

FUDS Property No. C02NY0057

FUDS Project Name – Fort Totten Coast Guard Station
Formerly Used Defense Site
Queens, New York

**Final
Decision Document
Engineer School, Fort Totten**

March 2016

Prepared for:



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1.0 DECLARATION	1-1
1.1 Site Name and Location	1-1
1.2 Statement of Basis and Purpose	1-1
1.3 Assessment of the Site	1-2
1.4 Description of the Selected Remedy	1-2
1.5 Statutory Determinations	1-3
1.6 Data Certification Checklist	1-3
1.7 Authorizing Signature	1-3
2.0 DECISION SUMMARY	2-1
2.1 Site Name, Location, and Brief Description.....	2-1
2.2 Site History and Enforcement Activities	2-1
2.2.1 Summary of Activities.....	2-1
2.2.2 Site Investigations	2-2
2.2.3 Site Actions.....	2-3
2.3 Community Participation.....	2-3
2.4 Scope and Role of the Response Action.....	2-4
2.5 Site Characteristics	2-4
2.5.1 Conceptual Site Model	2-4
2.5.2 Sampling Strategy	2-5
2.5.3 Sources, Types and Extent of Contamination	2-5
2.5.4 Materials to be Remediated	2-6
2.6 Current and Potential Future Site and Resource Uses	2-6
2.7 Summary of Site Risks	2-6
2.7.1 Findings of the Human Health Risk Assessment.....	2-6
2.7.2 Findings of the Ecological Screening Level Risk Assessment.....	2-7
2.8 Remedial Action Objective	2-7
2.9 Description of Alternatives.....	2-8
2.10 Comparative Analysis of Alternatives.....	2-8
2.11 Principal Threat Wastes.....	2-9
2.12 Selected Remedy	2-9
2.12.1 Summary of the Rationale for the Response Action	2-9
2.12.2 Description of the Response Action	2-9
2.12.3 Monitoring Well Closure	2-10
2.12.4 Summary of Estimated Response Costs.....	2-11
2.12.5 Outcome of the Removal Action.....	2-11
2.13 Statutory Determinations.....	2-11
2.13.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment.....	2-11
2.13.2 Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements	2-11
2.13.3 Cost-Effectiveness.....	2-11
2.13.4 Utilization of Permanent Solutions and Alternative Treatment Technologies to the Maximum Extent Practicable.....	2-11
2.13.5 Preference for Treatment as a Principal Element	2-11
2.14 Documentation of Significant Changes	2-12

3.0	RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY	3-1
3.1	Summary of Comments and Responses to Comments	3-1
3.2	State Acceptance	3-4
3.3	Community Acceptance	3-5
4.0	REFERENCES	4-1

TABLES

Table 2-1	Evaluation of Alternatives
Table 2-2	Cost Analysis – Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill

FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Site Locus Map
Figure 1-2	Site Map of Fort Totten CGS FUDS
Figure 2-1	Area 1 Lead Concentrations in Soil
Figure 2-2	Area to be Addressed by Alternatives

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A	Public Meeting Notice
Attachment B	Presentation
Attachment C	Transcript of Public Meeting
Attachment D	Newspaper Articles
Attachment E	Letters

ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY

ALM	Adult Lead Model
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements Applicable requirements means those cleanup standards, standards of control, and other substantive requirements, criteria, or limitations promulgated under federal environmental or state environmental or facility siting laws that specifically address a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, remedial action, location, or other circumstance found at a CERCLA site. Only those state standards that are identified by a state in a timely manner and that are more stringent than federal requirements may be applicable. Relevant and appropriate requirements means those cleanup standards, standards of control, and other substantive requirements, criteria, or limitations promulgated under federal environmental or state environmental or facility siting laws that, while not "applicable" to a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, remedial action, location, or other circumstance at a CERCLA site, address problems or situations sufficiently similar to those encountered at the CERCLA site that their use is well suited to the particular site. Only those state standards that are identified in a timely manner and are more stringent than federal requirements may be relevant and appropriate.
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
bgs	below ground surface
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act – a federal statute that concerns responses to releases or threats of releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, and concerns compensation and liability
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DERP	Defense Environmental Restoration Program – Congressionally authorized in 1986, DERP promotes and coordinates efforts for the evaluation and cleanup of contamination at Department of Defense installations and Formerly Used Defense Sites
DERP-FUDS	Defense Environmental Restoration Program Formerly Used Defense Site
DoD	Department of Defense
FS	Feasibility Study
ft	feet
FUDS	Formerly Used Defense Sites – a facility or site (property) that was under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense and owned by, leased to, or otherwise possessed by the United States at the time of actions leading to contamination by hazardous substances. The FUDS program is limited to those real properties that were transferred from Department of Defense control prior to 17 October 1986.
GRA	General Response Actions
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment – an evaluation of risk posed to humans from exposure to contaminants
HI	Hazard Index
IEUBK	Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model
µg/dL	micrograms per deciliter
mg/kg	milligram per kilogram
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan – regulations that implement and provide a regulatory framework for CERCLA.

NYC	New York City
NYSDEC	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation – regulatory body for environmental issues in New York State
NYSDOH	New York State Department of Health – regulatory body for health issues in New York State
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons – a class of semi-volatile compounds
Pb	lead
PbB	blood lead level
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl – a group of toxic, persistent chemicals used in electrical transformers and capacitors for insulating purposes, and in gas pipeline systems as lubricant.
PPE	personal protective equipment
RAO	Remedial Action Objective
RG	remedial goal
RI	Remedial Investigation
RSL	Regional Screening Levels
SCO	soil cleanup objectives
SI	Site Inspection
sf	square feet
SLERA	Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment – an abbreviated form of an ecological risk assessment that assesses the potential impact of site contaminants on the health of plants and animals at a site.
SRI	Supplemental Remedial Investigation
SRI2	Supplemental Remedial Investigation #2
SVOC	semi-volatile organic compound – a class of organic chemicals
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TCLP	toxicity characteristic leaching procedure
TMV	toxicity, mobility, and volume
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers – a federal agency whose authority includes response to releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants at formerly used defense sites
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
UU/UE	unlimited use/unrestricted exposure

1.0 DECLARATION

1.1 Site Name and Location

The Fort Totten Coast Guard Station (CGS) Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), “The Site”, is located in the northwest portion of Long Island in the Queens Borough of New York City, New York (Figure 1-1). The Fort Totten CGS FUDS is listed in United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) records as Engineer School, Flushing, New York, FUDS site C02NY0057. The FUDS is currently owned and operated by the United States Coast Guard (USCG), although a large portion is currently not in use. The FUDS was formerly owned and operated by the Department of Defense (DoD).

The DoD acquired Fort Totten, a 146.75-acre property, between 1857 and 1943, for the coastal defense of Long Island Sound and the eastern entrance to the East River. Fort Totten also served as a post-Civil War hospital, an engineering school, and a training site for West Point Cadets. The US Army Reserve portion of Fort Totten is currently the Headquarters for the 77th Army Reserve Command. In 1968 the Department of the Army conveyed 9.6 acres of the property to the USCG, retaining ownership of the remaining 137.15 acres. This FUDS property comprises the conveyed 9.6 acres.

Fort Totten CGS FUDS was divided into five investigation areas (Area 1 through 5), based on current and former building locations and uses (Figure 1-2). No further action will be taken at Areas 2 through 5. A remedial action will be taken at Area 1. Area 1, previously designated as the Fill Area, is a rectangular-shaped parcel of land located in the northeastern portion of the FUDS (Figure 1-2). Area 1 was created when the Army placed soil excavated from the vicinity of Buildings 118, 119, and 121 (former vehicle maintenance shops located outside of the Fort Totten CGS FUDS boundary) in a low spot in a recreational field to eliminate periods of standing water. The excavated material included portions of the building’s parking lots. Subsequent soil testing revealed that the soils in Area 1 contain lead at concentrations that are unacceptable for human health and that exceed background.

Area 1 is currently open space and is not used for a specific purpose. Future site use is not expected to change; however, the US Coast Guard has an approved planning proposal to increase its operational presence at Fort Totten and the location of the new facilities, which conceptually includes future duty housing units, may be close to the ball field area and thus close to Area 1.

1.2 Statement of Basis and Purpose

USACE is the lead agency for response actions for DoD’s hazardous substances at FUDS pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. § 9601 et seq., and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 300.

USACE commissioned a Site Inspection (SI) of Fort Totten CGS FUDS in 1988 (Metcalf & Eddy, 1988). The SI report recommended a risk assessment, at a minimum, or a Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS) be performed. The USACE initiated a comprehensive RI in 1997 to determine the nature and extent of the contamination (USACE, 2005). The RI was conducted in two phases. Phase I was conducted from July 1997 through August 1998 and Phase II was conducted between November 1999 and August 2000. The USACE conducted a Supplemental Remedial Investigation (SRI) in summer 2004 to address data gaps and questions raised by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) regarding the nature and extent of semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOC) and metals in soils in Area 1. The USACE conducted a Supplemental Remedial Investigation #2 (SRI2) in 2011 and 2012 to further delineate and characterize environmental conditions in the upland portion of the Fort Totten CGS FUDS and to support updated risk assessments. The results of the initial 1997 RI, SRI, and SRI2 were combined into a Final RI report (USACE, 2014a). Based on the findings of the risk assessment and other information provided in the Final RI report (USACE, 2014a), no further action will be taken at the ballfield, or at Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5. The only portion of Fort Totten CGS FUDS where Department of Defense (DoD) activities resulted in conditions that may pose a risk to future receptors is the lead impacted soil in Area 1. The

USACE completed a FS for Area 1 in 2014 (USACE, 2014b). The FS evaluated a range of options for addressing the human health risks posed by Area 1. Area 1 is an overgrown, open space area, adjacent to the ball fields which are used for active recreation.

A Proposed Plan (USACE, 2015) was issued for all of Fort Totten CGS FUDS in June 2015, with a preferred alternative for Area 1 of removal, off-site disposal, and backfill. The public comment period for the Proposed Plan ran from July 17, 2015 to August 28, 2015. The Proposed Plan was posted on the USACE web site and direct-mailed copies of the plan were provided to stakeholders and the Bay Terrace Library. A public meeting was held on June 30, 2015 at the Bay Terrace Jewish Center where the USACE presented the Proposed Plan and the public was offered an opportunity to voice their comments, and/or to provide them in writing.

The State of New York concurs with the Selected Alternative of removal, off-site disposal, and backfill for Area 1. In a May 22, 2015 letter, NYSDEC agrees that the remedy of removal, off-site disposal, and backfill for Area 1 is acceptable for the current use of the facility as an active Coast Guard Station. Although no further action will be taken at Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5, the NYSDEC's soil clean up objectives (SCOs) were exceeded at several sampling locations within each of these areas; therefore, NYSDEC intends to issue an Environmental Notice of their own for the property, not within the scope of the USACE remedy. The NYSDEC intends to issue the "Environmental Notice", notwithstanding a CERCLA-compliant risk assessment conducted by USACE, which concludes unlimited use/unrestricted exposure (UU/UE) at Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 (with no further action). UU/UE will be achieved at Area 1 when the removal of soils above background concentrations of lead is completed. The USACE remedy does not require five year reviews, because UU/UE will be achieved, site-wide.

The Administrative Record, which concerns information relevant to decision making for this site, may be viewed on the project web site: <http://www.nan.usace.army.mil/FortTotten>, and at the Bay Terrace Library, 18-36 Bell Blvd., Bayside, New York.

1.3 Assessment of the Site

Based on the findings of the risk assessment and other information provided in the Final RI report (USACE, 2014a), no further action is proposed at Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Fort Totten CGS FUDS. The only area and media requiring remedial action is Area 1 due to concentrations of lead in soil that result in unacceptable risk to human health.

The Remedial Action Objective (RAO) at Area 1 is to prevent or reduce the potential for a child's ingestion of soils with total lead concentrations significantly above background concentrations. By comparison, background concentrations [522.5 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) in shallow soils and 448.9 mg/kg in deep soils] are slightly above the 400 mg/kg NYSDEC soil cleanup objective.

1.4 Description of the Selected Remedy

Based on the evaluation presented in the FS and the Proposed Plan, the decision for Areas 2 – 5 of the Fort Totten CGS FUDS is no further action. The selected alternative for Area 1 is Alternative 4 – Removal, Off-Site Disposal, and Backfill. The selected remedy involves removal of soil from Area 1 that contains lead concentrations greater than background. The soil will be transported off-site for disposal at an appropriate facility. The area will be backfilled with certified clean fill and topsoil, and revegetated in accordance with the restoration plan provided as part of the remedial action work plan.

Alternative 4 provides the best balance of the threshold, primary balancing, and modifying criteria. It satisfies the RAO by excavating the contaminated soil and disposing of the soil off-site, thus eliminating the potential future residential exposure to contaminated soil in Area 1.

1.5 Statutory Determinations

For Areas 2 – 5, none of the CERCLA Section 121 statutory determinations are necessary in this section since no remedy is being selected; no remedial action is necessary for Areas 2 – 5 to ensure protection of human health and the environment. The selected alternative for Area 1 is Alternative 4 – Removal, Off-Site Disposal, and Backfill. Alternative 4 is protective of human health and the environment, utilizes permanent solutions, and is cost-effective. There are no Federal and State requirements that are Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARAR) to the remediation action. The remedy does not employ treatment; therefore, does not satisfy the statutory preference for treatment as a principal element of the remedy. However, the selected remedy is the only alternative evaluated during the FS that provides a permanent solution and an opportunity for site closure. A five-year review is not necessary because there will not be any residual risk after the selected remedy has been completed. NYSDEC intends to issue an Environmental Notice to address several sampling locations at Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 which exceeded NYSDEC's soil clean up objectives (SCOs).

1.6 Data Certification Checklist

The following information is included in the Decision Summary section (Section 2.0) of this Decision Document. Additional information can be found in the Administrative Record for this site.

Data Item	Location in Document
Contaminants of Concern (COC) and their respective concentrations.	Section 2.5.3
Baseline risk represented by the COC.	Section 2.7
Cleanup levels established for the COC and the basis for these levels.	Section 2.8
How source materials constituting principal threats will be addressed.	Section 2.12
Land use resulting from the implementation of the Selected Remedy.	Section 2.6
Estimated annual and total present value costs, discount rate, and the number of years over which the remedy cost estimate is projected.	Section 2.12.3
Key factor(s) that led to selecting the remedy.	Sections 2.12 and 2.13

1.7 Authorizing Signature

This Decision Document presents the selected response action at Fort Totten CGS FUDS, Queens, New York. The USACE is the lead agency under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) at the Fort Totten CGS FUDS, and has developed this Decision Document consistent with the CERCLA, as amended, and the NCP. This Decision Document will be incorporated into the larger Administrative Record file for the Fort Totten CGS FUDS, which is available for public view. Based on the findings of the risk assessment and other information provided in the Final Remedial Investigation Report, no further action is proposed at the ball field or at Areas 2, 3, 4, & 5, and the only media and area requiring remedial action is soil at Area 1 due to unacceptable lead concentrations in soil. This document presents the selected remedy for Area 1, which consists of the removal and off-site disposal of soils above background concentrations of lead, and backfill with clean fill. This decision is approved by the undersigned, pursuant to Memorandum, DAIM-ZA, September 9, 2003, subject: Policies for Staffing and Approving Decision Document, and to the FUDS Program Policy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulation 200-3-1 (2004).


Christopher J. Barron
Colonel, EN
Commanding

12 APR 16
Date

2.0 DECISION SUMMARY

2.1 Site Name, Location, and Brief Description

The 9.6-acre Fort Totten CGS FUDS property is located in the northwest portion of Long Island in the Queens Borough of New York City, New York and is currently owned and operated by the USCG (Figure 1-1).

For the purposes of the SRI2, the Site was divided into five investigation areas (Areas 1 through 5) based on current and former building locations and Site uses (Figure 1-2).

- Area 1 (Former Fill Area): Area 1 was created when the Army placed excavated soil in a low spot of the recreation field to eliminate periods of standing water. The soil came from excavation of parking lots associated with former and existing vehicle maintenance shops on the Army-owned portion of Fort Totten.
- Area 2 (Building 624): Building 624 was originally constructed as a workshop and was later used for storage, including the storage of pesticides.
- Area 3 (Buildings 610, 611, and 612): This area was originally investigated due to the presence of a transformer south of Building 610 that was suspected of containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).
- Area 4 (Building 625): A concrete pad adjacent to Building 625 originally supported two electrical transformers suspected of containing PCBs.
- Area 5 (Building 615): Building 615 was originally used as a torpedo and mine repair facility. The armaments contained mercury in their guidance systems and when repair required removal of the mercury, it was disposed of into the floor drains.

The area around Buildings 620 and 621 was excluded from further characterization during SRI2 based on the results of previous investigations that did not indicate a need for further characterization. Buildings 620 and 621 were constructed in the late 1800's, were formerly used respectively as a torpedo laboratory and shop building, and were later converted to housing and a garage, respectively (USACE, 1985).

Area 1 is the only portion of Fort Totten CGS FUDS that was recommended for further action in the RI and is the only area that will be addressed by the response action. Area 1, previously designated as the Fill Area, is a rectangular-shaped area located in the northeastern portion of the FUDS (Figure 1-2).

In accordance with the provisions of the DERP Management Guidance, the Department of the Army (DA) serves as the DoD Executive Agent for execution of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS).

The DA further delegated the responsibility of the DERP-FUDS program management and execution to the USACE. All plans and activities conducted by USACE at Fort Totten CGS FUDS are coordinated with the NYSDEC, the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), and the USCG.

2.2 Site History and Enforcement Activities

2.2.1 Summary of Activities

There is no record of any enforcement activities taken at this site.

The SI conducted at Fort Totten CGS FUDS indicated that contamination was present at concentrations that may require regulatory review in groundwater (lead and chromium), soil (mercury), sediment (mercury and petroleum hydrocarbons), and on building surfaces (pesticides). The contamination resulted from previous DoD activities at Fort Totten CGS FUDS.

Fort Totten CGS FUDS is listed on the New York State Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Sites as a Class 2 Site (i.e., a property that may present a significant threat to human health and the environment). The justification for classification stated: "The mercury contamination is (sic) the Bay is most likely the result of improper disposal of mercury contaminated wastes used in the manufacture, repair, or disposal

of various weapons systems during the Army's use of the site. The mercury contamination in the Bay is extensive; Marine Resources has stated that these sediments would be considered impaired for benthic and fish life. Elevated levels of mercury contamination on-site, and elevated levels of mercury and other heavy metals in sediments off-site represent a significant threat to public health and the environment. A determination of significant threat is warranted" (NYSDEC, 1996).

2.2.2 Site Investigations

The Fort Totten CGS FUDS has been the subject of several investigations. These include the land portion of the FUDS, referred to as the upland area, and the surface water and sediment of Little Bay. The results of these investigations are summarized below and are discussed in detail in the Final RI Report for Fort Totten (USACE, 2014a) and the FS for Area 1 (USACE, 2014b). The following investigations were conducted:

- 1988 SI
- 1992 Fill Area Soil Sampling
- 1996 Ball Field Soil Sampling
- 1997 Initial Comprehensive RI
- 2004 SRI
- 2006-2007 Building 615 Mercury Excavations
- 2011-2012 SRI2

The results of the investigations and accompanying human health and ecological risk assessments are summarized below.

- Area 1 (Fill Area): There is unacceptable risk from exposure to lead in Area 1 soils. Specifically, the probability percentage of blood lead concentrations greater than 10 micrograms per deciliter ($\mu\text{g/dL}$) exceeded the 5 percent acceptable risk margin for a future child resident.
- Area 2 (Building 624): Significant levels of pesticides were not detected in nearby soils. The final RI report recommended no further action under FUDS because the cancer risks and non-cancer hazard index (HI) for current and potential future land use receptors are within or below the acceptable risk range (10^{-6} to 10^{-4}) and below the threshold non-cancer HI value of 1.
- Area 3 (Buildings 610, 611, and 612): PCBs were not detected in soils collected near these buildings. The final RI report recommended no further action under FUDS because the only risk greater than risk limits was driven by a single elevated detection of arsenic associated with a pressure treated deck. In the absence of that detection, the cancer risks and non-cancer HIs for future land use receptors at Area 3 would be within or below the acceptable risk range (10^{-6} to 10^{-4}) and below the threshold non-cancer HI value of 1. Additional investigation and qualitative risk evaluation of mercury in Area 3 confirmed the conclusion of previous risk assessment; mercury in surface soil within Area 3 is not a human health concern.
- Area 4 (Building 625): PCBs were not detected in soils collected near the building. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were detected at concentrations significantly higher than background, resulting in unacceptable risk to future residents. Visual observations from soil borings and hand-dug holes confirmed that the elevated PAH concentrations in Area 4 are attributable to historic urban fill. Based on these observations, the final RI report recommended no further action under FUDS.

- Area 5 (Building 615): During investigation activities (to locate the exit point of floor drains), mercury-impacted soil was excavated to the extent possible from outside of the building in 2006 and 2007. Underground structures, including a buried electrical line, active sewer line, and former cesspools prevented complete removal of all impacted soils. These structures are still in place and will limit or prevent future soil removal within the source area. Air monitoring within Building 615 indicated that there were no detectable concentrations of mercury greater than the state screening level (USACE, 2006). Surface water sampling in Little Bay did not detect significant concentrations of mercury (USACE, 2005). The HHRA indicated there are no unacceptable risks or hazards from the remaining soil and the screening level ecological risk assessment (SLERA) indicated that concentrations of metals are not likely to result in actionable population level effects to ecological receptors. The final RI report recommended no further action under FUDS. Because Area 5 contains low-levels of residual mercury in the subsurface, the U.S. Coast Guard indicated in a letter dated 22 May 2015 (Attachment A) that management/institutional controls will be utilized to track any residual environmental liabilities at the site.
- Little Bay: Mercury levels in the sediment were not significantly higher than those found in sediment in other portions of Long Island Sound and New York Harbor, indicating that substantial quantities of mercury were not released from Building 615 into the Bay. An ecological risk assessment indicated that mercury posed no risk to the aquatic environment of Little Bay. The USACE issued a No Further Action Record of Decision for Little Bay (USACE, 2003) after additional fish and shellfish tissue sampling confirmed that mercury continued to pose no significant threat to human health and the environment.
- Ball Field: The NY Department of Health determined that no contaminants were detected at levels that would pose a health concern for users of the ball field (NYDOH, 1996). NYSDEC provided a letter dated March 18, 2014 confirming "... there were no waste handling practices ever inferred to have occurred at the ball fields portion of the site, and further, data collected early in the Remedial Investigation process from the ball fields did not reveal any significant contamination. Based upon that review... this area will require no further investigation ...".
- Site-wide Groundwater: Samples collected in 2011 contained PAHs, sodium, and chloroform above the New York State Class A groundwater guidance criteria. The PAH concentrations were likely related to suspended solids in groundwater samples rather than dissolved PAHs (based on a comparison of subsequent sample results from filtered versus unfiltered samples). A qualitative risk evaluation of 2012 groundwater sampling results indicated that risk from exposure to groundwater is not of concern. The final RI report (USACE, 2014a) recommended no-action for area groundwater because there is no current exposure and no potential for future exposure.

2.2.3 Site Actions

Site investigations and removal of mercury-impacted soil by Building 615 discussed above. These are the only site actions that have occurred at Fort Totten CGS FUDS.

2.3 Community Participation

Community participation activities provide the public with an opportunity to express its views on the selected remedial action. USACE considered state (NYSDEC and NYSDOH) and public input from the community in selecting the Preferred Remedy for Area 1.

The USACE hosted a public meeting on June 30, 2015 at the Bay Terrace Jewish Center to present the Proposed Plan for Fort Totten CGS FUDS. The public comment period for the Proposed Plan ran from July 17, 2015 to August 28, 2015. Approximately three weeks prior to the public meeting, the Proposed Plan was posted on the USACE website and copies were direct-mailed to stakeholders and the Bay Terrace Library.

The public meeting presentation included a discussion of the no further action decision for Areas 2 through 5 and a discussion of the Preferred Remedy for Area 1, which is Alternative 4 – Removal, Off-Site Disposal, and Backfill. Comments from the public were received and addressed during the meeting. A responsiveness summary, in which responses to public comments received during the public meeting and over the duration of the public comment period, is provided in Section 3.0 of this Decision Document. A transcript of the June 30, 2015 meeting is provided as Attachment A.

Notices announcing the public meeting were intended to be published in the *Bayside Times* and *Flushing Times* on June 12, 2015. Both newspapers have general circulation in the area of Fort Totten. Unfortunately, due to an error on the part of the newspaper, the notice was not published. A subsequent notice of the availability of the Proposed Plan was published on July 17, 2015. The subsequent notice extended the public comment period through August 28, 2015 and indicated that a second public meeting would be held if members of the public requested such a meeting (the initial public comment period was to close on July 24, 2015). No such request was made for a second public meeting.

2.4 Scope and Role of the Response Action

The response action will be undertaken by USACE as part of the FUDS program. Area 1 is the only portion of Fort Totten CGS FUDS that was recommended for further action in the RI and it the only area that will be addressed by the response action.

The need for the response action at Area 1 is driven by the risks to human health posed by contaminants in soil. The response action at Area 1 will protect potential future residents from human health risks posed by lead in soil by removing the contaminated soil from the site. The soil will be disposed of off-site at a permitted receiving facility. The area will be backfilled and revegetated.

2.5 Site Characteristics

The description of site characteristics is limited to the area where the response action will be conducted, specifically Area 1. Area 1 is approximately 0.84 acres located in the northeast portion of Fort Totten CGS FUDS. The land is fairly flat with a small wetland on the northern edge of the area. The wetland is not regulated under the New York State Freshwater Wetlands Act. Area 1 is currently heavily vegetated except along the eastern boundary.

2.5.1 Conceptual Site Model

A conceptual site model (CSM) is an effective tool for defining site dynamics, streamlining risk assessments, establishing exposure hypotheses, and developing appropriate corrective actions. CSMs are useful for identifying completed exposure pathways between the contaminated media and potential receptors. The purpose of the CSM is to aid in understanding and describing a site and presents the assumptions regarding:

- Suspected sources and types of contaminants present;
- Contaminant release and transport mechanisms;
- Affected media;
- Potential receptors that could come in contact with site-related contaminants in affected media under current and future land use scenarios; and
- Potential routes of exposure.

Potential human receptors are defined as individuals who may be exposed to site-related contaminants in environmental media. Consistent with United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) guidance, current and reasonably anticipated land uses were considered in the receptor selection process.

USEPA defines an exposure pathway as: “The course a chemical or physical agent takes from a source to an exposed organism. An exposure pathway describes a unique mechanism by which an individual or population is exposed to chemicals or physical agents at or originating from a site. Each exposure pathway includes a source or release from a source, an exposure point, and an exposure route. If the

exposure point differs from the source, a transport/exposure medium (e.g., air) or media (in cases of intermedia transfer) is also included.”

A review of potential exposure pathways links the sources, locations, and types of environmental releases with receptor locations and activity patterns to determine the significant pathways of concern.

Based on the investigations, the observations and reasonable assumptions for the potential human receptors for Area 1 are listed below.

- Current Receptors: Area 1 is open space and is not currently used for any specific purposes. Receptors include Outdoor Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults) and Trespasser/Recreational Receptors (adolescents and adults).
- Future Receptors: Future potential receptors include Outdoor Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults), Indoor Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults), Construction Workers (adults), Recreational Receptors (children and adults), and Residents (children and adults).

2.5.2 *Sampling Strategy*

A total of 24 surface and subsurface soil samples were collected from Area 1 during three separate sampling events conducted to determine the nature and extent of metals, SVOCs, and volatile organic compounds. Phase I sampling occurred from July of 1997 through August of 1998, Phase II sampling occurred in November 1999 and August 2000, and the SRI sampling occurred during the summer of 2004.

2.5.3 *Sources, Types and Extent of Contamination*

Area 1 was created when the Army placed soil excavated from the vicinity of Buildings 118, 119, and 121 (former vehicle maintenance shops located outside of the Fort Totten CGS FUDS boundary) in a low spot in a recreational field to eliminate periods of standing water. The excavated material included portions of the building’s parking lots.

Lead is the only contaminant of concern and soil is the only media of concern. Lead was detected in all soil samples collected from Area 1. The estimated extent of lead concentrations in excess of background [522 mg/kg for shallow soils (0 to 3 inches) or 449 mg/kg for deep soils (greater than three inches)]¹ is limited to the southern half of Area 1 (Figure 2-1). The maximum lead concentration in soil was 1,540 mg/kg detected at B-10 [0-1 feet (ft)] (Figure 2-1). The total surface area of lead concentrations greater than background is approximately 20,000 square feet (sf) (Figure 2-2).

At locations where both surface and subsurface samples were collected, lead concentrations decreased with depth. The depth of lead concentrations greater than background is between 1 and 2 ft below ground surface (bgs) in the southwestern portion of Area 1 and is greater than 2 ft bgs, but less than 16 ft bgs in the southeastern portion of Area 1. The depth of soil with lead concentrations that exceed background is assumed to be fairly shallow based on the source of the contamination (i.e., fill material deposited in the southern portion of Area 1 to fill in low areas of the topography). Depths are estimated to extend to 1.5 ft bgs in the western half of the area and up to 3 ft bgs in the eastern half of the entire 20,000 sf area. The total volume of soil with lead concentrations greater than background is estimated to be 45,000 cubic feet or 1,667 cubic yards (cy).

Lead in the surface soil is not migrating in significant quantities to surface water bodies. Surface water and sediment sampling in Little Bay did not detect concentrations of metals higher than those found in Little Neck Bay.

The mobility of metals in soil depends on many factors including soil type, oxidizing/reducing conditions, pH, and organic content. Infiltration rates and depth to groundwater are also important factors affecting transport of metals in the subsurface. Regardless, lead was detected in only one of the five site-wide monitoring wells sampled in 2011. The detection occurred in well MW-4R at an estimated concentration

¹ The background concentrations were calculated using the 95% upper tolerance limits for 90% coverage.

of 0.0018 milligrams per liter (mg/L). By comparison, the New York State Class A Groundwater standard is 0.025 mg/L. These results indicate that metals, including lead, are not leaching in significant quantities to the groundwater.

2.5.4 Materials to be Remediated

The soils in Area 1 with lead concentrations above background will be remediated by implementing Alternative 4. The Selected Remedy consists of excavation of the soil, off-site disposal of the soil, and backfill of the excavation. The removal of contaminated soil will eliminate the potential future residential exposure pathway, thus eliminating unacceptable risk from exposure to Area 1.

2.6 Current and Potential Future Site and Resource Uses

Area 1 is currently open space and is not used for a specific purpose. Area 2 is primarily open space and includes the remains of former Building 624. Area 2 is not used for a specific purpose. Area 3 includes Buildings 610, 611, and 612 that are primarily used for government office space, and the hillside lawn to the north, south, and east of these structures. Area 4 is primarily open space and includes Building 625 which is not currently used, and a small parking area for a local ambulance service. Area 5 includes Buildings 614 and 615 that are primarily used for government office space and storage, and adjacent parking areas. Future site use is not expected to change; however, the US Coast Guard has an approved planning proposal to increase its operational presence at Fort Totten and the location of the new facilities, which conceptually include duty housing units, may be close to the ball field area and thus close to Areas 1, 2, 4, and possibly Area 3.

The Fort Totten CGS FUDS is supplied by municipal water. No current or foreseeable use of groundwater has been identified, and potential salt water intrusion and low well yield would preclude future use of the groundwater for potable or non-potable purposes. As stated previously in Section 2.2.2, a qualitative risk evaluation of the 2012 groundwater sampling results indicated that risk from exposure to groundwater is not of concern. The final RI report (USACE, 2014a) recommended no-action for groundwater because there is no current exposure and no potential for future exposure.

2.7 Summary of Site Risks

Human Health Risk Assessments and ecological risk assessments were performed for Fort Totten CGS FUDS as part of the RI (USACE, 2005), updated in the SRI (USACE, 2006), and conducted again as part of the Final Remedial Investigation Report (USACE, 2014a). The results are summarized below.

Findings of the Human Health Risk Assessment

The human health risk assessment (HHRA) was performed in a manner consistent with USEPA CERCLA guidance. Carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic risks were calculated for each exposure scenario. Consistent with standard practice, risks associated with exposure to lead in soil were evaluated using USEPA blood lead models for both adults and children. The HHRA evaluated potential exposures to soil for Current Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults), Trespasser/Recreational Receptors (adolescents and adults), Future Outdoor Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults), Future Indoor Commercial/Industrial Workers (adults), Future Construction Workers (adults), Future Recreational Receptors (children and adults), and Future Residents (children and adults).

The results of the HHRA are detailed in the Final RI Report (USACE, 2014a). In general, cancer risks and non-cancer hazard indices (HIs) for all current and future land use receptors at all five exposure areas are within or below the acceptable risk range (10^{-6} to 10^{-4}) and below the threshold non-cancer screening HI and/or the target organ-based segregated HI of 1. There were two exceptions where calculated risks were above the aforementioned thresholds. These occurred in Area 3 where a finding of unacceptable risk was driven by a single sample deemed to not be representative of site soils and in Area 4 where unacceptable risk resulted from samples determined not to be representative of site soils.

Risks associated with exposure to lead were evaluated using USEPA lead biokinetic uptake models for both adults and children. The probability percentage of blood lead concentrations greater than 10 µg/dL was below the 5 percent acceptable risk margin for all five exposure areas except for the Future Child Resident in Area 1. This is described in further detail below.

The Adult Lead Model (ALM) was used to evaluate potential lead uptake and estimated blood lead levels (PbBs) for the outdoor worker, indoor worker and construction worker scenarios. The child lead model [Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model (IEUBK)] was used to determine the total lead uptake resulting from exposure to site soils and other non-site related sources, such as drinking water, inhalation of dust and airborne lead, and diet. To evaluate lead uptake from soil associated with future residential land uses, the IEUBK model was run using default values for all parameters except the soil lead concentration, for which the exposure point concentration provided in the final RI Report (USACE, 2014a) was used.

The IEUBK and ALM provide estimates of blood lead levels (PbB) that may result from chronic exposures to lead. The estimated concentrations calculated from the models were compared to a PbB of 10 micrograms per deciliter (µg/dL). USEPA considers a PbB equal to or greater than 10 µg/dL to be a level at or above which children's health is at risk (USEPA, 2015).

The adult blood lead concentration from exposure to both surface and subsurface soil is below 10 µg/dL. The probability percentage of fetal blood lead concentration greater than 10 µg/dL is also below the 5 percent acceptable risk margin for both surface soil and subsurface soil. The future child resident blood lead model indicates that the blood lead level for children exposed to surface and subsurface soil through residential exposure is below a blood lead level of 10 µg/dL; however, the probability percentage of the child blood lead concentration greater than 10 µg/dL is above the 5 percent acceptable risk margin for surface and subsurface soil (13.2 percent and 11.1 percent, respectively).

2.7.1 Findings of the Ecological Screening Level Risk Assessment

A SLERA was conducted to evaluate the potential for chemical constituents of concern detected in surface soil in upland exposure areas to adversely affect ecological receptors. The SLERA was performed in a manner consistent with USEPA, CERCLA, and NYSDEC guidance. The results indicated that:

- Concentrations of SVOCs in Area 1 are not likely to result in actionable population level effects to ecological receptors.
- Concentrations of metals in Area 1 are not likely to result in actionable population level effects to ecological receptors.

2.7.2 Areas Requiring Remedial Action Based on Risk

Based on the results of the HHRA and SLERA discussed above, no further action was determined for Areas 2 – 5. The only area and media requiring remedial action is Area 1 due to concentrations of lead in soil that result in unacceptable risk to human health. This finding is consistent with USEPA's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) Directive 9200.4-27P. The directive recommends that actions be taken at sites with lead-impacted soil to significantly minimize or eliminate exposure to soil lead levels such that a typical child or group of children would have an estimated risk of no more than 5 percent of exceeding a 10 µg/dL blood lead level (USEPA, 1998).

2.8 Remedial Action Objective

Remedial action objectives were developed for the purpose of evaluating the applicability of remedial technologies and the effectiveness of remedial alternatives. These objectives consist of media-specific goals for protecting human health and the environment, and for meeting ARARs in a cost-effective manner.

Area 1 poses an unacceptable health risk with respect to soil if the area is used for residential purposes in the future. There are no current unacceptable human health risks. The unacceptable risk is posed by exposure to lead in soil.

The remedial action objective established herein is based on site-specific information, including the nature and extent of chemical constituents, existing site conditions, and future land use plans. Remedial action objectives typically focus on controlling exposure of receptors (for example, children at Area 1) to chemicals of concern via exposure routes such as dermal contact, ingestion, and inhalation. The RAOs also focus on controlling the release of hazardous substances into the environment.

The following RAO was developed for Area 1.

- Prevent or reduce the potential for a child's ingestion of soils with total lead concentrations significantly above background concentrations.

Based on the RAO, a remedial goal (RG) was established that is an acceptable exposure level that is protective of human health and the environment. The RG is to reduce lead (Pb) contamination in surface and subsurface site soil so that the average Pb concentration does not exceed the average surface soil background concentration with 95 percent confidence. Because the average Pb concentration for the background surface soil may be greater than the NYSDEC Residential Use SCO of 400 mg/kg for Pb in soil, 6 NYCRR Part 375-6.8(a) and (b) is not selected as an ARAR.²

The selection of this RG was based on the following:

- The RG is feasible.
- The RG ensures the average Pb concentration in soil at the site will not be significantly greater than the average Pb background concentration with 95 percent confidence.

2.9 Description of Alternatives

Four remedial action alternatives were developed and evaluated based on the following CERCLA criteria: protection of human health and the environment; compliance with ARARs; long-term effectiveness and permanence; implementability; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness; and cost. The four alternatives are:

- Alternative 1: No Action;
- Alternative 2: Land Use Controls (LUCs);
- Alternative 3: Soil Cover Cap with LUCs; and
- Alternative 4: Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill.

2.10 Comparative Analysis of Alternatives

The four alternatives have been evaluated using the nine evaluation criteria outlined in the National Contingency Plan, 40 CFR Section 300.430, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA* (USEPA, 1988). The criteria include:

Threshold Criteria

- Overall protection of human health and the environment
- Compliance with ARARs

Primary Balancing Criteria

- Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment

² The average lead background concentration is not statistically different with 95 percent confidence from the NYSDEC Residential SCO of 400 mg/kg.

- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost

Modifying Criteria

- State Acceptance
- Community Acceptance

The criterion of cost is assessed by estimating relative costs for the alternatives. For an alternative to be eligible for selection, it must meet the threshold criteria. If these criteria are met, the primary balancing criteria are evaluated to provide the best balance of trade-offs among alternatives. Table 2-1 presents a summary of the alternatives, how well they satisfy the evaluation criteria, and how they compare to one another.

2.11 Principal Threat Wastes

There are no principal threat wastes at Area 1. EPA defines principal threat wastes as those source materials considered to be highly toxic or highly mobile that generally cannot be reliably contained or would present a significant risk to human health or the environment should exposure occur (USEPA, 1991). The lead in Area 1 soil represents a low to moderate threat because of 1) relatively low mobility and 2) relatively low concentrations. The selected remedy, Alternative 4, will effectively prevent human contact with the soils, thus eliminating threats to human health.

2.12 Selected Remedy

Based on the Administrative Record for the Fort Totten CGS FUDS, and the evaluation of comments received by interested parties during the public comment period, USACE has selected No Further Action for Areas 2 through 5 and Alternative 4 as the remedy for the Area 1 soil.

2.12.1 Summary of the Rationale for the Response Action

The selected remedy is protective of human health through the removal and off-site disposal of site contaminants, does not have any significant implementability concerns, and has minor impacts on worker safety, the community, and the environment that can be managed. The preferred remedy was selected over the other alternatives because it is expected to achieve the RAO in a timely fashion, allows for site closure, and is cost-effective.

2.12.2 Description of the Response Action

This alternative involves removal of soil with lead concentrations greater than background (Figure 2-2). Excavation confirmation sampling will be conducted. Then the area will be backfilled with certified clean fill and topsoil, and revegetated in accordance with the restoration plan provided as part of the remedial action work plan. For estimating purposes, the soil will be removed by excavation to a depth of 1.5 ft in the western portion of the area to be addressed and to a depth 3 feet in the eastern portion of the area to be addressed. The contaminated soil volume is estimated at approximately 1,667 cy measured in situ (bank cubic yard). Assuming a 20 percent increase in volume from fluffing (assuming a combination of sand, gravel and loam) and an approximate weight of 2,600 pounds per loose cubic yard (Department of Army, 2000), the total mass of waste material to be excavated will be approximately 2,600 tons. Conventional earthmoving equipment such as excavators, loaders, and dump trucks will be used for excavation of the soil. A summary of the site activities is presented below.

Pre-Design Investigation/Work Plans/Reporting: A pre-design investigation will be conducted to determine the extent of the soil with lead concentrations above background. The investigation results will be used to determine the planned extent of the excavation. Site-specific work plans will be prepared prior to excavation activities that will include a quality assurance planning component, health and safety component, work plan, a Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP) and field procedures. A Remedial Design will be completed. The plans will be reviewed and approved by USACE and coordinated with NYSDEC prior to remedial activities. The estimated time for completion of these plans is three months. This includes incorporation of review comments and revisions. After the remedial action has been completed and the final inspection conducted by USACE and coordinated with NYSDEC, a Remedial Action Report (also known as a Final Engineering Report) will be completed. The report will include site drawings, sample data, copies of all manifests, certification of clean backfill materials, photo documentation of the remedial action, and a detailed narrative of the work completed.

Site Set-Up: Site set-up for the excavation, off-site disposal, and backfilling at Area 1 will consist of setting up of a decontamination station and equipment/materials staging areas. The only water needs of the remedial activities will be for decontamination and dust suppression. Therefore, water will be trucked to the site and stored in a tank. Electrical power during construction will be supplied by portable generators. Construction activities will be conducted during daylight hours, so lighting will not be required.

Excavation: It is assumed that one excavator and one loader will be used to excavate and load the soil into dump trucks. The soil will then be transported to a permitted disposal facility. It is assumed that the excavation will proceed at the rate of approximately 400 cy per day, assuming that the disposal facility can receive wastes at this rate. A water truck will be required on site during excavation activities for decontamination and dust suppression purposes. Air monitoring for dust generation will be performed in accordance with the CAMP. The decontamination liquids generated from equipment cleaning will be stored in a storage tank for disposal. A storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be prepared as part of the Remedial Action Work Plan.

Confirmation Sampling: Soil screening using X-ray fluorescence will be conducted concurrently with excavation. The screening will be used to determine the limits of excavation based on the soil RG. Confirmation samples for total lead will then be collected using an incremental sampling approach and analyzed at an off-site analytical laboratory. The confirmation sample data will document that the arithmetic average lead concentration of soil remaining for exposure is not greater than background.

Waste Characterization: Soils will be characterized via laboratory analysis to determine if they must be disposed of as a hazardous or non-hazardous waste.

Waste Transportation and Disposal: It is assumed that 100 percent of the soil removed from Area 1 will be non-hazardous (as defined under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) and will be disposed as such. In addition, it is assumed that the decontamination water will be non-hazardous, so it can be disposed of in the New York City (NYC) Sanitary Sewer System, subject to NYC approval.

Site Restoration: Certified clean soil fill will be obtained and used to replace the excavated soil to match the surrounding grade. Samples of the topsoil and fill will be analyzed at an off-site laboratory prior to placement to verify that the fill is suitable for use at the site. The fill soil will be compacted in 6-inch lifts to minimize the formation of depressions. Finally, 6 inches of topsoil will be placed over the backfill and the area will be revegetated in accordance with the restoration plan provided as part of the remedial action work plan. Erosion mats or temporary barriers will be used as necessary to prevent erosion.

2.12.3 Monitoring Well Closure

In addition to the response activities described above, all monitoring wells related to previous investigations will be properly closed.

2.12.4 Summary of Estimated Response Costs

The recommended Alternative 4 will cost approximately \$450,935. The cost detail is provided in Table 2-2. The final cost may be higher or lower based on the extent of excavation identified in the pre-design investigation to achieve the remedial goal and the contractor bid(s) received for the work. This is greater than the cost of Alternative 2 (\$206,130) and Alternative 3 (\$282,635); however, only Alternative 4 provides a permanent solution that will result in site closure. It is estimated it will take one year to implement the remedy.

2.12.5 Outcome of the Removal Action

Alternative 4 mitigates the risks to human health through removal of contaminated soil. The remedy will be complete within approximately one year of completion of the decision document, subject to the availability of funds.

2.13 Statutory Determinations

Under CERCLA Section 121, selected remedies must be protective of human health and the environment, comply with ARARs (unless a waiver is justified), be cost-effective, and use permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, CERCLA includes a preference for remedies that employ treatment that permanently and significantly reduces the volume, toxicity, or mobility of hazardous wastes as a principal element. The following sections discuss how the selected remedy meets these statutory requirements.

2.13.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment

This alternative will leave the Area 1 soil below the RG, thereby protecting human receptors and achieving the RAO.

2.13.2 Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

There are no Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) for the selected remedy of removal, off-site disposal, and backfill of the Area 1 soil.

2.13.3 Cost-Effectiveness

The selected remedy for Area 1 soil is cost-effective. The overall effectiveness of the selected remedy was determined to be proportional to its costs and, hence, to represent a reasonable value for the money to be spent.

The cost-effectiveness of the selected Area 1 (Alternative 4) was evaluated based on the data currently available for the Area 1 soil and the following considerations: (1) lead concentrations in soil are not anticipated to decrease with time; therefore, alternatives 2 and 3 will need to be conducted in perpetuity; and (2) Alternative 4 is the only alternative that will achieve closure of the site.

2.13.4 Utilization of Permanent Solutions and Alternative Treatment Technologies to the Maximum Extent Practicable

The selected remedy for Area 1 provides a permanent solution for prevention of exposure to contaminated soil. The permanent solution will be achieved upon removal of the contaminated soil from the site. Alternative treatment technologies were evaluated in the FS, but none were retained due to either their inability to address lead in soil or because the technology was excessive for the level of contamination.

2.13.5 Preference for Treatment as a Principal Element

As noted above, numerous treatment technologies were evaluated in the FS, but none were retained and incorporated into alternatives due to either their inability to address lead in soil or because the technology was excessive for the level of contamination. As a result, none of the alternatives retained in the FS incorporated treatment of lead in soil.

2.14 Documentation of Significant Changes

The Proposed Plan (USACE, 2015) was issued for all of Fort Totten CGS FUDS in June 2015. The Proposed Plan identified Alternative 4: Removal, Off-Site Disposal, and Backfill as the Preferred Alternative for soil remediation. The public comment period ran from July 17, 2015 to August 28, 2015. USACE reviewed all written and verbal comments submitted during the public comment period. It was determined that no significant changes to the remedy, as originally identified in the Proposed Plan, were necessary or appropriate.

3.0 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

The Proposed Plan (USACE, 2015) for Fort Totten CGS FUDS was issued in June 2015 for public comment. A public meeting was held on June 30, 2015 at the Bay Terrace Jewish Center. The public comment period ran from June 18, 2015 to August 28, 2015.

Attachment A includes copies of the public notice for the meeting, the material presented at the meeting, the official transcript of the meeting, applicable newspaper articles, a letter from the USCG regarding management/institutional controls for the property, and a letter from NYSDEC accepting the Proposed Remedy for Area 1 at Fort Totten CGS FUDS.

3.1 Summary of Comments and Responses to Comments

Following are comments received from the public with responses provided by the USACE on the Proposed Plan for Area 1 of the Fort Totten CGS FUDS; these responses elaborate further on those presented at the Public Meeting:

1. Minutes of Public Meeting held on June 30, 2015, Bayside, New York, during which the public was provided an opportunity to comment on the Proposed Plan for Area 1 (Attachment A). Mr. Jacobowitz stated "...then my comment would be, you know, mentioning what was in the process with the groundwater being a problem. Groundwater doesn't sit still, it goes into the bay, it goes all around. What's the remedy for I mean, you're just saying it's safe if you don't drink it. But we got bays, we have people that have wells."

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Jacobowitz. Both groundwater and Little Bay were evaluated during the investigations. The groundwater beneath the Fort Totten CGS FUDS migrates to the west and discharges to Little Bay. There are no private wells in the area where the groundwater beneath the Fort Totten CGS FUDS is migrating or discharging. The results of the RI and risk assessment concluded that there is no risk to human health or the environment from groundwater discharging to the bays.*

2. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Branzetti stated "...But most important, you guys didn't do anything about marking the area for the people in the neighborhood not to do anything and not to come near it. Let me go on, because I went and planted trees with Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts in that contaminated soil and area. We had, it's my Parks Day with the City Parks Department, and we went and we planted trees and everything there. We wouldn't have planted anything there if the thing was roped up or anything. It's still not roped off, you don't have any kind of fencing, any kind of signage."

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Branzetti. Based on the risk assessment performed as part of the RI, there is no current or future unacceptable risk to recreational users or outdoor workers from exposure to the soils in Area 1. The only unacceptable risk from exposure to Area 1 soils is to potential future child residents.*

3. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Schreiber stated "And my other question, where you talk about risk assessment concluded, there's no unacceptable risk to human health, what's the, what are some of the -- without getting too technical -- what are some of the criteria for that risk assessment? What goes into that?"

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Schreiber. The human health risk assessment (HHRA) is completed using a four-step process. The four steps include: Data Evaluation, Exposure Assessment, Toxicity Assessment, and Risk Characterization. The data evaluation documents the selection of chemicals that are evaluated in the HHRA. The exposure assessment identifies the human populations that could access the Site under current and possible future land use. The HHRA evaluated potential exposures to Area 1 soil for Current Outdoor Workers, Current Trespasser, Future Outdoor Workers, Future Indoor Workers, Future Construction Workers, Future Recreational Receptors, and Future Residents. The toxicity assessment identifies the toxicological attributes of the chemicals assessed in the HHRA. The risk characterization identifies the methodology that is used to calculate and summarize the health risks. The results of each of these steps are presented in the Final Remedial Investigation Report (USACE, 2014a).*

4. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Ms. Johnson stated “So regardless of when it was determined that that soil in Area 1, I think it is that you're talking about, was determined that it could be harmful and that's why you're doing a remedy, what Joe had mentioned about there were people working in that soil, do those people, were they exposed to anything and should they be seeking some kind of remedy?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Ms. Johnson. There is no current or future unacceptable risk to recreational users or outdoor workers from exposure to Area 1. Short duration activities such as recreational use or tree planting activities would not result in an unacceptable risk; therefore, these people would not need to seek treatment due to exposure to Area 1 soils.*

5. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. LoPinto stated “So at some point we would like to make sure that we go back and review the restrictions that were put into the Army property, and if this property does come up for disposal and is transferred to whomever, that certain deed restrictions be put in there, in particular for those areas where it was found to be not a problem but there were still some chemicals that were there.” “Such as no residential, such as no growing of vegetable gardens, things like that.”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. LoPinto. The USCG has issued a letter to USACE (Attachment A) indicating that a description of remaining site impacts will be recorded in the Coast Guard’s Shore Asset Management Environmental Liability Module. This record will memorialize their location and concentrations in the event of a future property transfer or if a construction project would disturb site soils. If there are planned changes to the current land use, the USCG will notify NYSDEC to coordinate the management of soils. If the USCG should transfer the Fort Totten property in the future, all relevant reports depicting the environmental condition of the property would be provided to the designated property transfer agent, consistent with Federal policies regarding property transfers. The NYSDEC has issued a letter (Attachment A) indicating their intent to issue an Environmental Notice for the Fort Totten FUDS property. The expected notice, when issued, will advise site owners and prospective purchasers of the property that:*

- 1. While the controlled portions of the property have been found suitable for continued use as an Active Coast Guard Station, it has not been determined suitable for all uses;*
- 2. Groundwater should not be used for potable purposes without testing and treatment, as necessary, and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies;*
- 3. No long-term occupancy housing facilities or long-term occupancy dormitories should be constructed on the property;*
- 4. The institutionally controlled portions of the property must be further assessed (and remedied, as determine appropriate) if the property is sold and/or the current use of the site changes from an Active Coast Guard Station, and;*
- 5. The Change of Use provisions of 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.11(d) will remain in effect for the controlled property until such time as the Environmental Notice is rescinded.*

6. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Ms. Shepard stated “So at the moment what does the Coast Guard use the area for?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Ms. Shepard. Area 1 is open space that is not currently used for any designated purpose.*

7. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Ms. Shepard stated “My other question, so basically you're going to move a lot of dirt. Where to?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Ms. Shepard. The contaminated soil will be transported and disposed at an appropriately licensed facility. The specific facility has not been identified at this point, but our prospective contractor will be required to identify the facility prior to commencement of the work.*

8. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Ms. Shepard stated “You also don't know where you're getting the new dirt from either?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Ms. Shepard. The source of the topsoil and backfill has not been identified. Testing of the backfill and topsoil will be conducted before the material is used to ensure that the material meets criteria for unrestricted use.*

8. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Harris stated “So I mean, I would like to harvest the trees that were there and replant them.”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Harris. Area 1, and the trees that currently are planted in Area 1, are the on USCG property. Permission would have to be obtained from the USCG for transplanting trees from Area 1. Another consideration is that the soil in the root balls of any trees dug from Area 1 may contain elevated levels of lead which would be transported with the trees to their new location. For this reason alone, transplanting of any trees from Area 1 is strongly discouraged.*

9. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Branzetti stated “Yeah, but if you, another point is that I go there and I see, not the trees, but a couple of nice plants, oh, I'd like to see this in my yard, in my garden. I go and dig up one of those plants and bring it to my house and put it in my yard next to my vegetable garden or anything, how is that going to affect you.”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Branzetti. Area 1, and the vegetation in Area 1, is USCG property. Permission would have to be obtained from the USCG for transplanting trees or other plants from Area 1. Another consideration is that the soil in the root balls of any plants dug from Area 1 may contain elevated levels of lead which would be transported with the plants to their new location. For this reason alone, transplanting of any trees or other plants from Area 1 is strongly discouraged.*

10. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. LoPinto stated “In your evaluation for Area 1, you note that the concentrations are higher than the background.”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. LoPinto. Lead concentrations in soil in Area 1 are higher than background. The background lead concentration in shallow soils is 522 mg/kg. The background lead concentration in deep soils is 449 mg/kg. Lead was detected in Area 1 soils at concentrations up to 1,540 mg/kg.*

11. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. LoPinto stated “Did you do a health assessment for that area also?.. And what did it find?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. LoPinto. A risk assessment was conducted for Area 1. The risk assessment assessed current and potential future risks to a variety of receptors. The human health risk assessment evaluated potential exposures to soil for Current Outdoor Workers, Current Trespasser, Future Outdoor Workers, Future Indoor Workers, Future Construction Workers, Future Recreational Receptors, and Future Residents. The risk assessment indicated the risk was acceptable to all receptors, except the potential future child resident. The child blood lead model for Area 1 indicates that the blood lead level for children exposed to surface and subsurface soil is above the allowable blood lead level of 10 µg/dL. The probability percentage of the child blood lead concentration greater than 10 µg/dL for surface and subsurface soil are 13.2 percent and 11.1 percent, respectively.*

An ecological screening level risk assessment was also performed for Area 1. The results indicated that there are no contaminants that are likely to result in actionable population level effects to ecological receptors.

12. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Branzetti stated “Now, when is the last time the other parts of the property surrounding that have been tested, like the ball fields where the kids are playing?”

RESPONSE: *Thank you Mr. Branzetti. The USCG collected soil samples from the ball fields in 1996. Fifteen samples were collected and analyzed for the USEPA Priority Pollutant List compounds (126 compounds). The samples were collected from five separate areas at three different depths within the ball*

fields. The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) reviewed the data and determined that no contaminants were detected in the soil at levels that would pose a health concern for users of the ball field (NYDOH, 1996).

The only unacceptable risk identified to exposure to Area 1 soils was for a future child resident. There is no unacceptable risk from current or future recreational users of Area 1.

13. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Branzetti stated “I just want to make sure that the kids that are playing, that are playing on the side where their brothers or sisters are playing baseball, they're playing on the side with mommy and they're digging up that soil and stuff into their pails and everything, you know, that this is not going to, you know, affect them, that we're going to have a safe area for these kids to be at.”

RESPONSE: Thank you Mr. Branzetti. There is no unacceptable risk to current or future recreational users of Area 1.

14. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. LoPinto stated “And then after the remediation is complete is there a report?”

RESPONSE: Thank you Mr. LoPinto. The remedial action details will be documented in a Remedial Action Report.

15. Minutes of Public Meeting (Attachment A). Mr. Branzetti stated “There was garbage in Area 2 being dumped over there. Could that have affected some of your testing? There's groups that were dumping all their, everything that, all their trash and everything into that.” “Two years ago.”

RESPONSE: Thank you Mr. Branzetti. Area 2 was last sampled in 2011. Any dumping of trash conducted after 2011 would not have affected the results. If trash was dumped prior to 2011, it does not appear to have impacted the sampling data in that the risk assessment for Area 2 did not result in a finding of unacceptable risk.

16. Email from Mr. Warren Schreiber, Co-President, Presidents Co-op & Condo Council; President, Bay Terrace Community Alliance; President, Bay Terrace Cooperative Section I; July 30, 2015 (Attachment E). “Please be advised that Community Board 7 and other organizations representing the surrounding area, support Fort Totten soil remediation Alternative number four. We thank the Army Corps of Engineers for its attention to this matter and look forward to the work commencing.”

RESPONSE: Thank you for your letter Mr. Schreiber. We acknowledge your support for Alternative 4.

17. Comment on July 4th, 2015 Bayside Times article by Lucille Kernahan from Bay Terrace (Attachment D). “Select Option 4. The job would be completed and done. Other options would require annual maintenance and shut down of the area each year. Undoubtedly, the maintenance costs would increase over the years, despite present figure put forth.”

RESPONSE: Thank you for your comment Ms. Kernahan. We acknowledge your support for Alternative 4.

3.2 State Acceptance

Definition: This criterion considers whether the State agrees with, opposes, or has no comment on the Selected Alternative.

Analysis: In their letter dated March 22, 2016, the NYSDEC indicated “New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (DOH), has reviewed the Decision Document for Operable Unit 2 (OU2) of the Fort Totten site and agrees that the remedy put forth is acceptable for the current use of the facility as an active Coast Guard Station.”

3.3 Community Acceptance

Definition: This criterion considers whether the local community agrees with the Selected Alternative. Comments received during the Public Comment Period are an important indicator of community acceptance.

Analysis: The Proposed Plan for Area 1 was made available during the public comment period, which commenced on June 18, 2015 and closed on August 28, 2015. A public meeting was held to solicit public comment on the Proposed Plan at the Bayview Terrace Jewish Center, Bayside, New York, on June 30, 2015. Comments received from the public during the meeting are documented in Section 3.1 above.

After the public meeting, an email dated July 30, 2015 was received from Mr. Warren Schreiber, Co-President, Presidents Co-op & Condo Council; President, Bay Terrace Community Alliance; President, Bay Terrace Cooperative Section I. The email indicated the organizations support Fort Totten soil remediation Alternative 4 (Attachment E).

After the public meeting, Ms. Kernahan commented on a July 4th, 2015 article in the Bayside Times by indicating her support for Alternative 4 (Attachment D).

4.0 REFERENCES

- Department of the Army, 2000. Field Manual No. 5-434, Earthmoving Operations. Headquarters, Washington, DC. June.
- Metcalf & Eddy, 1988. Contamination Evaluation at the U.S. Coast Guard Station (Former Engineers School) Fort Totten, Final Engineering Report. March 28, 1988.
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1999. Fort Totten Historic District Designation Report. June.
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, 2013.
http://www.nyc.gov/html/lpc/html/about/arch_about.shtml
- NYSDEC & NYDOH, 2006. New York State Brownfield Cleanup Program, Development of Soil Cleanup Objectives, Technical Support Document. September.
- NYSDEC, 2013. Environmental Resource Mapper. <http://www.dec.ny.gov/imsmaps/ERM/viewer.htm>. Retrieved June 28, 2013.
- NYSDOH, 1996. Letter RE: Ball Field Soil Data Summary. December 2.
- USACE, 1992. Soil Sampling at Fort Totten. August.
- USACE, 1985. Inventory Project Report. April.
- USACE, 2003. Record of Decision for Little Bay, FUDS Fort Totten Coast Guard Station, Queens, New York.
- USACE, 2005. Remedial Investigation. Final Report. Fort Totten Coast Guard Station. May.
- USACE, 2006. Supplemental Remedial Investigation of the Upland Area, Final Report. Fort Totten Coast Guard Station, Formerly Used Defense Site, Queens, New York. February.
- USACE, 2014a. Final Remedial Investigation Report, Engineer School, Fort Totten. April.
- USACE, 2014b. Final Feasibility Study, Engineer School, Fort Totten. October.
- USACE, 2015. Proposed Plan, Fort Totten Coast Guard Station, Queens, New York, New York. June.
- USEPA, 1988. Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA, Draft. EPA/540/G-89/004OSWER Directive 9355.3-01. October.
- USEPA, 1991. A Guide to Principal Threat and Low Level Threat Wastes. Superfund Publication 9380.3-06FS. November.
- USEPA, 1998. Memorandum: OSWER Directive: Clarification to the 1994 Revised Interim Soil Lead (Pb) Guidance for CERCLA Sites and RCRA Corrective Action Facilities. EPA/540/F-98/030; PB98-963244; OSWER Directive #9200.4-27P. August.
- USEPA, 2000. A Guide to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During the Feasibility Study. EPA 540/R-00/002. July.
- USEPA, 2015. Superfund web page. <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/lead-superfund-sites>. Retrieved January 27, 2016.

TABLES

**Table 2-1
Evaluation of Alternatives
Engineer School, Fort Totten
Queens, New York**

Criterion	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls	Alternative 3 Soil Cover Cap and Land Use Controls	Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill
Protection of Human Health and the Environment	This alternative would not satisfy this criterion, because the contaminants continue to persist in the environment.	Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential human health risks from direct contact and incidental ingestion.	The soil cover cap would reduce the potential human health risks from direct contact, incidental ingestion, or inhalation of lead in soil.	Implementation of this alternative would remove the contaminants to a disposal facility. It would reduce the potential human health risks from direct contact, incidental ingestion, or inhalation of soils exceeding the RG.
Compliance with ARARs	There are no ARARs.	There are no ARARs.	This alternative would comply with the ARARs.	There are no ARARs.
Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence	This alternative would not be an effective, long-term solution.	This alternative would provide long-term protection only as long as the LUCs and the security fence remained in place.	This alternative would reduce the direct exposure to lead in soil, minimizing future risks to human health. Since this remedy is likely to provide a permanent solution, this alternative would be effective in the long term.	Since this remedy is likely to provide a permanent solution, this alternative would be effective over the long term.
Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume (TMV) Through Treatment	This alternative does not include treatment; therefore, it will not reduce the TMV of lead in soil through treatment.	This alternative does not include treatment; therefore, it will not reduce the TMV of lead in soil through treatment.	This alternative does not include treatment; therefore, it will not reduce the TMV of lead in soil through treatment.	This alternative does not include treatment; therefore, it will not reduce the TMV of lead in soil through treatment.

Table 2-1
Evaluation of Alternatives
Engineer School, Fort Totten
Queens, New York

Criterion	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls	Alternative 3 Soil Cover Cap and Land Use Controls	Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill
Short-Term Effectiveness	Because no action would occur, there would be no impact to the local community beyond the potential impacts to human health identified in the SRI2.	No significant risks are posed to the local community or to workers. During fence construction, engineering controls would be instituted to minimize noise and fugitive dust concerns. Workers would be protected from risks from being exposed to lead and other contaminants in the soil through the use of appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) and implementation of proper safety practices.	No significant risks are posed to the local community or to workers. During soil cover cap construction and site restoration activities, engineering controls would be instituted to minimize noise and fugitive dust concerns. Workers would be protected from risks from being exposed to lead and other contaminants in the soil through the use of appropriate personal PPE and implementation of proper safety practices.	No significant risks are posed to the local community or to workers. During excavation and site restoration activities, engineering controls, and PPE would be used to minimize noise and fugitive dust concerns. There would be perimeter air and dust monitoring. The waste would be transported to a permitted disposal facility.
Implementability	There would not be any implementability concern.	This alternative is implementable. No technical difficulties are anticipated in fencing and deed restrictions. The uncertainty associated with the volume of contaminated soil that must be removed to obtain an average lead concentration in soil that is not significantly elevated relative to the average background concentration will be addressed during the pre-design investigation.	This alternative is implementable. No technical difficulties are anticipated in constructing the soil cover cap or restoring the area. The uncertainty associated with the volume of contaminated soil that must be removed to obtain an average lead concentration in soil that is not significantly elevated relative to the average background concentration will be addressed during the pre-design investigation.	This alternative is implementable. No technical difficulties are anticipated in sampling, excavating, transporting, backfilling, or restoring Area 1 to its pre-existing surface condition. The uncertainty associated with the volume of contaminated soil that must be removed to obtain an average lead concentration in soil that is not significantly elevated relative to the average background concentration will be addressed during the pre-design investigation.

**Table 2-1
Evaluation of Alternatives
Engineer School, Fort Totten
Queens, New York**

Criterion	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls	Alternative 3 Soil Cover Cap and Land Use Controls	Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill
Cost	Total Cost: \$0 Capital Cost: \$0 30-year O & M Cost: \$0	Total Cost: \$206,130 Capital Cost: \$73,435 30-year O & M Cost: \$132,695	Total Cost: \$282,635 Capital Cost: \$156,527 30-year O & M Cost: \$126,107	Total Cost: \$450,934 Capital Cost: \$450,934 30-year O & M Cost: \$0


Table 2-2
Cost Analysis – Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill
Engineer School, Fort Totten
Queens, New York

Item	Rate	Unit	Quantity	Total	Present Worth Cost	Comments
Capital Costs						
Pre-Design Investigation						
Data and sample collection and analysis	\$ 16,182	LS	1	\$ 16,182	\$ 16,182	Vendor estimates and Watermark project experience. Includes workplan, 10 cores 10 ft deep, 30 soil samples, sample analysis, and data validation and management.
Report	\$ 15,000	LS	1	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	Watermark project experience.
Pre-Design Investigation Costs Total					\$ 31,182	
Construction Costs						
Mobilization	\$ 5,600	LS	1	\$ 5,600	\$ 5,600	Watermark project experience.
Site Services (portable toilets, Administrative)	\$ 560	mo	1	\$ 560	\$ 560	Vendor Estimates.
Utility Locating Services	\$ 2,016	LS	1	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	Watermark project experience.
Erosion and Sediment Control	\$ 7	LF	500	\$ 3,360	\$ 3,360	Watermark project experience.
Site Preparation	\$ 12,318	LS	1	\$ 12,318	\$ 12,318	Watermark project experience.
Excavation	\$ 13,440	LS	1	\$ 13,440	\$ 13,440	Watermark project experience.
Air Monitoring	\$ 336	week	1	\$ 336	\$ 336	Vendor estimate.
Confirmation Sampling	\$ 10,040	LS	1	\$ 10,040	\$ 10,040	Watermark project experience.
Waste Disposal Characterization	\$ 567	LS	1	\$ 567	\$ 567	Watermark project experience.
Transportation and Disposal of Soil	\$ 58	ton	2600	\$ 151,424	\$ 151,424	Vendor estimate.
Backfill	\$ 17	ton	2,022	\$ 33,973	\$ 33,973	Watermark project experience.
Topsoil	\$ 34	ton	578	\$ 19,413	\$ 19,413	Watermark project experience.
Site Restoration and Demob	\$ 5,040	LS	1	\$ 5,040	\$ 5,040	Watermark project experience.
Remedial Action Report	\$ 10,000	LS	1	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	Watermark project experience.
Construction Costs Total					\$ 269,072	

Table 2-2
Cost Analysis – Alternative 4 Removal, Off-Site Disposal, Backfill
Engineer School, Fort Totten
Queens, New York


Item	Rate	Unit	Quantity	Total	Present Worth Cost	Comments
Construction Management/Engineering Fees						
Engineering	8%	%	\$ 269,072	\$ 21,526	\$ 21,526	Percentage of Construction/Capital Costs. Based on "A Guidance to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During Feasibility Study" EPA 540-R-00-002.
Contingency	30%	%	\$ 269,072	\$ 80,722	\$ 80,722	Percentage of Construction/Capital Costs. Based on "A Guidance to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During Feasibility Study" EPA 540-R-00-002.
Oversight/Construction Management	10%	%	\$ 269,072	\$ 26,907	\$ 26,907	Percentage of Construction/Capital Costs. Based on "A Guidance to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During Feasibility Study" EPA 540-R-00-002.
Project Management	8%	%	\$ 269,072	\$ 21,526	\$ 21,526	Percentage of Construction/Capital Costs. Based on "A Guidance to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During Feasibility Study" EPA 540-R-00-002.
Construction Management/Engineering Fees Total					\$ 150,680	
Total Capital Costs					\$ 450,934	
Total Cost for Alternative					\$ 450,934	

FIGURES



J:\01 Projects\10404 - Fort Totten\11.0 Drawings\GIS\Feeability Study 6-19-2013\Figure 1-1 Site Locus Map.mxd

PROJECT NO: 10404-03	NOTES AND SOURCES:	SITE LOCUS MAP	FIGURE 1-1
PREPARED FOR: USACE			
DATE: 09/28/2015		Decision Document Fort Totten Coast Guard Station Formerly Used Defense Site Queens, New York	 Watermark Engineering • Construction • Operations
DRAWN BY: SDP			
CHK'D BY: KT			
APP'D BY: LJP			



PROJECT NO: 10404-03	NOTES AND SOURCES:	Site Map of Fort Totten CGS FUDS	FIGURE 1-2
PREPARED FOR: USACE			
DATE: 09-28-15			
DRAWN BY: SDP			
CHK'D BY: KT			
APP'D BY: LJP			
		Decision Document Fort Totten Coast Guard Station Formerly Used Defense Site Queens, New York	

J:\01 Projects\10404 - Fort Totten\11.0 Drawings\GIS\Feasibility Study 6-19-2013\Figure 1-3 Area 1 Lead Concentrations.mxd



N

0 20 40 80 Feet

Scale: 1" = 40'

Watermark
175 Cabot Street • Lowell • MA • 01854
Ph. 978-452-9696 Fax 978-453-9988

Decision Document
Fort Totten Coast Guard Station
Formerly Used Defense Site
Queens, New York

NOTES AND SOURCES:.

- All concentrations are reported in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).
- J - Reported concentration is estimated.

PROJECT NO: 10404-03

PREPARED FOR: USACE

DATE: 09/28/2015

DRAWN BY: SDP

CHK'D BY: KT

APP'D BY: LJP


AREA 1 LEAD
CONCENTRATIONS IN SOIL

FIGURE 2-1

J:\01 Projects\10404 - Fort Totten\11.0 Drawings\GIS\Feasibility Study 6-19-2013\Figure 2-1 Area to Be Addressed by Alternatives.mxd

Legend

- Soil Samples
- Area 1 Boundary
- Area Addressed By Feasibility Study Alternatives (Approximate Extent of Lead Concentrations Greater than 400 mg/kg)



N

0204080

Feet

Scale: 1" = 40'

W

Watermark

175 Cabot Street • Lowell • MA • 01854
Ph. 978-452-9696 Fax 978-453-9988

Decision Document
Fort Totten Coast Guard Station
Formerly Used Defense Site
Queens, New York

NOTES AND SOURCES:.

1. All concentrations are reported in milligrams per kilograms (mg/kg)

2. J - Reported concentration is estimated.

PROJECT NO: 10404-03

PREPARED FOR: USACE

DATE: 09/28/15

DRAWN BY: SDP

CHK'D BY: KT

APP'D BY: LJP

AREA TO BE ADDRESSED
BY ALTERNATIVES

FIGURE 2-2

ATTACHMENT A
Public Meeting Notices

➤ **OBITUARIES**

➤ **OBITUARIES**

➤ **OBITUARIES**

➤ **CLEANING SERVICES**

➤ **ATTORNEYS**

➤ **AUTOS WANTED**

**WHY
PAY
MORE?
CALL
NOW!**

To Advertise Here
Call 718-260-2555

Commemorate your loved one with an Obituary Notice in your local community newspapers.

Let us help you create a beautiful, personalized and lasting memory.

Call for details
718.260.2555

TIMESLedger
NEWSPAPERS

CLEANING LADIES



OF POLAND
We pay attention to detail & leave your home/ office "SPICK" & "SPAN". Excellent work at a low price! Exp. reliable & trustworthy. More info, **VOYTEK!!!!**
(917)415-7465
FAX!!!!
(718)894-1233

REAL ESTATE CLOSINGS Buy/Sell/Mortgage Problems. Expd Attorney & R.E. Broker, PROBATE/CRIMINAL/ BUSINESS-Richard H. Lovell, P.C., 10748 Cross Bay, Ozone Park, NY 11417 718 835-9300
www.lovelllawnewyork.com

➤ **AUTOS FOR SALE**

2004 LINCOLN STRETCH LIMOSINE:
Beautiful Car. Mint Condition.
917-687-4207

2008 Updated Dodge Pick-up Truck. Mileage: 88,700. Sirius XM Radio, Great Cond. ASK: \$7,800. Take as is! Joseph Denis: 718-622-3152

Beige, 2002 Cadillac. 4 Door Sedan, Very Good. \$4,000. Negotiable. OWNER: 718-946-2856 or 917-597-9916

Donate your car to Wheels For Wishes, benefiting Make-A-Wish. We offer free towing and your donation is 100% tax deductible. Call (855) 376-9474

Donate your car to Wheels For Wishes, benefiting Make-A-Wish. We offer free towing and your donation is 100% tax deductible. Call (855) 376-9474

DONATE YOUR CAR

Wheels For Wishes Benefiting

Make-A-Wish®
Metro New York and Western New York

100% Tax Deductible



*Free Vehicle/Boat Pickup ANYWHERE
*We Accept All Vehicles Running or Not
*Fully Tax Deductible

WheelsForWishes.org

Call: (917) 336-1254

*Wheels For Wishes is a DBA of Car Donation Foundation.

➤ **PUBLIC NOTICES**

➤ **PUBLIC NOTICES**

➤ **PUBLIC NOTICES**

➤ **PUBLIC NOTICES**



Availability of Proposed Plan for Fort Totten Coast Guard Station, Queens, New York

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) invites the public to comment on the Proposed Plan for remedial activities at the Fort Totten Coast Guard Station (also known as the Engineer School/Fort Totten), which is being addressed as part of the Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) Program. A portion of the site, identified as Area 1, contains lead in soil above background concentrations.

USACE has evaluated the following options for addressing the lead in soil in Area 1:

- Alternative 1 - No Action
- Alternative 2 - Land Use Controls
- Alternative 3 - Soil Cover Cap with Land Use Controls
- Alternative 4 - Removal, Off-site Disposal, and Backfill

USACE proposes Alternative 4 - Removal, Off-site Disposal, and Backfill as the preferred remedial alternative. This alternative includes a pre-design investigation to determine the extent of soil with lead concentrations above background levels, excavation of soil, collection and analysis of confirmatory soil samples, disposal of excavated soil at a permitted disposal facility, and site restoration. The USACE has determined that the preferred alternative is protective of human health and the environment, by removing Area 1 soils above background concentrations of lead.

Risk assessments completed by USACE identified no unacceptable risks at site Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5, therefore, USACE proposes no further action for those areas. However, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) has indicated their intention to emplace an Environmental Notice, as a State-issued institutional control, due to several sampling locations that exceed NYSDEC soil clean up objectives.

Remedial activities at the site have been conducted under the FUDS program. USACE has coordinated this plan with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, who has indicated that the proposed remedy is acceptable for the current use of the facility as an active Coast Guard Station.

Public Meeting

The USACE held a meeting that was open to the public on June 30, 2015 at 7 pm, to present the information provided in the Proposed Plan. The meeting was held at the Bay Terrace Jewish Center, 13-00 209th Street, Bayside, New York. The public did have an opportunity to provide comments in writing or verbally at the June 30th meeting. However, USACE ordered publication of a notice announcing the June 30th meeting that was not published. The newspaper issued a letter of apology for that omission. USACE can hold another public meeting regarding this matter, if requested.

Public Comment Period

The USACE invited the public to review and comment on the Proposed Plan during the public comment period, originally set as from June 18, 2015 through July 24, 2015. USACE is now extending the public comment period through August 28, 2015, since this public notice is now being published. Although Alternative 4 is the Preferred Alternative at the present time, comments are welcome on all of the alternatives listed above.

Copies of the Proposed Plan, along with other site documents, are available on the project web site: <http://www.nan.usace.army.mil/FortTotten>, and at the Bay Terrace Library, 18-36 Bell Blvd., Bayside, New York, 11360. Public Comments will be accepted in writing and must be postmarked no later than August 28, 2015. Oral comments from the June 30th, 2015 meeting will be entered into the record. Please send all written comments or requests to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District, Attn: Mr. Gregory J Goepfert, Project Manager, CENAN-PP-E, Room 1811, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278.

LEARN^{TO}EARN!

Get The HHA Training To Get The Job!

Train as HHA in as little 2 wks + 1 day clinical.
718-886-7018 (Eng)
718-492-4929 (Span)
QNS: 37-20 Prince St, Suite 4A, Flushing
BK: 763 58TH St, BK



Need to put some money in your pocket?

Sell your unwanted in our classifieds sections Today!

CALL 718-260-2555 TO ADVERTISE HERE

ATTACHMENT B
Presentation

Engineer School / Fort Totten Coast Guard Station – Proposed Plan

Gregory J. Goepfert

Project Manager

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers

New York District

June 30, 2015



US Army Corps of Engineers
BUILDING STRONG®



Purpose

- Present Proposed Plan for the upland area of the Coast Guard Station property at Ft. Totten.
- Also known as Engineer School / Fort Totten – Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS)
- Solicit public input on Proposed Plan.
- Verbal and written comments accepted tonight.
- Written comments can be provided anytime through July 24, 2015.



Environmental Investigations

- Numerous investigations of the Coast Guard property between 1988 and 2013.
- 345 soil samples at various depths & groundwater sampled from 5 monitoring wells.
- Final Remedial Investigation Report issued April 2014 – summarized all previous investigations and documents risk assessment.
- Property was divided into five areas (called Areas 1-5) for investigation management and reporting.



Areas of Investigation

Legend

-  Area Boundaries
-  FUDS Boundary
-  Former Buildings



Monitoring Wells

Legend




Monitoring Wells



Area Boundaries



Former Buildings



Area 1

- In northern portion of Ft. Totten, between the ball fields and the fortifications.
- Army placed fill soil in a low spot to eliminate standing water. Soil came from excavation of parking lots associated with vehicle maintenance shops at Ft. Totten.
- The fill soil contains lead at concentrations greater than Ft. Totten background.
- Soil removal and replacement with clean fill is proposed to prevent or reduce the potential of a child's ingestion of soils with total lead concentrations above background.



Area 2 (Building 624)

- Workshop, and later used for pesticide storage.
- 51 soil samples collected.
Depth range of 0-2 inches up to 20 feet.
- Low concentrations of pesticides, metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) identified.
- Risk assessment concluded that there is no unacceptable risk to human health.
- No further action proposed.



Area 3 (Buildings 610, 611, 612)

- Transformer south of Building 610. (suspected of containing PCBs).
- 106 soil samples collected. Depth range of 0-2 inches up to 17.5 feet.
- PCBs not detected.
- A single soil sample identified an arsenic concentration, believed to be associated with wood preservative for a nearby outdoor deck; a risk assessment considering remaining data representative of Area 3 resulted in a finding of no unacceptable risk to human health.
- No further action proposed.



Area 4 (Building 625)

- Concrete pad supported electrical transformers suspected of containing PCBs.
- 64 soil samples collected. Depth range of 0-2 inches up to 16 feet.
- PCBs not detected. Coal, coal ash, asphalt found at every location where compounds identified as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (“PAHs”) were detected—indicative of historic urban fill.
- No human health risk under current property use; unacceptable risk for hypothetical future resident (not an expected future property use).
- Recommendation: No further action is proposed.



Area 5 (Building 615)

- Torpedo and mine repair facility. Mercury in guidance systems was disposed of into floor drains.
- Floor drains removed in 1998.
- 60 soil samples collected. Depth range of 0-2 inches up to 7 feet; indoor air tested for mercury (results within regulatory limits).
- PAHs and metals present. VOCs in a few samples.
- Mercury-impacted soils outside building removed in 2006, 2007- excavation limited by underground structures & active utilities.



Area 5 (Building 615)

- Risk assessment concluded that there is no unacceptable risk to human health.
- Screening level ecological risk assessment indicated metals, including mercury, are not likely to result in actionable population level effects to ecological receptors.
- No further action proposed.




Site-Wide Groundwater

- Five monitoring wells sampled in 2011. Two wells (MW-4R and MW-5) had elevated PAHs, sodium, and chloroform above NYS Class A groundwater guidance criteria.
- Both wells resampled in 2012 for PAHs only. Only two PAHs detected at very low concentrations (not of concern from a risk perspective).
- Site groundwater not used for consumption; City water is available for use.
- No further action proposed.



The CERCLA Process



Next Steps

- Public Comment period on the Proposed Plan ends July 24, 2015.
- All public comments (written and verbal) will be addressed in the Responsiveness Summary provided as part of the Decision Document.
- The Decision Document documents the alternative selected and is signed by the District Engineer (*anticipated Fall 2015*).
- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to award contract for implementation of the remedy (*anticipated late 2015*).
- Remedy complete (*anticipated mid-2016*).
- Property close out (FUDS Program).



ATTACHMENT C
Transcript of Public Meeting

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITE PROGRAM

PUBLIC MEETING

Re:

PROPOSED PLAN
FORT TOTTEN COAST GUARD STATION

June 30, 2015

7:04 p.m.

Transcribed by
Donna C. Gilmore, a
Notary Public within
and for the State of
New York.

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 Gregory Goepfert,

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

3 Katie Thomas,

Watermark

4 Dean Brammer,

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District

5 Marilyn Bitterman,

District Manager, Community Board #7

6 Jack Bitterman

Bridget Boyd,

7 New York State Department of Health

Jim Kerr,

8 U.S. Coast Guard

Warren Schreiber,

9 Vice Chair Community Board #7

Joseph Branzetti,

10 Friends of Fort Totten Parks

Robert LoPinto, PE

11 Co-Chair Fort Totten RAB

Meg Panettiere,

12 Bay Terrace Community Alliance member

Larry Pannell,

13 Watermark

Gary Jacobowitz,

14 Bay Terrace CO-OP 1

Jon Greco,

15 New York State Department of Environmental
Conservation

16 Daniel Rossman,

NYS Assemblyman Braunstein's office

17 Mac Harris,

Fire Department City New York

18 Sylvia Johnson,

Bay Terrace Community Alliance

19 Richard A. Forman,

NYS DOE High School principal

20 Laura Shepard,

Queens Chronicle

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. GOEPFERT: Well, good evening,
2 everyone. Thanks for coming.

3 My name is Greg Goepfert, if I haven't
4 met you already. I'm from the Army Corps
5 of Engineers. I'm stationed in New York,
6 the New York district, at 26 Federal Plaza,
7 Downtown Manhattan. I'm the project
8 manager for Fort Totten. I'm also the
9 team leader for Formerly Used Defense
10 Sites in New York and New Jersey.

11 Tonight we're here to present you the
12 Proposed Plan for Fort Totten, Engineer
13 School/Fort Totten. Many of you have been
14 involved with this process for many years,
15 but this is actually one of the last
16 events under a Formerly Used Defense Site
17 Program, the last action that we will be
18 proposing to take. So tonight, because
19 it's a Proposed Plan meeting, we have a
20 transcriber to transcribe the meeting, to
21 take any of your comments or questions and
22 to put them in writing so they can become
23 part of the permanent record for our final
24 decision packet for the site. So I have a
25 short presentation I'd like to give you to

1 go over what we're planning to do.

2 So as I said, you know, the important
3 thing is for you to understand what we are
4 proposing to do at Fort Totten, the part
5 of the site that's the Formerly Used
6 Defense Site, which is the 9.6 acre
7 property that is now known as the Coast
8 Guard Station. We need to solicit any
9 input that you might have on this plan, or
10 any questions or any comments that you
11 would have, and we will accept any verbal
12 or written comments tonight and we'll
13 accept comments in writing up through
14 July 24th, after which we'll compile those
15 comments and questions, give appropriate
16 responses and make that part of the record
17 for our final decision process and final
18 decision document.

19 For many of you who are familiar with
20 the history of the Fort Totten site,
21 Formerly Used Defense Site, there have
22 been numerous investigations performed
23 over the period from 1988 through 2013,
24 approximately 345 samples and more -- and
25 I'm talking about the upland area right

1 now, referring to the upland area of Fort
2 Totten -- 345 soil samples at various
3 depths and groundwater that's been sampled
4 from five monitoring wells.

5 We issued a Final Remedial
6 Investigation Report that was issued in
7 April of 2014, which is a compilation of
8 many of the previous reports that were
9 made along the way, and that summarized
10 all the previous investigation work that
11 had been done.

12 For ease of management the property
13 was divided into five distinct areas for
14 management and reporting. The five
15 distinct areas are shown on this figure.
16 Areas 1, 2, 3 and 5 -- 4 and 5.

17 Area 1 is the area that we'll be
18 speaking about this evening. It is the
19 area commonly referred to as the Fill
20 Area. But I will be talking about the
21 other areas in the sense of what the
22 ultimate outcome of the investigations
23 were.

24 On this slide you can see I basically
25 show the five monitoring wells where we

1 took groundwater samples from. So they're
2 roughly in each of the areas that were
3 investigated.

4 So as I said before, for Area 1,
5 that's in the northern portion of Fort
6 Totten, just a little bit north of the
7 ball fields, commonly known as the ball
8 fields. The Army had placed some fill in
9 a low spot and we found that that fill
10 that was placed had some concentrations of
11 lead that need to be addressed. So we
12 would like to go ahead and clean up the
13 soil that has been impacted with lead and
14 replace it with clean material, clean
15 unrestricted material. And basically, the
16 area we're talking about is about 20,000
17 square foot. That comes out to about a
18 half an acre of property by about 2 foot
19 deep. And once we scrape off that area,
20 we will have really not much else to do in
21 the way of the Formerly Used Defense
22 Program.

23 Now in the proposed plan that was
24 presented previously and posted and many
25 of you I see have copies of, we did have

1 to do what they call an Alternatives
2 Analysis. And the Alternative Analysis
3 ranges from doing nothing, which basically
4 in the short run costs no money, versus
5 doing a removal of the soils, you know,
6 and that will be the most costly endeavor,
7 which is, runs about \$400,000 more or less
8 to get done.

9 The other two alternatives we examined
10 were putting up a fence around the area
11 and implementing land use controls and
12 some kind of administrative restriction
13 that we would have to continue to
14 administer, and then the other possibility
15 was doing, well, just the controls by
16 themselves or the controls, the
17 administrative controls plus a landfill
18 cover, or a landfill cap, I should say. I
19 would even scratch that word "landfill,"
20 it's not a landfill per se, but a cap
21 system, and that would be an intermediate
22 cost item. But again, we would still have
23 to do some maintenance in the sense of
24 going out there, doing some kind of a
25 certification every year. It would still

1 be an ongoing maintenance effort for the
2 Army Corps under the proposed plan.

3 So we thought that the wholesale
4 removal of the lead-containing soil would
5 be the best option. The amount of lead
6 that we're seeing exceeds the background
7 amount of concentrations of lead that are
8 indigenous to this area, by way of what
9 has been done with fill in this area. So
10 it really was something that the Army
11 would take responsibility for because it
12 is documented that the reason the issue
13 exists is because the Army put it there.
14 So we're going to take care of it.

15 Now, as far as the other areas are
16 concerned, Area 2, Building 624 was a
17 workshop and was later used for pesticide
18 storage. And if anybody would like me to
19 go back and see where this building is I'd
20 be more than happy to do it. This is at
21 the north-northwestern end of the
22 property. We collected 51 soils. We
23 found low concentrations of pesticides,
24 metals, a class of compounds called
25 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and what

1 that translates to is basically like coal
2 and coal ash, that type of thing. That's
3 where these compounds are more commonly,
4 you know, derived from. And VOCs, the
5 VOCs that we were seeing is very low
6 levels of compound, such as acetone, which
7 is a common laboratory solvent, it's a
8 solvent that's used in some paints, it's
9 more commonly used in nail polish remover.
10 So, you know, it's a common item, but
11 again, there were very low levels found in
12 the soils. Our risk assessments came to
13 the conclusion that there's no
14 unacceptable risk to human health, and in
15 Area 2, based on those, that study, we are
16 proposing no action.

17 In Area 3 there's a series of
18 buildings just south of Building 615 by
19 the bay. The reason why this area was
20 checked out is because there were some
21 transformers that were south of
22 Building 610, and I guess it was thought
23 that at one time the dielectric fluid
24 inside the transformer may have contained
25 PCBs, or polychlorinated biphenyls, which

1 is a toxic liquid. We had samples, 106
2 samples collected at various depths. PCBs
3 were not detected at this location.
4 However, we did find one single sample
5 with arsenic, and arsenic is known to be a
6 component of, you know, wood preservative
7 and this arsenate wood preservative may
8 have been coming from this outdoor deck
9 that's in the vicinity of where the sample
10 was taken. But as it turns out, there was
11 only one sample in 106 that showed this
12 arsenic concentration. So therefore, once
13 we took that sample out of the mix we
14 found that there would be no unacceptable
15 risk from concentrations of arsenic that
16 we found in that site area at all. So
17 therefore, in that area we, again, are
18 proposing no action at this area as well.

19 Area 4, which is next to Building 625
20 also had a concrete pad where we suspected
21 that there might have been PCBs.

22 64 samples were collected, soil samples.
23 The depths ranged from 0 to 2 inches up to
24 16 feet. Again, we did not detect PCBs;
25 however, at every location where we had

1 high PAH values we found coal, coal ash,
2 asphalt in every one of those locations in
3 the borings, in the soil borings. So
4 that's certainly something that's
5 indicative of the historic fill condition.
6 Under the current property use as the
7 Coast Guard Station, there's no
8 unacceptable risk, but if that property
9 was to be developed as it is, you know,
10 residential capacity, there might be some
11 risk. That's someone was living there, a
12 family, you know, 24 hours a day, 7 days a
13 week scenario. But again, the current use
14 of the site there's absolutely no health
15 risk under the current use. And so
16 therefore, according to our processes and
17 regulations and our program for the
18 Formerly Used Defense Site Program, we, in
19 the absence of current risk, we cannot
20 take any actions and therefore
21 recommendation is no action.

22 Area 5 is a building that focuses on
23 Building 615, which is right next to the
24 Little Bay. There was a torpedo and mine
25 facility. I know Mr. LoPinto is well

1 versed in that particular site because he
2 was very aware of when the floor drains
3 were removed back in 1998, there were two
4 4-inch cast iron pipes that were removed,
5 and that's where it was surmised that the
6 mercury from some of the maintenance
7 operations was discharged through those
8 particular pipes.

9 We did 60 soil samples. We found some
10 PAHs and metals in some of the soil
11 samples, VOCs in a few samples, all pretty
12 low concentrations. We did, as part of
13 the investigation in 2006 and 2007, we
14 removed about 40 cubic yards of soils that
15 were impacted with mercury outside the
16 building. And unfortunately, there's a
17 lot of underground utilities and other,
18 you know, underground structures there.
19 There's a cesspool, and, you know, we
20 cleaned out all the impacted soils as much
21 as we possibly could. Like I said, it
22 came out to about 40 cubic yards of
23 material, and that equates to roughly
24 about half a full dumpster of material.

25 So after that, after we did all this

1 activity in this building we found out
2 that with the resultant samples that we
3 had the risk assessment concluded no
4 unacceptable risk to human health. We did
5 an ecological screening also, including
6 mercury, and that screening level risk
7 assessment came out that there was no
8 expected population effects to any of the
9 ecology in the area. And again, no
10 further action is proposed. And on top of
11 this, I may have missed this on a prior
12 slide, but we did do some indoor air
13 testing inside this building as well, and
14 those tests came out clear. There are
15 workers in that building, I believe the
16 police department is a tenant in that
17 building, so we want to make sure that
18 it's clear for its use, its current use.

19 As far as groundwater is concerned, as
20 most of you well know, there's no
21 groundwater use at Fort Totten. There's
22 city water available at Fort Totten that's
23 piped in, but there's no wells that are
24 actively used, groundwater wells that are
25 used at Fort Totten. So originally

1 there's wells, five wells were sampled in
2 2011 and there were some PAHs, sodium,
3 which probably comes from salt intrusion,
4 and chloroform, which was another
5 substance that was found above the state's
6 Class A groundwater standards, which the
7 Class A groundwater guidance criteria
8 really is, I believe all the waters of the
9 state of New York are considered to be
10 Class A, which means that possible use for
11 potable water, so they're, you know, the
12 state would like everyone to be able to
13 drink any groundwater that's been pulled
14 from the ground.

15 But based on that initial result we
16 did a resampling in 2012. We found that
17 only two PAHs, two PAH-type compounds were
18 detected at low concentrations, and we
19 found that was not a concern from a risk
20 perspective. However, if water was ever
21 needed to be used, groundwater was ever
22 needed to be used out of Fort Totten, the
23 state would be consulted for any possible
24 treatment or, you know, restrictions that
25 may be applicable based on what someone

1 might want to use the groundwater for.

2 The acronym that's on the top, I don't
3 like to speak in acronyms, but the
4 Comprehensive Environmental Response
5 Cleanup and Liability Act is the
6 overarching law that we use to govern our
7 processes, starting from our preliminary
8 assessments through investigations through
9 recommendations as to what our plans
10 should be to do remedial actions. And
11 where we are right now, we're in the
12 Proposed Plan and Public Comment Period
13 section of this site, the upland area of
14 Fort Totten. And after we're through this
15 process of soliciting public comments,
16 then we move on to putting together a
17 document called a Record of Decision,
18 which we make public for public review.
19 Our district engineer usually signs off on
20 that Record of Decision, and then once
21 that decision is formally made, then we go
22 and solicit a program for funding to
23 actually do the work. So that's the real,
24 the whole process itself.

25 So as I said, the next steps would be

1 we're looking for any public comments on
2 our proposed plan by the 24th of July.
3 All public comments will be addressed.
4 The decision document will basically say
5 what our plan is and will be formally
6 signed off by our district engineer, and
7 then the Corps will award a contract for
8 implementing the remedy, the cleanup at
9 Area 1, and we're hoping that we could do
10 that later sometime this year, meaning
11 2015 --

12 MR. HARRIS: But you have up there
13 2016.

14 MR. GOEPFERT: Yes, anticipated in mid
15 2016, that's when the remedy, the cleanup
16 would be finished, would be started. So
17 that's where it would be, that would be
18 the end of the process. The beginning
19 would be getting the contractors and doing
20 the design work upfront.

21 And then, as I had said before, what
22 we're hoping for is that this action is
23 actually the last step that we're going to
24 be taking as the Formerly Used Defense
25 Site portion of Fort Totten, which is the

1 9.6 acre Coast Guard Station. And when we
2 get to a property close out, what that
3 means is that it's not an abdication of
4 responsibility for the site. What it is
5 is it says that everything we knew of was
6 looked at, everything we knew of was taken
7 care of, we took the process through its
8 necessary conclusion. If anything ever
9 should show up that we missed in any way,
10 then we reopen the site at some future
11 time. If something shows up that was
12 related to the Department of Defense
13 operation of the property, we would come
14 back and reexamine any of those issues
15 that might be evidenced.

16 So you have any questions, comments?

17 MR. JACOBOWITZ: I have a question and
18 a comment.

19 MR. GOEPFERT: Okay. Mr. --

20 MR. JACOBOWITZ: Gary Jacobowitz, Bay
21 Terrace Co-op 1. I live right across the
22 street from Fort Totten.

23 When you did all of these samples, I'm
24 just curious as to the, I guess it's a
25 bore, so what's the diameter of the

1 samples? You gave us the number, but, I
2 mean, if you're boring into the ground, is
3 it 1 inch, 2 inches, 10 inches, a foot?
4 You know, what's the size of it?

5 MR. PANNELL: A lot of them are
6 collected in one of two ways, either with
7 a hand auger, which might be 3 inches
8 diameter, or a drill rig with augers which
9 might give you, say, a 6 inch diameter
10 with a hole that would be sampled with a
11 slit spoon that is 2 inches in diameter,
12 so anywhere in that range.

13 MR. JACOBOWITZ: Okay. And then my
14 comment would be, you know, mentioning
15 what was in the process with the
16 groundwater being a problem. Groundwater
17 doesn't sit still, it goes into the bay,
18 it goes all around. What's the remedy for
19 that? I mean, you're just saying it's
20 safe if you don't drink it. But we got
21 bays, we have people that have wells.

22 MR. GOEPFERT: Right.

23 MR. JACOBOWITZ: There are wells in
24 the neighborhood.

25 MR. GOEPFERT: Right. The material

1 that we, what we found is that we
2 recognize that the groundwater moves, but
3 we're not finding these items in the
4 dissolved portion of the groundwater. So
5 much of the solvents are being intrenched
6 with the soils, and they're not dissolved
7 in the groundwater. So that's what,
8 that's why filtered and unfiltered samples
9 were taken.

10 MR. HARRIS: Now, can I say a
11 follow-up question to that?

12 What depth did you all do for the
13 groundwater, the holes?

14 MR. GOEPFERT: Groundwater went from
15 6 foot down to 17 foot, I believe.

16 MR. HARRIS: All right. Because
17 Fort Totten the water table is about
18 6 foot --

19 MR. GOEPFERT: Right.

20 MR. HARRIS: -- deep, so I just
21 wondered.

22 MR. GOEPFERT: So yeah, between 6 and
23 7 feet.

24 Sir?

25 MR. BRANZETTI: Two things. In

1 relation to his question, did you guys
2 test any of the fish in the bay or
3 anything?

4 MR. GOEPFERT: Oh, this fish testing
5 took place as part of a completely
6 different effort from these upland, and
7 that was, a decision was made on the bay
8 back in 2003, and I have a copy of that
9 which I can show you, and fish were tested
10 and surface water was tested and Little
11 Bay was tested.

12 MR. BRANZETTI: Okay. But most
13 important, you guys didn't do anything
14 about marking the area for the people in
15 the neighborhood not to do anything and
16 not to come near it.

17 Let me go on, because I went and
18 planted trees with Boy Scouts and Girl
19 Scouts in that contaminated soil and area.
20 We had, it's my Parks Day with the City
21 Parks Department, and we went and we
22 planted trees and everything there. We
23 wouldn't have planted anything there if
24 the thing was roped up or anything. It's
25 still not roped off, you don't have any

1 kind of fencing, any kind of signage. You
2 already -- I'm sorry, I'm just, I'm
3 annoyed --

4 MR. GOEPFERT: No, that's fine.

5 MR. BRANZETTI: You know about this
6 now and you still haven't done anything,
7 you haven't put fencing, signage, anything
8 to cordon off that area. Why?

9 MR. GOEPFERT: Well, actually, for the
10 reason why we're doing the work is really
11 for a future use, which is potentially
12 residential. Okay? The residential
13 exposure that --

14 (Multiple voices.)

15 MR. SCHREIBER: They have to do it for
16 residential.

17 MR. BRANZETTI: Understand that --

18 MR. GOEPFERT: That's the risk
19 scenario that we look at.

20 MR. BRANZETTI: Yeah, but --

21 MR. GOEPFERT: For a risk scenario of
22 someone spends --

23 MR. LoPINTO: Greg -- you said you did
24 this through the parks department?

25 MR. BRANZETTI: Through the parks

1 department.

2 MR. LoPINTO: They don't own that
3 property that he's talking about.

4 MR. BRANZETTI: It's my parks day.
5 They brought us over there to that area.

6 MR. LoPINTO: No, they don't.

7 MR. BRANZETTI: It wasn't only the
8 parks department. It was another group
9 that had the accessibility, availability
10 to do the planting there by the Coast
11 Guard. They wanted to get all the weeding
12 out. No matter what it was, the area
13 should have been marked off.

14 MR. LoPINTO: Whoever did it are the
15 owners of the property and they're
16 responsible for doing that.

17 MR. BRANZETTI: Right. But I'm saying
18 that once these guys found out that that
19 soil was contaminated, that area, the
20 ownership of that area should have had
21 that whole thing marked off because --

22 MR. LoPINTO: Then you have to talk to
23 the Coast Guard, because they own the
24 property.

25 MR. HARRIS: Well, the tree planting

1 was done about three years ago --

2 MR. BRANZETTI: Yes.

3 MR. HARRIS: -- before they did the
4 investigation. And it was done without
5 the consent of the Coast Guard by the
6 parks department, with the consent from
7 the Bloomberg Million Tree program.

8 MR. BRANZETTI: So now that you found
9 out about this, why wasn't any of this
10 thing fenced off? That's my other --

11 MR. LoPINTO: You have to ask the
12 Coast Guard. There's no one here from the
13 Coast Guard, so they can't answer that
14 question.

15 MR. HARRIS: What if the Coast Guard
16 didn't know?

17 MR. GRECO: If I could, Greg, is it
18 possible that we could make a commitment
19 to putting some kind of signage or snow
20 fencing with signage around that area?

21 MR. GOEPFERT: Yes, we can.

22 MR. GRECO: And I think that should
23 cure from this point forward.

24 MR. BRANZETTI: Right, because you
25 have people that, like I said, come in

1 that park, walk into that park, they go
2 all over the place, whether it's weeds,
3 they walk through the weeds, they go
4 everywhere. You know, it's --

5 MR. GRECO: No, I think that's a great
6 idea. I wasn't aware there was that much
7 use by anyone outside of the Coast Guard.
8 I knew there are ball fields there, but
9 frankly, I thought they'd fallen into
10 disuse.

11 MR. BRANZETTI: Yeah, no.

12 MR. GRECO: But yeah, if there's an
13 issue like that we won't get to the
14 cleanup until arguably this spring or --

15 MR. GOEPFERT: Right.

16 MR. GRECO: So we should do something.

17 MR. GOEPFERT: We will work with the
18 Coast Guard to put some signage on it, in
19 advance of any of the work that we do.

20 MR. SCHREIBER: Warren Schreiber, Bay
21 Terrance Community Alliance.

22 So first of all, is it possible to
23 submit comments online, and will it be
24 possible at some time to view the comments
25 online? Other government agencies do do

1 that.

2 MR. GOEPFERT: We could do that. I
3 would prefer to get the comments in
4 writing.

5 MR. SCHREIBER: Why?

6 MR. GOEPFERT: If you'd like to send
7 me something in writing, if you want,
8 would you rather e-mail it to me?

9 MR. SCHREIBER: Well, I mean, e-mail,
10 fax, or maybe just some sort of mechanism
11 where they can just be submitted online,
12 and also some mechanism where they can be
13 viewed online.

14 MR. GOEPFERT: I think we have a
15 mechanism where it can be viewed online,
16 and that's, we have a project website that
17 I can post all the comments. That would
18 be even in advance of the final document
19 that's being issued.

20 MR. SCHREIBER: Okay. And my other
21 question, where you talk about risk
22 assessment concluded, there's no
23 unacceptable risk to human health, what's
24 the, what are some of the -- without
25 getting too technical -- what are some of

1 the criteria for that risk assessment?

2 What goes into that?

3 MR. GOEPFERT: Well, generally with a
4 risk assessment you're looking at exposure
5 for the actual activities that may be
6 going on there, whether somebody is living
7 there, whether someone is a commercial
8 worker, an occasional worker, a
9 trespasser, someone who is doing
10 recreation at the site. It goes through a
11 whole litany of potential use scenarios.
12 Okay? That's all part of the conceptual
13 model that's in the investigation report.
14 And then once that's done then it's a
15 comparison of known standards of today
16 that can be, that are basically, you know,
17 developed by regulatory agencies and used
18 for screening. And there's a screening
19 done and then there's a look at what the
20 concentrations of materials in question
21 are in relation to those screening
22 materials, screening criteria in view of
23 what future use or current use of a
24 property might be. Generally, that's what
25 a risk assessment does.

1 MR. SCHREIBER: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. GOEPFERT: Yes, ma'am. What is
3 your name?

4 MS. JOHNSON: Sylvia Johnson.

5 So regardless of when it was
6 determined that that soil in Area 1, I
7 think it is that you're talking about, was
8 determined that it could be harmful and
9 that's why you're doing a remedy, what Joe
10 had mentioned about there were people
11 working in that soil, do those people,
12 were they exposed to anything and should
13 they be seeking some kind of remedy?

14 MR. GOEPFERT: Actually, the level
15 that we're talking about is -- well, the
16 short answer is no, because they're not
17 actually living there, they wouldn't have
18 been exposed to that for the period of
19 time that would have caused harm.

20 MS. JOHNSON: I like a short answer.

21 MR. LoPINTO: Greg.

22 MR. GOEPFERT: Sir. Bob.

23 MR. LoPINTO: I'd like to talk about
24 your last dot.

25 At one point Coast Guard was going to

1 get rid of the property and now I
2 understand that's not currently being
3 considered, or it may happen, you just
4 don't know?

5 MR. KERR: I think -- I'm Jim Kerr,
6 I'm with the US Coast Guard. The current
7 plan is to hold onto the property. We
8 haven't done any development thinking or,
9 but the plan is to hold onto --

10 MR. LoPINTO: However, if the Coast
11 Guard -- I just want to bring this up --
12 if the Coast Guard were to determine that
13 they were to relinquish control of the
14 property it would go through the same
15 process that the rest of Fort Totten, the
16 old Army-owned property went through.

17 MR. KERR: It would go through the
18 fallow property process --

19 MR. LoPINTO: Disposal, which first
20 would see if there's uses that might be
21 available that could be put there, you
22 know, we went through this when they did
23 the, the city went through it when they
24 did the old Fort Totten. When that
25 document eventually deeded the property to

1 the city, that deed has restrictions. So
2 at some point we would like to make sure
3 that we go back and review the
4 restrictions that were put into the Army
5 property, and if this property does come
6 up for disposal and is transferred to
7 whomever, that certain deed restrictions
8 be put in there, in particular for those
9 areas where it was found to be not a
10 problem but there were still some
11 chemicals that were there --

12 MR. KERR: So --

13 MR. LoPINTO: Such as no residential,
14 such as no growing of vegetable gardens,
15 things like that.

16 MR. KERR: Right.

17 MR. LoPINTO: And that's in the
18 current document for the Army site.

19 MR. GOEPFERT: The short answer to
20 your question, and that is actually
21 addressed in the Proposed Plan and there's
22 a paragraph that talks about the state
23 being interested in placing an
24 environmental notice on the property, and
25 the state actually, that's not the remedy

1 that the Corps has as far as its remedy --

2 MR. LoPINTO: Correct.

3 MR. GOEPFERT: -- but it's a remedy
4 that's been coordinated with the
5 environmental notice. And on top of that,
6 just to be absolutely certain things are
7 closed up nice and tight, we have a
8 commitment from the Coast Guard in a
9 letter dated May 22nd that says that they
10 are entering all our investigation data in
11 a database that they keep so that if the
12 property use should ever change in the
13 future, whoever gets custody of the
14 property or whoever is in charge of
15 transferring the property is cognizant of
16 anything that may be left behind.

17 MR. LoPINTO: I just want everyone to
18 understand that when you finish this
19 you're still not finished until some
20 document, if transfer is done or if not,
21 that information is not only with the New
22 York State DEC --

23 MR. GOEPFERT: So we're making a
24 distinction --

25 MR. LoPINTO: -- but a number of other

1 agencies.

2 MR. GOEPFERT: We're making a
3 distinction between what we, the Corps
4 does under the FUDS, or Formerly Used
5 Defense Site Program, versus the Federal
6 Property Transfer process, which includes
7 all those types of restrictions and things
8 as well as what the state would like to do
9 as part of their noticing of the property.

10 MR. LoPINTO: Thank you.

11 MR. GOEPFERT: I think the young lady
12 in the back -- could you introduce
13 yourself, please?

14 MS. SHEPARD: Sure. I'm Laura
15 Shepard. I'm from the Queens Chronicle.

16 MR. GOEPFERT: Hi, Laura. Did you
17 have a question?

18 MS. SHEPARD: Yeah, I did.

19 So at the moment what does the Coast
20 Guard use the area for?

21 MR. KERR: We don't.

22 MS. SHEPARD: You don't. You just own
23 it. How long has the Coast Guard owned
24 it?

25 MR. KERR: I forget how long Fort

1 Totten was in operation. They moved from
2 Fort Totten to Kings Point, they moved
3 their Search and Rescue Station from Fort
4 Totten to Kings Point, was that ten years
5 ago?

6 MR. LoPINTO: About that.

7 MR. GOEPFERT: In 1968 the department
8 of Army conveyed 9.6 acres of the property
9 to the United States Coast Guard.

10 MS. SHEPARD: My other question, so
11 basically you're going to move a lot of
12 dirt. Where to?

13 MR. GOEPFERT: It will be taken to a
14 licensed disposal facility. We haven't
15 awarded the contract so I couldn't give
16 you a definite answer at this point.

17 MS. SHEPARD: You also don't know
18 where you're getting the new dirt from
19 either?

20 MR. GOEPFERT: Correct. But I
21 guarantee you our specifications will be
22 for unrestricted material coming in.

23 MR. HARRIS: Can I say something?
24 This is in regards to the trees.

25 As part of your report for Area 1

1 where they planted the trees, it says that
2 there was what, 522 milligrams per
3 kilogram for that area?

4 MR. GOEPFERT: Yeah. The --

5 MR. HARRIS: Of lead.

6 MR. GOEPFERT: -- the background
7 numbers I believe was 522.

8 MR. HARRIS: The EPA guideline is
9 400 milligrams per kilogram for areas like
10 playground areas and for residential areas
11 1200. So I mean, the only problem is if
12 you ingest the dirt on a regular basis
13 then you have a problem. But normally,
14 there's lead in the environment, naturally
15 in the environment. So I mean, I would
16 like to harvest the trees that were there
17 and replant them.

18 MR. LoPINTO: That's a parks issue.

19 MR. BRANZETTI: Yeah, that's for now a
20 parks issue. But it's still an issue that
21 after this was found out about, that
22 nothing was done about that area, they
23 just left it weeded because they figured
24 if it was weeded nobody would go into it.

25 MR. GOEPFERT: There is actually --

1 MR. BRANZETTI: And even our group has
2 been looking over the years, and Warren
3 will tell you, we've been looking to get
4 part of the Coast Guard to use their pier
5 for a kayak launch and a bunch of other
6 things for the community and stuff, and
7 that was never mentioned, that that area
8 is a problem.

9 MR. SCHREIBER: Well, I mean, we all
10 know that the parks department, they're
11 very dependable, responsible, but maybe
12 they knew about this and just didn't tell
13 you. Maybe it was their responsibility to
14 let you know that, you know, or even to
15 say, Gee, maybe you shouldn't be working
16 here. And maybe that's a question to
17 ask --

18 MR. LoPINTO: I'm going to guess the
19 lower-level workers at the --

20 MS. BITTERMAN: They didn't know.

21 MR. LoPINTO: They didn't know.

22 MR. BRANZETTI: Maybe they didn't
23 know, but I'm saying that once -- okay,
24 they'd been planting there before they
25 found out about or did the testing, but

1 after the testing, still nothing was put
2 up, no signage, no nothing was put up
3 there. You have people going in and out
4 of that park, visitors coming from other
5 countries and stuff walking through that
6 park, biking through that park, walking
7 through those weeds. I'm saying no,
8 they're not digging up the ground and
9 stuff, but still that area should be
10 blocked off.

11 MR. SCHREIBER: Let me, okay, he
12 raises a good point. So let's say I walk
13 through there and I, somehow I pick up
14 some of this lead contamination, I have
15 this on my shoes and I'm walking through
16 the rest of the property. I mean, how
17 easily is that transferred, how far do I
18 have to walk before there's no longer a
19 problem with transference or is it not a
20 problem at all?

21 MR. GOEPFERT: Honestly, I think the
22 gentleman from the fire department
23 summarized it, that ingestion which really
24 becomes the issue.

25 MR. BRANZETTI: Yeah, but if you,

1 another point is that I go there and I
2 see, not the trees, but a couple of nice
3 plants, oh, I'd like to see this in my
4 yard, in my garden. I go and dig up one
5 of those plants and bring it to my house
6 and put it in my yard next to my vegetable
7 garden or anything, how is that going to
8 affect you.

9 MR. GOEPFERT: Your point is well
10 taken. As far as the issue about signage,
11 I was out there, I don't know, a year or
12 so ago, and I actually did witness signage
13 on the trees out there. I don't know when
14 your tree planting took place. But there
15 was signage about pesticide application.
16 Did you see those signs?

17 MR. BRANZETTI: That's a lot
18 different, pesticide application, poison
19 soil. So I just --

20 MR. GOEPFERT: I just want to mention
21 that there was some signage.

22 MR. BRANZETTI: Pesticide, yes, they
23 were spraying pesticide, actually, parks
24 department, actually, to get rid of the
25 weeds that were there.

1 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, that's what
2 pesticide was sprayed.

3 MR. LoPINTO: Can I ask a question.
4 In your evaluation for Area 1, you note
5 that the concentrations are higher than
6 the background.

7 MR. GOEPFERT: Correct.

8 MR. LoPINTO: Did you do a health
9 assessment for that area also? Because
10 you don't note it in here.

11 MR. GOEPFERT: Health assessment --

12 MR. GRECO: Risk assessment. There
13 was a risk assessment.

14 MR. LoPINTO: Okay. And what did it
15 find?

16 MR. GRECO: That's when it was
17 determined that based on residential
18 scenario.

19 MR. LoPINTO: On the residential
20 scenario. So when you do a risk
21 assessment, what it assumes, if I remember
22 correctly, it's 40 years residential
23 living at the site, constant living there,
24 which would mean you're out in the yard,
25 you're rolling in the, you're digging up,

1 putting in a garden. That risk assessment
2 then moves forward to what your exposure
3 would be, how much an average adult
4 weighs, how much an average adult might
5 ingest by touching it and whatever, and
6 they do the same thing for a child,
7 especially for lead because lead ingestion
8 is more critical for children than for
9 adults and they're a lower weight and
10 whatever. So when that assessment was
11 done it assumed this worst-case scenario
12 of exposure. So your exposure would have
13 been much less than the occasional worker
14 or what have you. And I don't know if
15 they even looked at that, you know, the
16 others, and if they had a risk or not.
17 But I would say that, based upon what you
18 were talking about, the lead is in the
19 soil. I would imagine that as you walk
20 the soil particles came off your shoes,
21 there wouldn't be many left. If you wash
22 your clothes it would more than likely,
23 because it's still in the particle form,
24 come off your clothes. If you were --
25 lead is in other forms, lead can be in a

1 fume form if it's heated up high enough,
2 but you're talking about particulate lead
3 here. So I would say that looking at it
4 from a statistical US EPA risk assessment,
5 the evaluation of your exposures would
6 prove that it was not a problem.

7 Would you agree, Jon?

8 MR. GRECO: I'm not a specialist, but
9 you're onto something.

10 MR. LoPINTO: I mean, that's the way
11 the assessments are done and a one-time,
12 you know, exposure, unless you fell in a
13 vat of lead probably wouldn't lead to any
14 problem. I have clients that still work
15 with lead, so...

16 MR. GOEPFERT: Notwithstanding the
17 fact of the assessment, I understand your
18 point that you're making. And going
19 forward, we should have something just to
20 let people know, or at least something
21 that says, you know, this is Coast Guard
22 property or the property of and please
23 contact, if you want to get into this
24 property.

25 MR. BRANZETTI: Now, when is the last

1 time the other parts of the property
2 surrounding that have been tested, like
3 the ball fields where the kids are
4 playing?

5 MR. GOEPFERT: Oh, the ball fields
6 were tested back in I believe it was 1996,
7 and the health department has signed off
8 on --

9 MR. BRANZETTI: So that's '96,
10 that's --

11 MR. GOEPFERT: -- it, it's clean.

12 MR. BRANZETTI: -- twenty years ago.

13 MR. SCHREIBER: There was an original,
14 there was what was known as the RAB, and
15 matter of fact, Bob was part of it and he
16 chaired that for a while, the Restoration
17 Advisory Board, and working with the Coast
18 Guard, Army Corps, New York State, and as
19 you saw in the original slide they took so
20 many soil samples and water samples --

21 (Multiple voices.)

22 MR. BRANZETTI: -- what I'm asking.
23 You have the underground water running
24 through that whole land there. What's to
25 say that that water from the area that's

1 contaminated has not gone over now to
2 underneath the ball fields. You haven't
3 tested in 20 years. How about getting
4 that tested?

5 MR. GRECO: The groundwater flow
6 actually doesn't flow in the direction of
7 the ball field, it goes out towards the
8 bay. But even if that weren't the case,
9 what's in the groundwater right now is
10 arguably the groundwater is really
11 uncontaminated at that Fort Totten. What
12 he's found in a couple of samples were
13 something called PAHs, which are a tarry
14 substance, but those wells were drilled in
15 a crumbling parking lot, and so we think
16 we just got a little particulate matter
17 from crumbling parking lot in the water
18 sample. The water sample, I'm sure, if we
19 go out and sample it today they're going
20 to be fine.

21 MR. BRANZETTI: Okay. So if you go
22 out and sample it today? How about going
23 out and sampling it today or tomorrow?

24 MR. GRECO: We're trying to get, not
25 to be argumentative, but we're trying to

1 get to the end of the process.

2 MR. BRANZETTI: Right, I understand
3 that, but you still have to keep testing
4 the other areas in the park, just to make
5 sure that over 20 years from your last
6 testing that something else hasn't now
7 passed on and contaminated another part of
8 the park.

9 MR. GRECO: It hasn't been 20 since we
10 sampled the wells, and -- you know, part
11 of the frustration at this site, I think,
12 is that you look at it and we've been out
13 here for a long time, and you say what are
14 you really doing, you're digging up one
15 area and you're saying the heck with the
16 rest of it. There's really a lot of
17 history. But the site itself starts as a
18 discharge of mercury into Little Bay, and
19 that's what put it on the map. When it
20 came and got listed as a site in New York
21 State Superfund, we listed it as the
22 property boundary, the 9.6 acres that
23 consists of the Coast Guard. Really, the
24 9.6 acres upland area is not what the
25 problem was, the problem was the discharge

1 to the bay. We investigated that years
2 ago and determined the discharge really
3 wasn't that significant and we did sample
4 two rounds of fish sampling, we did 400
5 borings out in the bay and we determined
6 it was not --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not what
8 was killing all the fish there in the
9 beginning each season?

10 MR. GRECO: No, it wasn't.

11 Then when we were done with that, we
12 turned an eye towards well, now what do we
13 do about the 8 acres that we've listed
14 that wasn't the original problem. So we
15 sampled areas of potential concern.
16 Nobody had, really other than the ball
17 field -- not the ball field -- the fill
18 area, there were no actual areas that
19 anyone suspected would be contaminated,
20 but as due diligence we said well, they
21 use pesticides here, they had a
22 transformer there, we sampled those areas.
23 We really didn't come up with much, other
24 than refined PAHs, which is a fancy word
25 for coal. We got little chips of coal,

1 and they used a lot of coal, they burned
2 coal over the years. That coal, when they
3 were done burning it they had coal ash.
4 It's quite possible filled a lot of low
5 areas with coal ash. So that's what we
6 really have, it is a coal ash issue. And,
7 but the rest of it, I mean, the lead is
8 from actual disposal and they're going to
9 address that.

10 And we will get signage out there,
11 right, for between now and digging it up?

12 MR. GOEPFERT: We'll get signage.

13 MR. GRECO: But, so we can do that,
14 but the rest of it really is not that
15 significant. It is something and it's
16 something that the state is going to keep
17 this on our registry as what we call a
18 Class 4, and it's really in the way of
19 institutionally controlling it so anyone
20 wants to use it they will see that it's
21 listed and they will come to us and we'll
22 tell them what's there, what uses may be
23 acceptable and what uses may not be.

24 MR. BRANZETTI: I just want to make
25 sure that the kids that are playing, that

1 are playing on the side where their
2 brothers or sisters are playing baseball,
3 they're playing on the side with mommy and
4 they're digging up that soil and stuff
5 into their pails and everything, you know,
6 that this is not going to, you know,
7 affect them, that we're going to have a
8 safe area for these kids to be at.

9 MR. GRECO: You make a great point,
10 and again, I wasn't aware that it was used
11 that heavily and we'll see to it that we
12 get that wrapped up.

13 MR. GOEPFERT: Yes, ma'am. Your name,
14 again?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Sylvia Johnson.

16 You mentioned about putting up the
17 signage, but you said that the signage you
18 propose the signage would say this is
19 Coast Guard property, contact the Coast
20 Guard. But I think until you do the
21 remedial action, I think that the signage
22 should say more than that and that any
23 restriction, you know, that it is
24 containing lead or it is dangerous,
25 there's a risk for being in that area, not

1 just contact.

2 MR. GOEPFERT: Your point is well
3 taken.

4 MR. LoPINTO: The next potential
5 meeting and next potential document?

6 MR. GOEPFERT: Actually, the next
7 document that we're going to have out is
8 the decision document.

9 MR. LoPINTO: And then after the
10 remediation is complete is there a report?

11 MR. GOEPFERT: Well, there's no
12 requirement for us to have a meeting,
13 but --

14 MR. LoPINTO: No, no, a report.

15 MR. GOEPFERT: There will be a
16 closeout report.

17 MR. LoPINTO: Okay. And then do we
18 meet again before the final closure of the
19 FUDS action?

20 MR. GOEPFERT: We are not required to,
21 but we can.

22 MR. LoPINTO: Okay.

23 MR. BRANZETTI: One last question.
24 There was garbage in Area 2 being dumped
25 over there. Could that have affected some

1 of your testing? There's groups that were
2 dumping all their, everything that, all
3 their trash and everything into that.

4 MR. GOEPFERT: Again, I don't know
5 when that happened or --

6 MR. BRANZETTI: Two years ago.

7 MR. GOEPFERT: I think that -- were we
8 out there two years? I don't think two
9 years ago. It was after that.

10 MR. PANNELL: The sampling that we did
11 in Area 2 was May of 2011.

12 MR. GOEPFERT: May of 2011 is the
13 sample, but thank you.

14 MR. PANNELL: And to expand on that,
15 if I might, what I remember seeing out
16 there was brush.

17 MR. BRANZETTI: No, this was, trust
18 me, there was garbage, because I asked
19 these guys to stop.

20 MR. PANNELL: I don't recall seeing
21 anything like that.

22 MR. BRANZETTI: I just asked them, you
23 know, stop throwing the garbage out in the
24 woods there, you know, put it in a trash
25 thing and, you know, call and come get it

1 picked up.

2 MR. GOEPFERT: Yes, ma'am?

3 MS. SHEPARD: Sorry. What is this
4 area from and what body is this, exactly?

5 MR. GOEPFERT: I'm with the Army Corps
6 of Engineers. You missed the initial
7 introduction.

8 MS. SHEPARD: Okay.

9 MR. GOEPFERT: My name is Greg
10 Goepfert, I'm the project manager for
11 Fort Totten. This is a public meeting for
12 the Proposed Plan for the area,
13 Fort Totten, and I can give you more
14 feedback information after the meeting.

15 MS. SHEPARD: Sounds good.

16 MR. GOEPFERT: Well, I appreciate
17 everybody's concern and comments. And
18 hopefully we answered them. If we
19 haven't, we'll make sure we answer them in
20 action, and we will be putting a notice in
21 the newspaper. I'll probably let you
22 know. We have a website that's our
23 project website that we'll post the notice
24 for the decision document.

25 MR. BRAMMER: The website is on the

1 Proposed Plan?

2 MR. GOEPFERT: The website is on the
3 Proposed Plan. I also put our documents
4 in the Bay Terrace Library if anybody ever
5 wanted to look at the library record that
6 we have there, and typically when I send
7 out reports I do send them out to
8 Ms. Bitterman, Mr. LoPinto, Mr. Schreiber
9 gets them as well, fire department, police
10 department, Coast Guard, department of
11 health, DEC; everybody is given an
12 opportunity to read whatever we produce.

13 So again, the next document that will
14 be coming out will be the decision
15 document. We will wait until the
16 July 24th comment period is ended. We'll
17 compile any of the comments we have, we'll
18 answer them appropriately. That will be
19 part of the record, the decision. And
20 they'll be posted on our website as well,
21 as Mr. Schreiber had requested, and we'll
22 have the decision document signed by our
23 commander probably, it will probably
24 happen towards the end of this year, maybe
25 mid fall time.

1 I thank you for coming.

2 (Time Noted: 7:58 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK)

) ss

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

I, DONNA C. GILMORE, a Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public within and for the State of New
York, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing transcript is a true
and accurate transcript of my original stenographic
notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand this 15th day of July, 2015.



DONNA C. GILMORE



ATTACHMENT D
Newspaper Articles

Queens Tribune

U.S. Army Corps to Clean Fort Totten Soil

Posted on June 25, 2015 by tribune in This Week Bayside, This Week Eastern Queens, This Week Flushing

BY YVETTE BROWN

Staff Writer

A small section of Fort Totten is receiving remedial action due to contamination of lead in the soil, the United States Army Corps of Engineers announced.

There have been four alternatives set into motion to resolve the issue, all of which require the removal or covering of the soil to make sure no one is affected.



The U.S. Army Corps. of Engineers will undergo a project to remediate contaminated soil at Fort Totten. File photo

The lead contamination can only affect the community if it is in constant contact with the community or ingested in any way.

A representative of the U.S Army Corps of Engineers, Chris Gardner, explained that the lead contamination located next to the ball field most likely came from soil taken from under an old vehicle maintenance area to fill in spots that were ponding water, but he stressed that the soil is not toxic.

“The area is still mostly owned by the Coast Guard,” Gardner said. “They basically leveled it out, filled in spots [with soil] taken from under an old vehicle maintenance area and so that’s presumably where the lead came from.”

William Schreiber, president of the Bay Terrace Community Alliance Inc. and President of Co-op and Condo Council, spoke about the history behind the contamination.

He said the contamination goes back six or seven years and began with the contamination of mercury “The RAB (Restoration Advisory Board) along with Community Board 7 began talking about toxic chemicals in the soil, at that time, they were looking for carcinogens, then they started focusing on mercury contamination in the soil,” said Schreiber. “According to the studies, they found that everything was within acceptable levels and that left two areas, there was an area they remediated about six or seven years ago for a small amount of mercury and now they’re coming back.”

Schreiber said the mercury contamination could have come from the mercury vapor lamps used by the Army base. Fort Totten is used by the Army base, FDNY for EMT training, Fire Marshalls, contingents of Army Reserve, terrorism units, specialized units of the police department and has been a park since 2005.

The four alternatives include

- * doing nothing at all for no cost,
- * land use restrictions for a total of \$206,130,
- *soil cover caps for \$282,635 or
- *removal of the soil, off-site disposal and backfill for \$450,934.

The alternatives, with the exception of the first and fourth alternative, allow for up to 30 years of protection from the contamination, while the first alternative requires no action and the last alternative requires full removal of the lead contaminated soil. While determining which alternative to go with, USACE must consider the overall protectiveness of human health and the environment, compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, long term effectiveness and permanence, cost, state acceptance, community acceptance, short-term effectiveness and implementability. USACE has chosen the most effective alternative, which is the removal of the contaminated soil, but must consult with the community to assure their comfortability.

The USACE have encouraged the community to become involved with the decision of what Fort Totten should do. The public is able to submit comments about the proposed plans to the USACE up until July 24. The community is also encouraged to attend a meeting held by the USACE on June 30 at 7 p.m. located at “The Bay Terrace Jewish Center” 13-00 209 St., so that they can explain the proposed plan and all of the alternatives.

They are also accepting verbal and written comments at the meeting. The documents to write specific comments are available on the USACE website.

Reach Reporter Yvette Brown at (718) 357-7400 x128 or ybrown@queenstribune.com

Plan outlined for Totten remediation

by **Laura A. Shepard, Chronicle Contributor** | **Posted: Thursday, July 2, 2015 10:30 am**

The U.S. Coast Guard doesn't use its 9.6 acres at Fort Totten anymore, but the government will be cleaning it up.

Gregory Goepfert, project manager for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, announced plans for removing lead-contaminated soil during a meeting Tuesday in Bayside.

The area is near the northern part of the fort between the ballfields and the old fortifications.

"We would like to go ahead and clean up the soil that has been impacted and replace it with clean material," Goepfert said.

The 20,000-square-foot site would be refilled with clean soil from elsewhere. The endeavor will cost about \$200,000.

Goepfert said the plan was preferable to alternatives like doing nothing, just fencing it off to the public or covering it with a landfill cap, but that would require additional maintenance in the future.

The Army Corps determined that it is the only one of five areas they tested at the fort that requires remediation.

The other four contained polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, likely from burning coal or coal ash, low levels of volatile organic compounds and traces of pesticides and metals. Analyzed soil samples do not pose a risk.

When the groundwater was tested, the corps didn't find concentrations of PAHs above state Class A requirements, so the water would be drinkable in an emergency.

The Army Corps will soon compile a document with public comments and submit its plan and bid for federal funding. If funded, the project could be completed by mid-2016.

Joe Branzetti, a member of the Friends of Fort Totten Park, told the Coast Guard representatives he was angry the community was never informed about the contamination and the site has been without fencing or signage, even though the Coast Guard knew about the problem.

Branzetti said that he's participated in tree plantings there with Girl Scout and Boy Scout troops, with the Parks Department's help. A representative from the Coast Guard said that was done without its knowledge.

The Army Corps emphasized that while lead, PAHs and VOCs may pose risks if people are exposed to high concentrations for long periods, unless someone actually ingests the soil, fort-goers who walk through the area are not at risk.

Army Corps presents Fort Totten lead remediation options to public

By Tom Momberg



The US Army Corps takes public comment on the proposed remediation of soil contamination from traces of lead.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers held a public meeting Tuesday to unveil options for remediation of soil containing traces of lead in a small area of Fort Totten behind the baseball field.

Project Manager Greg Goepsert identified five areas around the U.S. Coast Guard-controlled part of the fort that contain traces of lead, of which he said only the one behind the ball field had the potential need for remediation strategies.

The Army Corps put forward four options for a roughly 20,000-square-foot surface area where it said lead levels just barely exceeded background concentrations required for remediation. The minimum background concentration that has the potential to harm a child if ingested is about 523 milligrams per kilogram in shallow soil and 449 milligrams per kilogram in deep soil.

The area suggested for soil remediation has traces of lead from when fill was taken from surfaces of former and existing vehicle maintenance areas on the Army-owned part of the fort to fill areas with standing water.

The first alternative would be to do nothing and to spend no money, which New York District Army Corps Public Affairs Specialist Chris Gardner said is always the baseline consideration.

The second alternative would be to use land-use controls such as physical barriers or limitations on future land use, at an initial capital cost estimate of just over \$73,400 and a 30-year maintenance cost of just under \$132,700.

The third alternative would be to implement a soil cover cap by covering the affected area with additional topsoil and use land-use controls similar to the second alternative. The Army Corps estimated the construction time frame for the third option at a year and a half, with an initial capital cost of over \$156,500 and a 30-year maintenance cost of about \$126,100.

The fourth alternative, which seemed to be favored by the public, would be complete removal, off-site disposal and backfill of about 1,667 cubic yards of soil. Gardner said the fourth alternative would likely take just a few months over winter or spring of 2016, for a capital cost of nearly \$451,000.

A public comment period will open July 18 and close July 24, during which any member of the public can send written comments, questions and concerns regarding the project and any of the remediation alternatives.

Gardner said the project team would take all public comments into consideration before it determines which option it would take for soil remediation, and send out requests for proposals to be returned by fall.

Fort Totten has had a history of chemical remediation ever since a 1988 site investigation, and the Army Corps said it would continue to maintain contamination concerns and hold the Department of Defense responsible as the fort continues to have more of a public presence.

“Right now, they seem to feel they have inspected every inch of Fort Totten,” said Warren Schreiber of Community Board 7 and president of the Bay Terrace Community Alliance. “I thought it was very positive that they came back and are committing to this once again.”

Written public comments should be mailed, postmarked within the public comment period window, to Greg Goepsert at the New York district of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 26 Federal Plaza, CENAN-PP-E, Room 1811, New York, NY 10278.

Reach reporter Tom Momberg by e-mail at tmomberg@cnglocal.com or by phone at (718) 260-4573.

©2015 COMMUNITY NEWS GROUP

Reader Feedback

Lucille Kernahan from Bay Terrace says:

Select Option 4. The job would be completed and done.

Other options would require annual maintenance and shut down of the area each year. Undoubtedly, the maintenance costs would increase over the years, despite present figure put forth.

July 7, 10:38 am

ATTACHMENT E
Letters

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Division of Environmental Remediation, Office of the Director
625 Broadway, 12th Floor, Albany, New York 12233-7011
P: (518) 402-9706 | F: (518) 402-9020
www.dec.ny.gov

March 22, 2016

Mr. Gregory J. Goepfert
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
26 Federal Plaza, Rm. 1811
New York, New York 10278-0900

RE: Record of Decision/Decision Document
Fort Totten Site, Site No. 241017
Uplands Area; Operable Unit 2

Dear Mr. Goepfert:

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (DOH), has reviewed the Record of Decision (ROD)/Decision Document for Operable Unit 2 (OU2) of the Ft. Totten site and agrees that the remedy put forth is acceptable for the current use of the facility as an active coast guard station.

It should be noted that DEC believes this remedy is not necessarily protective for all other potential future uses of the property, and reclassification of the site on the state's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites from a Class 2 to a Class 4 will not occur until such time as DEC places an Environmental Notice upon all or, at a minimum, select portions of the Fort Totten site as noted below.

More specifically, DEC believes that areas of the Ft. Totten site that have not been shown to meet our Soil Cleanup Objectives for Unrestricted and/or Residential Use (see 6 NYCRR Part 375-6.8(a) and (b)) will require an institutional control via an Environmental Notice which minimally will advise site owners and prospective purchasers of the property that:

1. While the controlled portions of the property have been found suitable for continued use as an Active Coast Guard Station, they have not been determined suitable for all uses;
2. Groundwater should not be used for potable purposes without testing and treatment, as necessary, as determined by the appropriate regulatory agencies;
3. No long-term occupancy housing facilities or long-term occupancy dormitories should be constructed on the property;

4. The institutionally controlled portions of the property must be further assessed (and remedied, as determined appropriate) if the property is sold and/or the use of the site changes from that of an active Coast Guard Station, and;

5. The *Change of Use* provisions of 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.11(d) will remain in effect for the controlled property until such time as the Environmental Notice is rescinded.

In consideration of the above, DEC supports the ROD/Decision Document as put forth by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Please feel free to contact Jonathan Greco, of my staff, at (518) 402-9694 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "R. Schick", is centered on a light-colored rectangular background.

Robert W. Schick, P.E.

Director

Division of Environmental Remediation

ec: Michael Ryan, DEC
Robert Cozzy, DEC
Janet Brown, DEC
Jonathan Greco, DEC
Jane O'Connell, DEC
Krista Anders, DOH
Justin Deming, DOH
Bridget Boyd, DOH

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security

United States
Coast Guard



Commanding Officer
U. S. Coast Guard
Civil Engineering Unit
Providence

475 Kilvert Street, Suite 100
Warwick, RI 02886
Staff Symbol: ENV
401.736.1706
401.736.1703 (fax)
email: Michael.andrews@uscg.mil

5090

Certified Mail/Return Receipt Requested

MAY 22 2015

Mr. Gregory Goepfert
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District
Formerly Utilized Defense Sites (FUDS) Team Leader
26 Federal Plaza, Room 1811
New York, NY 10278

Re: Former U.S. Coast Guard Station Fort Totten, Queens, NY

Dear Mr. Goepfert,

The U. S. Coast Guard property at Fort Totten consists of 9.6 acres of land with several buildings that are currently leased to the New York City Police and Fire Departments. While the Coast Guard has no immediate plans to redevelop the property, the small boat station at Kings Point, NY may be relocated to Fort Totten in the future. Consequently, the residual soil contamination and status of the property as a Formerly Utilized Defense Site (FUDS) managed by the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will be a factor in the site redevelopment.

According to the USACE's *Supplemental Remedial Investigation #2 Report*, dated April 2014, no unacceptable risk remains for the low levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and metals (including mercury) remaining in soils at Areas 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Fort Totten FUDS. Based on the elevated contaminant concentrations in Area 1, USACE will be preparing a "Proposed Plan" to excavate the residual impacted soils in this area.

While soils in Areas 2, 3, 4 and 5 (including mercury levels at Area 5, adjacent to Building 615) pose no unacceptable risk to human health, the residual concentrations exceed the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) soil clean up objectives (SCOs). The SCOs are ordinarily applied under the FUDS program only in situations when risk assessments identify an unacceptable risk. To allay NYSDEC concern that there are PAHs and metals (including mercury) present in soils above SCOs at Areas 2 through 5, we assert that the following management/institutional controls will be utilized to track any residual environmental liabilities at the site, as follows:

A description of the existing contamination will be recorded in the Coast Guard's Shore Asset Management Environmental Liability (SAM EL) Module. This record will memorialize the locations and concentrations of the contamination in the event of a future property transfer or construction project that would disturb on site soils. In the event of planned changes to the current land use, the


Subj: FORMER U.S. COAST GUARD STATION FORT
TOTTEN, QUEENS, NY

5090
21 May 2015

Coast Guard will notify NYSDEC to coordinate the management of soils in Areas 2 through 5. In the event that the Coast Guard should transfer Fort Totten in the future, all relevant reports depicting the environmental condition of the property would be provided to the designated property transfer agent, as is common practice by agencies of the Federal Government.

It is anticipated that this correspondence will facilitate the continued progress of USACE toward addressing, and closing out, the remaining issues related to the Fort Totten FUDS.

Sincerely,



RACHEL MARINO

Environmental Branch Chief

By direction of the Commanding Officer

Copy: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation / Mr. Jonathan Greco
CG SILC LSC
CG SILC EMD
CG Sector New York

-----Original Message-----

From: Warren [<mailto:warrennyc@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 11:56 AM

To: Goepfert, Gregory J NAN02

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: PROPOSED PLAN - ENGINEER SCHOOL/FORT TOTTEN - FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITE

Mr. Goepfert:

Please be advised that Community Board 7 and other organizations representing the surrounding area, support Fort Totten soil remediation Alternative number four.

We thank the Army Corps of Engineers for its attention to this matter and look forward to the work commencing.

Sincerely,

Warren Schreiber

--

Warren Schreiber

Co-President, Presidents Co-op & Condo Council,

President, Bay Terrace Community Alliance,

President, Bay Terrace Cooperative Section I