ROD.

Seven sites have been investigated that are in the low priority category. The field work was initiated in February. We have completed that report. Again the pre-draft report has been submitted for Army review. We have comments. We have just received comments on it. The Army will be revising that document and issuing it for regulatory review.

The plan at this point is to perform RI/FS at 60, 63, 64, and 71 for a total of four. Then we will do completion reports for 62 and 70, and a removal action for 67, SWMU 67.

I know that doesn't really mean a lot to you. Those are all sites that I showed you earlier that have various types of activities performed on them.

I would like to move into the status of RI/FS that we have been actively involved in. Just to give you an update on where we stand on some of these investigations. And the first one that we

performed is the RI/FS at the OB, open burning grounds. The remedial investigation has been completed. It's submitted as final and accepted by NYSDEC and EPA as a final document. That's another primary document that has been accepted as final. That included a risk analysis of both human health and ecological risk.

The feasibility study has been completed. We have received EPA and NYSDEC comments. And we are currently involved in what we call the normal consultation to try to resolve some differences of opinion between the regulatory and the Army in terms of what actions will be performed.

The second site that we have or operable units that we have investigated is the ash landfill which actually includes five sites. RI/FS was submitted final in October. I believe that is another final document that has been submitted and finalized also included human health and ecological risk assessment. Another primary document that is complete, the feasibility study, was submitted for regulatory comments. We have received those comments and we are currently, similar to the OB ground, in consultation of a

resolution to try to resolve some of the differences in opinion in what -- terms of what remedial actions will be performed at these sites.

We are preparing or are preparing 28 RI/FS workplans to evaluate many of the sites that I have discussed with you previously.

Six workplans are complete. They include the workplans for -- I'm sorry. Yes. Six are complete and this included the workplans for the OB Ground, and the five sites at the ash landfill. We have implemented those as I've mentioned.

We identified, in this process, a real need to try to extract out of the workplans and make this -- make this process a little bit easier to handle. So the plan that we came up with was to extract information out of the workplans that are generic to all of the sites; that includes along the line of how we are going to install the wells; how we are going to sample the wells; what kind of landfill investigation techniques we are going to be doing. Looking for those standards that don't vary between site to site so much.

There is no reason to publish, each time

want to go do an investigation, a document about three or four inches thick, when a lot of that stuff is repeat information from one site to the other.

So, the plan we came up with was to put a lot of that standardized information into what we call the generic workplan. That workplan would be a stand-alone document, SOPs, recommending water hydrology, a lot of that information. And it will simply be referenced in the -- what the scoping plan is.

So, the plan is when we go and investigate a particular site, we want to only discuss, in the workplan or scoping document, the specifics of that site. That would be how many wells we were proposing to install; how many soil borings we would do; what kind of sampling would be specific for that one site. And then simply reference the generic workplan in terms of the specifics of how we are going to do that. We are going to construct the well in accordance with the generic workplan information.

So, we think that's going to be a real benefit to have the documents evaluated or

reviewed by the agencies and get this process going a little quicker.

We have prepared, or are in the process of I should say, preparing workplans for SEAD sites 11, 16, 17, 25, 26, 45, 46, 66.

11 is the construction debris landfill. 16 and 17 are operable units, I believe, two or three which is the deactivation furnaces. 25 and 26 are the fire demonstration areas. 45 is the OD Ground. 46 is a small arms range; former small arms range. 66 is and old pesticide storage facility.

We are also in the process of preparing workplans for 14 of them. They are various SWMU's here. To do our RI/FS at those 14 sites, when all this is said and done, very normally we have workplans prepared and reviewed by the agencies to perform 28 RI/FS programs.

Just a brief discussion on the status of the completion report or removal actions. As I mentioned, it's an integral part of the process to try to eliminate sites that really aren't too bad that be eliminated without going into the RI/FS process.

We are planning to perform that activity at basically two groups of sites. One -- one site has been impacted with petroleum hydrocarbons, as I mentioned. That would be for SWMUs 25, 38, 39, 40 and 41. 25 is the fire demonstration pad. 38, 39, 40 and 41 were areas where underground storage tanks existed and there was, there was some small release to the perimeter around those tanks. The plan is excavate that material and to, you know, have it treated at the ash landfill that is currently ongoing with a treatment process that would be ideal for remediation of that type of soil.

In addition, we are planning on preparing a decision document removal action or a decision document for a removal action at SWMU 24, 50, 54 and 67. That is primarily impacted with metals. And so, we are in the process of figuring out how we want to excavate the material and dispose of it properly off site.

The final subject that I mentioned to you today is the status of interim remedial measures that's being performed at the ash landfill. This involves excavating soil that has been impacted

with chlorinated organics.

The ash landfill involves excavation with low temperature thermal desorption, volatized chlorinated organics through an afterburner, discharge of clean air through a stack and then the clean soil would then be placed back in the excavated pit. The object is to obviously remove the threat to eliminate the source of ground water plume and to streamline or expedite the RI/FS process.

Our treatment goals here are to establish TAGM/NYSDEC values. TAGM is Technical Administration Guidance Memorandum. And those numbers are specific for soil impacted with TCE and DCE development.

TCE is tricloroethylene and DCE is dichloroethylene which are chlorinated organics used as solvents. We estimate approximately 23,000 cubic yards, or 35,000 tons, would be need to be processed.

As I mentioned, that process that is selected is low temperature thermal desorption. Remedial activities are currently ongoing.

Now, that's about all I have to say. Any

besides a few other sites -- I only have one chart here. I'm going to start at the bottom. It's hard to see, isn't it?

We had -- when we were looking at some of the other sites on the Depot, some of these are good candidates to do a removal action. Primarily SEAD 25 which is a fire demonstration pad had petroleum products in the ground, but it was not in the ground water.

SEAD numbers 38, 39, 40 and 41 are boiler houses, and at those sampling they also got some petroleum products in the ground. To do a full-blown investigation on each site cost about two million dollars.

We talked to EPA and the State about it. We have this thermo treatment out at the ash landfill. And said why not just dig these up and treat the soil? We have been proceeding with the decision documents that Mike had talked about. And there will be public notice and comment period on those decision documents. We go through a thirty-day public comment period on them.

Our chances are, when this project is completed at the landfill site, to go ahead and

subcontractor going bankrupt. And regardless of what -- whether the bonding company pays or not, the way the contract is set up, that certain people, if they get laid off or not, still have to get paid. And the army will pay those people. Some of them, many of them, were hired by IT Corporation to finish the job because they already knew how to run the equipment.

That job has progressed. It's been 80 percent complete right now as far as clean up whole area out that there. Okay.

MS. HERMAN: So, they are continuing on.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Yes. Yes. I don't know. I think the people have already been paid right now as far as what FERtech owed them for wages. They still have to get -- work it out with the bonding company and Army who gets paid what as far as the legal aspect of that goes. But people got paid and IT Corporation took over the equipment and they are going to finish the job. I was going to talk about that one last. That's already taken care of now.

Part, as related to the project out there, we had found -- Mike had mentioned --

questions?

MS. HERMAN: My name is Ann Herman. I'm a member of the community. There has been a report that the subcontractor on this last project went broke and the employees we were no longer working there. Do you know anything about that.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Actually, I think Randy is the best guy to discuss that.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Yes. We do -- you guys can correct me if I am wrong -- I have one guy, Doug Wehner, from the Omaha district IT Corporation over here who is running the project at the landfill.

Generally, what happens is FERtech, that runs the actual equipment, is the subcontractor. They went bankrupt. And what happens is that IT Corporation had become bonded for the project. What that basically means, as far as I understand, is insurance in case something like that happened. With that, arrangements are they are still able to operate the equipment.

Also what happens, as far as the bonding company goes, is suppose to pay employees and other costs that are associated with that

start treating those others areas. We avoid spending a lot of extra money in studying these areas. We still have to do some confirmatory sampling so that we got all that contamination, if it was going to be completed, done based on that.

But that's part of the process that Mike had talked about; the decision documents, public comment period, and close out reports that he had talked about.

What I have here also related to what Janet had talked about with respect to priorities. This is the Army's prioritized list of what work we are going to be doing in future. In particular, one of the things this remedial action board is going to participate in is setting those priorities. Previously we had the Army normally prioritized the project themselves. And then we consulted with the State and EPA as far as whether they liked those priorities.

The RAB is designed so the community can also participate in those priorities. Basically, we do worse case as far as what we look at first, whatever, based upon historical information that we have about the site. We will do what looks

like it might be contaminated first.

These 11 projects on the -- I don't know if that's in focus -- these top 11 projects are remedial investigation feasibility studies. I would just like to talk -- the first two we have already been through; the ash landfill, OB Grounds.

The first group we have grouped in four groups. And that's what Mike had been talking about doing. This actual plan which is a plan of what we are going to go about doing for those remedial investigation feasibility studies. Another thing we had done with this list, that we had that was different then previously, is when we went out and studied the sites around Depot. We got information back from those that make a judgment on whether or not we are going to need a full-blown investigation after that, or if it looks like it's not going to be contaminated. That also has to get approved through public comments, and also the State and EPA that those sites are not contaminated; that they are clean.

Some of sites are already in a categories "no further action." We know just by historic

operation there really wasn't any reason to investigate it further.

We also created another category "Multiple Sites ROD." With risk evaluation we found a little contamination when we first looked at the sites, but looks like they are all right now; not a risk of health human health and environment.

We are going to evaluate that risk prior to providing the two remediation -- full-blown remediation investigation and feasibility studies.

We also regrouped a number of the sites as far as to save money on what -- what you have to look at; how you go about looking at it. A process is set up for several particular sites to have RI/FS. Because some of the sites had similar operations, we grouped them together just do one RI/FS instead of two because of similar operations. But you can break it up and look at the separate sites.

We also created a project, which we are not sure right now if we are going to get accomplished. We have proceeded in the Decision Document for a number of SWMU's that had metals in soils. They are also small sites that we could

have the same cost to do the cleaning up as it would be to go and study about cleaning up. The plan was to identify a project for that.

And it's very preliminary right now. I think the EPA and the State haven't even looked at the site investigation yet as far as approving whether or not we do those.

To get back to the restoration advisory board. This is supposed to help the participation in the community and evaluating and advertising on how we do things around here. In looking at this, in the past, I think it's an improvement on the TRC as far as we have been reporting what we have been doing. It's not necessarily -- well, a participant in those valuations, those priorities.

That's about all I really had to say about the priorities. I don't know if -- there is a lot of numbers. I think I'll go through the particular sites and how we have grouped them.

The ash landfill, OB grounds, we have already been proceeding with the RI/FS. The next group is the fire training areas, radiation sites, deactivation furnaces, and old munition wash out

facility where they used to wash out the propellants, wash the TNT out of the rockets.

The next one is a number of landfills we have on Depot. It is pretty common. They build a building, they landfill the dirt on Depot. We don't know what they had in the landfill there.

We also have a few garbage disposal areas. IRFNA disposal, which is a nitric acid. Which, I think, is back in the fifties we had a poured into the lime stone pits and that's just another one.

And SEAD 52 and 60 which is a group of buildings that they took munitions apart at and we kind of just grouped them all together because geographically we looked -- we are going to look at the whole area.

Number is 10 a bunch of piles that's really a number of SWMU's. And in their site investigation, we found that they had buried a couple of drums and paint and solvents at a few disposal areas near where we had some sewage sludge piles. That's down as a remediation investigation feasibility study; also a candidate in the near future as far as doing removal. If you know now you have a couple of drums there, you

can start another project and remove them and dispose of them off-site.

The eleventh one, the munition destruction areas, which is the open detonation ground that Mike had talked about. That area had been, it was a training range and this was an explosive ordinance disposal area where they do training for blowing demil. And it's for the army bomb squad. They actually did disposal out there. So we grouped the detonation areas together.

In general, to look up the particulars of each site, Mike's handout had names of what they are. We've had hand outs before that discuss the history of each site.

And I would like to keep it open for questions and answers. If anybody has any specific questions or needed specific information; what sites are what and where they are.

MS. SWEET: My name is Mary Sweet from the Seneca Lake Pure Waters Association. Do you have any other statistics available on the 80 percent completed clean up at the ash landfill site.

MR. BATTAGLIA: We have about, what 7,000 cubic yards of soil remaining out of the 20,000.

MR. COUTTS: Right. Right.

MR. BATTAGLIA: We have treated 18,000 cubic yards; 7,000 cubic yards remain.

MS. SWEET: Is there any way to tell how much has been cleaned out of that soil?

MR. BATTAGLIA: We do uniform testing on each 150 tons.

MR. COUTTS: My name is Pete Coutts, the IT Corporation Site Manager for the ash landfill.

We sample every 150 ton stock pile of treatment of material for metals; sampling solvents, and we haven't rejected one stock pile yet. Everything is going well. Everything has been backfilled in the excavation.

MR. HEALY: In specific response to the lady's question, it has been cleaned up?

MR. COUTTS: Yes. It's been cleaned. Removal action for volatiles, we have -- we have eliminated all volatiles from all the treated material. We have been sampling for metals in addition to that to see if any cells were above those characteristics for metals. We found no metals above those characteristics. So all the material treated to date has been cleared and

backfilled.

MR. BATTAGLIA: And I think it would be safe to say all State standards and EPA standards have been met. Let's put it that way.

MS. SWEET: Would there be information forthcoming on when the project is completed as to how much you removed?

MR. COUTTS: We have sent out a Mid-Project Completion Report and it includes all analytical data for the treated material up to, I think it was November. Was December 22nd. Up through December 22nd. All the soil has been treated. All the analytical data has been submitted to all the agencies.

We are still sampling material on a 150 ton stock-pile-a-day basis. That material will be submitted as a final report so that there will be data submitted to the state and federal agencies on our treatment.

MS. SWEET: That answers my question.

MS. SANGREE: My name is Lucinda Sangree, S-A-N-G-R-E-E. My question is: Are those reports available as part of public record that's in town hall just like the minutes of this meeting? And

so is there someplace where they are located for people to look at?

MR. BATTAGLIA: I haven't put them down there yet. They are on my desk.

MR. STRUZIK: So the Mid-Project report, it eventually will be in that repository?

MR. BATTAGLIA: Yes, it will.

MR. HEALY: Just in case it wasn't clear what has been cleaned up; what Pete was telling you about the soil source. Which means it's the soil that's been cleaned up. The ground water is still there as far as the contamination that is there.

MS. SANGREE: There is a plan for treating, addressing that water?

MR. HEALY: We are in the process of doing modeling studies as far as how bad the problem is and as far as going to do -- if it's going to naturally degradate or if it's going to need special treatment. If it requires special treatment, and the public insists, and EPA accepts it, what we do, then we go ahead and do it.

MR. COUTTS: We are also treating ground water as part of the removal action. We are dewatering the excavation and currently we have

treated almost a half a million gallons of water. So we are, on a continual basis, treating ground water as part of the removal action.

MR. HEALY: There is some ground water treatment going on independent to soil removal. So it could be possible the largest part and the worst contamination in the ground water is taken care of. That -- that will have to be looked into as far as the modeling studies are concerned exactly how much and how bad it actually is, what's happening.

MR. CHAPLICK: We continue to sample the wells and the ground water every three months to see if that's changed.

MS. SANGREE: Wells for the Depot --

MR. CHAPLICK: The team are sampling them today. They do the sampling every three months.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: They look a the toe at the ends of the plume. So if the plume begins to move or do anything unexpected, we will be able to identify that from happening and we can take appropriate action.

MR. COOL: Is the water treated -- is it treated by bringing it to a boil to boil off the

volatiles?

MR. HEALY: No. The -- it's treated by air separation. It's more a standard technique for treating volatiles in ground waters. You force the water down, you force air up, and force the volatiles to leave the water state into the air state. Then the air is treated by carbon or some other standard technology.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Then the water is further treated with a filter before it's clean enough to discharge onto the ground.

MR. HEALY: You have multiple treatments for ground water. First you have the air separation. Then you have got treatment with carbon. Then a little polishing as well.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Out at the site, any snow or rain water at the site, drains in, seeps in, reaches the actual excavation hole which is ground water. Rain water from rain gets pumped out in what's called a Frac tank, 20,000 gallon tank. We store it in there. Then we process it through. We test it again after it's been processed before we discharge it onto the ground. That's currently --

MR. CHAPLICK: We have the discharge permit from the State.

MS. HERMAN: When you talk about ground removal, where does the ground end up?

MR. BATTAGLIA: We are excavating the soil. All the source areas where the source contamination, where the dirt could be clean. We put that in a staging area prior to putting it through the burning system. We put it through this burning system. Then it's stock-piled in another area that we built, contaminated area, where we put plastic down and sand over it with a berm around -- a little hill around to catch any rain water. And we sample those little piles of dirt; confirm that to be clean and free of contamination. Then the dirt goes back to the same hole that it came out of.

Right now we are backfilling in with treated soil right out of the source area where we are. We have a hole digging up contaminated area and starting to backfill in.

MS. HERMAN: When you talked about various number of sites, you were talking about removal. Is that what's going to happen at all the sites?

MR. BATTAGLA. Yes. Those particular sites will get the same dirt that came out of those sites. MR. HEALY: There may be different forms of treatment. Usually each of these you will see the same thing: Excavation, soil treated, and either put it back if it's possible, or remove it to a landfill and disposing of it properly.

MS. HERMAN: Do you have landfills that are targeted for this?

MR. HEALY: Don't know that. We haven't gotten that far in the process. Since the decision document's now being prepared, that's something that has to be determined as part of the decision document. I can't say right now.

MR. BATTAGLIA: That would be part of the decision document.

MR. CHAPLICK: I think the intention of the decision document is to try to get things moving a little bit quickly, smaller sites. So not every site will be addressed with a decision document. Those are just more or less special cases; are for small sites that have small problems.

MR. HEALY: We are talking about the removal specifically and the decision document will lay out the alternative as far as what's going to be done with the soil. And there will be a point in time where the specific landfills or choices of landfills will be named. And those decision documents have to undergo public review and scrutiny prior to anything being done. So you will get to see them.

MS. HERMAN: Where do you post the announcement of the public meetings?

MR. BATTAGLIA: Usually put in the Finger Lakes Times pub notice, in that section in the Finger Lakes Times.

I think Jerry Whitaker also puts it on the radio. To my knowledge I think he does.

MS. HERMAN: What radio?

MR. BATTAGLIA: I think it's WBGA.

MR. STRUZIK: WBGA, WNYR, WTFW.

MR. BATTAGLIA: I think it's in the notice page, I think, for five days in the public notice section of the paper.

If there aren't any more questions, or if you need any questions answered, you can always

get a hold of me. If you stay after, I can give you my number after.

I guess we can conclude at this time if there is no more questions.

MR. WEHNER: My name is Doug Wehner I am the Project Manager with IT Corporation. I just want to clarify one statement you made with respect to FERtech's bankruptcy.

We -- we have not paid the employees their back wages that FERtech owed them. We are in the process of working this out with the Department of Labor, figuring the hours and amounts due. We will be verifying that hopefully within the next couple of weeks. We are working diligently on that.

There are other companies that were owed money through FERtech. We are working closely with the bonding contract. We are working with the bonding company to get those amounts, as it's an ongoing process. It takes a little bit of time to verify the costs involved. We are in the process of doing that, and doing that as fast as we can.

MR. BATTAGLIA: What about the date for the

next meeting? We usually set whatever date. Same time second week of June. Second week of June same time.

(Off the record.)

(Back on the record.)

MR. BATTAGLIA: July 12th then.

The next meeting a TRC or RAB?

MR. ENROTH: It will be a TRC.

* * * * *

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

I, Mary Grasek, do hereby certify that I reported in stenotype shorthand the Technical Review Committee held on the 17th day of March, and;

That the transcript herewith numbered pages 1 through 41 is a true, accurate and correct transcript of those stenotype shorthand notes.

DATED AT: Rochester, New York

this 27th day of March, 1995.

Mary Grasek

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY
5786 STATE RTE 96
ROMULUS NEW YORK 14541-5001

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

SDSTO-SEI-PE

6 April 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Ms. Carla Struble, P.E.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Emergency & Remedial Response Division
290 Broadway, 18th Floor, E-3
New York, NY 10007-1866

Mr. Kamal Gupta
Project Manager, NYSDEC
Bureau of Eastern Remedial Action
Division of Hazardous Waste Remediation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12233-7010

SUBJECT: Quarterly Report

1. The emphasis of this quarterly report is on the events occurring between January 1, 1995 and March 31, 1995.

2. In accordance with paragraph 26.1 of the Interagency Agreement (IAG) between the Army, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), the following quarterly report is submitted.

a. **Minutes From Formal Meetings Held During the Reporting Period.**

On March 15, 1995, the tenth meeting of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) was held at the Seneca Army Depot NCO Club. The recorded proceedings from the tenth TRC are enclosed as Appendix 2. This TRC meeting was preceded by a quarterly meeting of the project managers. The minutes from the project managers meeting are included as Appendix 1.

b. **Milestones Met on Schedule, Explanation of Milestones Not Met on Schedule.**

(1) <u>IAG Milestones:</u>

(a) An update of Schedule 5.0 will be discussed at the next Project Managers meeting.

(2) <u>Ash Landfill Milestones:</u>

(a) The Draft Ash Landfill Feasibility Study (FS) is in consultation to resolve EPA (Kerr Laboratory) comments regarding ground water modeling and the Army's position that natural attenuation is occurring. A conference call was held on March 29, 1995 and the Army proposed to prepare a Work Plan to further characterize the site and determine whether or not natural attenuation is occurring.

(b) The Ash Landfill Removal Action is 70% complete with field work 85% complete. Some down time and lost production has occurred due to weather related problems and subcontractor

default. The following are totals up to March 31, 1995:

Item	Quantity to Date
Treated soil	21,293.7 tons
Soil Samples	208 (+41 QA)
Treated Water	470,536 gallons
Water Samples	26 (+3 QA)

(b) The First Quarter 1995 Groundwater Monitoring Report for the Ash Landfill is enclosed as Appendix 3.

(3) Open Burning Grounds Milestones:

(a) The Open Burning Grounds Draft FS is in consultation to resolve NYSDEC comments dated February 22, 1995 regarding RCRA closure as an ARAR. The Army is currently preparing a response.

(b) The First Quarter 1995 Groundwater Monitoring Report for the OB/OD Grounds is enclosed as Appendix 4.

(4) Solid Waste Management Unit Investigation Milestones:

(a) A Decision Document for no further action is being prepared for SWMU's 1, 2, 7, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 42, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 61, 65, 72 based on the findings in the Final SWMU Classification Report.

(b) A Risk Assessment will be prepared for SWMU's 9, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 56, 58, 62, 64B, 64C, 66, 68, 69, 70. Depending on the outcome of the Risk Assessment, a no further action Decision Document may be prepared for those sites.

c. Inspection Reports, Audits and Administrative Information.

FY-95 Funding Status:

The latest FY 95 Work Plan was approved on December 14, 1994. A revised draft Work Plan for FY 95 was printed on March 23, 1995 and a final copy should be available soon.

d. Permit Status as Applicable.

There was no change in the Seneca Army Depot Activity RCRA facility permit status during this reporting period.

e. Personnel Staffing Status

(1) SEDA Staffing Update:

No changes have been made this quarter.

(2) Training/Conferences:

There were no training courses or conferences attended this quarter.

f. Community Relations Activity Update

(1) Administrative Record Milestones:

The Administrative Record index is in the process of being updated and will be submitted in the next quarterly report.

3. The point of contact for additional information is Janet Fallo or Thomas Enroth at 607/869-1450.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Stephen M. Absolom
Chief, Public Works

Enclosures

Copies Furnished (w/o Appendices 3 and 4):

Legal Office, SEDA

Public Affairs Office, SEDA

Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division, Attn: CEHND-PE-E (Mr. K. Healy), P.O. Box 1600, Huntsville, AL 35807

Mr. Michael Duchesneau, P.E., Parsons Engineering Science, Inc., Prudential Center, 101 Huntington Ave, Boston, MA 02199

Commander, U.S. Army Depot Systems Command, Attn: AMSDS-IN-E (Mr. B. Stayer), Chambersburg, PA 17201-4170

Commander, Tobyhanna Army Depot, Environmental Division (Mr. J. Maciejewski), 11 Midway Road, Tobyhanna, PA 18466-5000

APPENDIX 1

MINUTES FROM THE

PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING

MINUTES OF PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING, 15 MARCH 95
SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY

Attendees: Note- the attendance sheet that was circulated was not returned to the installation attendees, please refer to the TRC attendance sheet.

R. Battaglia: Presented a recap of the information discussed at the Army's Project Managers Meeting:
+ Seneca Army Depot Activity is on the BRAC 95 list proposed for closure.
+ A hazardous material storage enclave is to remain here. What this means at this time is uncertain.
+ Funding will be DERA for now, a BRAC funding account may not be set up until FY 97.
+ A fast-track cleanup time period of 6 years is proposed by Headquarters.
+ Seneca will proceed to change the TRC to a Rehabilitation Advisory Board (RAB). Janet Fallo will address the TRC on this issue at the meeting today.
+ With respect to the issue of industrial vs. residential use, Seneca will plan for both scenarios, and pick one when the issue is settled.
+ The Environmental Baseline Survey for BRAC installations will be centrally funded.
+ Funding based on relative risk my be implemented.

K. Gupta: Question on the risk based funding with respect to the information available on the OB/OD grounds and the ash landfill. Also how the risk based funding will fit into the 6 year fast-track plan for time, priorities, and funding.

R. Battligia: At this time, just the raw data has been used to assess the risk level at the OB/OD and landfill. The EBS may help supply the information needed to avert an RI at each site.

M. Duchesneau: Questioned if the CRECLA documents would satisfy the requirements for BRAC documentation, such as doing 2 RI's per site, one to satisfy BRAC and one for IRP requirements.

K. Healy: Suggested if anyone has any questions on the melting of BRAC and CERCLA, now would be the time to express their concerns.

C. Struble: Asked if Tobbyhanna Army Depot can do the same missions as Seneca.

R. Battaglia: Answered no.

D. Geraghty: Asked about the ammunition to be destroyed.

R. Battaglia: Account classification will show how they will be handled, for example, the 3.5" rockets (Korean war era anti-tank rockets) cannot be taken apart therefore need to be open detonated

once the motor section is removed.

D. Geraghty: Questioned the use of the open burning pads for open detonation.

R. Battaglia: Answered no, the pads will only be used for emergency situations for open burning, not detonation.

Return to the agenda.

M. Duchesneau: Discussed the decision tree for site evaluation when the "does a threat exist" question is reached. The NYSDEC TAGM's for soil are very conservative therefore the alternative is to look at risk assessment, many sites at this point in the decision tree.

K. Gupta: Advised Mr. Duchesneau to address these concerns in writing and send to DEC, EPA, and DOH.

K. Hoddinott: Asked EPA if EPA will be using the Monte Carlo method to rate risk.

C. Struble: EPA responded that she will need talk to EPA's toxicologist.

J. Chaplick: ES is at a point at this time that they need to make, at many sites, a decision as to the next step in the process. The EI database, not the RI data base will be used for risk assessment for human health. Ecological risk assessment gives qualitative, not quantitative numbers to use in choosing the decision. In addition, the SWMU's can be classified into the no action, the RI/FS, or into the "in limbo" as there needs to be the decision as to which way to go from here.

M. Duchesneau: At any site, either a no action or ROD will be made and question was asked about getting to a ROD by other than RI method.

K. Healy: Asked if an abbreviated risk assessment is possible. EPA, DEC, and DOH responded "no".

J. Chaplick: Asked about any formal consultation on the OB RI/FS.

C. Struble: Asked when the Army lawyers would be done looking at the information sent to them.

R. Battaglia: Mentioned that we are not talking yet with respect to the regulators and the Army together. He continued to discuss the RCRA vs. CERCLA issues on the OB/OD grounds as Mr. Gupta said that he had a closure document for the facility.

K. Healy: Discussed the FY95 RI's draft workplans, time to get these documents to the regulators, and turnaround for review/comment should be ASAp in order to get a scope done and awards made. He mentioned the generic plan that has information

common to all plans, the site specific plans for SEAD 16 and 17, and the scoping for SEAD 25 and 26.

A discussion followed on how many RI's will be done and the need to review and comment within the timeframe to keep things moving.

K. Healy: Discussed the IT Corporation modification to the contract for the proposed additional sites for cleanup (VOC's) and the metals removal contract that Baltimore will be working on with Engineering Science.

C. Struble: Questioned the process as there are no draft SI reports yet on some of these sites so how can we agree to do a removal action at sites with no information available.

M. Duchesneau: Mentioned that the VOC's removal included the blowdown pits and fire demonstration pad. In addition, the information on these sites is in the decision document for the proposed removal.

At this point it was noted that the meeting is running past the time allotted and we need to break for lunch prior to the TRC. The meeting was adjourned at 1147 hours.