

ORIGINAL

PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN, OPERABLE  
UNIT 01 - ON-SITE SOILS REMEDY,  
NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE  
PLANT, BETHPAGE

Bethpage High School  
Bethpage, New York

November 15, 1994  
7:30 P.M.

JACK COLTER  
Navy's Remedial Project Manager

JACK DUNLEVY  
Navy's Remedial Technical Manager

JOHN D. BARNES  
New York State

TIM VICKERSON  
New York State Department of Health

DAVE BRAYACK  
Halliburton NUS' Project Manager  
(Navy's Consultant)

REPORTED BY:

Barry Eskenazi

11/94

FORM FED-25 - REV 04/83 BAYONNE, NJ 07002

21

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. COLTER: Good evening, everyone.

I'd like to thank you for coming out tonight, taking time out of your busy schedule.

Can you call hear me good enough back there in the back? Can everyone see the overheads clear enough?

Okay.

My name is Jim Colter. I'm with the Department of Navy. I represent the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. We're located in Philadelphia.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to go over comments and community input regarding the proposed remedial action plan for on-site soils at the Navy's property near the Grumman facility.

I was told that we ran out of proposed plans, so if anyone's interested in a copy of it, see me after the meeting. We'll get your name and address and we can mail you one.

There's also a copy in the Bethpage Library with the information repository.

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENNAC INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

If you just go in and ask for the reference section, they can point you to all the Navy documents that are there.

On the table outside -- hopefully you all got copies of fact sheets that we've been sending out periodically. Hopefully most of you are on our mailing list. Those of you who aren't on our mailing list, if you signed in outside, that will put you on the mailing list and you'll be getting future fact sheets and correspondence, what the Navy is doing at the property.

After tonight's meeting, we will take your comments regarding our proposed plan. And we will then do what's called a record of decision, which basically documents the official action that the Navy is going to take regarding the soil cleanup.

What's in the record of the decision is called a response to the summary. Basically, we respond in writing to all the comments that we get during the public

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENACAD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

comment period and also during any questions that come up tonight.

The official public comment period started on November 1. It runs through December 16.

The official start of the comment period is when we put the proposed plan in the Bethpage Library for the public to review.

Before we get into the meat of the presentation, I'd just like to ask that we have about 30 to 40 minutes of information to present, and then we want to get into your questions and concerns.

So if you could just bear with us and hold your questions and comments until after the presentation, we'd appreciate that.

If you have a comment -- we have a court reporter here tonight -- what I'd like you to do is to stand up and state your name. If we can't hear you, we have mikes on either side. You can come down and use the microphone. Just like I said,

11/94

FORM FED-25 PERCAD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

state your name and then go ahead and state your comment for the reporter. And if he can't hear you, we'll have to ask you to speak up.

There's a lot of people here tonight, and I'm sure there are a lot of questions.

What we'd like to do is limit each person initially to about five minutes, hear your question, hopefully we can answer it and get to your neighbor's question.

If there's, you know, time, and there will be, we're not going to go anywhere, if you have another comment or a follow-up, you know, go ahead and be welcome to give it.

I'd like to introduce some of the people that are going to be speaking here tonight.

In addition to myself, we have Mr. Jack Dunleavy. He also represents that Department of Navy. He's my technical manager.

11/15/94

6

1  
2 We have John Barnes, from the New  
3 York State Department of Environmental  
4 Conservation.

5 We have Tim Vickerson, from the New  
6 York State Department of Health.

7 We also have Dave Brayack, from  
8 Halliburton Nus, who is a Navy's  
9 consultant.

10 There's some other interested  
11 parties here of notable concern who is  
12 also in attendance tonight. We have  
13 representatives from the Naval Air Systems  
14 Command out of Washington. They are  
15 actually the property owners of the Naval  
16 Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant.

17 We also have representative from the  
18 Bethpage Water District here tonight,  
19 Nassau County Department of Health.

20 There's also representatives from  
21 the Grumman Corporation and the Hooker  
22 Ruco Corporation.

23 In the past year or so there's been  
24 a series of meetings, public meetings such  
25 as this. I think about a year ago the EPA

MGM COURT REPORTING (516)746-1393 (718)347-1441

11/94

FORM FED-35 PENNSA INC. BAYONNE, N.J. 07008

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

sponsored a public meeting for Hooker Ruco for their on-site soil program.

A couple of weeks ago, most of you probably came to the Grumman, the State-sponsored public meeting for what Grumman plans to do.

This is just another meeting in a series of meetings that the Navy will tell you what they would like to do to clean up soils on their property.

This map here shows -- this is the area that we're talking about.

(Indicating.)

It's roughly about 100 acres in size. And the Navy owns the property and leases it to Grumman for them to do their operations.

Basically, we had an agreement when this all got started that the Grumman Corporation would take care of their land that they own, and the Navy, regarding investigations and remediation, and then the Navy would go ahead and take control for the property that the Navy owns.

11/94  
MGM COURT REPORTING  
NEW YORK, NY 10022



1  
2 Before I go any further, I'd like to  
3 introduce Judith Hare. She's from the  
4 Naval Air Systems Command. She's actually  
5 representing the property owners.

6 MS. HARE: Thank you, Jim.

7 Can everybody hear me in the back?

8 I'd just like to bring you greetings  
9 from Admiral Bowes, who is the commander  
10 of Naval Air Systems Command, and Admiral  
11 Becker, who is the vice commander, and, of  
12 course, Captain Steven Bailey, who would  
13 like to have been here this evening. He  
14 was kind of unavoidable and was not able  
15 to make it. But he sends his greetings.

16 Also, he is director of  
17 environmental and securities programs for  
18 Naval Air Systems Command.

19 The Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve  
20 Plant here at Bethpage is one of seven  
21 government-owned contractor-operated  
22 facilities under the cognizance of NAVAIR.

23 And, as Jim has mentioned, NAVAIR is  
24 very interested in moving out smartly and  
25 continuing with this process which began

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

sometime ago until we can reach the final and ultimate conclusion and end result which will be full remediation of the facility.

So, with that, I'm very happy to represent NAVAIR, and I'm pleased to be here this evening and would like an opportunity, perhaps later, to meet some of you.

Thank you.

MR. COLTER: Okay.

This is a blow-up of the roughly hundred-acre property that I showed you earlier.

(Indicating.)

The areas that the Navy has investigated roughly were site one. There are three areas on the property. It's called the former drum-marshalling area.

Basically, it's a former drum storage area where waste from Grumman operations were put in drums and sent over there prior to off-site disposal.

The second area we investigated is

11/94  
FORM FEE 25 PENNSYLVANIA BAYONE NJ 07002

1  
2 what's known as the recharge basin area.  
3 It's roughly about sixteen acres.

4 The reason for investigations here  
5 were basically it's a discharge point for  
6 groundwater that Grumman had pumped up  
7 with its production wells.

8 This groundwater was contaminated.  
9 However, it was used for Grumman  
10 operations for non-contact cooling  
11 purposes and then re-injected into the  
12 recharge basins to be re-injected into the  
13 groundwater.

14 The third area that the Navy  
15 investigated is what's called the salvage  
16 storage area, and this is basically a  
17 junkyard of sorts for old aircraft parts  
18 and other items such as that. It is about  
19 a nine-acre site.

20 One of the most important things  
21 that the Navy tries to do throughout its  
22 investigation is to try to keep the public  
23 up to speed on what we're going as best we  
24 can.

25 Some of the things that we do -- one

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

of the first things we did was set up an information repository, that I mentioned earlier, in the Bethpage Public Library.

All the documents, all the fact sheets, all the pertinent information that the Navy generates, a copy of it goes to the information repository and it's available for anyone to go and review at any time.

Like I said before, you just go to ask for the reference section, ask for the Navy reports. That will be different that the Grumman reports. They're two separate studies.

So if you want to know what the Navy is doing, ask for the Navy reports.

You can't take them out of the library, but you can, you know, review them as much as you want in the library, make copies of pages, whatever.

We also have what's called a community relations plan. That is also at the repository. And it sets out what we'd like to do, the plans that we would like

11/94  
FORM 800'S PENACAD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to take to keep the public informed, fact sheets, public gatherings, such as this one.

A few years back, the State, the Navy and the Grumman Corporation had a joint meeting basically to kick off the remedial programs at the various areas.

We also -- the Navy also conducted a neighborhood workshop -- some of you might have been involved in that -- when we went out and wanted to put monitoring wells in your local community.

We wanted to let you know what we were doing and why we were doing it.

So we sponsored a little neighborhood workshop to try to keep you informed as much as we could about what we were doing.

Prior to the drilling, some representatives, myself, some representatives from our consultant went door to door, basically telling you that, you know, we're here and we're going to start drilling. There's going to be some

FORM 100-25 REVISED 11/94 PERCAD INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2 inconveniences due to the size of the rig  
3 and, you know, we tried to hopefully meet  
4 your needs as far as, you know, getting  
5 the work the next day and what not. And  
6 we got pretty good reception from the  
7 local community.

8 As I mentioned before, throughout  
9 the whole process, we put out periodic  
10 fact sheets. There are probably five or  
11 six out there, different dates on them. We  
12 tried to get one out about every six  
13 months to try to keep you up to speed as  
14 to where we were at and what the next step  
15 in the process was going to be.

16 One of the most important things  
17 that the Navy does, it sets up what is  
18 called a Technical Review Committee. It  
19 is basically a collection of technical  
20 representatives from various agencies, the  
21 Environmental Protection Agency, the State  
22 of New York, the Department of Health.  
23 The Bethpage Water District is a key  
24 member in that committee.

25 Basically, their job is to review

1  
2 what the Navy does, give us comments on  
3 what we're going, maybe some suggestions  
4 how we can do it better, and basically  
5 they're there to watch out for the  
6 community's interests.

7 Okay. What I would like to do now  
8 is get into the results of our  
9 investigation. And, after we do that,  
10 we'll try to let you know what our -- what  
11 the Navy and the State, that we're going  
12 to recommend as a preferred method of  
13 remediations.

14 Basically, it depends on your  
15 comment tonight. That plans can change if  
16 the public so thinks it's worth it.

17 So what I would like to do now is  
18 introduce Dave Brayack from Halliburton,  
19 and he'll go over what we found out at the  
20 Navy's property.

21 MR. BRAYACK: Good evening.

22 I'd just like to take about five or  
23 ten minutes and describe the results of  
24 the remedial investigation and to  
25 summarize what was looked at under the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

feasibility study.

As Jim had indicated, the Navy task has to conduct an environmental investigation at the Navy site.

The investigation mostly addressed past practices, contamination that occurred prior to 1980.

As part of this investigation, we collected soil, sediment, surface water and groundwater samples between 1991 and 1993.

During this time, we collected probably in excess of 500 samples and these samples were based on known or suspected locations of contamination.

These results are fully detailed in two phases of an RI investigation which is present in the library.

The results, for the most part, found that the soils are contaminated with solvents, metals, PCB's and PAH's.

PAH's are a common constituent of asphalt as well.

Most of the VOC's, VOC's being

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENNAC INC BAYONNE NJ 07002



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

solvents, are found at site one.

We did find these solvents throughout the rest of the facility, but the majority of them were found at the site one location.

We also found metal contamination relative to the solvents. It wasn't nearly as bad.

In many cases it was barely above background metals that are just commonly used at the facility, scrap metal.

PCB's were found.

One of the major locations of PCB location -- I have another slide coming up -- was at site one, right around here.

(Indicating.)

And also at site two, as well.

PAH's, as I mentioned, are just a part of asphalt. We found them throughout the facility. They may just be related to the road base material used.

With the PCB's, I'd also like to point out there were many locations at the facility that were not contaminated with

11/94

FORM FED-35 PENNAC INC. BALTIMORE, MD 21202

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the PCB's as well.

Okay.

I just have two slides. This first slide, this little shaded area, what we found when we were doing the testing was one single pit of PCB's at a concentration of about 1500 parts per million.

For comparison, the action level for these is around 10 parts per million for an industrial setting.

As a result of this, the Navy took an immediate and interim action at this facility and that was basically to cover this with about 8 to 10 inches of dirt.

The major risk with the PCB's is that people could contact them through one of several routes. And by placing the soil over top of them, it eliminated the risk as, once again, as an interim basis.

The perspective on this slide might be a little bit difficult. But this area, right here, is site one.

(Indicating.)

This is the residential neighborhood

11/94

FORM FEO'S PERCAD INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

right here.

(Indicating.)

Jim mentioned earlier about a drum-marshalling area. This is where Grumman brought all their waste solvents, waste soils and various materials and stored them here until they could consolidate them in the truckloads for off-site disposal.

What we found is, we found some fairly high concentrations of solvents in the soils right around this point.

(Indicating.)

We did sample throughout the entire area. And we found that the soil problem was very localized to here.

(Indicating.)

As part of the investigation, this building that you could just barely see here is plant three.

(Indicating.)

We went inside plant three and looked for solvent contamination coming from the floors within that building.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And we did find some contamination going underneath it.

The relevance of this solvent contamination is any of the groundwater contamination starts off as soil contamination. And there's no hopes of addressing groundwater contamination until you address the soil contamination, first.

I don't want to go through this slide -- I don't want to go through this slide in detail, but this is from the feasibility study.

After you conduct a remedial investigation and you determine that there's risks to either human health or the environment or that you've exceeded environmental regulations, then you proceed to the next step, which is a feasibility study.

The feasibility study is intended to identify a range of alternatives, going from eventually no action, which is required to be evaluated, to some fairly extensive, in some cases very innovative

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

or exotic technologies.

The intent of this feasibility study is to just present a range of alternative.

Okay. At this point, that completes my summary of the remedial investigation feasibility study.

Jim is going to get up again and present what the Navy has presented as the preferred alternative for the on-site soils.

MR. COLTER: Okay.

As I said before, the Navy, with the -- in consultation with the State of New York, have come up with a plan, with the alternatives that Dave showed. It's known as alternative S6.

If you go to the repository and look at the feasibility study, it's what is documented in the prap that hopefully most of you got to night.

Like I said before, it is just a plan, a proposed plan that the Navy is basically recommending to the State and to the local community.

1  
2 Based on the comments that we get,  
3 we can modify the plan and in some cases  
4 we can change the plan entirely, if it's  
5 deemed necessary.

6 Some of the components of the  
7 proposed plan is basically we're going to  
8 excavate the PCB contaminated soil that  
9 Dave showed. And that hot spot is going  
10 to be -- we're going to excavate the cover  
11 that we put on it as well as the soils  
12 underneath it that actually had the PCB's.  
13 Those concentrations that we find are in  
14 excess of 500 parts per million, we're  
15 going to take to an off-site incineration  
16 facility and dispose of it that way.

17 The remainder of the PCB's on the  
18 property that fall within 10 parts per  
19 million, up to 500, we will excavate those  
20 and dispose of them in an off-site land  
21 fill.

22 The metals that Dave alluded to, the  
23 arsenic, what is basically called  
24 fixation, it's basically mixing it with a  
25 cement type of material to immobilize the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

contaminant, and that will also be transported to an off-site hazardous waste land fill.

The area that Dave showed for the volator organics that were under plant three, as well as site one, we're going to use a technique that's known as vapor extraction and air sparging.

Basically, what that does, what the vapor extraction side of it does is it injects air into the soil. That process releases the contaminants into the air stream. And the air stream is then collected and treated.

The innovative thing about this technology is the air sparging side, which basically uses the same concept of injecting air, but into the upper levels of the groundwater.

If you can picture, you have the soils, then you have a layer where the soil starts to get saturated with water and that's known as your water table.

So there is contamination in the

11/94

FORM FED-35 PENNAC INC SAISONNE NJ 07003

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

shallow groundwater.

This technique that is mainly for the soils, though, will also interject the air into the groundwater, the upper levels of the groundwater, where most of the contamination is present.

So we will be doing some limited groundwater remediation at the same time that we're doing the soil remediation.

After we take care of the volator organics, we excavate the PCB's. We excavate the metals. That was deemed basically the most economical solution out of the range of solutions.

There are solutions down to the lower end of Dave's slide. They are basically in the range of 50 million to a hundred million dollars, pretty expensive to undertake.

So what we're going to do is, we're going to excavate the most contaminated areas and we will be leaving residual contamination in place.

We will be leaving some PCB's in



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

place, between one and ten parts per million PAH's we will be leaving in place, and some metals, either naturally occurring or artificial will also be left in place.

With consultation with the EPA and the Technical Review Committee, also look at what we have been doing, you know, it's been determined really that these chemicals that we're leaving in place will not pose any risk to the on-site worker or to the residents in the area.

But the Navy took basically one step farther, and what our plan includes is over those areas, those residual chemicals are going to be placed. We're going to cover that with either a soil cover or a gravel cover, depending on what the use of the property is going to be.

We will also impose deed restrictions on the property to basically limit any construction in those areas and any accidental excavation of the chemicals.

11/94

FORM FEES PERIOD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The last thing I'd like to mention, before we get into the questions and answers, is, if you read the proposed plan, you also see in there an interim remedial action section. It deals with protection of the public water supply.

As of now, the Navy is in consultation with the Bethpage Water District. And, basically, we're discussing what steps need to be taken to protect the water supply wells that are located to the south of the property.

Basically, there's three clusters of water supply wells. They're known as plant four, plant five and plant six.

The Grumman Corporation is also in consultation with the Water District, and they are contributing to protection of plants four and six. And so the Navy has basically said that we will take care of plant number five.

That pretty much concludes the results of what we found and how we want to proceed with cleaning up the Navy

11/94

FORM 100-25 PERIODIC INC. BAYONNE, N.J. 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

property.

What I would like to do, before we get into the questions and answers, I would like to introduce John Barnes and Tim Vickerson.

They represent the State of New York. And they have a couple of things they'd like to mention.

MR. BARNES: Thank you, Jim.

On behalf of the State of New York, I would like to welcome you all to tonight's meeting. And I'm glad to see that we have a good turnout.

Approximately three weeks ago, the State of New York sponsored a public meeting such as this here at the high school, during which we presented our proposed remedy for treating on-site source areas at the Grumman site.

For those of you that attended that meeting, you have no doubt noticed that this meeting is run quite a bit differently. The difference has to do with the fact that for the Grumman site,

11/94  
FORM FEE-35 PENNAC INC. BAYONNE, NJ 08002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the State of New York and, in particular, the Department of Environmental Conservation, is a lead agency.

In the case of this study at the Navy property, the U.S. Navy is the lead agency.

In October of 1990, Grumman Corporation signed a consent order, which is a legally binding document, with the State of New York, by which they agreed to conduct a remedial investigation and feasibility study at their site.

There is no such legally binding document between the Department of Environmental Conservation and the Navy.

In the early 1980's, then President Ronald Reagan signed an executive order by which he assigned the lead role for investigations at Department of Defense facilities to the Department of Defense.

As Mr. Colter mentioned in his introductory remarks, the Department of Defense has a Technical Review Committee. And they have also other specified

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENNSYLVANIA STATE DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1  
 2 procedures that they must follow to  
 3 involve the EPA, the State agencies and  
 4 local community leaders.

5 In 1991, the State of New York and  
 6 the Department of Defense entered into  
 7 what we call a memorandum of agreement.  
 8 This is a vehicle by which the State can  
 9 oversee the investigations conducted at  
 10 Department of Defense facilities.

11 In addition, the Department of  
 12 Defense pays a sum of money to  
 13 approximately three percent of their total  
 14 cost of the investigations of cleanups to  
 15 the State of New York. This money is used  
 16 to offset the State's costs in overseeing  
 17 the investigations and the cleanups at DOD  
 18 facilities.

19 The role of the Department of  
 20 Environmental Conservation in this  
 21 particular project fell within two  
 22 different categories.

23 First of all, as well as the other  
 24 members of the Technical Review Committee,  
 25 we had the right of review and comment on

FORM FED-55 PENNSYLVANIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 11/94

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

work plans that were generated by the Navy, as well as all reports and fact sheets which were issued by the Navy.

The remedial work which was done by the Navy, the investigation work, was acceptable to the Department work which we requested that they do -- they did.

All of our comments on the reports and fact sheets were also incorporated.

Secondly, we also provided oversight of the field work which was conducted at the site, to the extent that we could.

This involved overseeing the drilling, the well installation, and sampling activities.

When the Navy collected groundwater samples for analysis, the State also collected samples from some of the wells, which we sent these samples to our laboratory as a means of verifying the results generated by the laboratory used by the U.S. Navy.

The State of New York, in particular the Department of Environmental

11/94

FORM 100-2, PENNSYLVANIA, BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Conservation and the Department of Health, are co-authors of the proposed remedial action plan. At least most of you got a copy of it.

Therefore, we do concur with the remedy which has been proposed by the Navy.

I would like to expand on a couple of points on that.

First of all, for the PCB's and the metals contamination in the soil, the cleanup goals which the Navy has selected is within our requirements set by the Department.

The cleanup goals for cleaning up the chlorinated solvents in the soils are lower than those required by the Department. In other words, they're doing everything they would require of parties who have the cleanup in hazardous waste sites and they're going a little bit further. They're being a bit more protective than they normally are.

This proposed remedial action plan

11/94

FORM 100-25 PERMAD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2 just addresses on-site soil issues.

3 On October 7 of this year, there was  
4 a meeting held in Albany which was  
5 attended by representatives of the Navy,  
6 Grumman Corporation and Occidental  
7 Chemical Corporation, which is a  
8 responsible party at the Hooker Ruco  
9 national priority site, which is located  
10 on New South Road, which is just west of  
11 the Grumman facility.

12 All three parties agreed to  
13 participate in a regional background water  
14 feasibility study which would basically  
15 cover the area of Bethpage, a little bit  
16 of Hicksville, and Levittown.

17 The purpose of this feasibility  
18 study is to develop a remedy for dealing  
19 with the massive groundwater plumes which  
20 exist in the area.

21 Based on current estimates, we're  
22 talking about a plume of about 1,500 acres  
23 in size in areas maybe as deep as 500  
24 feet, the northern terminus of which is  
25 the northern boundary of the Hooker Ruco



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

site and the Navy site.

It is our anticipation at this point that this project will take one year to complete and hopefully by this time next year we will hold a meeting such as this in which we present our plan for dealing with and addressing the groundwater contamination in the area.

At this time I would like to introduce Tim Vickerson from the New York State Department of Health.

MR. VICKERSON: Thanks, John.

Thank you all for coming here tonight.

I'm with the State Department of Health's Bureau of Environmental Exposure and Investigation, and with me here tonight is Miss Nina Knapp. She's our community outreach specialist. And also Lori Lutsker (phonetic) of the Nassau County Health Department. She's our eyes and ears down here. And we keep a good working relationship with the County.

The DOH role is to assist in the

FORM 100-23 PERMAD INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002 11/94

1  
2 investigation in any way we can and  
3 provide input, you know, from keeping  
4 public health in mind when we make those  
5 decisions and make comments on any of  
6 these investigations.

7 We recommend actions from our point  
8 of view.

9 And our primary goal is to determine  
10 if the public is being exposed to  
11 hazardous substances from the site based  
12 on a careful review of the environmental  
13 data.

14 And having done that for the Navy  
15 site, I do not believe that exposures are  
16 occurring to anybody that lives in this  
17 area. But we're still involved because we  
18 want to make sure that exposures will not  
19 occur in the future.

20 So I've reviewed the remedial action  
21 plan and along with all the other past  
22 investigation reports, and I concur with  
23 the cleanup plan, because I feel that it  
24 will be protective of public health and it  
25 will keep exposures from occurring in the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

future.

I don't want to downplay the significance of these sites, you know, from an environmental point of view they are a problem. And -- but I really don't believe that the public has any reason to be concerned with this situation.

And if you want to give us a call, 1-800 number is 1-800-458-1158, extension 305, if you want to talk to me about something.

A VOICE: Repeat it again slowly, please.

MR. VICKERSON: Yes.

It's 800-458-1158, extension 305.

And that's all, Jim.

MR. COLTER: Okay.

We can entertain some of your questions and concerns.

What I would like to do, basically, is to reiterate we do have a court reporter here. If you can stand up, state your name. If we can't hear you, we may ask you to use one of the mikes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

What we'd like to do is, initially, have any comments that you have on our proposed plan.

Basically, for us to cooperate with the spirit of the law, we need to address your comments and concerns regarding our proposed plan.

I do realize there are other questions and issues regarding ground water and air quality and other issues such as that.

What we would like to do is just initially, to go over any comments on the prap.

If there are none, or after they are completed, then we can go into any other concerns or questions you might have.

Does anyone have any questions on our proposed plan?

MR. FRANCINO: My name is Larry Francino (phonetic).

From what I understand, you're using a similar method as what Grumman proposed? It is called a soil vapor extraction. Is

FORM FEO-25 PENNSYLVANIA BAYVIEW, NJ 07022 11/94

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

that the same method?

MR. COLTER: Yes.

MR. FRANCINO: I've had an opportunity to look a little at what Grumman has proposed, and if it is the same, I've got some questions on it.

I'm just concerned there is some monitoring that is going on of the air that is extracted from the ground. From what I understand, that is how it works. You extract air from the ground?

MR. COLTER: Yes, basically.

MR. FRANCINO: Now, you do that by generating a vacuum or you actually push air into the ground?

Can you explain that to me a little bit?

MR. COLTER: Basically, if I could, I would like to have Dave Brayack, who is our consultant, he is the technical expert on this kind of remediation, he could probably help you a little better than I would.

MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

11/94

FORM FEEDS PENNAD INC. BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2           Basically, you inject air into the  
3 soil or, in this case, we're going to  
4 inject it actually into the groundwater,  
5 which is about 50 to 60 feet deep.

6           MR. FRANCINO: Just into the ground  
7 water? You're not taking the contaminants  
8 out of the soil above the ground water?

9           MR. BRAYACK: No.

10           What we're going to do then is, you  
11 inject a certain amount of air, say a  
12 hundred CFM, a hundred cubic feet per  
13 minute. Normally, you extract more than  
14 you inject.

15           If you inject a hundred, you would  
16 extract one-fifty.

17           One of the biggest concerns when  
18 you're bubbling this area is, you don't  
19 want it migrating out beyond where your  
20 point of control is.

21           MR. FRANCINO: That is my concern.

22           MR. BRAYACK: That's right. You  
23 always extract more.

24           And what you wind up with is a net  
25 downward migration from the perimeter.

1  
2 You know, for example, the fence  
3 line around site one, the air at that  
4 point would actually be going from the  
5 atmosphere down into the ground and into  
6 the air extraction wells --

7 MR. FRANCINO: Uh-huh.

8 MR. BRAYACK: -- to insure that  
9 you're capturing everything.

10 MR. FRANCINO: How do you contain --  
11 from what I understand, you're telling me  
12 you push air in some method into the  
13 ground and extract?

14 MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

15 MR. FRANCINO: How do you contain  
16 the air from coming out at different areas  
17 of the soil other than where you plan on  
18 extracting it?

19 MR. BRAYACK: Okay.

20 Basically, when you're injecting the  
21 air, it's almost like a fish aquarium.  
22 You're bubbling the air down into the  
23 aquifer into the gravel. What you do is,  
24 you inject the air in the middle and you  
25 extract from the perimeter.

1  
2 You have some safety factors in  
3 there.

4 One of the problems with injecting  
5 too deep into the groundwater is, you can  
6 inject as deep as you want, actually, but  
7 as the air starts bubbling up, it has a  
8 tendency to go in different directions.

9 By injecting 10 -- we're talking 10  
10 to 20 feet deep, it's not going to migrate  
11 more than 10 or 20 feet to either side.

12 MR. FRANCINO: So you're not going  
13 to actually have any seepage of the air,  
14 contaminated air out of the ground?

15 It's actually all going to be drawn  
16 into your system?

17 MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

18 MR. FRANCINO: Okay.

19 Now, by doing this you're generating  
20 -- you're creating air that is  
21 contaminated. And if that air itself was,  
22 before it was treated it is a contaminant  
23 to the air, if it did not get through your  
24 canisters --

25 MR. BRAYACK: Yes.



1  
2 MR. FRANCINO: -- I think it's very  
3 important, the safety concerns of making  
4 sure that all the systems prior to, where  
5 you actually treat the air, I want to make  
6 sure that none of that air in any way can  
7 leave your system.

8 MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

9 What you do is -- this is getting a  
10 little technical here -- you put the  
11 blower on the very exhaust end of the  
12 system, meaning that everywhere underneath  
13 the site, all the contaminated area is  
14 under a vacuum. If something breaks down,  
15 such as your blower, the air continues to  
16 fill into the system. But it's not being  
17 blown out into the atmosphere, being  
18 contaminated.

19 In this case, there is a residential  
20 neighborhood, very close, much closer than  
21 you normally see in any type of facility  
22 or any type of plant like this.

23 Protecting that neighborhood is one  
24 of the major concerns in this case because  
25 of its proximity.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

What you would normally do, we would probably take and double it for that added level of safety.

MR. FRANCINO: Now, this system has been used in other locations?

MR. BRAYACK: Hundreds of sites across the country.

MR. FRANCINO: And -- okay. And the results of those are available somehow?

MR. BRAYACK: I don't know of any comprehensive report that summarizes them.

For example, I know our company alone has done over a hundred of these throughout the country.

These systems are fairly reliable.

The chemicals that we're talking about here, even though we haven't talked about ground level much, the primary threat here is to the groundwater with these solvents.

MR. FRANCINO: Eventually, what is in the soil is going to migrate into the groundwater?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. BRAYACK: Exactly.

MR. FRANCINO: You want to get rid of it before it gets into the groundwater?

MR. BRAYACK: It will reach into the groundwater for -- I played with some numbers on this -- but it goes between decades and centuries at the current levels.

MR. FRANCINO: I'm very interested in finding out some more information about this system. I don't know if it is possible to find out some of the results from the past application.

MR. COLTER: If you see me after the meeting, give me your name and address, you can work with the State. They also used this technology in their State remedial programs and maybe they can help us out with getting some statistics to you, if that would be okay.

MR. COLTER: Another question.

MR. CODIO: My name is Joe Codio (phonetic). Don't worry about the spelling.

11/94

FORM FEES PENNSAID INC. BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

You're talking about 50 feet or 20 feet you're going to drill down, and you're saying it is going to go down 1,500 feet.

What are you waiting on? Instead of going ahead and taking care of everything, why are you going to take care of some of it and leave the rest of it behind?

You're talking about economics with one or two or three billion or whatever. There's got to be money around. And now that it is all said and done, we got to sit down with it and now you're going to take some of it and leave the rest of it behind? I don't get that part.

MR. COLTER: Well, basically it deals with the efficiency as well, as Dave said. The deeper you go, you run the risk of that contaminated air escaping or capture wells. And with the local community, you know, with the close proximity, we basically want to take care of the most contaminated ground water, which is at the interface from the soils

11/94

FORM FED-35 PENGAD INC BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

where the spills have occurred and the leaks have occurred.

By doing this type of dual system, the soils and the ground water, we will be addressing the most contaminated ground water with the State's program of the three-party unified approach.

We will take care of the deeper contamination, roughly about a year, hopefully.

A VOICE: He's talking about the long-range effects of decades or a century. You know, sooner or later it's going to get into there.

I'm living here 30 years. If I am dead already -- he says there is no problem with the water. We have people dropping in Bethpage from cancer there. Whether it's got any connection, I don't know. I think somebody should be held accountable. If everybody is making money on what they're dumping, from what, I don't know. All the money they got, they have to fix something. Selling boats for

11/94

FORM FEES PENNAD INC. BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2 20 million dollars. Go clean up your  
3 garbage.

4 MR. BARNES: The State of New York,  
5 in conjunction with the United States  
6 Environmental Protection Agency, has  
7 developed a general plan of how to deal  
8 with not only this site, but with Grumman  
9 and Hooker Ruco. And the first thing we  
10 decided to do, let's target the on-site  
11 source there, the above-the-ground water.  
12 Let's remediate those soils so there is no  
13 further degradation. That is step one.  
14 And that has been done at Hooker Ruco  
15 site. They already have a remedy that is  
16 under design. And we have proposed  
17 remedies out for Grumman and the Navy.

18 A VOICE: On that cleanup, are they  
19 cleaning up 80 percent, 90 percent or 30  
20 percent, or are they cleaning from that  
21 level up?

22 MR. BARNES: They're cleaning their  
23 on-site soils from the groundwater up.

24 At the same time, I know it seems  
25 like, gee, we're going to wait another --

1  
2 before they get to the groundwater. At  
3 the same time, we have targeted the Water  
4 Districts which could become impacted, in  
5 particular the Bethpage Water District.

6 There are three plants, pumping  
7 centers that the Water District has sought  
8 of the Grumman facility. And you have  
9 heard of people referring to plants four,  
10 five and six.

11 A VOICE: A few.

12 MR. BARNES: Okay.

13 A few years ago, 1990 or  
14 thereabouts, Grumman paid for a treatment  
15 system at plant number six. And just a  
16 summary, Grumman has paid for a system at  
17 plant number four, and that is already on  
18 line, as I understand.

19 Part of this remedy is to make sure  
20 we have treatment for plant number five.  
21 So while we are trying to determine how to  
22 remedy the groundwater situation, we are  
23 least protecting the water supplies.  
24 These water supplies are sampled on a  
25 regular basis to make sure that the water

1  
2 that you get meets the New York State  
3 Department of Health drinking water  
4 standards.

5 A VOICE: Parts per billion and all  
6 this stuff, just what they think is going  
7 to be fatal or detrimental to your health.  
8 Are they going to be building another  
9 water tower? Do you have any idea about  
10 that?

11 I was told there was a proposal for  
12 another water tower being built.

13 MR. COLTER: The Navy? I don't know  
14 if you're talking about --

15 A VOICE: I don't know if they're  
16 going to build another water tower. Maybe  
17 this one is no good anymore.

18 MR. COLTER: We talked to the Water  
19 District. We talked to them this morning  
20 about putting some type of treatment  
21 system on plant five.

22 I'm not sure that is what you're  
23 talking about, as far as a water tower.

24 A VOICE: I heard they were building  
25 another water tower. I don't know if it is



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

just talk or what.

MR. COLTER: We will be working with the Water District to put that treatment system on plant five, to make sure that the contamination that is heading down there does not go into the water supply.

Grumman has and the Navy is going to do plant five, and that is basically all the Water District plans to the south where this contamination is heading.

A VOICE: One last question. What about the air? You were talking about you were going to extract all the air.

After you extract it, what do you do with the air? It got to go back to the air, somebody else's house.

MR. BRAYACK: When the air passes through the carbon, all the contaminants absorb onto that carbon. And then you basically have clean air coming out of it.

A VOICE: What do you do with the carbon?

MR. BRAYACK: The carbon you have to take to an off-site --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A VOICE: Somebody else's house.

MR. BRAYACK: They'll burn it.

A VOICE: And then we'll breathe it in.

MR. VICKERSON: The Department of Health would not have approved of this plan if not for those carbon canister systems.

They're not going to take it from the ground and put it back in the air. It's going to get absorbed in these carbon units and then they will get properly disposed of at a REQA facility, you know, somewhere out in whatever, in the western part of the state.

So, you know, once it gets in those carbon canisters, it is out of here.

MR. COLTER: Sir?

MR. STONE: My name is Alan Stone. I have a couple of questions here.

MR. COLTER: Thank you.

MR. STONE: My name is Alan Stone. I live on Sycamore Avenue. I have a couple of problems here. Maybe you can

11/94

FORM FED-33 PENNAC INC. BAYONNE, N.J. 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

explain it to me.

I understand that we're going to clean up the area and then we're going to go into a deed restriction, in which basically, from what I know of deed restrictions, you're basically going to condemn the land over there.

Now, as we all know, Grumman is getting off the Island within the hour. The Navy will probably be off the Island within an hour and a half after everything is taken care of.

And I don't mean to belittle this, but after you guys have left, we're going to be left with a piece of property over there. As far as our tax base is concerned, where do we go from there with this?

MR. COLTER: Okay.

MR. STONE: No one would want that property if it is not cleaned up properly. And, again, deed restrictions mean? Will you define what a deed restriction is to me?

11/94

FORM FEO-25 PENNSYLVANIA INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2 MR. COLTER: I'm not exactly sure  
3 what type of deed restrictions we're  
4 using.

5 MR. STONE: That is very critical.

6 MR. COLTER: It's going to be on the  
7 Navy property only. And it's basically  
8 for today's present use of industrial use.

9 We don't want Grumman going out  
10 there and building some type of facility,  
11 excavating the soil and releasing the  
12 chemicals that we've left in place.

13 That is going to be the extent of  
14 the deed restriction.

15 MR. STONE: But the problem we have  
16 here, we know Grumman is going to be gone.

17 MR. COLTER: Right.

18 MR. STONE: We know that the Navy is  
19 going to be gone. It's going to happen.  
20 Let's face facts.

21 MR. COLTER: Right now, Grumman  
22 has -- yes, they are consolidating with  
23 Northrop, but they still have said they  
24 need the Navy's property to continue the  
25 Beth -- this area is going to be closed.

1  
2 Let's face facts. They're going to be off  
3 the Island. Give it two years, give it  
4 three years. Bye-bye, Grumman. It's  
5 done.

6 Our tax base, where are we going  
7 with this? If we turn around and say  
8 okay, guys, clean it up, what's going to  
9 happen? And if we don't get something for  
10 this or at least to pick up the difference  
11 in the tax base, we're dead.

12 MR. COLTER: I understand your  
13 concern.

14 If Grumman leaves the property, the  
15 Navy still retains the ownership of the  
16 land.

17 And the Navy has the responsibility,  
18 we will work with the local community. If  
19 a different type of treatment is what is  
20 required at that point, we will come back  
21 and look at our environmental problems.

22 We have residual -- we will clean  
23 those up before the Navy gives the  
24 property to anybody.

25 MR. STONE: As far as deed

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

restrictions goes, this has to be explained a little more.

MR. COLTER: Judith Hare may be able to shed a little more light on the use of the property.

MS. HARE: I'll try.

The Navy is interested, of course, in divesting of their government-owned contractor-operated facilities.

However, we're interested in doing that responsibly.

And, as you probably already know, Grumman is vacating our other facility on Long Island in Calverton. And, of course, through special legislation that property is being turned over for redevelopment to the community.

Now, certainly where that property is concerned, and where this property is concerned, if at some future time Grumman were to decide to vacate the property, and certainly they have given us no indication that they're going to do that, we still have --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. STONE: Excuse me, dear.

You read the papers? You know what is going on?

MS. HARE: Yes, I do.

I can only tell you what I know currently.

MR. STONE: Do you live here on the Island?

MS. HARE: No.

MR. STONE: Okay.

MS. HARE: I don't. I live outside of Washington, as a matter of fact.

But even if they do present that scenario to us, that in no way would stop or even slow down our process for cleaning up the Navy's property.

MR. STONE: I understand you're going to clean it up. But what's going to happen as far as the dollar base, if you do, and you will decide to get off the Island sooner or later? What's going to happen to our tax base here in the area?

Because, if you condemn that land, and deed restriction, if you look around

11/94

FORM FED-35 PENNSYLVANIA BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2 any other places where it was a superfund  
3 site, that land is worth literally zero.

4 MS. HARE: Well, that would probably  
5 be yet to be determined, because in the  
6 normal course of events, barring any  
7 further special legislation, the property  
8 at the time that the contractor -- if the  
9 contractor decided to vacate the property,  
10 the property would then be turned over to  
11 the General Services Administration. And  
12 the General Services Administration would  
13 then go through their normal procedures  
14 for disposing of property.

15 MR. STONE: But if you put a deed  
16 restriction on this land, who's going to  
17 want it?

18 MR. COLTER: We can lift the deed  
19 restriction.

20 MS. HARE: If it is cleaned up.

21 MR. COLTER: If the community  
22 decides whatever the use is, and it is  
23 determined that we need to do more, then  
24 we can do that and lift the deed  
25 restriction.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. HARE: Absolutely.

MR. COLTER: This is just a hundred-acre property now.

MR. STONE: Just a hundred acres? It's primary over there.

MR. COLTER: Excuse me.

The Grumman property, Grumman actually owns their property. It is roughly 600-some acres, I believe.

What the Navy is talking about is that little hundred-acre piece I told you.

MR. STONE: You keep saying "a little hundred-acre piece."

That means a lot for development here.

MR. COLTER: You're right. You're right.

MS. HARE: Oh, absolutely.

MR. BARNES: If I can just follow up on something that Jim just mentioned.

One of the deed restrictions that can be imposed is restrictions to whether property can be used for industrial purposes or residential purposes.

11/94

FORM FEES PERIOD INC. BAYONNE, N.J. 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The cleanup goals that we selected for this particular facility are for industrial use.

At this point, if the Navy does pull out, that property could still be used for industrial purposes and industry can't come in and use that property.

However, if somebody wants to come in and built a residential community there, then we'll definitely have to re-evaluate the cleanup goals and do additional cleanups.

Another type of deed restriction would be limiting use to industrial or residential.

MR. SHERER: I live on Thomas Avenue.

The first question I have, and I think it is on the minds of somebody else, you just mentioned deed restriction could be residential.

Would you buy a house or build a house on a site that you know used to be a toxic dump?

11/94

FORM FED-35 PERGAD INC BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

That's just a general question.

The real question I have is, first of all, in terms of the air blowing into the ground, okay, does it, depending on how much air or the way you blow air, have any effect directly on the ground water in the location that you're working? And will that directly affect any of the adjacent ground water in the communities that are just adjacent to the property that you're working on or is it negligible?

MR. COLTER: The system will be pretty much a localized system. We would be addressing that area that was cross-matched for the most part. As Dave said, this system does not radiate out laterally into the community.

MR. SHERER: That's true. That's in terms of the air.

Now you're disturbing the aquifer in the direct area that you're working in. So you have groundwater that is there.

Now it's like if you throw a rock in

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENNAD INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2 a puddle of water -- now I'm not sure if  
3 I'm describing this properly -- but if you  
4 throw a rock in a puddle of water, it  
5 radiates out. Okay.

6 If you're blowing air into the  
7 ground, and you have your groundwater  
8 which, true, is compressed and it's  
9 saturated soil, will this cause -- I'm not  
10 an expert -- will this affect any of the  
11 ground water adjacent in the houses that  
12 are just over the fence?

13 Okay.

14 And part of this -- we are all  
15 talking about Grumman. We are talking  
16 about areas on the other side of the  
17 fence. And we are very close to that  
18 area.

19 We've never really talked about  
20 exactly the results we found in the  
21 community.

22 Now, I know that there were just at  
23 the level or EPA regulations said we are  
24 just near the parts per million of PCB's  
25 and metals in the soil.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Okay.

But we have gardens. We plant.

Okay. Not necessarily from the water in our hoses, but we are eating from the soils in our houses.

Are we allowed to do this? Should we be doing this? Should we be concerned about this?

Nobody has ever really addressed it and said, oh, it is great, we can continue doing everything, business as usual.

MR. COLTER: That is a legitimate question.

Being a homeowner and living in the area, that would be an utmost concern of mine.

What I would like to do is address your groundwater questions and Dave address that.

We do have some information to present regarding off-site soil sampling.

What I would like to do is just hold that until the second part of the questions and answers. And I think we

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

would be able to answer your concerns about that.

MR. SHERER: One last quick question.

Okay. How are they taking the PCB soil away from the community? How is it being trucked or transported through the neighborhood and to wherever it's going to get incinerated?

MR. COLTER: Basically, by dump truck, I would imagine.

MR. SHERER: Well, you know, potholes ridden -- okay.

They did the --

MR. COLTER: Working with the Department of Health, as far as the best route. We don't want to truck this thing all through your neighborhood.

MR. SHERER: Well, everything around Grumman is our neighborhood, so unless they're going to beam it off-site, which I don't think they're going to do --

MR. COLTER: We're going to come up with the best and shortest route to get

11/94

FORM FEES - PENNSA INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the soil from the area.

MR. SHERER: It shouldn't be the fact that it's being transported. It should be the type of holding canister container that we're going to use to take it off, not an open dump truck like the construction companies use, but like a closed cylinder. It's sealed and it cannot leak and cannot drop dirt on the street.

Those are things that have to be addressed.

MR. COLTER: They will be addressed in the overall design of the best way.

Would you like to help him out on the groundwater questions, Dave?

MR. BRAYACK: Yes.

Basically, on the groundwater, the effects of this vapor extraction are very limited, where you bubble air in, raise maybe a foot or two.

We'll have the extraction, vapor extraction wells more around the perimeter there. You actually pull the ground water table up a little bit as well as a result

FORM 11/94 PENNSYLVANIA REPORTING INC. BAYONNE, N.J. 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

of that.

But the effects are very localized, to within 50 or 60 feet of where the wells are. Anything 50 or a hundred feet away wouldn't be affected at all. The groundwater would not be cleaned up. You would not change the groundwater flow patterns, except very locally. And that is simply as a result of when you apply a vacuum at that location, it pulls the water up a little bit and you bubble the air in, it has a tendency to bubble the water up a little bit. Does that --

MR. SHERER: Yes, it gives me an idea.

MR. BRAYACK: If we put an extraction system at site one of the Navy, which is very close to the site line, the effects at the first line of houses, where the actual houses are, probably could not be measured.

A VOICE: Are they still dumping over there? There is no dumping going on over there at site one?



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. COLTER: I really can't answer that. There is a representative from Grumman over here.

A VOICE: Stand up.

A VOICE: The answer is no. The problems we're dealing with, we tried to address in prior meetings. And it is very important to do.

Grumman has had a long history on the Island. Practices back in the war, during the '50's and '60's, nothing like what goes on today. You learn. You get smarter. Science changes. There are a lot of things that happened in the past, shouldn't have happened. But the regulations -- we didn't know. These are things that you shouldn't do, put petroleum in the ground. In the '50's and '60's you cleaned engines with gasoline or whatever was the common practice.

A VOICE: Is there any kind of dumping going on over there?

A VOICE: That area is not a marshalled area for drums anymore. That

11/94

FORM FED-25 PENNAC INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002

1  
2 has not been going on for many years.

3 As you heard before, the problems  
4 really predate 1980. The laws changed in  
5 1987, said you must manage hazardous waste  
6 and chemicals in a certain way. From that  
7 time on, companies changed the practice,  
8 Grumman being one of those companies.  
9 That doesn't mean that the problems go  
10 away that existed before.

11 Now you have to stand up as a  
12 company and address the problems. It is  
13 very expensive. That is what you have to  
14 do. And they are sizable problems. They  
15 are very serious.

16 A VOICE: You live in Bethpage?

17 A VOICE: No. But I worked here for  
18 20 years.

19 A VOICE: I heard at the last  
20 meeting that they have some type of  
21 storing system that they can store 500  
22 barrels of contaminated waste.

23 A VOICE: It was a thousand barrels.  
24 A barrel has 42 -- you know, approximately  
25 42 gallons per barrel. That sets a maximum

1  
2 limit. We are storing much more than  
3 that.

4 A VOICE: But they are bringing  
5 into that facility?

6 A VOICE: Right.

7 A VOICE: Where is it coming from?

8 A VOICE: Around the entire complex.  
9 It is 600 acres. We marshalled it there,  
10 get the same types of chemicals together.  
11 So that a truck coming in takes away 40 or  
12 45 drums at a time, rather than coming in  
13 every day and taking three or four. So  
14 they'll come in once a month and take away  
15 a certain lot. But that facility is  
16 constructed with controls. It has a roof  
17 over it. It is inspected regularly. Every  
18 week we have to document inspections and  
19 the labeling of the drums. So that site  
20 is very tightly and carefully monitored.  
21 It is a subject every year of inspection  
22 by the agency.

23 A VOICE: This is site one you're  
24 talking about?

25 A VOICE: No. I'm talking about a

1  
2 separate -- actually, site two, you'll see  
3 there is a storage area for chemicals with  
4 a plant near that location, but that is a  
5 secure area. It meets all permit  
6 requirements.

7 Site one is no longer a marshalling  
8 area for chemicals. It has not been for a  
9 number of years.

10 A VOICE: Would that be taken down?  
11 Once the plant starts, would that  
12 marshalling area be torn down?

13 A VOICE: There is a permit and REQA  
14 facility. That means it meets all current  
15 regulations for carefully marshalling  
16 drums of waste materials and having them  
17 shipped out for incineration or recycling  
18 by outside --

19 A VOICE: So there is storing?

20 A VOICE: Not in site one.

21 MR. COLTER: This area here is one.  
22 (Indicating.)

23 A VOICE: It has not been use for  
24 many years as a marshalling area.

25 Many years ago, we're talking about

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

in the '60's, that's where it used to be marshalled.

A VOICE: When is that going to be taken down, marshalling area?

What's there now?

MR. COLTER: This area here.

(Indicating.)

A VOICE: Site one.

A VOICE: Site one.

MR. COLTER: There are concrete pads there. There are soil cutting drums that we generated from our investigation that are stored out there. And those will be sample tested and disposed of if they're found to contain anything of significance.

There is just concrete pads out there now. Our vapor extraction system won't disturb those concrete pads.

A VOICE: When will this proposed plan start?

When will it start?

MR. COLTER: Hopefully before September. Our fiscal year, our new fiscal year starts in September or next

11/94

FORM REC-25, PENNSYLVANIA INC. SAVONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

October. We hope to have some people out there by this coming summer excavating soil if all goes well.

A VOICE: And then from now you'll discuss the groundwater?

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A VOICE: Talking about '97 --

MR. COLTER: Correct.

MR. BARNES: Just to keep the record straight, state your name and where you're from so the court reporter can make an accurate record of this proceeding.

MR. COLTER: Yes, ma'am?

MS. GOULD: My name is Rita Gould. I live on Tenth Street.

I spent couple of hours this morning at the library reading everything and opening up many, many maps.

And one thing I found that was missing was, I know that Grumman is taking care of their property and the Navy is taking care of their property, but who takes care of the property of the residents who live along the fence of site

FORM 100-1 (REV. 11/84) PANGLOSS INC. RAYMOND, N.J. 07068

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

number one?

How come all, everything I saw in all the maps and all the contaminated soils end at the fence on 11th Street?

A VOICE: That's right.

MS. GOULD: You mean that nothing comes through the fence?

How does contamination of the soils know how to end at a fence? Very smart soil.

11th Street, 10th Street, who has tested the soil on the residents' property? Who has tested my soil?

I happen to have, on my property, 25 feet by 100 feet of my property is original woods, soil, no lawn. Should I keep raking leaves? Should I keep planting?

I had a vegetable garden for 25 years. I don't want to plant anymore.

If you tell me I should only work on my cement and my driveway and the street, I will do that.

But who's watching the residents?

11/94

EDMUND INC. PENNSYLVANIA, NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Who's watching our property?

Another thing, what kind of health hazard do we already have over the years?

I've lived there for 30 years. A lot of people have lived there for many, many years.

This is not a residential area that people come and go. They come. They stay. They raise their children.

What do we know from health hazards that have affected us over the past 30 years?

How do I know when I've been digging in my garden years ago? Every single year I had a vegetable garden. As of now, I do have a rare form of leukemia that they say has been -- possible cause has been exposure to heavy metals.

Where do I have heavy metals in my garden? I didn't go to work.

I don't know there is any connection. You prove to me there is no connection.

There is so much cancer on 10th

FORM FD-203 PENGAD INC. DAYTON, OH 45424



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Street, on almost every house. I don't know what is going on, 11th Street, Sycamore Avenue, Maple, Thomas, 9th Street. I don't know.

Should I go up and down the street and make a poll and report it to you?

Whose representing the residents? The properties on Grumman and the Navy property, everyone's representing them. Who is representing us?

That's it.

MR. COLTER: I'd like to address that at the end of the question and answer session.

Those of you who got an agenda, you'll see an item under closing remarks called off-site soil sampling.

The Navy, with the Department of Health, will be out in the local community the next two days doing residential sampling.

As far as the question of who's watching out for your concerns, your local Health Department, your State

FORM FEEDS, PENNAD INC, BAYONNE, NJ 07002, 11/94

1  
2 representative, Environmental Protection  
3 Agencies, they are all members of our  
4 review committee that reviews what the  
5 Navy does.

6 And they make sure that we don't  
7 miss anything. And, if we do, they ask us  
8 to fill in the gaps.

9 The Navy is going out to the off-  
10 site -- to the residents to sample all the  
11 data that we have to date.

12 And you're right, contamination  
13 doesn't know the boundaries of the fence  
14 line. And you're right.

15 The information that we have says  
16 that at our fence line we really don't  
17 have any contamination. We have that PCB  
18 hot spot a few hundred feet inside the  
19 fence line.

20 What we're going to do in the next  
21 couple of days is basically verify that  
22 hypothesis for you.

23 MR. VICKERSON: Yes.

24 I'd also like to point out, you  
25 know, the Department of Health asked the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Navy to perform this sampling down in the residential areas, because that was a concern that a number of you brought up in the past.

And we felt that that was a legitimate concern.

And we have asked the Navy to do that. And all I can say is, you should be in touch with your County Health Department official or me.

If you want, I'll repeat the 1-800 number, or see me afterwards and, you know, we can talk about it.

But I really don't believe that growing gardens and eating vegetables out of your garden is a big problem.

There's not a whole lot of information on the uptake of PCB's in vegetables. And I'm not, you know, I'm not a cancer epidemiologist or a toxicologist.

I can't really talk about specifics about those kinds of effects, but we can get you in touch with people that can

11/94

FORM FEE \$5 PER PAGE INC BY PHONE IN ORDER

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

answer those kinds of questions.

MR. COLTER: Sir?

MR. PIKE: My name is Dave Pike. I live on 9th Street.

We had talked at the last meeting about the possibility of a toxilological survey of residents in the area to determine whether there were PCB contaminants in their body tissue or any other maybe heavy metals or something.

And it was raised by one of the folks, you folks, I mean, who would volunteer for something like that?

We took the time to send out newsletters to the community, based on the mailing list that you've done.

I think it might be something prudent, considering the high level of cancer in this area, that we do so, as far as sending out a survey, asking for people who might want to volunteer for tissue studies or something to see, in fact, we do have PCB contamination in our systems that you folks are unaware of, because you

11/94

FORM FEEDS PERCAD INC. BAYONNE NJ 07002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

don't think it is possible. Let's prove it by a study and let the Navy and Grumman fund it. That's my number one concern.

I think there is enough people in this area that would respond positively and would be a testing person for that.

I certainly would sign up today, if you wanted to get a list right now. That's number one.

Number two, the deed restriction -- I would like to go back to that for a second -- the level of improvement that you're going to make for the property will allow for industrial use.

We all know that the last thing we need is restrictive property for industrial use only, considering that Grumman and most of the other industries in this area are leaving Long Island.

What would be the expense of improving that property for use as a residential site, considering that in the very near future a senior citizen site is proposed for a portion of that property

FORM 100-2.1 PERIOD INC. BAYONNE, NJ 07002 11/94

1  
2 adjacent to it? And would senior citizens  
3 want to move in there, knowing that  
4 there's a property adjacent to theirs  
5 that's contaminated?

6 And since you're going to be in the  
7 middle of a residential community, and  
8 there are no industrial takers for the  
9 property, what use is it to us if it's  
10 only good for industrial usage? Let's  
11 clean it up to the level of residential  
12 usage now so we don't have to chase your  
13 people ten years from now when somebody  
14 wants to do construction or we've got to  
15 go through a lawsuit or something else  
16 that is going to drag on forever.

17 Let's get it over with now. We've  
18 waited -- you studied this since 1986, and  
19 now you're going to tell us you're going  
20 to do a half cure to the problem, that  
21 we're going to have to take time out from  
22 our lives later on to address all over  
23 again.

24 Let's get it done now.

25 I see there are representatives of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Catapano Realty that are involved in that senior citizen thing here.

I'm sure they would be interested, too.

We're concerned about them being able to sell the property, also concerned that the only way that we're going to recoup our tax base here is to have something like a senior citizen development come in that is going to generate tax dollars.

If that property is unsalable because the senior citizens are certainly going to have to be let known about the potential hazards before they buy that property, what protection do we have?

Is it impossible to clean to a level of residential use or is it that the government doesn't want to spend the money? You know, what's the real reason?

MR. COLTER: Well, you bring up a good point.

Pay me now, pay me later, seriously.

What the Navy is faced with,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

basically, is cutbacks by one of its --

A VOICE: I just saw yesterday in the paper the Republicans are gloating about being able to reinstitute the B2 bomber program.

Let's steal a few million from that and clean up this situation. Because I think we'd rather have residential use property than you guys have a new five hundred million dollar bomber to bomb nobody.

I don't buy any of that about cutbacks when there's money to be spent on that or new submarines that we're building in Groton, Connecticut to keep a plant open. We can't live on land that's in our own neighborhood.

MR. COLTER: I agree with you. I don't have any control over the B2 program or anything like that.

I get my money through Congress and NAVAIR. And we take what they give us.

The reason we're going with just an industrial scenario at this point is



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

basically that is the level of funding that we have.

A VOICE: But that is not acceptable, though.

There's money to be had for everything else. There should be money for this.

I would like to know, personally, why isn't our congressman here? I think everybody in this room should write a letter to our congressman and say, What the hell is he doing tonight, that we could all be here. He should be going to Congress and forcing you guys to clean this to the level that should be done.

MR. COLTER: You bring up a very good point. You get your local politicians involve in the program, they probably can help you out.

Like I said, you bring up a good point about doing it now. However, Grumman hasn't informed the property owner of the hundred-acre parcel that they're going to be leaving anytime soon.

1  
2 Again, if they do, the Navy retains  
3 the ownership. We will then work with the  
4 local township. If a senior citizen home  
5 is deemed to be the best use of that  
6 facility, we'll have to come back and see  
7 after our program here how good that is,  
8 see what's left. And if a residential  
9 type of setting is deemed acceptable by  
10 your town planners, we'll work with the  
11 town planners. If that is what is deemed  
12 acceptable, we'll work with that goal.

13 A VOICE: And what about cleanups  
14 that take place, let's say, once this  
15 construction starts and additional ground  
16 contamination is found at that point? I  
17 think it's a Grumman situation rather than  
18 a Navy situation where that site is going  
19 to be.

20 Is there going to be funding to do  
21 cleanups at that point?

22 Will the New York State Department  
23 of Health have on-site representatives  
24 there while the construction is taking  
25 place to make sure that in construction

1  
2 excavation that the contaminants aren't  
3 released into the air? If the site has to  
4 be shut down while cleanup takes place,  
5 will Grumman and the Navy foot the bill to  
6 the construction company to keep them from  
7 going out of business or evacuating the  
8 site and cancelling the project while  
9 waiting for the cleanup to take place?

10 MR. COLTER: We won't have to shut  
11 down any operation in the area.

12 Basically, that area was for past  
13 drum storage use, which the Grumman  
14 representative mentioned isn't used  
15 anymore.

16 There is basically no one over at  
17 site one. It is a laid-down area for  
18 construction material. So we won't have to  
19 be shutting anything down or anything like  
20 that.

21 A VOICE: Just one other question  
22 that I have and I'll sit down and let  
23 somebody else talk.

24 While they're doing this  
25 construction for the proposed senior

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

citizen site, with deep excavation, is there any threat to disturbing the aquifer and moving the -- disturbing the water flows that, you know, might cause the contamination to move in a different direction or anything along those lines?

MR. COLTER: This construction, this work will not change the ground water flow patterns.

I'm curious, though, as to where the senior citizen project is located.

Is it on the Navy property or Grumman property?

A VOICE: It's centrally located on Central Avenue in Bethpage. So it is not on this map. It is about -- probably a mile south of it there.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 84.)

11/04

FORM 85-25 - REVISED FEBRUARY 1982

1  
2 MR. BARNES: The depth to  
3 groundwater at that particular location is  
4 45 to 50 feet.

5 There is no way they'll be  
6 excavating down to that depth.

7 In addition, that portion of the  
8 property, as I understand it, is no longer  
9 part of the inactive hazardous waste site  
10 of Grumman.

11 That since was delisted fairly  
12 recently by the Department of  
13 Environmental Conservation.

14 Grumman submitted its delisting  
15 petition, which they collected samples,  
16 installed additional wells above and  
17 beyond what they've already installed.

18 There were no waste that was  
19 disposed of in that area.

20 That document was not only reviewed  
21 and approved of by the Department of  
22 Environmental Conservation, but was  
23 reviewed and approved of by the Department  
24 of Health.

25 MS. BLACK: My name is Terry

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Catapano Black and I'm a resident of  
Bethpage.

That's why I'm here tonight.

I was born and raised in the  
community. And I have a couple of  
questions.

I did want to just briefly  
comment as I stood up, to make known the  
proposed senior housing is to be on  
Central Avenue.

As this gentleman informed us, there  
was a phase 1 and a phase 2 done. And, as  
I understand, everything was tested and it  
was delisted.

My question is with reference  
to -- I am sorry I came in late. You may  
have covered it -- as to the number of  
wells that were drilled around Bethpage  
and the findings in reference to these  
three wells and the number of wells that  
were drilled, because I have noticed them  
all around the town and the findings of  
the other wells.

MR. COLTER: We have two programs

1  
2 going on, the Navy program and the Grumman  
3 program.

4 But most of the off-site wells that  
5 the Navy installed were in the eastern  
6 residential area, in this area here.

7 (Indicating)

8 The ones I believe that you might be  
9 referring to were probably installed by  
10 the Grumman property, by the Grumman  
11 study.

12 I -- the information that Grumman  
13 has is also in the Bethpage Public  
14 Library. And that is the best as far as  
15 Grumman goes.

16 Dave can probably help out as far as  
17 how many wells we put in the eastern  
18 residential area.

19 That is about as far as I can take  
20 it.

21 A VOICE: So your studies were  
22 completely independent of the Navy study  
23 and the other study?

24 MR. COLTER: Yes.

25 MR. BARNES: They were

1  
2 independent, but they were coordinated by  
3 the State of New York Department of  
4 Environmental Conservation and the  
5 Department of Health.

6 During these two investigations,  
7 roughly ninety to a hundred wells were  
8 installed.

9 That is in addition to maybe that  
10 many more wells which were installed by  
11 the United States Geologic Survey back in  
12 the late 1980's.

13 A number of wells that were sampled  
14 were over a hundred between the two  
15 properties.

16 A VOICE: My question is: My family  
17 and I, my sister and I, we were weaned on  
18 this water.

19 As far as myself, I don't really  
20 feel, at this point, there is much I can  
21 do, but I have young children.

22 There have been rumors around the  
23 town, I would like to know if you have any  
24 information on this, as to the surface  
25 levels that you were finding.



1  
2 Do they work their way down? I  
3 mean, historically, is that what happened  
4 with these chemicals? Are they working  
5 their way down to our water system? Have  
6 they always been there?

7 MR. COLTER: Past practices due to,  
8 you know, spills of, you know, drums,  
9 leaks and the chemicals do work their way  
10 down through the soil and get moved with  
11 the movement of the groundwater.

12 We have identified this during our  
13 investigations.

14 And, as I stated earlier, part of  
15 this remedial program is going to be  
16 working with the Bethpage Water District  
17 to ensure that the public water supplies  
18 do not distribute this type of  
19 contaminated water to the public.

20 We're going to be doing treatment on  
21 the systems. Grumman is also going to be  
22 doing treatment on the Water District  
23 wells.

24 We're in consultation with the  
25 District.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

We had a meeting with them this morning to talk about some details.

So, you're right, chemicals do work their way down.

They do get into the groundwater. They move with the groundwater, but they are not coming to your tap.

MR. VICKERSON: Okay.

I'd like to say that this type of groundwater contamination is very, very easily removed with the agreement technologies that are currently being employed at plants 4 and 6 of the Bethpage Water District.

At no time does the water entering the distribution systems, and thus far into your taps --

At no time does that exceed the New York State drinking water standards that we have set and are, you know, the most conservative of any other state in the area.

And, as a matter of fact, the EPA has been putting us under pressure to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

lower our standards to keep us in line with the other states.

So, you know, you shouldn't be worried about drinking your water.

I would have no hesitation whatsoever of drinking this water out of the Bethpage Water District.

A VOICE: Well, there are rumors going around. I spoke to someone last week who, unfortunately, has breast cancer.

She was told by her oncologist in Garden City, when she said where she was from, he said, "Don't even wash your vegetables in that water."

And these are doctors now. And this is why we're all here tonight. We're trying to gather some facts.

We're scared. I know I'm afraid.

I have a nine-month old baby.

I don't like to give her water from the tap.

MR. VICKERSON: It is very unfortunate that a physician would be

1  
2 saying anything like that, because we've  
3 got epidemiologists -- we can fill this  
4 whole room with epidemiologists that would  
5 not, you know, that would not make that  
6 connection.

7 A VOICE: Thank you.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Wesley  
9 Williams.

10 I moved here about in '78.

11 My stepfather's wife died in '73 of  
12 cancer, breast cancer and uterus cancer.  
13 And it seems strange that ten years later,  
14 my mother develops the same thing. But,  
15 thank God, she didn't died.

16 And it's not in our water? How can  
17 you say that when everybody else is dying  
18 from cancer?

19 How can you say that? Because you  
20 don't live here. That's why.

21 MR. VICKERSON: All I can say is I  
22 can't answer any specific question about  
23 cancer.

24 All I can say is the Bethpage Water  
25 District, you know, periodic monitoring,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

has shown that no chemicals are reaching  
your taps.

A VOICE: Now it's not. What about  
ten years ago?

MR. VICKERSON: I can't address  
what it was in the past because  
analytical procedures were a lot different  
back then.

A VOICE: Is there somebody here  
from the Water District here tonight?

A VOICE: Yes. I'll speak when  
everybody is done.

MR. PASQUALE: Peter Pasquale,  
Bethpage.

You say there are two different  
amounts of financing, one for a good job  
and one for the best job.

Have you determined from your  
studies now of the amount of work that  
would have to be done and what the job  
cost for the job you're recommending  
versus the job that would clean up the  
whole thing and leave us without any other  
worries?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Do you have any determination of what them two costs would be?

MR. COLTER: Yes, sir.

MR. PASQUALE: You do have?

MR. COLTER: Yes, sir.

A VOICE: F-14's cost about \$25 million. How many \$25 million jobs do we need?

MR. COLTER: To clean up everything?

MR. PASQUALE: To do everything with the grade A job, get rid of it and gone.

MR. COLTER: Roughly four to five.

MR. PASQUALE: Four to five F-14's. You're talking about a hundred million dollars to do the job right, versus \$40 million to do a level job for just industrial plant site.

Now, that's not acceptable for this community as far as I'm concerned.

We should go for the best job for the people that are here and the people that have been dying here that we know about as community citizens.

And I think that everybody here is

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

responsible for trying to do that job the right way.

Thank you.

MR. COLTER: Okay.

We're here to entertain your comments such as that.

If this community thinks that what the Navy is doing is not appropriate, we will, you know, we will listen to your concerns.

If you think we need to spend a hundred million dollars in this community alone to do that, we can talk about that.

A VOICE: We just did. We are telling you you should spend a hundred million dollars.

MR. COLTER: Bear in mind, sir, that the Department of the Navy is not only looking at the Bethpage community, but several other local communities in the whole northeast region of the United States.

The money we're planning on spending

1

here is going to address 95 percent of the  
contaminants in the soil

2

3

4

If it comes down to spending a  
hundred million dollars to get the extra  
five percent, and that's roughly the  
comparison we're talking about, Congress  
will not let the Department of Navy do  
that.

5

6

7

8

9

10

They will want to spend another \$40  
million on 95 percent at another local  
community, because what we're talking  
about leaving in place is not going to  
pose any risk to anybody.

11

12

13

14

15

A VOICE: Then what you're saying  
is, what we're doing is -- talking about,  
you can't do nothing about.

16

17

18

It's like trying to slap yourself in  
the ass. It's not going to work.

19

20

We're just talking about it but  
you're not going to spend the money. So  
why are we here for?

21

22

23

MR. COLTER: Somebody mentioned  
writing your local congressman.

24

25

If you can get him on board to have



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

him appropriate more money for this area, I would be more than willing to spend it.

A VOICE: How much more money would it cost to bring it up to a residential usage?

Is that a hundred million dollars?

MR. COLTER: Yes.

All the alternatives are in the feasibility study in the library.

Bottom line, dollars are in there.

A VOICE: On a deed restrict, any piece of property that is known as having soil problems is worthless.

MR. COLTER: At that point, if the Navy turned the lane over to the local community, we will work with the local town planners and town authorities to determine -- we'll let the town tell us.

A VOICE: Any construction that is going to have to go on, they're just passing the buck to whoever is going to own the property in ten years or twenty years.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

You guys are out of here.

MR. COLTER: Again, I can just say we're going to work with the town planners. If we need to do more environmental work for the purpose of the land, we will do that.

A VOICE: What type of company is going to come onto 600, 800 acres to something like Roosevelt Raceway?

MR. COLTER: I cannot answer that. Judith would like to.

MS. HARE: I have a comment.

MR. COLTER: Sure.

Go ahead.

MS. HARE: When special legislation was passed recently, which now allows the Secretary of the Navy to convey the property at Calverton to the local community, the Town of Riverhead, I believe the Town of Riverhead actually is looking at a lot of various interested parties that may want to utilize that property.

Now, obviously, at any of our

1  
2 properties, the Navy is going to continue  
3 to perform clean-up activities.

4 And there have been some discussions  
5 of conditional conveyances that can be  
6 made so that the Town of Riverhead can  
7 proceed with their plans once our  
8 contractor has cleared that property and  
9 it has been ready to be conveyed.

10 So I think that there are lots of  
11 possible interest levels, from industry  
12 standpoint, with these properties.

13 I think it just -- there may be a  
14 concern out there that I'm hearing, that  
15 that there would not be. And I think  
16 already on Long Island there is evidence  
17 that there is interest, at least on that  
18 end of Long Island.

19 A VOICE: What is the shape of  
20 Calverton compared to Bethpage as far as  
21 the toxic contamination?

22 MS. HARE: I can't really --

23 A VOICE: Is it similar?

24 A VOICE: There is none. Zero.

25 MR. COLTER: At this point, we are

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

currently conducting initial investigations at Calverton.

We are much farther in the process at the Bethpage facility than we are at Calverton.

We do have contamination at Calverton. And the Navy, as with Bethpage, will address it.

A VOICE: When he is saying there is no contamination on the Calverton being conveyed, the only thing you're selling out there is clean property to begin with.

MR. COLTER: At Calverton.

A VOICE: I'm familiar with the legislation and the conveyance.

MR. COLTER: Yes, sir.

A VOICE: Brian Mickey.

This is a question to the Grumman lawyer: Are there any other toxic sites?

We're just talking about a hundred acres of a 600-acre area of industrial area.

Are there any other toxic areas in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the other 500 acres that we have to be concerned about also?

There are other surrounding neighborhoods.

We're just talking about one area in the middle of that whole bunch there.

A major cleanup there for residential in the middle of all the other garbage.

What do you do then? Is there any other toxic sites?

MR. BARNES: Okay.

In the repository over at the Bethpage Library, there is a proposed remedial action plan which the State of New York issued for the Grumman site.

There are two plant sites on that 500 acres which we identified as source area where we are still doing some investigation.

At the known source area, which is known as plant 2, a soil vapor extraction system has been designed and construction is nearly complete.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

That should go on line very shortly.

We're still investigating the plant 15, which is just a little bit to the north and west of the Navy facility.

A VOICE: I worked for Grumman for eight years prior to this. And there were other basins and other garbage that stuff was flowing into constantly.

I worked in the transportation end. And I carried barrels into the backyard.

Before concrete was poured there, there was chemical milling and dicing in about a hundred yards from 11th Street.

There is a lot of other places that I remember bringing stuff to that was possibly toxic at the time.

I was a young man at the time.

We weren't told anything back then anyway. But I'm sure there are other areas. There are basins along Harrison Avenue that I remember being filled with garbage looking water for years.

I don't know if the ducks survived there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. BARNES: Actually the geese are doing quite well there.

After the meeting, I would like to talk about your comment about the basins.

Based on the information that we have from the recharge basins, not only on the Navy property, but on the Grumman property, getting this information, these basins are no longer source areas.

They may have been source areas in the past. But due to the constant flushing and over the last two years Grumman has set surface water and groundwater discharge standards which are promulgated by the Department.

Those basins are no longer source areas.

And in the Department of -- in the opinion of the Department, in the past it may have been different -- in the present, they are not source areas.

A VOICE: It was an industrial area for over 60 years. The community park was built on toxic dump. Nobody knew

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

anything, just built a community park over that area.

There's got to be 60 years of industry. There has to be a lot of chemical plants. I don't think you could ever clean it up for residential.

MR. BRAYACK: There may have been sources in the past that the, just nothing, residual in the soils. That is possible. As we see it right now, I think we have identified the source areas that exist presently in the site for the areas that were historical source areas. The contamination in the groundwater, we will be dealing with that through this groundwater feasibility study. But it's almost impossible to backtrack to where some of that contamination may have come from.

Yes, sir?

A VOICE: In the last meeting, we had in the deed restrictions -- didn't come up concerning the Grumman site -- but with the vapor extraction you're doing at



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

some of those locations, would that leave those sites that you're cleaning up with the residential usage or would they be restricted to commercial usage only?

MR. BARNES: The cleanup goals that are used are for residential or industrial use.

However, the contamination that we're talking about, generally from five feet, I think in the shallow contamination is about five feet at plant 2, and I'm not sure that if we turn this over to residential use, that those contaminants -- in fact, I think they'll be gone. But if there is any residual, I don't think people will come into contact with it.

A VOICE: How much acreage is concerned on the Grumman end of the contaminated area? Do you know off the top of your head?

MR. BARNES: It is measured in tens of square feet.

A VOICE: I would just like to get

1  
2 an idea of the scope of the property. Out  
3 of the total of 600 acres, are we going to  
4 be locked out for residential use later  
5 on?

6 MR. BARNES: Less than a quarter of  
7 an acre.

8 MR. COLTER: Yes, ma'am?

9 A VOICE: Thank you.

10 What kind of notice was given for  
11 this meeting? I came late. You might  
12 have addressed the question already.

13 MR. COLTER: What we did for this  
14 meeting was roughly accept, first, the  
15 proposed plan.

16 If you came late, we ran out of  
17 copies.

18 If you see me after the meeting --  
19 this goes for everybody -- we have index  
20 cards out on the table.

21 If you give me your name and  
22 address, I'll make sure that one gets  
23 mailed to you.

24 To get back to your question: We  
25 put the proposed plan in the Bethpage

1  
2 Public Library on November 1st. That  
3 officially started the public comment  
4 period.

5 We then put a notice in the Bethpage  
6 Tribune, which is I believe a weekly  
7 paper.

8 That notice should have been in  
9 Monday's paper.

10 We also put in Newsday, which is a  
11 daily paper, in the public information  
12 section, a notice that the public meeting  
13 will be held.

14 We also put out a fact sheet.

15 On top of the fact sheet, which  
16 was a public meeting invitation,  
17 basically the Navy has roughly three to  
18 four hundred persons currently on our  
19 mailing list.

20 Again, those of you who did not get  
21 a direct mailing, if you signed up, you'll  
22 be added to our mailing list for future  
23 fact sheets.

24 But we did send out basically a  
25 summary of the prap in a three- to four-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

page fact sheet that was mailed to roughly 300 to 400 people in the area.

A VOICE: Where did you get that mailing list? Where did the three to four hundred names come from?

MR. COLTER: We generated it from basically going around to the communities, taking addresses.

There were also Hooker. EPA sponsored one. We also got the Grumman, the State one, three weeks ago. We got that mailing list and basically canvassed the area.

A VOICE: Was there any direct mailing done to our local public officials?

MR. COLTER: I believe so, yes.

A VOICE: So you're telling me that they were notified?

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A VOICE: Anyone that was involved in this area?

MR. COLTER: I believe so.

Yes, sir?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A VOICE: I have a question.

You say you're going to remove the soil from this area. Concrete pads were constructed after the contamination was taking place. How are we going to get to the soil. And if they are removed, they are going to be treated as hazardous waste or end up in somebody's driveway a few weeks later?

MR. COLTER: The soils underneath the concrete will be addressed by the vapor extraction.

Since you're dealing with below the surface, it will go under the concrete.

A VOICE: You said you're going to remove some surface soil. How much are you going to remove, an inch?

MR. COLTER: We are roughly talking about 300 cubic yards.

A VOICE: Over how many square feet?

MR. COLTER: I don't have the exact numbers.

Dave maybe has the better numbers for you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. BRAYACK: There's two removal actions. Basically, the PCB contamination, it is about 12 inches.

Okay. The area is, whatever, 12 inches thick and, offhand, it's 15 to 20 foot wide and maybe a hundred foot long.

A VOICE: Concrete pads in there.

MR. BRAYACK: Where the PCB contamination is, there is no concrete pads. There is a fence line running through, right through the middle of site 1 and that is where the --

A VOICE: The solvent --

MR. BRAYACK: The solvents will be treated by the -- you don't have to remove any concrete. If concrete has to be removed in an area, and there's one place with the arsenic in it, that's going to be treated and removed. It's possible some concrete might be picked up at sites like this. Very little material gets recycled. Everything is hauled to a hazardous waste site and disposed of at a hazardous waste site, at a landfill.

1  
2 A VOICE: The only other thing I  
3 would like to say is, you keep talking  
4 about you're going to restore this  
5 property to an industrial use, an  
6 industrial usage or industrial use  
7 construction.

8 What I want to know is, assuming  
9 that the community wanted to accept this,  
10 how do you do any industrial development  
11 without excavation? What you're telling  
12 me, you're trying to separate this  
13 property to --

14 MR. BRAYACK: The restrictions would  
15 not prevent digging in the soils. The  
16 restrictions would be there. That if you  
17 are digging in the soils, mostly the on-  
18 site workers, the construction workers  
19 typically would be forced to wear some  
20 type of respiratory protection. They  
21 would be the ones exposed.

22 A VOICE: What happens to dust?

23 MR. BRAYACK: Under most  
24 construction scenarios, we look at those  
25 scenarios, most of the exposures that

1  
2 we're talking about are a 30-year, 70-year  
3 exposure.

4 During construction practices, if  
5 there is any type of dusting whatsoever,  
6 you typically would wet it down, moisten  
7 it to keep the dust from --

8 A VOICE: Nobody wets it down.

9 MR. BRAYACK: That is not a  
10 hazardous waste site. That is the type of  
11 deed restriction we're talking here.

12 You're saying that you just can't go  
13 out and get someone who has a backhoe and  
14 a truck and go out and dig. The deed  
15 restriction would stipulate that the  
16 people doing construction here would have  
17 to have certain levels of construction  
18 when they're doing it, would have to  
19 employ certain construction practices to  
20 make sure that you don't have big dust  
21 plumes migrating off-site. That is what  
22 the -- they're not saying you should never  
23 dig here.

24 MR. COLTER: What we want to do with  
25 the deed restrictions is let Grumman know



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

where the areas are.

If they can avoid construction in that area, that is the preferred alternative.

Obviously, if they say, hey, we have to dig here because we need this building, and the deed restriction, as Dave points out, recommends the best level of protection for the worker that has to be working in there.

Yes, sir?

A VOICE: That last slide that you had up, and you took it down, can you go to that, please?

MR. BARNES: That one?

(Indicating)

A VOICE: Right along that fence line.

You're claiming that none of the PCB's have crossed that fence line?

MR. COLTER: The limit that the Navy is allowed to investigate, initially, is on our property.

If we deem it necessary to go off-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

site, if we think contamination has migrated, we will do that.

In this case, right up along the fence line, and it is in the report, there is no contamination along the fence line.

However, because of the proximity of the hot spots, the PCB hot spot, which is roughly right around in here, we basically want to confirm that that dust migration hasn't migrated PCB's off-site, be it dust.

That is why we are going to be out there the next few days verifying that.

A VOICE: If you make that suitable for industrial site, and they come and dig and the workers have their protective gear, you put a big X, because that is where most of the houses are --

A VOICE: Sure.

MR. GARGIULIO: Greg Gargiulio.

I live on Sycamore, which is the corner, right there, the other corner, down.

(Indicating)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. COLTER: Right here?

(Indicating)

MR. GARGIULIO: The northeast corner, right there.

(Indicating)

So if you make that suitable for an industrial development, when they come and dig, the construction workers will have all their protective gear.

What happens to all the people who live on 11th Street when they do that?

MR. COLTER: The dust that is generated will be wet down to not allow the dust to migrate off the site.

I understand your concern.

We're going to do everything in our power to limit the dust.

MR. VICKERSON: Also, the Department of Health will institute what we call a community health and safety plan that will require dust monitoring and VOC or, you know, PCB, whatever, monitoring around the perimeter of the work zone any time that

1  
2 the dust or whatever it is they're  
3 monitoring for exceeds a certain level, a  
4 very low level, the workers are going to  
5 be required to stop working and take  
6 measures to prevent whatever that is  
7 causing the dust.

8 MR. BARNES: This is routinely done  
9 at sites within New York State.

10 MR. COLTER: Yes, sir?

11 MR. BARNES: State your name,  
12 please, sir.

13 MR. PETRANO: John Petrano  
14 (phonetic). I live on 4th Street.

15 What you were just saying, I know  
16 people, they live with a geiger counter in  
17 their kitchen.

18 I don't understand what the purpose  
19 is because once that goes off, is it too  
20 late?

21 Now you're going to monitor with  
22 eleven, ten, or whatever.

23 Once you find something,  
24 you're going to tell the people to leave  
25 then?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. BARNES: Radiation is a  
different --

A VOICE: Monitor in case something  
is going to happen, right?

MR. BARNES: It is measured as a  
safety precaution for the community.

A VOICE: What happens when you find  
something?

MR. BARNES: First of all, we'll set  
the levels as low as we can so that, let's  
say that, just to throw out a number, that  
one part per million at the property line  
is a concern. We would then set the level  
of the property at .2 and .1.

A VOICE: What is the next step, to  
evacuate the area?

MR. BARNES: Just stop work, make  
the corrective measures and probably  
wouldn't be a need to evacuate.

However, if that is necessary, we  
have a site up in Millerton, just east of  
Poughkeepsie, where we have an evacuation  
plan, if we need to do that. If that is  
what you want, we can do that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. COLTER: I don't think  
evacuation is going to be necessary.  
We're not talking about a major Three Mile  
Island type of deal here.

A VOICE: I don't mean that.

Once something is found out, it is  
usually too late.

MR. COLTER: There will be ample  
warnings for us to take the measures so we  
don't have to evacuate.

A VOICE: Clarify for me who does  
Judy work for?

MR. COLTER: The Naval Air Systems  
Command. They're a Washington-based Naval  
Command. They're actually the owners of  
the hundred-acre property that we're  
talking about tonight.

A VOICE: And Judith stated -- and  
you can correct me if you look in the  
paperwork over there -- but she said full  
remediation, in the beginning of the  
meeting, in her opening statement.

That has changed a lot in the last  
hour.

1  
2 I mean, if you guys want to look it  
3 up, I'm sure that is what she did say.

4 MS. HARE: Maybe I should clarify.

5 The Navy is interested in full  
6 remediation of the plan at the present  
7 time. And I think that plan, Jim has  
8 fully disclosed to you this evening.

9 A VOICE: But according to Jim --

10 A VOICE: Seventy-five dollar wax  
11 job or a hundred?

12 A VOICE: You didn't explain to us  
13 which way you're going to go, spread  
14 between 125 million and a hundred million.  
15 Are we getting the \$25 million package or  
16 the hundred dollar package. That is what  
17 we want to know.

18 Full remediation?

19 MR. COLTER: Full remediation is the  
20 plan that we have.

21 A VOICE: To implement the plan?

22 MS. HARE: Yes.

23 MR. COLTER: To implement the plan.

24 Again, it goes back to the --

25 A VOICE: That was misleading.

1  
2 One other question. The Department  
3 of Health, what do you guys base or what  
4 studies have you done to decide the  
5 numbered street area I would like, let's  
6 say, is the closest area does not have a  
7 higher, I guess, cancer rate. I guess,  
8 listening to what's going on here, I have  
9 lived in Bethpage all my life. By the  
10 way, I lived here when I was growing up on  
11 a block that has eight houses on it,  
12 including myself, two younger people.  
13 This was around '74, '75, developed  
14 Hodgkin's disease. That is within a 300-  
15 foot area.

16 Now I'm hearing all this stuff  
17 here. It is very hard for me to believe  
18 that that doesn't prompt a study of some  
19 sort.

20 MR. VICKERSON: The only thing we  
21 have to go by is the environmental  
22 indicators.

23 We look in the environmental data to  
24 determine whether any exposures are  
25 occurring off-site.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A VOICE: What is the data? What are you using?

MR. VICKERSON: The results of the remedial and phase 1 and phase 2.

A VOICE: Nothing like a house-to-house question?

MR. VICKERSON: That is not the way we operate.

MR. DUNLEAVY: My name is Jack Dunleavy. I'm with the Navy. And the National Institution is doing a four-year study to look at breast cancer.

I don't know if they're looking at other cancers. But it is a pretty comprehensive study.

I've been in communication with them. And I have a point of contact, if you would like to contact them.

A VOICE: I don't want to belittle that study at all. But I don't think that I guess contaminants that are here are just -- how do you say -- confined to breast cancer. We're talking about leukemia, heavy metals, lung cancer,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Hodgkin's, brain cancer, breast, uterus,  
uterine cancer.

MR. VICKERSON: I can't answer  
specific questions about that. See me  
afterwards. We can get you in touch.

A VOICE: I still don't understand  
what you buys base your statement on that  
this area is not any higher than any  
other.

MR. VICKERSON: If people are being  
exposed, we would ask the cancer --

A VOICE: Isn't this why this is a  
class 2A site, because it is an  
environmental hazard 2 site?

I'm not sure. I'm not looking for  
an actual definition. I mean just for  
this to be happening.

MR. BARNES: The reason it is a  
class 2 site, there is a potential for  
exposures to occur.

A VOICE: Earlier you said that you  
couldn't tell. I guess what had happened  
ten years ago or prior to ten years ago,  
you were really not sure if it did get

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

into the water. You guys did put in wells because something was found in the water, correct?

MR. VICKERSON: Correct.

A VOICE: Okay. Good.

So I mean, ten years ago or more, these people were drinking something, I don't know why that's prompt a study.

MR. COLTER: I believe, though, that the Bethpage Water District is throughout -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- but it is throughout its supply of public water, was not supplying any type of adverse contaminated water.

A VOICE: After all the regularly things were put in.

MR. VICKERSON: Even before. They were still monitoring on a regular basis.

A VOICE: But you caught something, didn't you? I mean, I don't know.

MR. COLTER: Maybe you have to ask the Water District.

A VOICE: Okay.

So the Department of Health still

1  
2 feels that there is no reason or there is  
3 no --

4 MR. VICKERSON: No.

5 A VOICE: Before the man from the  
6 Water District speaks, it was just brought  
7 to my attention, I was thinking about this  
8 too, all the construction has been going  
9 on about ten years when Hendrickson  
10 Brothers dug up all our streets, ten,  
11 fifteen feet with those big dams. Those  
12 guys were deep. And they were all around  
13 my back street. And they stored all --  
14 knocked the fences down. And what about  
15 that? I mean, that's got to be something.  
16 I don't think any of you can drop a dime  
17 on that.

18 MR. COLTER: Construction in your  
19 neighborhood, we can' control. We don't  
20 know about it.

21 A VOICE: Why weren't they warned,  
22 told? Maybe they shouldn't be digging  
23 here.

24 MR. COLTER: Five years ago, we got  
25 the appropriation from Congress. Now we

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

know about the environmental laws to start this investigation.

We basically started the investigation five years ago. We didn't have any idea that there may or may not be a problem in the local community back then.

A VOICE: They started digging again last summer.

A VOICE: I was here at the last meeting. They knew 20 years ago there was a problem.

A VOICE: I live between 10th and 11th on Maple.

They were done with my street last year. So two years ago --

A VOICE: Three years.

A VOICE: Three years ago, this was going on.

They were digging down deep. Sometimes they go down 15 feet.

You're talking about -- if you can't say when or where they are contaminated, then half those guys are probably going to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

croak down there, too. They shouldn't be in there. You're shaking your head. You're not in there.

A VOICE: You don't live there either.

A VOICE: These guys are down there. I'm not the one in there.

MR. VICKERSON: We show you tonight that the contamination is on the Navy site itself.

A VOICE: You're talking about the fence.

MR. COLTER: Let me clarify.

MR. VICKERSON: I don't know what you're talking about.

MR. COLTER: The investigation that we did, the results that we have, do not indicate any off-site contamination. Okay.

A VOICE: Did you test it?

MR. COLTER: I'm going to tomorrow. I want to get to that as soon as the questions and answers are all done.

Just bear with us.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

You want to do it now?

A VOICE: Tell us now.

MR. SABINO: Is there anyone here from Harrison Avenue?

This is meeting number 6 for me. My name is Anthony Sabino. I represent the Bethpage Water District.

And some of you are here for your first meeting. I go back with this since before the first meeting in 1990.

When I first met John Barnes in 1990, he got lost coming to Nassau County.

He has since been able to find Nassau County quite well. And he has been very responsive to some of the concerns of the Bethpage Water District.

We started looking into a lot of the problems that you raised in 1986, when we had a well that was closed due to contamination.

Now, the Bethpage Water District has never put into its system contaminated water.

When Grumman closed its well sites

1  
2 in 1976, I believe they closed them  
3 because the water on the Grumman site was  
4 so bad people were actually getting  
5 nauseous from the smell of the water  
6 coming out of the drinking fountains,  
7 toilet waters, faucets and so on, because,  
8 at that time, the County of Nassau really  
9 got involved more so than the County of  
10 New York.

11 The Bethpage Water District  
12 immediately closed any well site that we  
13 thought could be affected by this type of  
14 contamination.

15 At that time, the drinking water  
16 level was 100 parts per billion. We never  
17 exceeded that amount, but nor could you  
18 even test to the levels that we test to  
19 today.

20 So what we did in '76 was take the  
21 well off-line. So no one in Bethpage got  
22 water through the distribution system that  
23 was contaminated.

24 That well stayed closed until 1990,  
25 approximately, but the District, because



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

it needed additional supply capacity,  
began to design a stripping tower,  
completely independent of all of these  
gentlemen that you heard tonight,  
completely independent of all of these  
studies that have gone on.

We didn't know who caused the  
problem, nor did we care. All we knew is  
that we had a well site that cost roughly  
a million dollars that we couldn't use and  
the Bethpage District needed the water.

So we began a study and plans to put  
that well back on line to remove 100  
percent of the contamination, not just a  
little bit, not to industrial use, but so  
we could break it, zero contamination.

When we say "zero," in this  
framework, what we mean is below any  
detectable level. That is what zero  
means. No one knows what zero is when you  
test the chemicals.

All we know is we can't detect any  
level in the sample of water that we're  
testing.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

So that is the level to which the Bethpage Water District treats the water to supply to the Bethpage Water District consumers.

The water in the Bethpage District usually exceeds the water given to the consumers of a majority of the districts on the Island.

Now, another thing that you have to understand about water, is you heard many concepts tonight about soils, vegetables, property values, tax bases. And you're hearing it for the first time.

I have been living with it for almost eight years now.

The water that is at the surface, the top of the water table is not the water that is pumped into the distribution system by the Bethpage Water District.

Our wells start at approximately 500 feet and go down to 700 feet.

You're hearing about contamination tonight that is 50 feet deep, a hundred feet deep.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

There is some contamination on the Grumman site and that does go down into the deeper levels.

However, the well sites of the Bethpage Water District are not even in the part of the water table that is affected by what you're hearing tonight.

So although it frightens you to hear about water contamination, that is not where the pumping wells are that serve you or supply you with your water.

Now, on the southern areas where we have put treatment on, there is every -- that you heard about tonight is going to approach those wells, affect those wells and have to be removed from those wells. That is why Grumman and the Navy are doing what they are doing finally to assist, to remove the contamination.

To this day, no one in this room has drunk water from the Bethpage Water District that has had levels that exceed State limits but, more than that, that has had any detectable level.

1  
2 We've heard that a lot of us have  
3 lived here a long time. My mother was  
4 born here. I was born here. My children  
5 were born here, along with the  
6 commissioners of the District and their  
7 children.

8 So we have an interest, an interest  
9 very similar to yours.

10 We all drink Bethpage water. It is  
11 not out of product loyalty, I can assure  
12 you of that.

13 Let's move on a little bit beyond  
14 that.

15 On Harrison Avenue, the reason I  
16 asked about that, is because four years  
17 ago the meeting surrounded the state site,  
18 the state study. And we're dealing with  
19 the Grumman property. And Harrison Avenue  
20 has recharge basins, sometimes called a  
21 southern recharge basin, of the Grumman  
22 property, right along the fence line of  
23 residential areas, actually closer than  
24 11th Street, because 11th Street, you have  
25 the fence. You have the street and you

1  
2 have the houses. On Harrison Avenue, you  
3 have the recharge area, the fence and the  
4 backyard.

5 There are gardens right along the  
6 fence line.

7 So when you want to talk about  
8 fright from growing vegetables, in what  
9 may be contaminated soil, you have either  
10 a more acute situation than what you might  
11 have in the numbered streets.

12 So what the state did as a result of  
13 people actually yelling at that meeting, a  
14 lot more vociferous than what I heard here  
15 tonight, the fence line was completely  
16 tested and the soils were found to be free  
17 of contamination.

18 And you heard John Barnes saying  
19 that not only did they test the fence  
20 line, they went into the recharge basins.

21 I personally examined those studies.  
22 These are soil studies. They had nothing  
23 to do with water.

24 Now, as near as we can tell, no  
25 contamination has gone beyond the fence

1  
2 line. Slightly different type of problem,  
3 though, than what you had in the numbered  
4 streets, because on the Grumman recharge  
5 basins, contaminated water was being put  
6 into the recharge basins and seeped into  
7 the ground.

8 You didn't have a case where the PCB  
9 transformer may have been spilled on the  
10 surface of the ground. And who knows what  
11 happened to the PCB? But these are really  
12 not airborne chemicals.

13 Now, what the Navy is going to  
14 propose for the numbered streets tonight,  
15 is to sample some of the yards, the actual  
16 yards of your houses.

17 A VOICE: How many are you planning  
18 on doing?

19 MR. COLTER: Roughly twelve.

20 A VOICE: All right.

21 MR. COLTER: Immediately adjacent to  
22 the Navy's property.

23 A VOICE: Let's start with twelve.  
24 Let's start immediately adjacent and see  
25 what they find.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

What is your timetable on results?

MR. COLTER: Results will be available in roughly one to two months.

What we'll do, is make them available to the individual property owners.

We also have a public dissemination regulation. We have to meet. So we have to put this report basically together, and put it out for public information, public comment or public availability at the Bethpage Library.

That report will not have any house numbers, street addresses or property names.

MR. SABINO: Would you see that I get a copy of that report?

MR. COLTER: Sure.

MR. SABINO: And what the Water District will do, is have our engineers and environmental experts take a look at those results to see what they show.

We will do assessment for the residents in that area with our technical

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

people to make sure the results are not --  
do not indicate harmful contaminant levels  
on anyone's property.

There's a --

You hear people say harmful  
contaminant levels, levels that exceed  
drinking water standards.

There is only one level that is  
acceptable to the people in this room, and  
that level is zero.

So if these studies show anything,  
I'm not going to have our engineer give  
the homeowners a report that says, well,  
there are levels, but they are deemed to  
be not harmful.

Who the hell is an engineer to tell  
a homeowner that the contamination on his  
property is not harmful.

We'll tell you exactly what the  
results show in English. That is again  
part of the problem at all of these  
meetings.

The technical people speak in  
alphabetical terminology of TCE, VOC's,



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PRP, praps, rods, all of these types of terminology that none of us use in our daily language.

We'll interpret that for you, as we have been doing for the last four years since these meetings have been taking place, just as we did for the people on Harrison Avenue.

Also, as a result of some of the meetings, the wells were dug off the Grumman property to determine what has been in the water supply -- not in the water supply -- in the water table.

And those studies and those results are part of the proceedings that you're hearing tonight and you've only heard part of it.

So after this meeting tonight, I would appreciate it if property owners would see Jim Colter to make sure he gets enough addresses. If you don't get your twelve, please let me know and I will volunteer people that I know in the numbered streets to make up the full

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

complement of twelve.

I think there are enough interested people in the room tonight, close enough to the fence line that he should be able to get the number of samples, you know, if they're willing, to do twelve samples.

I want eleven.

The next thing is with respect to property values and tax base, the Grumman -- the Navy property is currently not on your Bethpage tax base. It is not assessed. It's federally owned property and it is not in our tax base today. So anything that occurs with this property in the future can only help the tax base, because it's zero today.

With respect to the ability to develop, there is a very beginning initiation of contact with Peter King to have him introduce legislation very similar to what Hooker Ruco did for the Navy out in Calverton, where a local municipality -- more likely than not it would be the Town of Oyster Bay -- like

1  
2 the Town of Riverhead, took the lead in  
3 the Calverton property to take title to  
4 the Grumman property.

5 Now, I'll tell you that and stop  
6 there, because the contact with Peter King  
7 has not even been made yet. It has been  
8 discussed in only very peripheral terms.  
9 And it is because of these discussions  
10 that I'm aware of what the Navy did out in  
11 Riverhead.

12 The Navy Calverton site has  
13 contamination on the site.

14 Calverton is how many acres? I  
15 think it is over a thousand, isn't it? It  
16 is larger than the facility than we have  
17 here in Bethpage, maybe in Grumman  
18 combined.

19 Art, do you know what the size of  
20 Calverton is?

21 A VOICE: Three thousand.

22 MR. SABINO: Three thousand acres,  
23 600 acres that we're dealing with,  
24 Bethpage on the Calverton site, there is  
25 some contamination. I have been led to

1  
2 believe by Hooker Ruco's office that none  
3 of the land could be conveyed to Riverhead  
4 has contamination on that very piece of  
5 property.

6 With respect to a deed restriction,  
7 the deed restriction in this case is more  
8 of a notice to a potential and future  
9 property owner than it is an actual  
10 restriction.

11 The property is tied up. And, as  
12 you heard the gentleman say, it restricts  
13 certain construction and activities. It  
14 restricts what can be done on the surface  
15 of the ground.

16 However, right now, Grumman has  
17 already had three sites delisted.

18 A VOICE: Six.

19 MR. SABINO: Six parcels of property  
20 delisted by use of other companies for  
21 various purposes, senior citizens homes.  
22 The Robert Plan site is delisted, probably  
23 a piece of property purchased by the fire  
24 department on that site that's been  
25 delisted and others.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The Forest Lab site, which was a company that wanted to move into Grumman, also had its site delisted.

So just as Grumman gets sites delisted, the deed restrictions on the Navy parcel can also be dealt with.

What it is intended to be is a restriction to stop people from moving on that property now or without taking the proper precautions to develop it or to do anything else with the property.

So is it a temporary measure? It can be. But it can be dealt with.

And if the Town of Oyster Bay gets its hands on the property, it will be dealt with.

Let me quickly address the levels of clean-up. Right now, the site is zoned by the Town of Oyster Bay as industrial. That is the zoning.

It would almost be illegal to ask a property owner to clean the site to a residential level, when it's not zoned for residents. It's zoned industrial.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

So a property -- if I was -- if you were the property owner or if I was the property owner, and I could only use it for industry, that is the level of clean-up I would demand.

Now, I can also tell you that in the letters that will be going to Peter King, the Town of Oyster Bay is going to ask for a higher level of clean-up.

Whether or not that gets anywhere with the Navy, no one in this room can even speculate on that tonight.

And I have been led to believe that Peter King is going to use his offices to do whatever the political people do to assist this community to get the property cleaned up to the standards that we all expect, not what these people expect, not what I expect, but what the community expects. And if that means to the residential level of safety, and that is really what you're talking about, that's what he will ask for.

But he may say to the Town of Oyster

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Bay, why are we cleaning this up to a residential level, if it can't be used for residents?

Now, in conjunction with that 80 acres roughly of the Grumman property is considered for residential use, not just 12 acres that is presently in contract for senior citizens complex, but an additional 68 acres.

That means the Grumman property on those 80 acres has to be cleaned up to a residential level of safety.

I almost hate to mention this word in this room, but right now at the Love Canal site, there are residential properties, new residential properties that have been constructed on the site because the level of clean-up done by Union Carbide or Occidental, whoever owned it, was done to support residential homes.

The idea of what we're talking about, residential versus industrial, is a level of safety. And because people live on the site, that has to carry with it the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

highest level of safety.

So that the difference you're talking about is what a \$10 wax job or a \$25 wax job may be. But when this job is done, the community should have a piece of property that it can use.

But I don't believe the Navy is going to clean it up to a residential level, if there are never going to be residences on it.

A number of methods of construction can be used on the site to make it productive.

But I think it's going to take more than Grumman and more than the Navy to get to that point.

Fortunately or unfortunately for all of us, the Town of Oyster Bay, as the zoning authority in this area, is going to have to get involved to zone it for particular uses that a buyer, be it a residential developer, an office complex developer or an industrial complex developer, which I think most of us know



1  
2 is not reality today, the Town of Oyster  
3 Bay is going to change the zoning on that  
4 property to support that type of  
5 development.

6 And based on what I know of the  
7 contamination on the site, the largest  
8 portion of the 600 acres -- and I don't  
9 want to throw out an acreage number -- but  
10 the largest percentage of it -- and I'm  
11 talking upwards of 90 percent -- will be  
12 available for some type of development.

13 Lastly, let me go back to water.

14 I am also a member of the One and  
15 Nine Committee. And anybody who knows  
16 anything about breast cancer knows that  
17 that is one of the leading committees on  
18 the Island that is a proponent of the  
19 breast cancer problem, and the breast  
20 cancer studies on the Island.

21 The State of New York has already  
22 done a study with respect to breast cancer  
23 and water.

24 It sounds like a commercial for me  
25 to say as a representative of the Water

1  
2 District, but the study is totally  
3 inconclusive with respect to a linkage  
4 between breast cancer and water.

5 And that is the study that came out  
6 about two years ago, where they think it  
7 is a condition in diet.

8 If you were at the very last  
9 meeting, you heard me say that I contacted  
10 Grumman, years ago, to find out if their  
11 workers had any ill health effects as a  
12 result of working on the site where all  
13 these contaminants is.

14 I know I represented Bethpage for  
15 roughly 16 years now and in other water  
16 districts prior to that. So I know what  
17 the level of purity for the Bethpage Water  
18 District is for quite a while.

19 So I was trying to find out what  
20 would be the pathways for contaminants to  
21 get to the residents of this community.  
22 And I determined that the very best way to  
23 look for that would be among Grumman's  
24 employees.

25 They wash their hands in it. They

1  
2 drink the water from shallow wells, not  
3 the wells that we supply water from. They  
4 actually -- the fellows who wipe the  
5 grease off these machines with these  
6 chemicals dipped it in a rag, wiped it on  
7 the machine and they had direct contact  
8 and exposures.

9 Grumman tells me that the employees  
10 showed no inordinately high ill health  
11 effects. But since our last meeting, when  
12 I heard what you heard tonight and what I  
13 heard last week, a lot of people came up  
14 to me after that meeting and told me there  
15 is a high incidence of cancer in their  
16 families and in their neighborhood. Right  
17 now on my desk is a letter to Tim  
18 Vickerson -- if I had known he would have  
19 been here tonight, I would have brought it  
20 with me -- where I am asking on behalf of  
21 the residents of Bethpage as a resident --  
22 not as a resident of the Water District --  
23 to begin the planning process for a more  
24 vigorous and thorough health study of  
25 people in this area.

1  
2 As I mentioned last week, I  
3 contacted Mid-Island Hospital and the  
4 Nassau County Medical Center and various  
5 cancer registries to try and determine if  
6 Bethpage people showed up more than other  
7 communities. And the answer, at that  
8 time, was that it did not show up.

9 But, based on what I have heard  
10 tonight, and I think what the  
11 representatives of the state have heard,  
12 we probably can't ignore the problem.

13 Now, I said ignore the problem. If  
14 you walk into any community on Long  
15 Island, next Tuesday night I'll be in Glen  
16 Cove dealing with an incinerator problem  
17 there with the Town of Oyster Bay. I was  
18 involved in all of Oyster Bay's landfill  
19 contamination problems and I attended  
20 numerous meetings like this.

21 Every single meeting, you hear the  
22 same refrain with respect to cancer: My  
23 neighbor has it. My grandmother had it.  
24 My uncle had it.

25 So you almost tend to get callous.

1  
2                   However, based on where we live, I  
3 am personally asking the state to start  
4 the planning process for a health survey  
5 of this area.

6                   I am turning over to them the  
7 letters that Grumman sent me years ago,  
8 based on the request that I made. And I'm  
9 going to ask the state to ask Grumman for  
10 that same type of follow-up.

11                   I think it might be time to look at  
12 Grumman's health records.

13                   Now, as some of you know, especially  
14 some of you know who have worked for  
15 Grumman, Grumman has its own internal  
16 medical staff. All of the employees are  
17 covered by Travelers Health Insurance  
18 Plan. And they process all of the claims.  
19 So you should have a real good database at  
20 that location.

21                   Art is the one who sent me the  
22 letter which says Grumman has studied that  
23 data. And it shows no unusual high or --  
24 let's not say unusually high -- no unusual  
25 incidents of any type of health problem

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

among its workers.

Well, Art, I hate to say it, I think the state is going to have to be involved. I think you heard it from the people in the room tonight that that becomes necessary.

The study that Mr. Dunleavy mentioned is a study that the federal government has just decided, within the last several months, to undertake to study breast cancer on all of Long Island. So it's really not going to impact very much what we discussed here tonight.

I can tell you, though, that the type of chemicals that we're talking about don't or haven't been linked to breast cancer. They are linked to other types of cancers.

And all of the chemicals that we're talking about are linked to different types of cancers.

However, what we may have going on here is a soup of chemicals where it is going to be very difficult to say, well,

1  
2 PCE doesn't cause breast cancer. It  
3 causes liver cancer. PCB's doesn't  
4 cause -- they cause Hodgkin's disease.  
5 There are studies which determine which  
6 type of chemicals cause certain types of  
7 cancer. And they are, with reasonable  
8 certainty, able to eliminate certain  
9 chemicals with certain types of cancer.

10 And with respect to what is in the  
11 groundwater, it's largely TCE,  
12 trichloroethylene. There is absolutely  
13 positively no link in any study anywhere  
14 done by the County, the state or the  
15 federal government, linking that  
16 particular chemical to breast cancer.

17 Can I say it any different than  
18 that?

19 I'm not telling you that to reassure  
20 you because I represent the Water  
21 District. I'm telling you that I have a  
22 wife and I have a daughter and I'm  
23 concerned about the same things you're  
24 concerned about.

25 I wouldn't be human if I wasn't.

1  
2           So I wrote to Washington to get the  
3 test results of the studies on TCE and I  
4 only use that chemical because that is  
5 what is in the water supply. And there is  
6 no link in any of those studies to breast  
7 cancer.

8           On December 5th I will be at Post  
9 College attending another One in Nine  
10 meeting on breast cancer on Long Island.  
11 I have been to every one they have for the  
12 last four years since this problem has  
13 surfaced.

14           I don't believe there is a person in  
15 this room that has studied it more than I  
16 have. And that includes Mr. Vickerson  
17 from the State of New York.

18           I'm not here to assure you. I'm  
19 looking at the problem as an attorney for  
20 the district and as a resident of this  
21 community and as a husband and as a father  
22 of a daughter.

23           I'm interested in it just as you  
24 are.

25           Cancer statistics show that cancer



1  
2 is going to touch one out of every three  
3 families by the end of this decade. Now,  
4 what the heck is causing that? Is it the  
5 PCB on the Grumman site?

6 I'm sorry for taking up so much of  
7 their time.

8 Now, I heard a lot of comments.  
9 Somebody mentioned gasoline from the  
10 airplanes being dumped on the runway.  
11 Very simple problem. Gasoline floats  
12 along the -- not like these other  
13 chemicals that we talked about that  
14 actually sink in and disseminate and  
15 dilute itself in the water table.

16 Gasoline floats on top.

17 The initial wells dug by the County  
18 of Nassau, long before any of these  
19 studies commenced, sampled the shallow  
20 wells only. No gasoline and oil  
21 byproducts were found in this particular  
22 area, other than as a result of being  
23 downgrading of a gas station.

24 So we're reasonably certain that no  
25 gasoline or oil is coming off the Grumman

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

site, reasonably certain, because it doesn't appear in any test data.

Somebody asked how many wells were dug.

And John Barnes mentioned the hundred that he knows of.

I know of many, many more than that, because USGS and the County of Nassau have a well-drilling program in this area for approximately the last ten years.

And the wells are here by the hundreds.

If you go to the library and look at the data, you will see little black dots with numbers that correspond to these wells.

The Bethpage Water District has looked at the test results of almost every single well that could possibly affect our distribution system and our supply wells, not the hundred Mr. Barnes is talking about, every single one.

I personally have examined every single one.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Since I have been involved in this, I have learned the chemical compounds that we're talking about.

I know their symbols. I know their dangers.

I know their characteristics, let's say within reason. I'm not a scientist by any means, but I know what I'm looking for.

And, more importantly, John Molloy from H2M, who is an engineer, who is a scientist, has environmental people on his staff that are organic chemists and who know exactly what to look for.

They also, on behalf of the Water District, have examined the same test data.

As a result of those examinations, we pushed John Barnes. We helped him find Nassau County. And we told him what we wanted him to do on Harrison Avenue. And where we wanted him to dig off-site wells and you know something, they did it.

They yelled and screamed. They were

1  
2 very upset at me at the first meeting, to  
3 actually screaming at them, and  
4 representatives of Grumman saw -- they  
5 like to do their studies on their  
6 property, just as you heard the Navy said  
7 we're limited to our property and we're  
8 limited to now go across the street.

9 I have no news for you. Depending  
10 on what you find, you're not going to do  
11 11th Street, you will do 10th, you'll do  
12 9th. I'm talking to him like that,  
13 because I know if we as a community make  
14 enough noise, as we did with the State of  
15 New York, that is exactly what they do.

16 If someone with knowledge looks at  
17 the data and sees the potential for a  
18 contaminant flow under your property, we  
19 are going to ask tht it be done further  
20 out.

21 Wasn't there some soil samples done  
22 from the test borings of the shallow wells  
23 you dug in the numbered streets? Didn't I  
24 see some soil samples?

25 MR. COLTER: (Shakes head)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. SABINO: Then I must be talking --

John, you tested soil samples, off-site, correct?

MR. BARNES: No, we didn't. The reason why we didn't, off-site we just sampled the groundwater. We didn't sample the soils from those borings, rationale being when we get down to depth, those areas were not areas where disposal occurred. We didn't think there would be any reason to find any contamination.

All of the soil samples I found were on-site. All were on-site.

Okay. The Navy will come off-site now and they will go as far as they have to go. But on the Grumman's property, we didn't find soil contaminations beyond the fence line. And somebody made a joke about how do contaminations know how to stop at a fence line. It depends on how the chemicals were dumped on the ground.

If I chemical was put in a recharge basin, it goes down the bottom of the

1  
2 recharge basin, is contaminated soil. But  
3 that water does not come out and defy  
4 gravity, go over the edge of the recharge  
5 basin and contaminate the soils beyond the  
6 fence line.

7 We have a similar situation on the  
8 Navy property, although I'm a little less  
9 sure about the PCB contamination, only  
10 because I think you're less sure of its  
11 origination. I think it is probably a  
12 transformer of some sort that was there or  
13 who knows. You know, transformers can  
14 explode. So who knows how it happened,  
15 how it got there. But what they call a  
16 hot spot, means they have a high level of  
17 concentration.

18 As you radiate out from that hot  
19 spot, your contaminations actually come to  
20 zero.

21 Let's see what happens when they go  
22 beyond the fence line. A copy of the data  
23 will be given to me and we'll look at it  
24 for you.

25 If anyone has a question that I

1  
2 haven't addressed -- I know I have taken  
3 up a whole lot of time -- I come to these  
4 meetings a lot of times. You may come  
5 once. I encourage you to come more often.  
6 You'll get more familiar with the terms  
7 that we use at these meetings. You'll get  
8 more familiar with what they're talking  
9 about and what I'm talking about and  
10 hopefully you'll feel a little bit safer  
11 about your drinking water and about the  
12 tomatoes and about having kids play on  
13 your lawns.

14 And now I think is the time to move  
15 forward with the health survey. I think  
16 I've personally heard enough. Hopefully,  
17 I'll be able to convince Mr. Vickerson of  
18 the State that something should be done.  
19 I don't know what he should do. He can't  
20 answer that tonight either.

21 I'll put together what I know to be  
22 necessary to have the State do this type  
23 of investigation in this community.

24 A VOICE: You were talking about on-  
25 site or off-site I guess it was, about six

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

months ago, maybe seven months ago. And I saw this wire that was going along the curb. It went down into one of the water caps that was on the street side of 11th Street.

It looks just like the mike you have in your hand. It was an extension cord coming from the cable through the fence, went all the way, 11th Street and down the water hole. What was that about?

MR. BARNES: I don't know. I have no idea.

A VOICE: Somebody at Grumman. It was three o'clock in the morning. It looked like an extension cord on the floor. I went to the hole, pulled the thing out. And it looked like a mike without any holes on it and went all the way back in the Grumman area.

There was some guy sitting there. And he had a light on.

A VOICE: Somebody should know what that is.

MR. BRAYACK: As part of the



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

remedial investigation, we conducted a pump test in the area.

A VOICE: It was on 11th Street.

MR. BRAYACK: Has a well just outside the fence, close to Sycamore.

A VOICE: It was on 11th Street, in between Maple and Sycamore. The guy I seen pulling it, the next day was in a silver station wagon.

MR. BRAYACK: Right about where the number 3 is on the map?

A VOICE: Where is the number 3?

Yes, yes, something like that. I walked. And it was to the right -- I mean, to the left. Actually, the hole was -- the guy was all the way back to Sycamore.

MR. BRAYACK: As part of the ultimate groundwater clean-up, we had to conduct a 72-hour pump test for the facility. We pumped groundwater at a rate of 72 --

A VOICE: Gallons per minute.

MR. BRAYACK: Thank you.

1  
2 As part of this test, you measure  
3 the water levels throughout the area. And  
4 as part of that, they're called data  
5 loggers. They're continuing, automatic,  
6 computerized water level meters.

7 A VOICE: So I probably screwed your  
8 test up.

9 MR. BRAYACK: And we had to throw  
10 out all that data.

11 A VOICE: You'll see a big jump on  
12 the paper.

13 MR. BRAYACK: We had erratic  
14 results. And we had to throw it out. But  
15 that wasn't six months ago now. That was  
16 longer than that.

17 That was probably about a year ago.

18 MR. COLTER: Yes.

19 A VOICE: Terry Black. I came here  
20 tonight because I have a lot of questions.  
21 And I do appreciate that the Navy has come  
22 out and we're getting the information.

23 I will sleep better tonight, knowing  
24 that Mr. Sabino, with the information he's  
25 given -- he is a resident. He is a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

lifelong resident, also. I don't intend on moving.

My question is -- and I'm putting it out to the group as well as to Anthony Sabino -- what can we do at this point? Let's take some positive action. When do we start forming a group?

I think a major part of the problem is this, is not my area of expertise. The information in the library, you know, you need a Master of Science, you know, to be an engineer to understand it.

Most of us don't understand the language.

MR. SABINO: Unfortunately, because the Water District is involved in the environmental aspects of this thing, we have kind of taken the antagonistic approach with the state and with the Navy. But I use that term constructively, because they have their own myopic view of the type of study and remediation they have to do.

And that's more within the framework

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

of what they have to do. They are not as quite concerned as I am and the Water District is. I don't want to put a quantum on their level of concerns, but their job necessarily isn't to make sure that they have an answer to the cancer problems on 10th Street and 11th Street.

Well, as I said at the last meeting and as I said at every meeting, I need your help and your participation.

I've asked for the names of those people that are here tonight and the names of those who attended the State meeting last week, because I want to contact a number of those people to get information to me.

And I can see the Water District developing as a focal point to hear your individual problem.

Because, if I hear back from the State that they don't have the financing, the funds, the interest, the data and all of these other things that they can come up with not to do this study, then it's

FORM FED-28 PENGAD INC BAYONNE, NJ 07002 11/94

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

going to have to be done in a different fashion.

So while I'm not prepared to offer my services to the group to do a study, I'm not competent to do that, I will be the focal point for information to be given to me.

There are some people here tonight that were at the last meeting. And when I heard the cancer stories on Parkview Circle --

Anybody here from Parkview Circle?

That's right, you are on Parkview Circle.

(Indicating)

There is three or four houses in a row, all of which have incidents of various types of cancer. Some of them are three or four incidents in the same house.

Now, is that genetics at work?

Well, one is the husband. One is the wife. They are not related. So who knows what the environmental cause is. They are not located on the Grumman perimeter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Water that they well, the water that they get, comes from nowhere near from any well from any type of contamination whatsoever.

So there has to be something else going on there.

Now, I have people from Harrison area that have cancer, people in the numbered streets and Parkview Circle. What is going on in Bethpage? I don't have the answer to that.

But somebody with the capability is going to have to start looking at it.

There are new regulations with respect to health studies for superfund sites which I have looked into. And, technically, we don't fall into that pigeonhole yet.

Maybe with the help of John Barnes and the Navy and Tim Vickerson, maybe we will get more action than we have gotten to date.

So far, it has all been done by me, all done by the Water District.

1  
2 And the answer we have gotten back  
3 is nothing is unusual. That is not what I  
4 heard tonight. So, you know, you can  
5 contact me through the Water District.  
6 You don't even have to give me a name.  
7 You have to give me an address and the  
8 type of cancer you have, because that is  
9 the information I'll turn over to  
10 Mr. Vickerson and let him make a -- I'm  
11 not saying he is even going to do that. I  
12 think he'll take a look at it.

13 His predecessor, Lloyd Wilson,  
14 worked with me on this. He is very  
15 receptive to the ideas I had when he came  
16 up with a blank. The more information we  
17 could give to them, the more likelihood  
18 there is they could do something.

19 MR. COLTER: I really appreciate the  
20 level of interest we're getting tonight.

21 I know we have been here tonight  
22 quite a long time.

23 I would like to address what we are  
24 going to be doing the next few days.

25 To tell you the truth, if I lived in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

this area -- I'm a father. I'm a husband -- I would be sitting in your place right now.

I appreciate the time you have taken.

We've gotten some good comments. And, hopefully, this is going to help the Navy do what the community would like to see done.

Talking about the next two days, the off-site soil sample we're going to be doing, the question has come up at other public meetings. And, you know, are our yards free of this contamination from the Navy's property?

Right now, to the best of my knowledge, I can say yes, it is.

The State would like us to confirm that. And that is what we're going to be doing the next few days.

Mr. Sabino is correct. If we do find a problem in this area, we're just not going to say there is a problem. We're going to stop. We'll then go



1  
2 farther and we'll determine, at that  
3 point, what the overall problem is.

4 But we're going to start relatively  
5 close to the Navy's property.

6 Like I said, twelve samples. What I  
7 would like to ask tonight is from those  
8 people who live in any of those numbered  
9 areas, if you can see Tammy in the back on  
10 your way out, she'll have a card for you,  
11 put your name and address down.

12 Like I said, we're going to do  
13 twelve. If there are two properties right  
14 next to each other, we'll pick one or the  
15 other. We're looking for a uniform --  
16 it's going to be through dust. So if your  
17 neighbor and you want your yard sampled,  
18 their yard is going to reflect your yard.  
19 So if you can, you know, give us the names  
20 of this, we will be around in the next two  
21 days, knock on your doors.

22 We have a pamphlet to hand out to  
23 you to let you know what we're going to be  
24 doing.

25 It will make our job easier if we

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

had your cooperation to let us sample your yards. And we'll give you the results when we have them.

Like I said, individual results will be sent to the individual property owners. For the purposes of the public information report, the names and addresses and results will be withheld due to privacy.

So that's basically it. We will address some more concerns.

I wanted to get to the issue of what's on the table.

If you want to leave and you want your yard sampled, see Tammy in the back. She'll take your name and address and we'll hopefully see you in a couple of days.

A VOICE: Gentlemen, I just want to state, for the record, my name is Richard Fender (phonetic). I'm here representing Councilman Consig (phonetic). I have listened to all of the concerns that the residents of Bethpage had. And I have asked that a copy of this transcript be

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

made available to the councilman. And I will be discussing this with him tomorrow.

MR. COLTER: Did you give Tammy your name?

A VOICE: I included my card, asking for the transcript.

MR. COLTER: I would like to thank you all for coming. Appreciate it.

(TIME NOTED: 10:30 P.M.)

\*\*\*\*\*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION

I, Barry Eskenazi , a Notary Public in  
and for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing is a true and accurate  
transcript of my stenographic notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
hand this 8<sup>th</sup> day of Dec., 1994.

Barry Eskenazi  
BARRY ESKENAZI