Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant

Bethpage, New York

Restoration Advisory Board

Regular Meeting

----------X

7:00 P.M.
September 30, 1999

Bethpage Community Center
Bethpage, New York

P R E S E N T:

Joe Kaminski	United States Navy Naval Air Systems Command
Dave Brayack Debbie Cohen	Tetra Tech NUS
Jim Colter	Northern Division, NAVFAC

RAB Members

FREELANCE L.I., INC. - Court Reporters
259 Southfield Road
Baiting Hollow, New York 11933
Voice (516) 369-2912 Fax
E-mail flli@aol.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KAMINSKI: I want to welcome you to the initial meeting of the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant Bethpage Restoration Advisory Board, which I'm sure will soon be better known as the Bethpage RAB. I'm Joe Kaminski, I'm on the second page of your hand-outright now, I'm with the Naval Air Systems Command. I want to welcome you here on behalf of Admirals Lockheart, Seidel and Captain Ball, who formed the chain of command down to my immediate supervisor, Judithanne Hare, who is listed on your agendas as the person that should be speaking here, where I am.

Judith was called away, I guess it was last week on an emergency meeting, she sends her deepest regrets and I'm sure she would rather be here than where she is this week which is in Austin, Texas at a public hearing on an emergency wastewater permit that we need, the Naval Air Systems Command needs for the facility that we own in MacGregor, Texas in order to start a pump and treat system on a groundwater issue down there.

The state of Texas doesn't check with us on when they hold their public hearings, and even though Judith had this planned well in advance, she

had to be down there because of the fact that Texas asked for the owner to be there and we are that Federal owner, just as we are the Federal owner of the facility here at Bethpage. As you all know, as the owner of Bethpage, one of our primary goals is to transfer the property to the County of Nassau, to Nassau County, for economic redevelopment.

In order to do that, we have to meet certain environmental regulations and we are certain that the RAB will help us in the process of bringing those regulations and that charge up to a conclusion.

My boss, Judith, would be able to do this presentation to you with two hands tied behind her back and one eye closed. I'm not quite as good at it as she is. So, I'm going to ask Jim Colter from the engineering command to jump in any time to help comment, or elaborate on any portion of the discussion that we're in, at any given time.

To go through the agenda with you, what we are going to do tonight, is slightly different on this slide than it is on your handout agenda. We'll go -- after I finish with this preview, we'll go through introducing ourselves, asking each person to

introduce themselves. When that is over, I'll give you 10 more slides of what a RAB is all about, and how a RAB functions. That is probably the next 10 slides, or so, in your hand-out. After that, we'll go into the election of the community co-chair. At that point the Navy will leave the room. The recording will stop, the RAB is the appointed Navy co-chair and will retain that position.

After the election of the co-chair, we'll return, the Navy will return and Mr. Colter will give you a brief introduction as to what's gone on on the remediation program here at Bethpage. With the help of the newly elected co-chair, we'll set the agenda for the next meeting. That is a pretty ambitious agenda for tonight. There may be a number of questions that will arise, a number of issues that people will bring up. We should look at that as the kinds of things we'll bring up in the next meeting. We'll try to stick to the agenda for this meeting.

Before we get into the introductions, let me give you background on the RAB concept in general. It originated in 1994, actually as an outgrowth of Technical Review Committee, TRC, the

Navy and DOD are the TRCs, which were composed of the Navy and regulators, looking at the various cleanup efforts. And it became obvious to the Department of Defense, I think with the urging of EPA, that something was lacking. And that was the input from the community. So about 1994, DOD came out with a policy that the Navy followed through on for turning the TRCs into Restoration Advisory Boards. The benefits were pretty clear, it gave the community a better understanding of what the Navy was doing and let the Navy take the input from the community. In particular things like priorities and incorporated that into what was going on, and it established some credibility and trust that would not otherwise have been there.

And it led to more responsive cleanup. I think each one of us probably comes into this meeting and the concept of the RAB with a little bit of healthy skepticism. I believe as we work together over the next couple of months, couple of years, probably, that we will establish that credibility and trust and bring the program forward quicker.

The RAB concept is national in scope. As

Proceedings

I mentioned, Naval Air Systems Command has three other RABs besides this one, one out in Calverton in Suffolk County, two down in Texas, at MacGregor, and in Dallas. We may be starting one up in Connecticut at our facility, out in Bloomfield, in the upcoming year.

As a RAB, you all are a member of an elite group. You get to have at least the name of the co-chair in a book the Restoration Advisory Board Directory, that the DOD puts out. You can look at this later if you want to to see the other RABs. This is updated annually. I'm not sure we are going to make the next update which is going I think about right now, but as soon as we can we'll get the Bethpage RAB into this book of RABs. I'll ask the community co-chair later on, when that person is selected, to fill out the form that allows their names to be put in this book.

As part of a RAB concept, you are made privy to a lot of information that you would not otherwise see.

Jim will be giving out a lot of that as the course of the RAB goes on. One of the things you get from other sources, and I will be able to

give you tonight, is a volume on the whole Navy's Installation Restoration Program.

This was passed or sent to each RAB co-chair toward the beginning of this year, back around March, the letter is dated in March. You didn't exist in March, but you existed a few months later. I'll leave this with the community co-chair and the entire RAB can look at the entire Navy Restoration IR Program and compare what is going on here at Bethpage.

I want to remind you to take a careful look at your RAB workbook that was handed out to this evening. Section 2, is the mission responsibilities operation section. At the end of the -- at the session today, we are going to ask you to sign on to that mission statement. So you need to take an opportunity tonight to read through it. Most of the slides that I'm going to go through in a few minutes, paraphrase that. We'll talk more about that in a little bit. Also in that workbook is good background information on CERCLA and national programs, and in particular fact sheets on what is being done here, at Bethpage, at this particular time.

Proceedings

In the packet, I think it is still there, is a glossary, or a list of acronyms that you can refer to. I think one of the best -- I've used three or four acronyms already tonight. I think no matter what it is, everybody in the Federal Government puts together two words and they create an acronym. I have no hesitation to ask my colleague, Jim Colter what do you mean by that acronym.

When you don't understand what an acronym is, ask what that acronym is. Any time you want to have a discussion this evening, feel free to ask questions.

With that brief overview, I'd like to go into the introduction of the RAB members.

Sir?

A MAN: My name is John Lovisolo, I'm a member of the community. Are there funds to have an independent expert in mediation to give advice to the RAB.

MR. KAMINSKI: At a future meeting when the agenda is established, you'll be given a full description of possibilities like that. Rather than me giving you a cursory answer, I'd rather you hear

a briefing that goes on for perhaps 15, 20 minutes, that we are not prepared to give tonight.

Jim Colter gives that, I don't. We'll let you know about that.

We think in general the people working for the Navy will be able to provide you with the answers you need. If that is not the case, we'll find out how to do that.

A MAN: I was looking for someone that would be on the side of the community, as opposed to the side of the Navy.

MR. KAMINSKI: Like I say, we need to establish a degree of credibility and trust, and that doesn't happen in the first five minutes that I've spoken here. Certainly as I've said, a degree of skepticism, like you're showing, is healthy. And I'm sure we can work that out as we go along. I would like you to hear the full story, though. Thank you.

Introductions, I'm Joe Kaminski -- start with me and go to Jim Colter, and go around the table this way.

I'm Joe Kaminski, I'm with the Naval Air Systems Command. I have been an environmental

engineer for in excess of 30 years. I guess I got into the business when I was growing up in Baltimore and would go down to Chesapeake Bay each summer and see the bay getting dirtier and dirtier as the years went by. I thought it would be a good business to get into. I'd like to hang around long enough to see Bethpage participate in being one of those accomplishments as well.

MR. COLTER: I'm Jim Colter, I'm the Navy's project manager for the Bethpage site. I have been working on Bethpage since 1992. I'm an environmental engineer, by education. I'm basically -- I work out of the Philadelphia office. Our Naval Facilities Engineering Command is headquartered out of Washington, D.C. and we have seven sister agencies around the country, Philadelphia office being one of those sister agencies. And our job is basically to secure funding, congressional funding, and put that into investigations and remediations for the Navy's property up here.

MR. SCHARF: My name is Steve Scharf, I'm with the New York State DEC, I'm the project manager on the Grumman Aerospace and the Navy

Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant Project which is the hazardous waste site. I work with the Division of Environmental Remediation. We are working to come to a decision on groundwater issues, as well as all the other issues involving scaling down of the former Grumman facility.

I'm out of the Albany office but there are -- if there ever are questions on a local level, you can always contact the DEC out of the Stony Brook office.

MR. MANGANO: Ed Mangano, Nassau County legislator and resident of Bethpage.

MR. RESCH: Ed Resch, local resident, if anybody needs anything, if I can help anybody out, call me at home.

MR. SIMONSON: Marty Simonson, I work with the DCMC, Defense Contract Management Command. I have worked in Bethpage for the last seventeen years.

MR. TRINGALI: Roy Tringali, I live in Hicksville. I'm a member of the Community Council in Hicksville, Hicksville municipal and former Northrop Grumman employee.

MR. LOVEJOY: John Lovejoy, I'm here

representing my supervisor Bruce Mackay, who is at another public hearing tonight with the Nassau Public Health Department and couldn't make it. I would like to take back any concerns anyone has to the office if I can.

MR. KELLY: I'm Tim Kelly, Nassau County Department of Public Works. I'm a hydrogeologist in the environmental division.

MS. MANGANO: Linda Mangano, the editor and publisher of Bethpage Tribune, and Bethpage resident for seven years.

MR. McBRIDE: Jim McBride, bethpage resident. I've done environmental health and safety work for the corporation I work with.

MR. FENDER: I'm Rich Fender, I'm representing Supervisor John Venditto. Also, I'm also a resident of Hicksville for the last 46 years.

MR. KAMINSKI: Thank you. Thank you all for coming, again. We appreciate it. We are going to change the printed agenda, to the agenda on the screen, here. I'm going to run through the slides on what a RAB is all about and what happens, and then you'll have an opportunity to elect a co-chair and take a closer look at the Section 2 of your work

books. As I said, I'm going to kind of paraphrase -- as I go through here, paraphrase Section 2, leave a few things out, and add a few things on responsibilities. Sort of follow that format in Section 2, though.

Let me switch to Purpose. What is a RAB? Well, basically, it is a forum for discussion. It is a place where the Navy and regulatory agencies and the community come together and discuss the restoration program. In this case, Bethpage. I think the key word is advisory. The Navy advises the community as to what the Navy is doing. The community advises the Navy of what is important to the community. What is a priority for the community, and the regulatory agencies advise all of us on what the regulations are. And that is pretty important too.

The RAB will consider important environmental cleanup is such as priorities like I said, clean up levels, remedial action alternatives, and we'll do it in a partnership way, where we cooperate and work together to get those benefits that EPA and DOD envisioned in 1994, when they started the RAB concept.

Proceedings

As I said earlier, the technical review committee still exists here so it contains the regulators and the Navy, and this evening we are adding the community members. The RAB is co-chaired by the Navy and community co-chairs. As I said, my boss, Judithanne Hare, is the Navy co-chair. She's appointeded by the commanding officer. The community co-chair is elected. The RAB is jointly operated and all members are considered equal. There is a series of repsonsibilites that go along with the RAB and we can run through them.

The Navy is responsible for explaining the cleanup actions. They'll be able to convey to the RAB and the public in general what it is that the Navy is doing. As an example, would be at Calverton there was initial discussions that were a bit too technical for me to understand, Dave, and the consultant working for Jim, was able to take complicated groundwater contamination charts or issues or samples and turn them into a perspective that could be seen actually in a computer program to better explain what we are doing. From that we have done a better job to figure out what we are doing out there. So the Navy needs to explain its

actions in that way. And work with input from the community to incorporate into what the direction that the cleanup should go. The Navy provides administrative and logistics support, RAB work books, minutes and notes -- being recorded and will be turned into minutes. The Navy will distribute various discussion materials from time to time and the Navy puts all of the documents that the Navy has to do, to cause this cleanup to occur, in a public repository which is the Bethpage public library so all the documents that are required for cleanup are public information to be put in that repository.

Responsibility of the regulatory agencies are to identify the issues. I've never known a regulatory agency that has any trouble with that that should function pretty well. Explaining the regulations as you said is important. I work with activities in five or six different states and regulations do vary quite a bit from state to state. We need the regulators to explain both to the Navy and the community what the regulations really say.

Of course they are going to ensure compliance with the regulations with their job.

Another important job of the regulatory community is to educate all the RAB members and example of that I saw at the formative meeting we had a couple of months back when two members from which ever New York regulatory agencies it was I'm not sure, stood up and again they explained to the people assembled what a particular regulation meant in the context of the question that had been asked at that time. That was excellent and I was pleased to hear that happening.

Community members act as a liaison with the community, knowing what the concerns of the community are, as John has expressed, and being able to convey them and know what is wanted out there.

But it is also necessary for the community members to understand the Navy process, the Navy has a huge bureacratic process to go through to achieve cleanup. There is a lot of issues that are not environmental, contractual, budget, getting approvals, competition with other places.

Jim will give you a lot more information on that as things go along. It is a not a matter of the Navy saying we can go out and do things right

away. There is a lot of back and forth communication with regulatory agencies and others, that is something you need to understand and learn as you become RAB members.

The community members need to provide constructive cleanup input. I emphasize "constructive". This is not to say that there isn't an occasion where someone would want to vent a little bit. We saw some people at Calverton last night giving their personal opinions. About some issues that they had. It is good for us to hear that, but we need to keep on the agenda and keep track of where we are trying to go. And, really, a personal agenda, as such, is not the thing to bring to a RAB meeting. But we all get excited, and I want you all to get excited about what we are doing.

The community members need to explain the decisions that are made and take them back to the community.

All RAB members have a responsibility to prepare for the meetings. That means read. Most of the time, the Navy will be sending out things ahead of time; take a look at it, read it and come prepared. Attend all the meetings.

Proceedings

There are ways that we'll get into -- we'll have alternates if you need to, but attendance is important. And everyone should make sure that all the issues are brought forward. I don't think we'll have any trouble with that one. Reviewing and reporting on the reports. The Navy has a responsibility to come back and answer questions that are asked from the floor.

Everyone should report back to the group they represent, there are some people here, like here, that are representing somebody else. I'll go back and tell my boss what went on. Everybody should do that when you go back to your community.

Co-chairs have particular responsibilities. The Navy co-chair, my boss, most of the time needs to coordinate with the community co-chair on what the next agenda should be.

The Navy co-chair has to ensure that the Navy is meeting the specifications of the RAB, that we are presenting materials in a way that they are understood, and responding responsibly to the questions that are being asked. Make sure that we are not aloof or anything like that. Indeed, in addition, the Navy co-chair needs to make sure that

everybody has an opportunity to speak, that everyone has an opportunity to contribute, that they are all being heard. Then to refer to any questions that might come up, that don't have relation to clean-up to the appropriate place.

So there still will be times for most questions to be discussed, whenever it is necessary.

Community co-chair responsibilities mirror the Navy co-chair's responsibilities in that the community co-chair has to coordinate with the Navy co-chair to develop the agenda. The community co-chair is going to have -- develop a close one-on-one working relationship with my boss. Judith calls the community chairs of the other RABs, on occasion, and you'll get to know her pretty well.

Community co-chair needs to make sure the community members participate in an open, constructive manner, stay on the agenda, meet expectations of the Navy to move this thing forward, get it cleaned up and get it given to Nassau County.

Any concerns that are brought forward or any questions that are answered, and reported back to the community.

Make sure we are not forgeting something.

Proceedings

Basic operating procedures: Meetings are called by agreement at a convenient location. If this is a convenient location, we could keep this as a place to have the meetings. Often the community co-chair or one of the RAB community members has an input in that. If this is the place, we can keep it, and we can talk about that later. Setting the place for the agenda of the Navy, announce meetings in advance and provide you with handouts, if necessary. Navy will be responsible for the minutes that are being taken right now.

But in between RAB meetings you are all encouraged to get together among yourselves, and participate in subcommittees collectively or individually, and discuss what it is that ought to be presented at the next meeting.

In your handouts, this section is called Membership. I've called it Commitment, because you have made a big commitment by being here. We have left the number of members blank, number of alternates, because it is possible to add or subtract from that. Totally voluntary for your being here. If you feel you need to do something else, there is not anything wrong with leaving,

there is nothing wrong with us adding people to the RAB as they want to make it kind of a commitment. If someone doesn't come for an extended period of time, there is an option for the community, not the Navy, to ask them to step down.

Finally, almost finally on this slide, the participation is really important. Participation is not just attendance, but as I say, it is reading and understanding and making sure you know what's going on.

This whole concept is flexible, we can amend the mission statement as necessary. And cleanup in and of itself is flexible. Cleanup decisions have to be made often, almost always are made, without having the total amount of information that could conceivably be gathered. It is almost always impossible to pay for all of the information that would be conceivable to gather. But the other side of that coin is that it is usually possible to come up with the series of finite alternatives that aren't going to change much with the information that is available.

Expect the Navy to take interim action on cleanup, which it is doing, and completion of those.

Proceedings

Everything is done in conformance with the regulation of the State of New York and the federal regulations. As I said earlier, the effective date of this RAB, in effect will be when everyone signs the mission statement and operating procedures.

Going to take about a 10 minute break right now. I'd like the RAB members to use that time to take a look at that Section 2, to make sure they understand it, and then get together and elect your co-chair. The Navy is going to leave. The minutes are going to stop being taken. I'd like to ask, if I may, Ed Mangano, who knows a little something about elections, to lead the group when the Navy leaves.

Take time to read Section 2, if you haven't done it.

MR. MANGANO: I have been involved on many levels. I have attended mostly all of the meetings, if not all of them. I myself from that, I'm not going to be the co-chair, so I'll help you in the selection process. I would suggest, instead of everybody leaving, there is a little office over here in the community center, if the members of the

RAB would like to convene in there over the next 10 minutes. We could read the statement and see if we all agree on that and seek -- give everybody an opportunity to present their credentials and why they want to be the co-chair and then the group will do it by vote.

MR. KAMINSKI: If you want to, you can do that. Let me encourage you the fact the community members that are in the audience are part of the selection process. If you want them to listen in to it. I don't know if you want to cram everybody in.

MR. MANGANO: If the Navy doesn't want to be here, you can convene in the office.

MR. KAMINSKI: That is up to you. You come in and get us when you're done.

(Off the Record at 7:45 p.m.)

(The Proceedings Reconvened at 8:10 p.m.)

A MAN: We are happy to report that we met, and we have elected the chairman, Mr. McBride. I'd like to introduce James McBride as our co-chairman of the RAB.

MR. KAMINSKI: Welcome to a lot more work than you expected.

MR. COLTER: We do it that way,

unfortunately.

A MAN: We have also adopted the operation mission statement procedures with the following amendments, we amended Section 5-A to read "RAB shall consist of nine members from the community and one non voting alternate member."

I'll give you this, if you want a copy of that, it is nine and one. We have already elected our alternate non-voting member, that is Mr. John Lovisolo, and he's joined us at the table.

MR. KAMINSKI: Excellent, thank you very much. That almost ends my duties as the surrogate -- I'm sorry, it almost ends my duty as a surrogate.

I have a couple more slides to go through but I'm going to do that after Jim takes you through. The only thing we have left to do administratively is future meetings, and thank you all for being here.

A MAN: How do you want this signing to take place?

MS. COHEN: Have you got the page that Judith has already signed? We can pass it as we go along here. Judith has already signed this copy, you can put your names on.

Proceedings

MR. KAMINSKI: Again, I have two more slides, and that is at the end of Jim's presentation. Then all we have left to do is talk about the agenda of the next meeting and then we'll give a final closing and thank you.

So I'll turn it over to Jim, here, to talk about the restoration program, which is what we are really here for.

MR. COLTER: Evening, everyone. Again, my name is Jim Colter, I'm the project manager for the Bethpage property. I have been working at the site since 1992, my main job in addition to my duties out at Calverton, is to secure funding to hire consultants, perform investigations, work with the regulatory agencies in making decisions and implementing decisions with various remedial actions.

I work for the Northern Division, Naval Facilties Engineering Command. We are headquartered out of Washington, D.C., and we have seven sister agencies around the country. The Northern Division is responsible for all the naval installations in the 10 Northeast states.

Basically, the creation of the

Installation Restoration Program, and I'll refer to it from now on as the IR Program, was because back in the '40s, '50s, '60s, the war years, it was acceptable that the old industrial ways of handling waste we now know to be potentially damaging to the environment. However, back in those times, defense of the nation was paramount and we really didn't know much about the chemicals that we were using. 30 years later, we have a lot more education, a lot more data, and a lot more research that has happened. We now know that some of the things that were done for disposal weren't the best for the environment.

In 1975, the DOD department of defense took the first step to create a program to identify the environmental problems at all of its federal facilties, Army, Navy, Air Force.

Then in 1980, after that initiative, Congress enacted what is known as the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act. You all know it as CERCLA.

Basically, CERCLA consists of these following reports that have to be done by a responsible party, submitted to a regulatory agency,

concurred with, and then you're allowed to proceed to the next report.

They consist of a preliminary assessment. Basically, you go out and look at the ways that you handle your chemicals, where you dispose of your chemicals, where you stored your chemicals, to see where there might be a potential for releases to the environment. After you identify what they call Areas of Concern, you go to a site investigation, you take some quick samples, just to see if you have chemicals in your soil, chemicals in your groundwater. It is a very quick program, very low cost program.

If you confirm that you have chemicals in the environment, then you proceed to a Remedial Investigation, which is a more comprehensive, more costly investigation, that basically tries to delineate the nature and the extent of the soil or groundwater or sediment contamination, whatever you might have.

Once you've identified the problem, then the next step is a Feasibility Study that offers alternatives and technologies to address that type of contamination. Different alternatives for soil

exist than do for groundwater. Basically, we put every technology out there that we know of and we screen them for cost, long-term effectiveness, community acceptance. There is nine criteria items that we go through. Basically we work with the regulators to pick the best technology that will get the job done quickly and as economically as possible, because the money that we use in the IR Program, is Congressionally appropriated dollars, and we all know where that comes from, that is taxes. So it is incumbent upon us to try to do what is cost effective not -- the pockets aren't as deep as they once were, and we have to try to do the best we can with an ever shortening pot.

Once the best alternative is chosen, and historically that was between the regulators and the Navy, we would go to a public meeting and say this is what we decided. At that point, at different times, the community would say I have a problem with that for various reasons, that maybe the Navy and the regulators didn't think of. Basically we had to start from scratch. That's one of the main reasons for establishment of the RAB, is insteed of getting those comments at the 11th hour, we try to get them

up-front before we start making our remedial decisions.

Once again, we pick the best alternative that meets community concerns, and that meets regulatory statutes. We do a Record of Decision that basically is a legal document that binds the Navy to whatever decision is in that Record of Decision, or ROD.

Then of course we design the remedy and we implement the remedy.

Following the same logic as on the previous slide, the Navy's program here at Bethpage commenced back in 1985 with the initial assessment study. That was completed in 1986, we then -- we then did a remedial investigation, and I'll get into the details of these as the slides go on. We did a remedial investigation in 1992. The EPA and New York State DEC, in the middle of our investigation, issued a RCRA operating permit for the Bethpage facility, that outlined certain corrective measures that had to be done before we could terminate that permit.

Based on the funds of the Phase I, we found we had data gaps and we had to proceed to a

Phase II RI, that was completed in 1993. We did our feasibility study and outlined all the different technologies available for soil and groundwater in 1994. Some of you might remember a public meeting that we had back in 1994, that outlined what the remedy for the soils at Bethpage was going to be. That again was held in the Fall of 1994. The New York State DEC and the Navy signed a Record of Decision for the soils and we call that Operable Unit 1, in 1995.

We have partially designed a portion of the remedy, and I'll get into again more details as we go along, and we are out there right now, actually, doing some cleanup. Implementing a remedial action, if you will.

So back in 1986, the initial assessment study identified three areas of concern at the Bethpage property, you'll all know that it is a fairly small property, roughly 105 acres. The three areas where -- that are called Site 1, Site 2 and Site 3, are the former Drum Marshaling Area on the east end of the big plant, plant there; the Recharge Basin Area and associated grounds associated with the Recharge Basin Area was Site 2, and an old bone

yard, if you will, a Salvage Storage Areawas Site 3.

Basically they took, because of the operations and the storage and things like that, these were identified, some samples were taken, however, in the IAS, and chemicals were detected. So we basically combined the Initial Assessment Study and the site assessment process into one.

The report recommended a remedial investigation be conducted.

As I said earlier, the EPA and New York State DEC issued a RCRA permit in 1992. Although it's a RCRA operating permit, because we were already under way with our CERCLA process, the agreement was made to continue to investigate the Bethpage property under the CERCLA program. That is basically just a terminology difference between RCRA and CERCLA.

So in August of 1991, we developed a work plan that basically outlined everything, all the samples we wanted to take, how we were going to take the samples, the labs that were -- going to analyze the samples, the techniques they were going to use, to ensure quality of the sample. Before we do any field work, we are required to put this work plan to

get and submit it to the DEC and the local health agencies for review and comment.

Basically that was again conducted in -- completed in August of 1991. Shortly thereafter, we were out in the field taking our samples in all these sites and we finalized the Remedial Investigation Report in May of 1992. As I mentioned earlier, based on the regulatory concerns, there was a conclusion that there was some data gaps in our investigation that needed to be filled before any decision could be made.

So basically in 1992, we put together another work plan, submitted that to the DEC for review, and we finalized that in November.

The Phase II work basically consisted of some off site groundwater sampling, to determine if our groundwater contamination may have emanated offsite. PCB delineation in soils at the Drum Marshaling Area and the Recharge Basin Area, that was one of the conclusions of the Phase I, that we did have PCBs in soils and we needed to better delineate the extent of that.

Thirdly and probably most importantly, we developed a groundwater computer model for the

Navy's property to try and anticipate what has happened over the years and what might happen in the future.

During 1993, the whole year we basically were in the field doing field work and we submitted our report to the DEC later that year and got it finalized in October, 1993. The year after that, we developed our Feasibility Study outlining the alternatives that we saw for the soils and the groundwater on the Navy's property. We submitted that again to the DEC, and we got that approved in March of 1994.

Immediately after that, we wrote a Preferred Remedial Action Plan, known as a PRAP, basically picking the best alternative, after input from the community at a community meeting.

Real quickly I'll go through what that ROD, the contents of the ROD were. In July of 1995, the Navy and the New York State DEC jointly signed that, basically making it a legal document, outlining the following actions that the Navy now has to meet.

It said that the Navy would excavate PCB contanimated soils above an industrial cleanup

number, as the Navy's property was considered to be an industrial facility which is 10 parts per million at Site 2, where the recharge basin is. We completed that in 1996. The ROD also stated that we would remediate volatile organic contamination in soils at the former Drum Marshaling Area, being Site 1, using an air sparging soil vapor extraction technology. We basically constructed that system, a couple of years ago, and start up of that system was in June of 1998, it continues to run out there today and we are hoping to continue to run that all of next year. We'll reevaluate the soils at that point and see if our cleanup has met its objectives for soils.

It also said that the Navy would excavate for metals that were considered to be hazardous out at Site 1, and again, PCB contaminated soils out at Site 1 in excess of the industrial cleanup goal of 10 parts per million. Because of the construction of the air sparge system, which has a lot of pipes and a lot of equipment, we have to wait until that air sparging system is completed so we can dismantle it and go in and conduct our excavations.

A couple other items of the ROD that

dealt basically with some groundwater issues. It said that the Navy would fund construction of a treatment plant in the Bethpage Water District Plant No. 5, located to the south of the Navy and north of Grumman properties. Most of you are aware of the location of that. Basically, the water district had some regulation that they not allow outside agencies to construct systems for their supplies, and so an agreement was reached where the Navy would basically reimburse the Bethpage Water District so they could go ahead and construct the treatment plant under their own specs, using a contractor that they are comfortable with.

That funding was forwarded to the Bethpage District back in August of 1996. That treatment plant has been completed. It is ready to be operational if needed. The other part of what we have been investigate -- yes, sir.

MR. LOVISOLO: Just a question. The treatment you were talking about before for the industrial area, you said, was that -- was I correct in understanding it was down to 10 parts.

MR. COLTER: Ten parts per million, yes. Which is nationally recognized as a safe level for

industrial operations so that the people that work there aren't exposed 365 days. It is basically where they work so there is a lot less exposure, and it is a whole calculation done by the EPA, New York State DEC.

MR. LOVISOLO: What are the local regs for drinking water.

MR. COLTER: This was a soils cleanup, which is different -- it is a different cleanup number than if you had PCBs in groundwater. Offhand, I don't know what the number is in groundwater, but PCBs are very -- they are not very mobile. They adhere to the soil and it is very difficult in -- the groundwater at Bethpage is roughly 50 to 60 feet depth. So it is very difficult for PCBs that are spilled on the surface to migrate to that type of depth. It does happen. But at Site 1, we have actually found it to be down to, like, 30 feet. So there's really -- as far as the Navy's property goes, right now we don't have PCBs in groundwater.

MR. MANGANO: What about the local residents in the area. How is that going to affect us? You're saying just on that property.

Proceedings

MR. COLTER: Right.

MR. MANGANO: Fine. How far does that plume go to the people in the area between Hicksville and Bethpage? Your people work immediately on that area. We have people who live around that area. They have to be there 365 days a year.

MR. COLTER: That question came up back in the 1994 public meeting, and that was a very vocal concern of the community, and rightfully so. To answer that question, we actually went out into the local community and sample various yards and residences for PCBs. In a nutshell, we didn't find that the PCBs at the Navy's property had been blown over or migrated over into the community. We -- we gave those results to the Department of Health and the residents seemed to be happy at the effort that we did.

MR. MANGANO: It is contained to the Navy property and only the Navy property, is that understood.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A MAN: Could you quantify that for us, that you're cleaning it up to a standard of 10 parts

per million?

You find the PCBs, and then you address it, you're going to remove them.

MR. COLTER: Right.

A MAN: So you get a detect of 10 parts per million or less.

MR. COLTER: Right.

A MAN: Can you quantify that as a health risk what you would have to do to have that adversely affect your health? Do you have -- if somebody -- if you walked over it, would that affect your health? If you picked it up, if you fell in it, would that affect your health? Would you have to ingest it?

I want to get some kind of degree that you're going to clean it up to an industrial standard. What does that mean to us that have to live here?

MR. COLTER: To be honest with you, that is a very involved answer to that question. We could actually spend an agenda item to give that answer to you. We can do that if you'd like.

The quick answer to that is is it based on a risk assessment, and it is a very lengthy

process, involving a lot of calculations, a lot of numbers that go into a calculation to come up with that number. The 10 parts per million has been calculated by other -- different agencies, the EPA -- around the country, different state agencies, the Navy has done calculations and basically has said that because of your exposure time being a couple hundred days a year, because you don't work there on weekends, things like that, all those calculations get run through, and they come up to 10 is safe for the on-site work, basically.

It does talk about ingestion of soils, how much you have to ingest. That would be eating the soil. So that's very unlikely. Direct contact, inhalation of the dust. There is a whole slew of calculations. If you want to see those calculations, we can put that on as an agenda item. It would be too difficult to try to get into that.

A MAN: I understand that. I would respectfully ask the chair to consider that.

We have to raise the level on that. Two questions come to my mind with it. You talk about the PCBs in the soil. As part of the '94 study, is there a hydrogeologist's report in there for the

mobility.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A MAN: The PCBs we are talking about are in the subsurface soil, or are capped in impervious soil, or both.

MR. COLTER: Both. Right now it is Site 2, we have actually excavated the PCBs. The surface soils are clean. When you excavate to get to a subsurface area, you have automatically excavated the surface and disposed of whatever concentration that is.

A MAN: Have we capped it.

MR. COLTER: No. After we are done with all our excavation, we have to finish Site 1, we put either gravel or a soil type of covering over these areas as a safety reason, on top of the excavations that we have done.

A MAN: Didn't you say you completed one site, though.

MR. COLTER: Completed the excavations.

A MAN: It is not a closed site yet.

MR. COLTER: No. Basically, for a site close-out, we have to submit an application to the DEC and we haven't done that yet.

Proceedings

A MAN: So it is still all active. You haven't signed off on any of it yet.

A MAN: No.

A MAN: Two issues, the inside of the building and outside of the building on Plant 3.

MR. COLTER: Oh, okay.

MR. KEEL: Plant 3, on the inside, is under the direction of the RCRA program. And currently the entire 105 acres is still Class 2, which is a hazardous waste site under the regulation. What the Navy is looking to do is delist that, and transfer that majority of property, correct me if I'm wrong, to the county. Some of it will never go to the county.

MR. COLTER: Not never, but for the near future, that being the Site 1.

MR. KEEL: Unless something can be resolved specifically at Site No. 1 and possibly around those two drywells, which are adjacent to Site 1.

MR. COLTER: Something the county has to consider in the future, is whether we maintain it at 10 parts per million or whether we can contain it.

MR. MANGANO: As far as the county goes,

we are not taking any land that has contamination, number one. We have made that pretty clear and we have been working with the Navy on that point.

We have been working on it to a point and extent where they are surveying the property and we'll retain title to certain sections until they are cleaned. That will keep the onous on the Navy to complete the cleanup while still allowing parts of the property that are clean to be transferred and used. So you know that is the approach that the county and that really I've insisted on, that we go in that area. So if we are focusing on what we are taking, that is where this question of how many parts per million is safe?

MR. COLTER: Real quick, I'll explain another hat that I wear. I'm in charge of getting the documents together to transfer, environmentally transfer the property. We have to write what is called a Finding of Suitability to Transfer. Basically that document takes all of our historical information, summarizes why we feel the property is suitable for transfer, and that gets sent to the regulatory agencies for review. So although the strict purpose of the Restoration Advisory Board is

to review installation and restoration documents, and these finding of suitability to transfers are not part of the IR Program. But I'm still in charge of that at this site. I've just taken it upon myself, because we have to have a basically public review period of this information, to make use of the RAB to -- so you all will be getting copies of what we call a FOST document to review and to give us any concerns you may have. Those concerns you can bring up at a public meeting and give them to the DEC, so we'll utilize the RAB concept here to try to get that process forward.

A MAN:: Follow-up, Jim. You mentioned, in one of the documents, you detected metals. What are the other solid soil contaminants that we are talking about.

MR. COLTER: Basically we call them PAHs, ployaromatic hydrocarbons, the constituents you find in asphalt, tire rubber.

A MAN: Nothing exotic.

MR. COLTER: No.

Sir.

MR. LOVISOLO: Ed, giving a little comment, doing that risk assessment that takes into

account certain factors such as how many hits you're recommended to take per million.

I say in doing a risk assessment, getting back to what you were asking about before, they take in consideration how many hits or how many fatalities per million you're prepared to take, and that is based on the adult population, the juvenille population, and these things. So I think perhaps the Department of Health might be able to give you some specific information on that.

A MAN: I hope we would take that suggestion, share it with the committee and do a complete.

MR. MANGANO: As well as birth defects, and everything else.

MR. COLTER: To let you know, the health department was an active member of the Technical Review Committee. All these remedial reviews went through the national department of health and state department of health, and they concurred with that cleanup action of 10.

A PERSON: You're saying at an industrial level, an acceptable level for contamination is 10 parts per million.

Proceedings

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A PERSON: What is the residential standard.

MR. COLTER: One.

A MAN: Will there be any surface contaminants left? After your process, is there anything.

MR. COLTER: No. Pretty much, when we excavate Site 1, we have surface and subsurface, and we'll basically be taking up all the surface soils to get to the subsurface locations, and things like that.

A MAN: Any property that you propose to transfer the surface contaminant will be zero.

MR. COLTER: No, not zero. They will be below regulatory cleanup standards. There may be a chemical that you will detect, but it is not above a regulatory cleanup standard.

A MAN: What about the PCBs, if you're taking them up and covering them, will there be any left on the surface.

MR. COLTER: The new surface will have none, it will be a clean soil we use as a cover. There may be residual PCBs on what is the old

surface, but it will be below the cleanup level of 10.

A MAN: Let me put it this way: When the Navy completes its proposed remediation, will there be any PCBs that the public or anyone working on the property or visiting the property or walking through the property could come in contact with on the surface of the property.

MR. COLTER: No.

A MAN: The answer to that is no.

MR. COLTER: No.

A MAN: That is all outside. But you're talking about inside contamination.

MR. SCHARF: That was dealt with by the Grumman corporation. They removed all the equipment inside the building and all the facilities located in-plant, which is a huge building, over a million square feet.

Get residuals left in the concrete and surface subsurface areas in the building.

Then they had to dig soils out that are sometimes to a depth of 30 feet, without damaging the structure. And that's been going on for the last three years.

Proceedings

MR. COLTER: I have a slide at the end, here. I will summarize what they have done.

A MAN: Just to restate my own point so I get that clear: I want to include the inside. Whether it be inside a building or outside a building, is there any PCBs that the public could come in contact with, whether they walk through the property, work on the property, walk their children through the property, after you have completed your remediation.

MR. COLTER: No, there won't be any PCBs that they can come in contact with.

A MAN: Nothing that they can come in contact with.

MR. MANGANO: How are they excavating the property right now to take out the contaminant?

MR. COLTER: As far as type of equipment.

MR. MANGANO: How are they removing the soil.

MR. COLTER: Just basically with a backhoe type.

MR. MANGANO: The dust and everything could possibly be air borne.

MR. COLTER: We have -- as part of our

remedial plan, we have air monitoring that goes on that is required as part of the work. We have people out there with air monitoring equipment, monitoring the air.

MR. MANGANO: During the wind factor, are they with the wind.

MR. COLTER: Yes. Wind factors are considered. If we do get particulates registering in our air monitoring equipment, we institute mitigating members, and we water it down to mitigate the dust. So there are members in place to protect that, yes.

MR. SCHARF: You may want to mention too, at this point, residual PCBs that do remain or that are allowed to remain, they are in a position never to come in contact with anybody because they will be too deep for exposure, which is something we are in discussion with right now. It is very specific areas on the Navy property.

MR. COLTER: As this RAB continues, you know, we have other work that has to be completed we are by no means done. We are not anticipating being done in the next several years, so this RAB will be in establishment for sometime and as these issues

come up, I can't answer all your questions tonight. Quite frankly, we haven't gotten there yet. That is what you're all here for, to participate with us so we make sure we do the right thing.

A MAN: I want to clear up that one point: That really the surface at this point -- the this point, the surface exceeds the residential standard.

MR. COLTER: Yes. Of the property that we are going to retain, exceeds the residential cleanup standard.

A MAN: And the property you're going to transfer, obviously, does.

MR. COLTER: Not at Site 2, no.

A MAN: It is the other way, then. It is the property you're going to retain that you're cleaning up.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A MAN: The property -- when you transfer something.

MR. COLTER: It will be suitable for transfer. It will be below any regulatory standard.

A MAN: I understand that. I want to talk to the surface. Maybe it goes beyond, you

know, like, the technical end. But just in plain kind of, like, English so we can understand it, from what we can come into contact with, getting back to that issue, the surface of this property, meaning anything that you could walk by, touch, have a child run through, that will be free of PCBs, therefore it will really exceed -- it will meet the residential standard, the surface of the property, because it will be less than one part per million?

MR. COLTER: Yes, if you took a sample of the.

A MAN: If I fell down, if I rolled in it, if I ingested the soil, it is going to have no, zero, or obviously less than the one part per million.

MR. COLTER: Correct.

A MAN: Which is the residential standard.

MR. COLTER: Correct.

A MAN: I needed to get that clear.

A MAN: To follow-up on what Ed was saying. You targeted a number of areas based on the industrial cleanup standard. Are there other areas where you come -- where we hit positive for

contaminant but they are below industrial standard.

That haven't been identified as a site.

MR. COLTER: No, all the sites have been identified. Our Site 3, which is our Salvage Storage Area, didn't have any PCBs. They had those ployaromatic hydrocarbons below the cleanup standard. So we basically have -- we haven't submitted it yet, but we really have no action, no further action for soils at the Salvage Storage Area.

MR. MANGANO: How deep does it go, contaminants.

MR. COLTER: At which site, Site 1.

MR. MANGANO: One, two and...

MR. COLTER: Well, two has been remediated to below -- we took subsurface soil samples, and I can't really remember exactly to what depth. But as we, in our investigation, we identified what depths had contamination for PCBs above 10. We went down to that depth to excavate. It was fairly shallow, I believe 8 to 10 feet was the depth we went to.

MR. SCHARF: That was the sludge drying area. Every time we established recharging the

basin, we take the sediment out and dry it out.

MR. COLTER: For Site 1, we have identified PCBs down to a depth of 35 feet, as I mentioned earlier. We do have other areas that I'll mention at the end of the presentation that have just recently been included in the Navy's program. They were identified by the Northrop Grumman Corporation.

In a deal made between Northrop Grumman and the Navy, they are going to investigate the extent of the contamination and then turn that remediation over to the Navy. At those locations, we have confirmed PCBs down to 60 feet.

A MAN: Maybe we could get it the next meeting, a printed map.

MR. COLTER: I have a map here. I'll show you.

A MAN: A stand, when you say Site 1 we can glance at it so we don't have to stop.

MR. COLTER: If I can continue real quick, I have a few more slides, and we'll answer more questions if we have more time.

The other concern obviously other than soil at Bethpage, is underlying groundwater. Since

1994, the Navy, Northrop Grumman Corporation and the New York State DEC have all been working jointly to come up with a one remedy system, if you will, to address groundwater. The Navy was pursuing its own groundwater treatment on the Navy's property as part of the Feasibility Study that was done in 1994. The DEC came in ,and similarly Northrop Grumman was pursuing their own action for their property. The DEC came in and asked us if we would put both plans aside and work jointly in coming up with one groundwater remedy for the Navy/Northrop Grumman properties.

It sounded like a good idea, sounded like we could save taxpayer dollars. So we started that process back in '94.

Part of groundwater treatment that was done was that Northrop Grumman Corporation paid for treatment on the Bethpage Water District wells, Plants 4 and 6, similar to what the Navy did for Plant 5.

Before we put any remedy in place for groundwater, again we had to do a feasibility study. That preliminary Feasibility Study was completed in 1996 and submitted to the DEC for review. Because

we felt pretty strongly that one of the alternatives stood out head and shoulders above the rest as far as implementibility and cost, Northrop Grumman started constructing that system as an Interim Remedial Measure. When I say "interim", it is not -- it was not known at that time if that would be the final remedy. We figured it would be part of the final remedy and thought it would be a good idea to put a pump and treat system in and start cleaning groundwater while these technical discussions and the regulatory review process was going on.

Northrop Grumman volunteered to take that initiative and they constructed basically a pump and treat system and completed that in 1997. That system is up and running today.

I'll get into the details real quick of what that system entails in a minute.

So after we got regulatory comment on the preliminary feasibility study, Northrop Grumman prepared a revised feasibility study and submitted that to the DEC earlier in 1998. And submitted basically a draft -- I'm sorry submitted the draft actually in February of 1999. The final feasibility study is expected this winter. The DEC

will then hold a public comment period to basically outline the contents of what the final remedial alternative will be. And we expect to sign a Record of Decision with the DEC and Northrop Grumman sometime in March of 2000, which is, right now, the current schedule.

I'll go real quickly. There's a lot more detail to this groundwater remedy but the highlights basically of it are that there is four deep extraction wells. Three are new, one is Grumman's Production Well No. 1. These wells are located to the southern boundary of Grumman's property and they are all connected to a brand new air stripping treatment facility constructed on Northrop Grumman property. What this system is designed to do is basically capture all groundwater on the Navy and Northrop Grumman properties, run it through a treatment system, discharge it to the recharge basins.

Obviously, when we constructed this system, we are going to take care of all the contaminated groundwater that is on the property but obviously other contaminants have already left the boundary of the Grumman property. That is why

Northrop Grumman and the Navy installed a treatment system in the Bethpage Water District located immediately downgradient of the property.

So if there is any concerns on the quality of the drinking water coming from the Bethpage Water District, there is a treatment system on those plants. So if contaminants do get there, and you know, the water district routinely samples, and that is their mandated mission, is to supply safe drinking water so there should be no concerns on your part as far as the quality of your tap water.

MR. LOVISOLO: A quick question.

MR. COLTER: Yes, sir.

MR. LOVISOLO: What is the closest proximity to the water district's wells to where the contaminants are.

MR. MANGANO: 200 feet.

MR. COLTER: Northrop Grumman has installed what we call sentry wells, upgradient of water district wells. I'm not sure, I think the one sentry well is several hundred feet upgradient of Plant 4, and it does have -- it has had detection, of VOC contaminations in that sentry well. That is

what prompted Northrop Grumman to go ahead and basically construct a treatment system on that plant.

MR. LOVISOLO: Did they make that determination when the pump and treat system was in operation, or when it was off.

MR. COLTER: We have been investigating this property jointly since the early 1990's. Back in, again, the mid-1990's is when that potential scenario was discovered and -- so it was well before the completion of the treatment system.

MR. SCHARF: Jim, you may want also to explain in a little detail that the Navy site and the Grumman site are two separate listed sites under the registry, and that the RAB is only associated with the Navy site and not with the Grumman site. However, it is all intertwined because the Operable Unit 2 groundwater issue, as it says here, it was put together as a joint approach in order to facilitate implementation of a regional remedy.

One other thing that is not listed here is that the Occidental Corporation at one time owned the Hooker facility to the northwest of Grumman. Groundwater contamination also associated with that

site is now largely between the northern end of what used to be mainly Grumman property. And at one time they were trying to bring all three parties together in this regional groundwater issue. However, for a number of reasons, the decision was to split off the Occidental -- the Occi site from the Northrop Grumman sites. The Occi site is being handled by the Environmental Protection Agency as an NPL site. And as we go along, the DEC was going to be holding *a public meeting at some point on Operable Unit 2, based on the feasibility study being produced by Grumman, which incorporates the issues that the Navy has. So that's why the RAB's associated with the Navy site, but not with the Grumman site, and DEC will be holding a public meeting. In a sense, it may seem a little confusing, but to clarify that point, so you all understand the agencies involved.

A MAN: Steve, how would the RAB find out about the -- any of the activities associated with other sites? Are we able to get on a distribution list for the mailing of that, about upcoming events?

MR. SCHARF: That is with the Environmental Protection Agency, the person to contact is *Sirude Quadri, Q-U-A-D-R-I, his phone

number is 212 637 4233. There is also citizen participation specialist with EPA that can handle those questions.

A PERSON: There is a repository of all data at the library, just like this site has.

MR. SCHARF: The EPA is doing a separate groundwater remedy with Occi, and their own feasibility study for that portion of the plume, and that is -- the main contaminant of concern there is vinyl chloride. There are also compounds called tentatively identified compounds; and the other issue is also some of the same volatile organic compound associated with the Northrop Grumman site.

Just to briefly discuss it, it gets more detailed but I won't go into that here.

MR. KAMINSKI: If the RAB wants to, we could do it.

MR. COLTER: The last thing I want to mention on the groundwater remedy although we don't have a ROD in place, based on the expertise of our consultants that both Northrop Grumman and the Navy hired, we felt that this containment system, pump and treat, would be the most cost effective solution. What we also expect on the back end of

this pump and treat system, is to have a long-term monitoring program that is going to extend several years into the future, basically for two reasons:

One, to prove that the system's operating as it has been designed. Two, to show hopefully we are cleaning up the groundwater in and around the Navy's property and thereby stopping further migration off site.

To that end the Navy has agreed to construct twenty additional groundwater monitoring wells in the Town of Oyster Bay, Town of Hempstead communities. We have just started that process. We have to do -- we have to work with the towns. We are hoping to put those wells in the township right of ways so we can work with the town agencies. We have not really approached them yet with this. This is pretty preliminary. The Navy does have some legal requirements that we have to get site access agreements. That protects both the Navy and the local towns. So we have started that process. It is a lengthy process, but we are hoping to begin at least installing some of the wells sometime next year, or early in the calendar year 2001.

After those wells are installed, Northrop

Grumman will then step in and their consultant will institute a quarterly or semi-annually or whatever the agreed upon frequency sampling is determined by the regulators for those twenty wells, and I think 30 other wells that are already in the local community and on Northrop Grumman property. As I said, they will be doing some frequency of sampling for the next 10, 15 years or however long it has to be done.

MR. LOVISOLO: Is there a listing of how many wells they are and where they're screened at.

MR. COLTER: I could give you that. I couldn't give you that tonight. But since the Navy is constructing these wells under its IR Program, it's obviously part of anything that we can share at the Restoration Advisory Board. If you want more detail on our monitoring installation, we can put that on as an agenda item for a future meeting.

I have the last couple slides here. Newly discovered areas of contamination that have just recently been included in the Navy's IR Program. These areas were identified by the Northrop Grumman Corporation during their efforts to vacate the Navy's property. Northrop Grumman had

leased 105 acres from the Navy upon termination from that lease, they were mandated to return the land in a condition not exactly as they got it, but in a condition that is favorable and that meets Navy requirements. That is what prompted a lot of sampling in Plant 3, a lot of excavation in Plant 3, a lot of investigation in and around the buildings and they -- these three additional areas were discovered by Northrop Grumman. Most of the areas that they discovered they remediated themselves. These areas posed a much bigger problem, a much more expensive problem. And to help facilitate them vacating the property, the Navy agreed to put it in the IR Program, which is already going to be running over the next several years into the future.

Again, we made basically a deal with them if they did the investigation, and came up with the remedy, the Navy would include it in its IR Program, go for funding, and when funding became available, would implement that remedy. So the three areas we are talking about are all to the south, if you're familiar with the Navy's property at Plant 3, located to the south of the property. I'll show you a map here in a minute. Basically what we call Area

of Concern 22, which is former UST location, the tanks were removed back in the '70s or early'80s, we are now founding residual petroleum contamination there. We're investigating that, trying to determine the size of the petroleum contamination, how deep it is, if there is a free product layer on the groundwater.

The field work for that, that is something the Navy has undertaken for its initiative. That field work has been done and we are now getting the report prepared to submit to the regulatory agencies.

The other two areas are drywells. Basically these were investigated under a county and EPA program called Underground Injection Control, UIC. Most of the drywells that they found contamination in, Northrop Grumman went in and dug them out, cleaned them out, filled them back in with clean soil. Again these two represent orders of magnitude of contamination above any of the other drywells, and they asked the Navy if they would take over the cleanup of that. We agreed, again, with the caveat that they delineate what the problem is. They are out there today actually, doing sampling,

doing field work to delineate those areas.

A report subsequently will be submitted to the regulators, we'll all get together and try to come up with what is the best approach. Again, since it is in the Navy's IR Program, it is eligible to be discussed at the RAB meeting.

This kind of gets to what we talked about earlier. What Grumman has done as far as environmental restororation of the property. This is not included in the Navy's IR Program. It was initiated solely by Northrop Grumman, voluntarily by Northrop Grumman, to facilitate and try to meet the requirements of the lease, and return the property into a pretty good condition. In a quick nutshell, they took over 32 hundred samples and they removed over 13,000 tons of contanimated soil. A lot of that was inside Plant 3 as Steve mentioned earlier. They had to go through the concrete block floor, excavate the soil, and keep the integrity of the structure in place. They then filled it with clean soil and put either a wood block or concrete cap back on, depending on where they were in the building.

So any source area that might have

historically existed in the plant because of the type of equipment that is there, basically has been removed. This basically is a rough sketch of the Navy's property. Those of you that are familiar with the area know that Northrop Grumman owns property in and around this. They have over the last several years conveyed certain properties to the local developers, they own bits and pieces of what used to be the Grumman campus. This still is the Navy property. Again, we are trying to transfer as much of this as we can to the county in a timely manner.

This area, here, known as Site 1, drum marshalling area, this drywell 34-07, this drywell 20-08 and this UST site, this will be carved out in some fashion and retained by the Navy because we anticipate that this will be a quite lengthy cleanup program. We can't do it within the next year or even two years. And so the agreement has been made with the county that we carve that parcel out on paper, the Navy will retain ownership, we'll come up with some type of easement agreement with the county to allow them access to that land. Basically, this is a roadway so we need to keep access to that

roadway open. Although the Navy will own the property, it will still be able to to be hopefully reused by development corporations. Eventually, as funding becomes available, as we finish our investigations, we can clean the site up and transfer -- at some point basically transfer this parcel over to the county,at some point well into the future.

Site 2 is a Recharge Basin Area. This area over here is an area of former sludge drying bed, which was an operational process done by Northrop Grumman. This area is where we detected PCBs and surface and subsurface PCBs.

As I mentioned earlier, the boneyard salvage area, that would be Site 3, here, although depicted as Site 1 an -- I think we did correct it for the RAB workbook, though. But basically soil contamination, we didn't find much. We found some chemicals that were below regulatory standard and our position is there is no further action for soils required there.

Groundwater contamination underlies most of this site. Again, we are working with that, putting a treatment system in to the south of -- the

southern boundary, of the Northrop Grumman property, to address basically both Navy and Northrop Grumman groundwater contamination.

That is it for a summary of what we have been doing the last seven, eight years here at Bethpage, both by Northrop Grumman and the Navy.

Again we can get into a lot more detail of decisions that have already been made if the RAB so desires. But that's my attempt to give you a quick bullet summary of what we have been doing.

A PERSON: Plant 12, has that been addressed at all.

MR. COLTER: Plant 12 is Northrop Grumman.

A PERSON: Two weeks ago, there was an article on some kind of cleanup there at plant 12. It was in the local papers.

MR. COLTER: Okay, that would be a Northrop Grumman initiative with the DEC, if they are ready to make a decision on a cleanup remedy, then they are holding a public meeting to announce that to the community. That is not Navy property so I don't have much information at all on that.

MR. LOVISOLO: Out of curiosity, that

13,000 tons of contaminated soil, I'm wondering where it wound up going.

MR. COLTER: I don't know.

MR. LOVISOLO: Town of Hempstead, maybe.

MR. COLTER: Maybe Suffolk County. I don't know. That was initiated by Northrop Grumman. I wasn't involved in that. I don't have the details on what landfill that might have been taken to or really any of the specifics of what they did with it. If that is important, I can certainly get the information.

MR. LOVISOLO: No, it is not. Out of curiosity.

A MAN: Those removals, are those certified. There is a whole process when somebody removes and transfers a contaminated material.

MR. COLTER: Yes. Each time -- if I'm not mistaken Grumman identified over 250 areas of concern. Basically 250 IR sites. As they investigated each one, they wrote a report, either a big report or in some cases maybe a couple of pages to the Stony Brook office of the DEC, saying this is what we found, this is what we want to do, here is how we plan to do it, do you have a problem with it.

The state most of time came back and said we concur. Northrop Grumman went out, did their excavation, did their sampling to make sure they got out what they were supposed to get out, and again forwarded another report saying this is how much we dug up, this is how many contamination samples we came up with, this is the result of the samples. We think we are done. What do you think. Nine times out of 10, the DEC came back said yes, we concur.

Yes, there is a process. Although Northrop Grummn is not required, as the Navy is, to put their documents in a public repository. That is a federal requirement.

A MAN: But they are required to get the DEC's approval.

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A MAN: Correct?

MR. COLTER: Yes.

A MAN: That has been monitored.

MR. COLTER: I would suggest if anyone has a question on that, call the Stony Brook office of the DEC and I can give you a name if you want to talk to.

A MAN: If you want to get an answer to

the question, the state DEC is monitoring that process.

A MAN: It has been contaminated for a long time.

MR. SCHARF: Plant 12 is a separate issue you asked about earlier, that is Northrop Grumman property solely. That is located on the.

A MAN: I know exactly where it is, hook.

MR. SCHARF: Northrop Grumman has submitted a work plan on Plant 12 to the RCRA Program, which is an active facility permitting process, to a group out on the Stony Brook. In this work plan they want to go in and remediate areas that were identified that are still small areas of concern at Plant 12 and they want to -- before Grumman transfers that property, they want to address the environmental issue and still remain there.

MR. COLTER: We have been here a --

A MAN: One more thing, that big tower on the runway, can you identify it?

A MAN: It is a water tower.

A MAN: Is it a water tower.

A MAN: I believe Northrop Grumman paid

for that. It is a Bethpage water tower. That is a permanent water storage tower.

MR. KEEL is it used now?

A MAN: No, it is under construction.

A MAN: Jim, what is the feasibility before the weather turns of getting for the RAB a field walk of the sites so we have a better understanding of what we are actually talking about.

MR. COLTER: A site visit?

A MAN: I find it better to take a look at it first before I start reading any technical documentation.

MR. COLTER: Normally we hold these RAB meetings every quarter. We lack for agenda items. Sometimes we have a report that is under review. We don't have anything new to discuss. Three months, believe it or not, is a very short time frame to get environmental documents submitted, prepared, and reviewed. So there will be a lot of time we are struggling for an agenda item. We can cancel that RAB meeting or fill it with agenda items. One can be a site visit.

Next quarter is the dead of winter and it will be getting dark soon. I'm on call, basically

as much as I need to be. You guys get together, find a time that is convenient within the next couple of weeks, next month or so. I would be happy to make a trip up here and during the day on a Saturday, whatever you guys deem appropriate. I will be more than happy to come up here and take you around the Navy property.

MR. KAMINSKI: The second option is to wait to have another RAB meeting inside and have the RAB meeting that would come in the spring at the site when it's light enough to take you all through there. It is up to you guys.

A MAN: It might be a better idea to, as soon as we could, just to get over there.

MR. COLTER: I would suggest you talk among yourselves over the next couple days, give Judith a call. I'll leave my card, you can call me directly and let know what you have decided.

We have been here a couple hours. I'm happy to entertain a few more questions if you like. I don't want to extend it too far. I want to maybe talk about some agenda items that you guys have been noting. I'd like to get a summary of what those might be. We might not be able to hit them all but

we can certainly hit a couple of them if the RAB and community feel it is appropriate.

MR. KAMINSKI: What I have so far is there is some interest in the aspect of independent assistance, some interested in academic discussion of the risk assessment, what the risk assessment is all about. Some more maps.

A MAN: We would want that specifically in terms of what is on the property, what is going to be left, what the Navy intends to -- how the Navy intends to leave the property. We want the risk assessment specific to the site rather than a general education.

A MAN: Review all the risk assessment that was performed.

MR. COLTER: That risk assessment was performed while the contamination was there. It was performed to determine what level of cleanup we had to do. A lot of those actions are being implemented. A lot of risk that was identified no longer exists.

A MAN: Right. We would rather know -- what you're leaving or what you intend to leave and the risk associated with that, as opposed

to going over a two hour meeting of what a risk assessment is and how you do it. John was starting to explain it. If anyone disagrees, say it. We want to go specific to that issue.

A MAN: What milestones they have reached and how you drew the conclusions to come to the standards you have met.

MR. KAMINSKI: Potentially related off site issues at some point in time, New York DEC will help us with that. You all need more maps, more explanations from map standpoint, where monitoring wells. You need more information like that.

A MAN: A standard one and leave it off to the side so when anyone is speaking Site 1 you can glance at it.

MR. COLTER: We are developing a geographic information system, a GIS for environmental data. It it is basically a computer database compiled with a lot of information. It enables you to click on a building, a structure, a well and get all kinds of data on what the structure is, the dimensions of the structure. If you click on a well, we'll have information on analytical data of that well, such as when it was sampled, what

chemicals we found in it. We are using it out at Calverton right now. It has gone a long way in taking seven, eight years of data and putting it basically under one report. It has gone a long way helping us to explain to the community what we have done out there and need to do. We have already gotten that about 90 percent complete, and we'll anticipate using that at future TRC and RAB meetings.

A MAN: I have a question. As it relates to the areas that you're going to retain and at some point possibly probably transfer to the county, for future development, somebody is going to go in there and dig a footing and build something. They are going to disturb what you did.

MR. COLTER: Right.

A MAN: Can we get a handle, including with the existing building, for argument's sake Plant 3 may stay or somebody might take it down subdivide it, somebody is going to do something. Does that disturb any of what has been done? Does that then take some of that soil that is down below the gravel that you have placed, and make that an issue.

Proceedings

MR. COLTER: Couple different answers to that.

A MAN: You don't have to answer it tonight. You can supply that as part of future development.

MR. COLTER: I can give you an overview quickly. Another process that goes on an environmental impact statement, it is a federal process. The federal government is mandated to take a look at the environmental impacts but they deal with traffic, noise, historic, archaeological. Things like that. What are the impacts of transferring this property to the county. That is done also by my division in a separate group. It also heavily relies on the government entity, in this case being the county, doing a redevelopment plan. It takes a look at what the county would like to do and assesses the impacts of implementing that.

So there is a plan out there that says what the county wants to do with the property. In some cases it is demolition and other cases things are going to remain. It is totally separate process.

To answer your question, though, if we

were leaving contamination in the subsurface, there is not going to be in direct contact with anybody as long as a cap is in place, or as long as that gravel cover is in place. What the Navy would do if we are not going to remove it, is put a deed restriction on the property.

The deed restriction would say that it is going to let everybody know what's there and it is going to say that as it stands now it is not a danger. However, if you want to disturb that and you want to make changes to it, it is your responsibility and our deed restriction normally says you have to consult with the local regulatory agencies before doing anything in that area. At this point, I don't think we are going to have much in the way of deed restrictions for the environment. Any area where we would have to restrict use of the property, we are going to retain it. So that.

A MAN: That was the path -- kind of keep it in the Navy's hands and their responsibility to clean it up, and then we would take it.

I want to mention on the other thing. The county developed a plan through several public meetings that we had here in Bethpage. But, really,

the plan is just used as a basis to stimulate this study. It is not -- it doesn't mean that that is what is going to happen to the property. But if you went along the course of not having a plan, this study would -- may not be as exhaustive or as detailed, and that is why we dedicated resources to do several scenarios, and we elicited experts that predicted what a developer may want to do or may want to propose. It doesn't mean that that will be it or it can be it. This study is based on what would happen, based on those scenarios.

So you understand, even after this process, even after the transfer, even when it goes out and developers want to purchase it and in fact if it does get purchased, it still has to go through all the municipal processes and all those hearings that are required if they want to change zone or need special use permits. I can't imagine a property of this size not having fallen into that category. That's another whole stage of hearings that you'll get into. That study is used as a basis for this study, the what-ifs, so we can apply what we are learning here today and ask questions base on that. Keep that in mind.

Proceedings

MR. COLTER: I want to add on to that response of John. Obviously the Navy tries its best to identify every area of contamination that is on its property. The Bethpage area is 100 acres. It is fairly small. We are fairly confident that we've hit all the areas. A site like Calverton, that's 3,000 acres, there is a lot of area out there and a lot of undeveloped area and we are not sure what has happened historically in there. So the Navy covers itself on that. When it transfers property, it puts in place a deed restriction or covenants that says in the course of your redevelopment of the property, if you dig a foundation, and you turn up contamination, you know, there is an agreement that the town is going to take this property with the understanding that that scenario happens. But the Navy is going to want to come back on the property. We are not going to want to mess around with property access agreements, legal agreements and all this other baloney that we normally have to do. We want to gain access to that property. They have to agree to give us that access so we can do an investigation and see what we missed and things like that.

Proceedings

We don't profess that we hit it 100 percent of the time all the time. There is a recognition out there that we to have to leave an avenue open, just in case we did miss something. As again for Bethpage, it is fairly small. We have been doing this for ten years. We work closely with Northrop Grumman. We know what operations they conducted. It's a tight property. There is not much area to hide. Between the efforts of Northrop Grumman voluntarily and the Navy's IR Program, I think we've hit most of them.

MR. LOVISOLO: Would there be objection for the -- GIS software to be given, for example, to the water district so they could incorporate it with their system and for their different layers and such like that they would be able to have some.

MR. COLTER: Typically, the Navy shares all its, basically its technology with those who are capable of using it. You need certain software to run a GIS program. If a RAB member has that capability, we are not opposed to submitting that to them for their use. Similar to all the regulatory agencies, if they have the technical capability to use that program, we give it to them and let them

run their own scenarios and -- all the data in the GIS are in the reports that are in the library, so it is all public information.

The GIS is going to be very central to the Navy's property. The water district right now is working with the DEC, Northrop Grumman and the Navy. Northrop Grumman has developed a groundwater model similar to what we did for the Navy property. They have done it for the Navy, Northrop Grumman, and south, down to the Bethpage Water District. They basically tripled the size of the Navy's groundwater model. That model has different layers. It shows computer modeling of where contamination may end up; that is how we designed the treatment system, to make sure we capture the groundwater.

So the water district is involved in that process. They really haven't asked that they be given that model to do their one review. I'm sure if they did that, Northrop Grumman would share that.

Anything else? It is getting late.

A MAN: There's two agenda items you might want to include. You're submitting your final FS in '99, a review of what is being submitted. And also really a general understanding of the groundwater

models and the soil characteristics.

MR. KAMINSKI: I'm going to ask Jim to come up with a tentative agenda and get back to you by phone, trade phone numbers.

A MAN: We'll get the copy of the tentative agenda, and mail it out to everyone to comment on it. If we all agree on it, we'll send it back and come up with a formal agenda.

MR. COLTER: It is possible, these are involved, some of those will take up the whole two hours.

A MAN: Can you indicate that -- indicate which ones is a subject of one meeting versus three.

MR. COLTER: Sure.

A MAN: So we can get a better idea and you can prioritize.

MR. COLTER: Okay.

MR. KAMINSKI: Also get together with Jim, trade phones on when and if you want to take a daytime site visit, as Jim said, any time.

A MAN: Is everybody in favor of doing a daytime site visit?

Why don't we all look at a Saturday

coming up in the next four weeks, or so, and we'll talk and come up with an idea and come up with a tentative date and I'll get back on it with you.

MR. KAMINSKI: I have one more slide. It says you all made a serious commitment. A lot of civic hard work, we appreciate your participation, take a lot of dedication, a lot of energy, a lot of time and primarily you care, that is why you're here. I think the fact that you care is what we need the most and I'm delighted at the communication we have had this evening. I think it is going to get even better. I want to thank you on behalf of the Navy, as I take off my surrogate mantel and give it to your co-chair.

THE CO-CHAIRMAN: Anybody have anything else. Motion to adjourn.

A PERSON: So moved.

A MAN: Second.

THE CO-CHAIRMAN: Anyone opposed?

Let's go home.

(Time noted: 9:28 p.m.)

-o0o-

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

I, JENNIFER MAUE, a Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing Matter, taken at the time and place aforesaid, is a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, nor in any wise interested in the result or outcome thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22d day of December, 1999.

JENNIFER MAUE