Department of Environmental Conservation

Division of Environmental Remediation

Record of Decision
Camp Georgetown Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site Number 7-27-010

March, 2004

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
GEORGE E. PATAKI, *Governor* ERIN M. CROTTY, *Commissioner*

DECLARATION STATEMENT - RECORD OF DECISION

Camp Georgetown Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site No.7-27-010

Statement of Purpose and Basis

The Record of Decision (ROD) presents the selected remedy for the Camp Georgetown site, a Class 2 inactive hazardous waste disposal site. The selected remedial program was chosen in accordance with the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and is not inconsistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan of March 8, 1990 (40CFR300), as amended.

This decision is based on the Administrative Record of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) for the Camp Georgetown inactive hazardous waste disposal site, and the public's input to the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) presented by the NYSDEC. A listing of the documents included as a part of the Administrative Record is included in Appendix B of the ROD.

Assessment of the Site

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous waste constituents from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD, presents a current or potential significant threat to public health and/or the environment.

Description of Selected Remedy

Based on the results of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site and the criteria identified for evaluation of alternatives, the NYSDEC has selected a Modified Part 360 Multi-layer Synthetic Cap over the primary area of contamination with other areas of concern to be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap. The components of the remedy are as follows:

1. Installation of an impermeable cap to minimize the risk of exposure to contaminants. This would involve placement of a modified Part 360 multi-layer geomembrane cap over the primary area of contamination. The remaining areas of contaminated soil would be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap.

2. Implementation of a groundwater monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the remedy.

3. Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring.

4. The property owner would provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the NYSDEC, which would certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation and maintenance or site management plan.

5. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that would: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

New York State Department of Health Acceptance

The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) concurs that the remedy selected for this site is protective of human health.

Declaration

The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with State and Federal requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action to the extent practicable, and is cost effective. This remedy utilizes permanent solutions and alternative treatment or resource recovery technologies, to the maximum extent practicable, and satisfies the preference for remedies that reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element.

MAR 2 9 2004

Date



Dale A. Desnoyers, Director
Division of Environmental Remediation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECORD OF DECISION

Camp Georgetown Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site Number 7-27-010
March, 2004

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF THE RECORD OF DECISION

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), has seleceted this remedy for the Camp Georgetown site. The presence of hazardous waste has created significant threats to human health and/or the environment that are addressed by this remedy. As more fully described in Sections 3 and 4 of this document, past wood treatment operations using pentachlorophenol (PCP) and chromated copper arsenate (CCA) have resulted in the disposal of hazardous wastes, including semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), dioxins, phenols, and metals. These wastes have contaminated the soil and groundwater at the site, and have resulted in:

- a significant threat to human health associated with current and potential exposure to contaminated soil and shallow groundwater.

- a significant environmental threat associated with the impacts of contaminated soil and groundwater.

To eliminate or mitigate these threats, the NYSDEC has selected the following remedy:

- Installation of an impermeable cap to minimize the risk of exposure to contaminants. This will involve placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over the primary area of contamination. The remaining areas of contaminated soil will be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap.

- Implementation of a groundwater monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the remedy.

- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring.

- The property owner will provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the NYSDEC, which will certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that could impair the ability of the

control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation and maintenance or site management plan.

- Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that will: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

- In addition to the remedial components listed above, an option to excavate and consolidate the impacted soils from the Camp Pharsalia site to be included beneath the capped area at Camp Georgetown may be explored. A March 2003 Record of Decision selected a low permeability soil cover remedy for Camp Pharsalia. Due to the similarities in contamination and the close proximity to the Camp Georgetown site, such an option may provide an improved remedial approach for Camp Pharsalia without compromising the effectiveness of this remedy for Camp Georgetown.

The selected remedy, discussed in detail in Section 7, is intended to attain the remediation goals identified for this site in Section 5. The remedy must conform with officially promulgated standards and criteria that are directly applicable, or that are relevant and appropriate. The selection of a remedy must also take into consideration guidance, as appropriate. Standards, criteria and guidance are hereafter called SCGs.

SECTION 2: SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Camp Georgetown is a large complex consisting of a NYSDEC crew headquarters and a New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) active incarceration facility, located in the Town of Georgetown, Madison County (see figure 1). The incarceration facility is operated by the NYSDCS, but is located on property managed by the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS occupies the property north of Crumb Hill Road and does not include any past wood treatment operations associated with the contamination. The NYSDEC occupies the property south of Crumb Hill Road, which includes the area defined as the Class 2 inactive hazardous waste disposal site. This area defined as the site occupies approximately 6.6 acres , as shown on Figure 2. The site is bordered on the northeast by Crumb Hill Road, south by private property, and west by State Reforestation Land.

The area around the site is typified by a mature and eroded plateau that is dissected by a series of valleys several hundred feet deep. This plateau has a rolling, rugged appearance. Approximately 45 percent of Madison County is classified as commercial forest.

SECTION 3: SITE HISTORY

3.1: Operational/Disposal History

Incarceration facility inmates participate in various work programs. One of the work activities formerly performed by the Camp Georgetown inmates was a sawmill and wood treatment operation. The wood treatment plant was operated from approximately 1970 to 1983 as a dip tank process using

the chemical biocide pentachlorophenol. Untreated poles were stored in drying sheds northwest of the treatment building. The poles were moved into the treatment building by rail and then hoisted into one of two empty dip tanks. The poles were strapped in place to prevent the logs from floating during treatment. The dip tank would then be filled with a pentachlorophenol mixture, which would come from one or both of the two 2,000 gallon above ground storage tanks (AST) by gravity flow. The poles were usually submerged in the treatment solution for 24 hours. Wood was treated using a pentachlorophenol (PCP) solution consisting of approximately one part PCP, to eleven parts fuel oil. Unused treatment solution would be pumped back into one of the storage tanks for pentachlorophenol /fuel oil mixtures between treatment batches.

After treatment, the poles were hoisted from the dip tanks and allowed to drip back into the dip tank for a period of time. The poles were then moved by rail to the drip pad, located on the southeast end of the building. The poles would remain in this uncovered area for another 24 hours. Finally, the poles were moved to one of the designated "treated material storage areas." These areas were located around the outside of the treatment building and also along the southwest side of the service road serving the treatment plant and storage buildings.

In 1983 the PCP treatment process was discontinued. From 1983 until 1991, the treatment plant was operated as a pressure treatment process using chromated copper arsenate (CCA)solution. The CCA solution used at Camp Georgetown was comprised of 23.75% chromic acid, 17% arsenic pentoxide, 9.25% cupric oxide, and 50% water. Unlike the dipping process employed for PCP, this process involved placement the wood in a pressurized vessel for treatment.

3.2: Remedial History

In 1999, the NYSDEC listed the site as a Class 2 site in the Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites in New York. A Class 2 site is a site where hazardous waste presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment and action is required. This listing was based on the past use of PCP at the site.

The Camp Georgetown site is one of three NYSDCS facilities in the State currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

In October of 1997 the NYSDEC Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at Camp Georgetown.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The PI consisted of the excavation of 22 test pits, the installation and sampling of 8 monitoring wells and the collection of 26 surface soil, and 22 subsurface soil samples. The investigation found PCP in the

soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites. The site, consisting of the property on the south side of Crumb Hill road, was designated a Class 2 site, which is defined as a site which " presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site. The RI was developed to build on the information generated during the PI and to help fully delineate the extent of contamination at the site.

SECTION 4: SITE CONTAMINATION

A remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) has been conducted to evaluate the alternatives for addressing the significant threats to human health and/or the environment.

4.1: Summary of the Remedial Investigation

The purpose of the RI was to define the nature and extent of any contamination resulting from previous activities at the site. The RI was conducted between October, 2001 and November 2002. The field activities and findings of the investigation are described in the RI report.

The following activities were conducted during the RI:

- Research of historical information, including review of the Preliminary Investigation Report;
- Ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of 2 soil samples within a seep area;
- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- A survey of public and private water supply wells in the area around the site;
- Collection of 4 aquatic sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

To determine whether the soil, sediment, biota, and groundwater contain contamination at levels of concern, data from the investigation were compared to the following SCGs:

- Groundwater, drinking water, and surface water SCGs are based on NYSDEC "Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidace Values" and Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code. *Division of Water Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (TOGS 1.1.1) was used for screening groundwater. The groundwater standard for total phenolic compounds listed in TOGS 1.1.1 is 1.0 part per billion (ppb). Because PCP is the only phenolic compound detected in the groundwater at the site, an SCG of 1.0 ppb has been used. Finally, 6NYCRR Part 700-705 lists a groundwater standard of 0.0007 parts per trillion (ppt) for 2,3,7,8-TCDD. This value has been adopted as the groundwater SCG, with the other forms of dioxins and furans normalized to 2,3,7,8-TCDD using the USEPA's toxicity equivalence factors (TEFs).

- Soil SCGs are based on the NYSDEC "Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum (TAGM) 4046; Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels". For dioxins/furans a cleanup level of 1 ppb 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence has been selected as the soil cleanup objective.

- the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document.

- NYSDEC Technical Report 87-3, *The Niagara River Biota Contamination Project: Fish Flesh Criteria for Piscivorous Wildlife*, July 1987.

Based on the RI results, in comparison to the SCGs and potential public health and environmental exposure routes, certain media and areas of the site require remediation. These are summarized below. More complete information can be found in the RI report.

4.1.1: Site Geology and Hydrogeology

The overburden geology was investigated during the test pit and monitoring well investigations. The top foot of overburden consists of weathered, broken gray shale (i.e., soil and unconsolidated rock fragments) that range in size from gravel to boulders mixed with grey silt and sand or brown sandy topsoil, considered to be non-native fill material most likely originating from a shale quarry located northwest of the site. Underlying the fill material is glacial lodgment till consisting of a silty till with thin sand lenses overlying a clay till with thin sand lenses. Both till layers are very dense and vary in color across the site from grey, tan and brown. Glacial till was observed to a depth of approximately 46 feet bgs (which is the maximum depth of drilling during monitoring well installation during PI activities). Overall thickness of the till was reported to be in excess of 150 feet during the installation of the water supply well, which is approximately 200 feet total depth. The till is very dense as evidenced by high blow counts and difficult drilling conditions. Observations during drilling confirm that the upper 15 feet of the till unit contains numerous thin lenses of more permeable sands and fine gravel that may or may not be interconnected.

Depth to groundwater across the site ranged between 2 to 5 feet bgs during the groundwater sampling events. Gauging data indicates that groundwater flow appears to be in a southwesterly direction, generally following topography and eventually discharging into Mann Brook.
Recharge of the water table is likely provided by precipitation infiltrating areas of the site. Shallow groundwater accumulates in the more permeable sandy lenses found within the till and then appears to disperse slowly into the regional groundwater flow regime. Groundwater recovery rates witnessed during well development and purging activities indicated that the hydraulic conductivity for the till unit is very low.

4.1.2: Nature of Contamination

As described in the RI report, many soil and groundwater samples were collected to characterize the nature and extent of contamination. As summarized in Table 1, the main categories of contaminants that exceed their SCGs are pentachlorophenol (PCP), dioxins/furans, fuel oil, and metals.

PCP is a manufactured chemical (i.e. not naturally occurring) which is a restricted use pesticide and is used industrially as a wood preservative for utility poles, railroad ties, fence posts, and wharf pilings. PCP was used at the Camp Georgetown site in the treatment of wood using a mixture of PCP and fuel oil. The fuel oil was used to dissolve the PCP into solution for a dipping process.

The primary fuel oil constituents of concern at this site are a subset of semi-volatile compounds (SVOCs), known as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

PCP and dioxins/furans have low water solubility and a strong tendency to adhere to soil or sediment particles in the environment. PAHs are also expected to be adsorbed to soil with limited potential for leaching. Therefore, their mobility in the environment is mainly limited to physical (erosional and depositional) mechanisms. Furthermore, PCP breaks down rapidly when exposed to sunlight and is less likely to be present in exposed surface soils.

CCA is a preservative used at Camp Georgetown subsequent to the PCP operations which was the source of the inorganic contamination identified at the site consisting of chromium, copper, and arsenic.

4.1.3: Extent of Contamination

This section describes the findings of the investigation for all environmental media that were investigated.

As discussed in Section 3.2, a Preliminary Investigation (PI) was conducted to assess the conditions at the site and determine if additional investigation was warranted. The PI included soil sampling, both shallow and subsurface, installation of 8 monitoring wells, and collection of 8 groundwater samples. Discussions that follow this section include the data generated during both the PI and the RI.

Much of the soil sample data from the PI presented below is from immunoassay testing, as noted. Immunoassay testing is a screening procedure that allows for efficient and cost effective analysis of

the sample for a specific compound, in this case pentachlorophenol. A percentage of the samples collected were split, with one half undergoing the immunoassay testing, the other half sent to a contract laboratory for verification that the immunoassay tests were producing reliable results and therefore usable data. All immunoassay testing was found to be reliable based on this verification method.

Chemical concentrations are reported in parts per billion (ppb) for water, and parts per million (ppm) for soil and sediment. For comparison purposes, where applicable, SCGs are provided for each medium.

Table 1 summarizes the degree of contamination for the contaminants of concern in surface soil, subsurface soil, sediment, groundwater, and biota and compares the data with the SCGs for the site. The following are the media which were investigated and a summary of the findings of the investigation.

Surface Soil

A total of 88 surface soil samples were collected during the PI and RI from approximately 0 to 2 inches below ground surface (bgs). Seventy-four (74) surface soil samples out of 88 were analyzed for PCP only (PI immunoassay results) or total SVOCs. PCP was the only SVOC detected above a TAGM 4046 guidance value (1.0 ppm) in all surface soil samples sent for laboratory analysis. The PCP guidance value was exceeded in 8 surface soil sample locations The concentrations ranged from 1 ppm to 130 ppm.

PCP was also detected (estimated values) in several additional surface soil samples in the drip pad area, the former AST area, and the area southwest of the former treatment building at levels well below the TAGM 4046 guidance value. PCP was not detected in any of the other surface soils collected from across the site. One potential explanation for the relatively low concentrations of PCP in surface soils is that PCP will readily breakdown by photochemical processes when exposed to the ultraviolet radiation in sunlight.

The highest concentrations of total SVOCs (5.048 ppm) were observed in surface soil sample SS-19. This sample was collected from an apparent drainage area southwest of the former Post Peeler building.

39 of the 88 surface soil samples were also sent for analysis of dioxins. Dioxins and furans were detected at low concentrations in all the samples; only two samples (SS-5 and SS-8) contained 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence above the 1.0 ppb guidance value. Slightly exceeding the PCP guidance value of 1.0 ppm at concentrations of 1.09 ppm and 1.16 ppm, respectively, these samples were collected from the former drip pad area.

A total of 40 of the 88 surface soil samples that were collected from "on site" locations were sent to the laboratory for analysis of metals. Additionally, 10 samples were collected from "background" areas (areas where former treatment operations did not appear to have existed). Of the three metals of concern (chromium, copper, arsenic), 1 out of 40 surface soil samples across the site exhibited chromium concentrations above background levels; 2 out of 40 surface soil samples analyzed for

metals showed copper at concentrations above background; and 27 out of 40 soil samples analyzed for metals possessed arsenic above the average background concentrations.

Two (2) soil samples (SEEP-1 and SEEP-2) were collected from a seep that was located near the end of the south footer drain (downgradient) of the former treatment building. Both samples were sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in SEEP-1. No PCP was detected in SEEP-2. The two seep samples were also analyzed for dioxins. These results are also included in Table 1. SEEP-1 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 3.29 ppb, while sample SEEP-2 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 2.18 ppb. Both of these values were above the site screening level of 1.0 ppb.

Subsurface Soil

Subsurface soil samples were collected from both soil borings and test pits conducted at the site. Results from the soil boring samples are discussed first, followed by the results for the samples collected from the test pits.

A total of 68 soil samples were collected from 34 soil borings across the site during the PI and RI.

The 68 samples were analyzed for SVOCs, 34 of 68 samples were analyzed for dioxins and 11 of 68 samples were analyzed for metals.

PCP was detected in 10 samples above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value, located under the former treatment building. The samples were collected from 1-6 feet bgs. PCP was also detected in GSB02-1 (2-4' bgs), GSB02–3 (2-4', 6-8' and 8-10' bgs), GSB02-4 (6-8' bgs) and GSB02-8 (1-2' and 7-8' bgs) above 1.0 ppm in the area immediately surrounding the former treatment plant, including the former drip pad area, and former AST area.

Forty-seven (47) samples were collected from test pits installed during the PI and the RI. These results are summarized on Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in 7 test pits, 3 located near the former treatment building, 2 located southwest of the former treatment plant within a grid of surface soil samples collected during the PI, and 2 located west of Drying Shed #1. These samples were collected during the PI and are based on immunoassay results.

While several SVOCs were detected in samples collected from the test pits during the RI, none exceeded TAGM 4046 guidance values.

Dioxins were analyzed in 20 of the 47 samples collected, however, no sample exceeded the 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration guidance of 1 ppb.

Sediments

Four (4) sediment samples were collected from Mann Brook and sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1.

No PCP or any other SVOCs were detected above the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document in any of the four sediment samples collected .

Several dioxin and furan congeners were detected in each sample, however, the total 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations were well below the SCGs.

Groundwater

Groundwater samples were collected in three separate sampling events. Samples were collected in 1998 during the PI as well as during the RI in November 2001 and December 2002. Additional monitoring wells were installed after each round of sampling, as needed based on the evaluation of the data. A total of 8 wells were sampled during the PI, 17 wells during the first round of the RI, and 19 wells during the final round of the RI. The NYSDEC potable water supply well located east of the treatment building was also sampled during the PI.

PI Groundwater Results

Samples were collected from MW-1 through MW-8 and were analyzed for SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals and dioxins. Analytical results were below SCGs except for PCP, metals, and dioxin.

Pentachlorophenol was detected in 5 of 8 monitoring wells above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value ranging from 30ppb to 1700 ppb during the PI sampling event.

Dioxins were also detected above the 0.0007 ppt 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence guidance value in all wells (except MW-7) during the PI sampling event.

Chromium was the only metal related to wood treatment activities detected above TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Chromium concentrations above guidance values were detected in 4 wells. Copper was detected in every well, however, it didn't exceed the 0.2 ppb guidance value in any sample analyzed. Arsenic was detected in only one well at concentrations below guidance values.

No SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals or dioxins were detected in the NYSDEC potable water supply well above SCGs.

RI Groundwater Results 2001

A second round of groundwater samples were collected in December 2001as part of the RI. The 8 wells that were installed during the PI were analyzed for fuel oil, SVOCs and dioxins. Nine newly installed wells were analyzed for pesticides/PCBs, VOCs and SVOCs. The new wells were not analyzed for dioxins during this sampling event.

Fuel components, including diesel fuel, were not detected in any of the eight previously installed monitoring wells that were sampled.

PCP was detected above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values for water in 5 monitoring wells ranging from 44 ppb to 160 ppb.

Concentrations of dioxins were found in five of the wells sampled. However only three wells exhibited a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration over the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. These wells are located radially around the former drip pad area and were identified to have dioxins from the PI. Note all water dioxin results are reported in parts per trillion (ppt). Concentrations ranged from 0.000009 ppt to 1.6694 ppt .

The PCB aroclor 1254 was found in three of the nine wells sampled. Concentrations of Aroclor 1254 in MW-9 (15 ppb), MW-12 (1.7 ppb), and MW-15 (2.7 ppb) were above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Aroclor 1254 concentrations were randomly distributed near the outer perimeter of the Site; MW-9 is north and upgradient, MW-12 is located downgradient to the southeast, and MW-15 is downgradient to the southwest. PCBs are not known to be a site-related contaminant of concern. No pesticides were detected in any of the monitoring wells sampled.

RI Groundwater Results 2002

A third round of groundwater samples were collected in November 2002. Unfiltered samples were collected from 19 wells for analysis of SVOCs, fuel oil, dioxins and pesticides/PCBs. Six (6) of the 19 wells were filtered and analyzed for the same parameters in an attempt to determine if high turbidity in groundwater was a contributing factor in elevated concentrations of contaminants. Groundwater from MW-5, MW-9, MW-12, MW-15, MW-18 and MW-19 was filtered via a 0.45 micron in-line filter.

No PCBs were detected in any of the monitoring wells. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected above the TOGS 1.1.1 0.6 ppb guidance value in all samples collected except MW-15 (filtered). Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is believed to be a laboratory artifact.

Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value in MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-5 filtered, MW-6, MW-7 and MW-11. Concentrations ranged from 1 ppb to 370 ppb .

Fuel oil components (e.g. diesel range compounds) were detected in MW-4, MW-6 and MW-7.

Groundwater samples collected from MW-4, MW-7 and MW-8 exhibited 2.3.7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations above the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. Concentrations ranged from 0.0009 ppt in MW-8 to 0.0215 ppt in MW-4.

Groundwater results from all three rounds of sampling are summarized on Table 1 and Figure 3.

Biota (Fish)

A total of 22 fish samples were collected from upstream and downstream locations within Mann Brook, located west and hydraulically down gradient of the site. Fish samples were collected by

electroshock sampling methods and were submitted for laboratory analysis of dioxins. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Eleven of the fish samples were collected upstream of the site. Another eleven samples were collected downstream of the site.

2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations are reported as wet weight concentrations in parts per trillion (ppt) and ranged from below detection limits (BDL) to 0.12 ppt, all below the SCG of 2.3 ppt.

Summary

Evaluation of the analytical data generated during the PI and RI resulted in the identification of several areas of concern with soil and localized groundwater contamination exceeding the SCGs. As shown on Figure 4, those areas include:

- Entire area beneath the former treatment building and immediately to the south of the building;
- The area of the former above ground storage tanks;
- The area across the access road to the south west of the former treatment building, and;
- An area across the access road to the north west of the former treatment building associated with a staging area for the drying of treated logs.

4.2: Interim Remedial Measures

An interim remedial measure (IRM) is conducted at a site when a source of contamination or exposure pathway can be effectively addressed before completion of the RI/FS.

There were no IRMs performed at this site during the RI/FS.

4.3: Summary of Human Exposure Pathways:

This section describes the types of human exposures that may present added health risks to persons at or around the site. A more detailed discussion of the human exposure pathways can be found in Section 3.3 of the RI report.

An exposure pathway describes the means by which an individual may be exposed to contaminants originating from a site. An exposure pathway has five elements: [1] a contaminant source, [2] contaminant release and transport mechanisms, [3] a point of exposure, [4] a route of exposure, and [5] a receptor population.
The source of contamination is the location where contaminants were released to the environment (any waste disposal area or point of discharge). Contaminant release and transport mechanisms carry contaminants from the source to a point where people may be exposed. The exposure point is a

location where actual or potential human contact with a contaminated medium may occur. The route of exposure is the manner in which a contaminant actually enters or contacts the body (e.g., ingestion, inhalation, or direct contact). The receptor population is the people who are, or may be, exposed to contaminants at a point of exposure.

An exposure pathway is complete when all five elements of an exposure pathway exist. An exposure pathway is considered a potential pathway when one or more of the elements currently does not exist, but could in the future.

There are no complete exposure pathways currently at the site. Potential pathways include:

- Direct contact with contaminated surficial soils in the former drip pad area and seepage areas of footer drains of the former treatment building. There is currently an institutional control, in the form of fencing, which serves to alert personnel to avoid impacted areas. Inmate access of these portions of the site has been restricted since the Preliminary Investigation.

- Direct contact with contaminated subsurface soils by construction or utility workers in the future.

- Ingestion of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater in the immediate area of the former treatment building is a potential future pathway should a well be installed.

4.4: Summary of Environmental Impacts

This section summarizes the existing and potential future environmental impacts presented by the site. Environmental impacts include existing and potential future exposure pathways to fish and wildlife receptors, as well as damage to natural resources such as aquifers and wetlands.

The Fish and Wildlife Impact Analysis, which is included in the RI report, presents a detailed discussion of the existing and potential impacts from the site to fish and wildlife receptors. The following potential environmental exposure pathways and ecological risks have been identified:

- Terrestrial animal contact with chemicals present in the surface soil, groundwater (at seep areas);

- Ingestion of chemicals from surface soil, groundwater and food sources, and;

- Direct uptake of chemicals in soil or groundwater by terrestrial and aquatic plants

Samples of the creek sediments and biota in Mann Brook, which receives drainage from the site, did not contain elevated levels of any site related contaminants, therefore a completed exposure pathway to fish and wildlife receptors within the streamwas not identified.

SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF THE REMEDIATION GOALS

Goals for the remedial program have been established through the remedy selection process stated

in 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.10. At a minimum, the remedy selected must eliminate or mitigate all significant threats to public health and/or the environment presented by the hazardous waste disposed at the site through the proper application of scientific and engineering principles.

The remediation goals for this site are to eliminate or reduce to the extent practicable:

- exposures of persons at or around the site to PCP, dioxins/furans and metals in soil and groundwater;
- environmental exposures of flora or fauna to PCP, dioxins, and metals in surface soil and groundwater;
- erosional transport of contaminated soil;
- the release of contaminants from soil into groundwater that may create exceedances of groundwater quality standards; and

Further, the remediation goals for the site include attaining to the extent practicable:

- ambient groundwater quality standards , and ;
- compliance with all applicable SCGs and cleanup goals.

SECTION 6: SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The selected remedy must be protective of human health and the environment, be cost-effective, comply with other statutory requirements, and utilize permanent solutions, alternative technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Potential remedial alternatives for the Camp Georgetown Site were identified, screened and evaluated in the FS report which is available at the document repositories identified in Section 1.

A summary of the remedial alternatives that were considered for this site are discussed below. The present worth represents the amount of money invested in the current year that would be sufficient to cover all present and future costs associated with the alternative. This enables the costs of remedial alternatives to be compared on a common basis. As a convention, a time frame of 30 years is used to evaluate present worth costs for alternatives with an indefinite duration. This does not imply that operation, maintenance, or monitoring would cease after 30 years if remediation goals are not achieved.

6.1: Description of Remedial Alternatives

The following potential remedies were considered to address the contaminated soil and groundwater at the site. The alternatives below are numbered sequentially for simplicity and do not necessarily correspond to the numbering system in the FS.

Alternative 1: No Action

Present Worth: *$714,000*
Capital Cost: *$0*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$55,000*

The No Action Alternative is evaluated as a procedural requirement and as a basis for comparison. It requires continued monitoring only, allowing the site to remain in an unremediated state. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Alternative 2: Excavation and Off-site Disposal

Present Worth: *$13,125,000*
Capital Cost: *$12,701,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-5: *$28,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacted soil would be addressed by excavation and off site disposal. The areas of concern delineated in Figure 4 would be excavated using conventional methods and equipment. The treatment building would be demolished as part of remedial activities.

The estimated removal volume would be 6,270 cubic yards of soil, measured in place. A 20% bulking factor yields roughly 7,530 cubic yards of soil that would be managed. Additionally, stabilization of saturated soils would be necessary (estimated 30% by volume), which would require approximately 1,520 cubic yards of ash or similar product. The slab under the former treatment building would be removed and crushed as part of this remedial alternative. The slab would produce roughly 180 cubic yards of waste that would require disposal. Consequently, the total volume requiring disposal would be approximately 9,230 cubic yards. Excavated soils would be transported to a permitted hazardous waste landfill and may require treatment prior to disposal due to the presence of dioxin.

Since the water table at the site is typically at 2 to 5 feet bgs, excavation operations would require dewatering. Groundwater would be containerized as needed and transported for off site disposal.

Alternative 3A: – Modified Part 360 Multi Layered Synthetic Cap

Present Worth: *$2,287,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,845,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a modified 6NYCRR Part 360 cap across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern

(shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material. The treatment building would be demolished and disposed off site as part of remedial activities, The modified Part 360 cap would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and prevent rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. The cap would consist of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion and infiltration of precipitation;

- Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of porous material (sand) that enhances lateral drainage of any precipitation that infiltrates through the vegetative layer; the vegetative and drainage layers help protect the underlying barrier layers from the environmental stresses of wetting/drying and freezing/thawing;

- Synthetic Barrier – low permeability membrane (at least 20 mil thickness) that represents the final impedance to precipitation infiltration;

- Subgrade Layer – approximately 12 inches of sand or other porous material that serves as the foundation for the cap. A gas collection system is not incorporated into the cost estimate for this alternative.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring, including groundwater sampling, would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative would be expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted.

Alternative 3B: – Low Permeability Cover System (LPCS)

Present Worth: *$2.330,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,888,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this containment alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a LPCS across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern (shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material The LPCS would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and greatly reduce rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. A LPCS typically consists of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion;

- Low Permeability Layer – approximately 12 inches of compacted clay to reduce infiltration into the impacted media.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative is expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted and a clay LPCS has been assumed.

6.2 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

The criteria to which potential remedial alternatives are compared are defined in 6 NYCRR Part 375, which governs the remediation of inactive hazardous waste disposal sites in New York State. A detailed discussion of the evaluation criteria and comparative analysis is included in the FS report.

The first two evaluation criteria are termed "threshold criteria" and must be satisfied in order for an alternative to be considered for selection.
1. Protection of Human Health and the Environment. This criterion is an overall evaluation of each alternative's ability to protect public health and the environment.

2. Compliance with New York State Standards, Criteria, and Guidance (SCGs). Compliance with SCGs addresses whether a remedy would meet environmental laws, regulations, and other standards and criteria. In addition, this criterion includes the consideration of guidance which the NYSDEC has determined to be applicable on a case-specific basis.

The next five "primary balancing criteria" are used to compare the positive and negative aspects of each of the remedial strategies.

3. Short-term Effectiveness. The potential short-term adverse impacts of the remedial action upon the community, the workers, and the environment during the construction and/or implementation are evaluated. The length of time needed to achieve the remedial objectives is also estimated and compared against the other alternatives.

4. Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence. This criterion evaluates the long-term effectiveness of the remedial alternatives after implementation. If wastes or treated residuals remain on-site after the selected remedy has been implemented, the following items are evaluated: 1) the magnitude of the remaining risks, 2) the adequacy of the engineering and/or institutional controls intended to limit the risk, and 3) the reliability of these controls.

5. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume. Preference is given to alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of the wastes at the site.

6. Implementability. The technical and administrative feasibility of implementing each alternative are evaluated. Technical feasibility includes the difficulties associated with the construction of the

remedy and the ability to monitor its effectiveness. For administrative feasibility, the availability of the necessary personnel and materials is evaluated along with potential difficulties in obtaining specific operating approvals, access for construction, institutional controls, and so forth.

7. Cost-Effectivness. Capital costs and operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs are estimated for each alternative and compared on a present worth basis. Although cost-effectiveness is the last balancing criterion evaluated, where two or more alternatives have met the requirements of the other criteria, it can be used as the basis for the final decision. The costs for each alternative are presented in Table 2.

This final criterion is considered a "modifying criterion" and is taken into account after evaluating those above. It is evaluated after public comments on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan have been received.

8. Community Acceptance - Concerns of the community regarding the RI/FS reports and the PRAP have been evaluated. The responsiveness summary (Appendix A) presents the public comments received and the manner in which the NYSDEC addressed the concerns raised. In general, the public comments received were supportive of the selected remedy. Several comments were received, however, pertaining to the potential option of excavating the contaminated soil at Camp Pharsalia and consolidating that soil beneath the cap at Camp Georgetown. Opinions were mixed regarding the option, with some supportive and others strongly opposed with consolidating the two sites.

SECTION 7: SUMMARY OF THE SELECTED REMEDY

Based on the Administrative Record (Appendix B) and the discussion presented below, the NYSDEC has selected Alternative 3A, Multi layer geomembrane cap as the remedy for this site, as shown in Figure 5. The elements of this remedy are described at the end of this section. The selected remedy is based on the results of the PI, RI and the evaluation of alternatives presented in the FS.

Alternative 3A has been selected because, as described below, it will satisfy the threshold criteria and provides the best balance of the primary balancing criteria described in Section 6.2. It will achieve the remediation goals for the site by effectively preventing direct contact or potential ingestion of contaminated soil (the potential human health pathways) and erosion or infiltration (the primary mechanisms for contaminant migration).

Because Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B all satisfy the threshold criteria, the five balancing criteria are particularly important in selecting a final remedy for the site.

Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B would all have short-term impacts. The impacts associated with construction would be more significant with Alternative 2 which requires significanlty more excavation and handling of the contaminated media. Alternatives 3A and 3B, which leave the contaminated media in place, would have considerably fewer short-term impacts. The containment alternatives could be implemented without special handling requirements or transport of contaminated media.

Achieving long-term effectiveness would best be accomplished by Alternative 2, which would result in a pre-disposal scenario by removing the contaminated media for offsite disposal. Alternatives 3A and 3B, though contingent on long-term monitoring, would be effective in the long term as contamination would be contained, eliminating the potential for contaminant migration. Each of these alternatives would reduce or eliminate the potential for human and environmental exposure to contaminated soil.

Alternative 2 would require a great deal of coordination. The contamination identified at this site would require disposal as hazardous waste and, depending on the contaminant concentration, pre-treatment may be required. This alternative would require a predesign sampling program to quantify which material would be disposed as hazardous waste, which material would require pre-treatment (e.g. incineration), and which material could be disposed as non-hazardous waste.

Alternative 3A could be implemented using standard construction techniques. Alternative 3B would be the least complicated of these alternatives to implement. Placement of the soil cover system could be completed using standard construction techniques and system design would be straightforward.

Alternative 2 would greatly reduce the mobility, toxicity and volume of contaminants. Alternatives 3A and 3B would not reduce the toxicity and volume of contaminants, but would greatly reduce the mobility of contaminants.

The cost of the alternatives varies significantly. Although Alternative 2 results in greater reduction in toxicity, mobility and volume of contaminated soils,Alternative 3A and Alternative 3B would be more readily implemented and at significantly less costs.

Because each of these alternatives can achieve the remedial goals, the implementation and cost criteria weigh heavily in this evaluation. Alternative 2 is permanent remedy.. This alternative is the most costly of the alternatives evaluated. Alternatives 3A and 3B, coupled with monitoring, present similar protectiveness at much lower cost with fewer short term impacts during construction.

The primary purpose of a cap would be to eliminate the potential for exposure to surface and subsurface soils, eliminate erosional transport of contaminated soils, and prevent the infiltration of precipitation. Of the containment options, Alternative 3A would be only slightly more complex to construct, but at a lower cost. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Alternative 3A is the NYSDEC's preferred remedial alternative.

The estimated present worth cost to implement the remedy is $2,287,000. The cost to construct the remedy is estimated to be $1,845,000 and the estimated average annual operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs for 30 years is $29,000 per year.

The elements of the selected remedy are as follows:

1. A remedial design program will be implemented to provide the details necessary for the construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the remedial program.

2. Demolition and offsite disposal of the former treatment building its contents.

3. Excavation of areas B through G, consolidating the material onto area A for covering with the cap.

4. Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over area A including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.

5. This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the site. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site will eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option will be further explored during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown, including an evaluation of applicable laws to ensure compliance with current regulations.

6. The site will be restored by grading to insure proper drainage, placement of additonal topsoil as necessary, and seeding.

7. To address the identified groundwater contamination and since the remedy will result in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term monitoring program will be instituted. Groundwater samples will be collected annually for a period of at least 30 years. This program will allow the effectiveness of the cap to be monitored and will be a component of the operation, maintenance, and monitoring for the site.

8. Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring; and (c) prohibit redevelopment or use of the capped area.

9. The property owner will provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the Department, which will certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that could impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation an maintenance or soil management plan.

10. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that will: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and

development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

SECTION 8: HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

As part of the remedial investigation process, a number of Citizen Participation activities were undertaken to inform and educate the public about conditions at the site and the potential remedial alternatives. The following public participation activities were conducted for the site:

- Repositories for documents pertaining to the site were established.
- A public contact list, which included nearby property owners, elected officials, local media and other interested parties, was established.
- A fact sheet was sent on February 23, 2004 detailing the Proposed Remedial Action Plan and announcing both the start of the comment period and a public meeting.
- A meeting was held on March 8, 2004 with onsite staff from the NYSDEC and NYSDCS. The purpose of the meeting was to present the RI findings, the proposd remedy, and answer questions concerning the remedial program.
- The public meeting was held on March 10, 2004 to present and receive comment on the PRAP.
- A responsiveness summary (Appendix A) was prepared to address the comments received during the public comment period for the PRAP.

TABLE 1
Nature and Extent of Contamination
May 1998 - November 2002

SURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND - 0.36	0.224	1 of 49
	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl)Phtalate	ND - 68	50	1 of 49
	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 130	1	8 of 76
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 0.003822	0.001	4 of 46
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	5 - 104	7.5	30 of 50
	Chromium	7.8-171	50	1 of 50
	Copper	7.4-59.5	25	1 of 50

SUBSURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Pentachlorophenol	1.1 - 123	1	24 of 116
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - .0024951	.001	1 of 49
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	8.4 - 33	7.5	8 of 21
	Chromium	7.4 - 68.1	50	1 of 21
	Copper	ND - 32.4	25	3 of 21

Table 1 (Con't.)

GROUNDWATER	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppb)[a]	SCG[b] (ppb)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 1700	1	16 of 44
Compounds (SVOCs)	Fuel Oil Compounds	ND-820	NA[c]	3 of 10
PCB/Pesticides	Aroclor 1254	ND - 15	0.009	3 of 9
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 1.6694	0.0007	14 of 29
Inorganic	Chromium	24.5 - 155	50	4 of 7
Compounds	Lead	8 - 84.1	25	6 of 7

[a] ppb = parts per billion, which is equivalent to micrograms per liter, ug/L, in water;
ppm = parts per million, which is equivalent to milligrams per kilogram, mg/kg, in soil;
ug/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter

[b] SCG = standards, criteria, and guidance values; {list SCGs for each medium}

[c] Results compared to detection limit of 303 ppb

ND = Compound not detected

Table 2
Remedial Alternative Costs

Remedial Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual OM&M	Total Present Worth
No Action	$0	$55,000	$714,000
Excavation and Off-Site Disposal	$12,701,000	$28,000	$13,125,000
Modified Part 360 Multi Layer Cap	$1,845,000	$29,000	$2,287,000
Low Permeability Cover System	$1,888,000	$29,000	$2,330,000

APPENDIX A

Responsiveness Summary

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Camp Georgetown Site

Proposed Remedial Action Plan

Georgetown, MadisonCounty

Site No.7-27-010

The Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown Site was prepared by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) and issued to the local document repository on February 23, 2004. This Plan outlined the preferred remedial measure proposed for the remediation of the contaminated soil and groundwater at the Camp Georgetown Site. The preferred remedy is a Modified Part 360 Multi-layer Synthetic Cap over the primary area of contamination with other areas of concern to be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap. The remedy would also include monitoring and institutional controls.

The release of the PRAP was announced via a notice to the mailing list, informing the public of the PRAP's availability.

A project briefing for the Department of Correctional Services was held on March 8, 2004 to present the PRAP to those working at the site. A public meeting was held on March 10, 2004, which included a presentation of the Remedial Investigation (RI) and the Feasibility Study (FS) as well as a discussion of the proposed remedy. The meetings provided an opportunity for on-site employees and the general public to discuss their concerns, ask questions and comment on the proposed remedy. These comments have become part of the Administrative Record for this site. No written comments were received during the public comment period for the PRAP, which ended on March 26, 2004.

This Responsiveness Summary responds to all questions and comments raised at the March 8th and March 10th meetings.

The following are the comments received, with the NYSDEC's responses immediately following:

Question 1: What buildings are planned for demolition as part of construction of the remedy?

Response 1: The main treatment building will be emptied of its contents and demolished down to the concrete slab. The demolition debris will be sent off site for disposal at a permitted construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The concrete slab will

subsequently be broken up for disposal beneath the cap.

Question 2: Why will it cost $714,000 for the no action remedial alternative?

Response 2: The no action alternative is evaluated for all sites to serve as a baseline alternative as required by the National Contingency Plan. The no action alternative for the Camp Georgetown site includes 30 years of groundwater monitoring, which accounts for the estimated costs of $714,000.

Question 3: The PRAP states that transporting contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site for disposal beneath the cap at the Camp Georgetown site may be considered. Does the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) feel there is a benefit to combining two hazardous waste sites into one larger site?

Response 3: The NYSDEC believes there are significant benefits to combining the two sites that warrant further consideration.

The Camp Pharsalia site is a much smaller scale, but very similar, wood treatment site also owned by the NYSDEC located approximately 15 miles from Camp Georgetown. A Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in March 2003 selecting a cap remedy for the 1/4 acre site with continued groundwater monitoring for the next 30 years, the same as would be required at Camp Georgetown. The total volume of soil impacted with pentachlorophenol (PCP) and dioxins at Camp Pharsalia is estimated at 860 cubic yards. The estimated volume of contaminated soil at Camp Georgetown is 9,200 cubic yards.

The contamination is essentially the same at the two sites, therefore there would be no additional requirements for the Camp Georgetown remedy other than a modification to the design of the cap to accommodate the approximate 10% increase in volume of soil that would result from including the soil from Camp Pharsalia. Combining the two sites would eliminate the need for extended groundwater monitoring at Camp Pharsalia since all contaminated soil would be removed from the site. Full removal at Pharsalia would also eliminate the need to place permanent use restrictions and environmental easements on the property

Combining the sites at Camp Georgetown would require an amendment to the Camp Pharsalia ROD, which would include another public comment period at that time.

If an amendment is made to the Camp Pharsalia ROD, the Camp Georgetown mailing list would be included in the notification of the amendment and associated public comment period. Evaluation of applicable laws to ensure compliance with current regulations would be necessary prior to moving forward with plans to amend the ROD.

Question 4: What are the public health impacts associated with PCP and dioxin?

Response 4: There are currently no significant exposures to PCP and dioxin occurring at the Camp Georgetown facility. Levels in surface soils are quite low and very localized. According to ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry) studies in workers show that exposure to high levels of PCP in industrial settings can cause increases in body temperature, liver effects, damage to the immune system, reproductive effects, and developmental effects. Exposure to large amounts of dioxins may cause chloracne, and serious skin effects. Former workers at the treatment facility may direct their questions about occupational exposures to PESH, Public Employess Safety & Health. (see Response 8 for contact information).

Question 5: Are PCP and dioxins cancer causing compounds?

Response 5: The US Environmental Protection Agency considers PCP to be a probable human carcinogen. The US Dept. Of Health and Human Services has determined that dioxins, which are present in PCP as contaminants from its manufacturing, may reasonably be anticipated to cause cancer.

Question 6: How deep is the contamination?

Response 6: Soil contamination was found in the upper 10 feet of soil at the site.

Question 7: How deep are the wells at the site?

Response 7: Monitoring wells installed at the site were 14 feet or less in depth.

Question 8: What is being done for past employees who may have been exposed to the PCP and dioxins?

Response 8: Former employees who are concerned that they may have been exposed should

contact the Public Employee Safety and Health (PESH) Bureau, which oversees workplace protection of public employees at the State and local level. Alternatively, employees can contact one of the New York State Department of Health Occupational Health Clinics. Contact information is as follows:

PESH District Office - Binghamton
44 Hawley Street 9th Floor
Binghamton, NY 13901
Tel. (607) 721-8211
Fax (607) 721-8207

New York State Department of Health
Network of Occupational Health Clinics
Syracuse/Binghamton/Utica
Central New York Occupational Health Clinical Center
6712 Brooklawn Parkway, Suite 204, Syracuse NY 13211
Tel. (315) 432-8899
Fax (315) 431-9528

Question 9: Who will mow the grass on the cap?

Response 9: It is anticipated the NYSDEC Division of Operations will be responsible for mowing the cap.

Question 10: Will it be okay to walk on the cap once in place?

Response 10: Yes, the cap will be suitable for pedestrian traffic as well as the machinery necessary to keep it mowed.

Question 11: We do not want the Camp Pharsalia wastes brought to Camp Georgetown.

Response 11: Initial reactions to the idea of combining the two sites have been mixed. As stated in RESPONSE 3 above, if it is determined to be a feasible approach after evaluation of applicable laws, the ROD for Camp Pharsalia would be amended. A public comment period of 30 days would be associated with the amendment, at which time concerns and comments would be accepted. As with any remedy for an inactive hazardous waste disposal site, community acceptance is one of the evaluation criteria that is

considered.

Question 12: Were there any drums found during the remedial investigation?

Response 12: Anecdotal evidence suggested there may have been drums buried in the wooded area immediately to the south of the treatment building. A geophysical method known as ground penetrating radar (GPR) was employed over the area in an effort to locate any buried metallic objects. If the GPR indicated the presence of buried metal, that area was excavated with a backhoe to determine if a drum was present. There were no drums containing wastes identified as a result of this effort. Metal identified with the GPR included concrete reinforced with steel, empty buckets, and lids from drums. Subsequent soil sampling did not find any contamination in these areas.

Question 13: Fuel oil has made it through the ground surface from past operations. Is the groundwater contaminated?

Response 13: Low level PCP and dioxin contamination has been identified in the groundwater in monitoring wells immediately adjacent to the treatment area. Specific methods for screening for fuel oil did not identify fuel oil in the groundwater. Based on the results from the groundwater sampling conducted at the site, it does not appear that contamination is migrating significantly beyond the monitoring wells located closest to the treatment building. The proposed remedy is expected to eliminatefuture contaminant impacts to groundwater and includes continued groundwater monitoring.

APPENDIX B

Administrative Record

Administrative Record

Camp Georgetown Site
Proposed Remedial Action Plan
Georgetown, MadisonCounty
Site No.7-27-010

1. Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown site, dated March 2004, prepared by the NYSDEC.

2. Preliminary Investigation Report, May 1999, NYSDEC.

3. Camp Georgetown Remedial Investigation Report, October 2003, Shaw Environmental, Inc.

4. Camp Georgetown Feasibility Study, January 2004, Shaw Environmental, Inc.

5. Fact Sheet announcing the PRAP, March 2004.

6. Responsiveness Summary for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (Appendix A of the Record of Decision)

Scale: 1:24,000

Reference:
DeLorme 3-D Topo Quads, 1999
Yarmouth, Me.
Datum WGS84

Shaw

NYSDEC

Figure 1
Site Location Map
Camp Georgetown

NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- SOIL BORING
- BGM 1 — SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE

MW-5				
PI	2001	2002(F)	2002	DATE
1700	44 J	41	27	PCP ug/L (ppb)
0.00308	0.0000058	0.00000036 J	0.0001968 J	DIOXIN ng/L (ppt)

NA NOT AVAILABLE
BDL BELOW DETECTION LIMIT
NS NOT SAMPLED

PCP > 1.0 ug/L
DIOXIN > 0.0007 ng/L

NOTE: GROUNDWATER FLOW FOLLOWS TOPOGRAPHY AND FLOWS IN A SOUTHWEST DIRECTION.

Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 3
GROUNDWATER CONCENTRATION MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK







REFERENCE:

BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- IMPACTED AREA

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 4
IMPACTED AREA SUMMARY MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK



ENLARGEMENT OF THE AREA REQUIRING REMEDIATION

Volume Report Berm 01/28/2004 10:51
Comparing GRID file: D:/PROJECT/BJ0271/EXBJ027108T.GRD
and GRID file: D:/PROJECT/BJ0271/BERMBJ027108T.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.06,11712.48 to 11755.06,12666.48
Grid resolution X: 4.32, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 646.9 S.F., 0.01 Acres
Area in Fill: 19,541.2 S.F., 0.45 Acres
Total inclusion area: 20,188.1 S.F., 0.46 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.03
Average Cut Depth: 0.17 Average Fill Depth: 1.62
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 8.76
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 2844.59
Cut volume: 108.7 C.F., 4.06 C.Y.
Fill volume: 35,595.1 C.F., 1,318.34 C.Y.

Volume Report Cell 01/28/2004 10:57
Comparing GRID file: D:/PROJECT/BJ0271/MERG.GRD
and GRID file: D:/PROJECT/BJ0271/DESIGNBJ027108T.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.06,11712.48 to 11755.06,12666.48
Grid resolution X: 4.32, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 757.3 S.F., 0.00 Acres
Area in Fill: 32,528.8 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Total inclusion area: 32,885.9 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.00
Average Cut Depth: 0.07 Average Fill Depth: 2.76
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 0.53
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 4428.80
Cut volume: 10.8 C.F., 0.40 C.Y.
Fill volume: 89,722.7 C.F., 3,323.08 C.Y.



REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 — SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- PROPOSED AREAS OF EXCAVATION
- PROPOSED AREA OF CONCERN
- CONTAINMENT; PROPOSED LIMITS OF IMPACTED SOIL



TYPICAL MULTI LAYER GEOMEMBRANE CAP
NOT TO SCALE



TYPICAL LOW PERMEABILITY COVER SYSTEM
NOT TO SCALE

APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 5
EXCAVATION AND CONTAINMENT OF IMPACTED SOIL PRELIMINARY DESIGN
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK

NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Office of Media Relations
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1016
(518) 402-8000 (518) 402-2209 (Fax)

FOIL Request No. **05-1101**

Denise M. Sheehan
Acting Commissioner

Referral Memo

FOIL NOT FULFILLED
7/6/05

To: Kathy Follett - Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7012

From: Ruth L. Earl

Date: 6/20/2005

The attached FOIL request 05-1101 was received by us on 6/20/2005. If you have any records which are responsive to this request, please send them directly to the requestor and a copy of your transmittal letter to me.

Kathy Follett - Environmental Remediation

Please let me know before 6/27/2005 if you do NOT have records which are responsive to this request, and/or if you know of ADDITIONAL UNITS, not listed to the right, which may have relevant records. If I have not heard from you before **6/27/2005,** I will send an acknowledgment to the requestor indicating that I have referred the request to you.

To: Ruth L. Earl
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 122331016
(518) 402-8000

From: Kathy Follett

FOIL Request No. **05-1101**

_____ I do not maintain records which are responsive to this request.

_____ There are additional unit(s) / individual(s) who maintain or probably maintain records responsive to this request.

Lauren

1101

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

APPLICATION FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS

(See Instructions on Reverse Side)

NUMBER 07-~~10~~11

APPLICANT

- TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:
  I hereby apply to inspect the following records under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Law:

Record of Decision and related documents for Camp Georgetown, State registry number 727010.

After inspection, should I desire copies of all or part of the records inspected, I will identify the records to be copied and hereby offer to promptly pay the established fees. (Cost of reproduction or 25¢ per page as applicable). Contact me if cost will exceed $ Please advise me of the cost.

Name (Print or type) Andy Gilchrist Telephone No. (518) 463-3990

~~Attention of:~~ Tuczinski, Cavalier, Burstein & Collura, P.C.

Mailing Address 54 State Street, Suite 803, Albany N.Y. 12207

Signature [signature] Date 6-17-07

RECORDS CUSTODIAN

- TO THE APPLICANT:

–Records Provided

☐ The reproduction costs for the records provided are $ _____

☐ Records have been (partially, fully) provided. (If not fully provided, date when records are expected to be fully provided: _____)

JUN 2

–Records Not Available

☐ Records cannot be found after diligent search

☐ The Department is not the custodian for records indicated

–Records Denied

I hereby certify that access to the records–or part of the records–circled above has been denied to the applicant for the reason(s) checked below:

☐ Specifically exempt by other statute

☐ Unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

☐ Would impair present or imminent contract awards or collective bargaining negotiations

☐ Are examination questions or answers

☐ Are inter-agency or intra-agency materials that are not:
- statistical or factual tabulations or data
- instructions to staff that affect the public
- final agency policy or determinations; or
- external audits, including but not limited to audits performed by the comptroller and the federal government

☐ Are trade secrets

☐ Could endanger the life of any person

☐ Are compiled for law enforcement purposes and which, if disclosed would:
- interfere with law enforcement investigations or judicial proceedings
- deprive a person of the right to a fair trial or or impartial adjudication
- identify a confidential source or disclose confidential information relating to a criminal investigation, or
- reveal criminal investigative techniques or procedures, except routine techniques and procedures

☐ Would jeopardize an agency's capacity to guarantee the security of its information technology assets, such assets encompassing both electronic information systems and infrastructures

Identification of records withheld (attach listing if additional space is required) and/or explanation if appropriate:

Records Custodian Signature _____ Title _____ Date _____

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Remedial Bureau B
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7016
Phone: (518) 402-9768 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9020
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Denise M. Sheehan
Acting
Commissioner

July 6, 2005

Andy Gilchrist
Tuczinski, Cavalier, Burstein, and Collura, P.C.
54 State Street, Suite 803
Albany, NY 12207

RE: Freedom of Information Request
Camp Georgetown Site
Site No.: 7-27-010

Dear Mr. Gilchrist:

As per our telephone conversation and your Freedom of Information (FOIL) request, enclosed is a copy of the Camp Georgetown Site Record of Decision dated March 2005. The cost of reproduction for this came to $6.00. Please remit a check payable to the "New York State Department of Environmental Conservation" in the amount of $6.00.

Please call me if you need further information regarding this FOIL request.

Sincerely,

Ralph Keating, P.E.
Remedial Bureau B
Div. Of Environmental Remediation

bcc: James Quinn/ Ralph Keating/file

rk/s

NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Office of Media Relations
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1016
(518) 402-8000 (518) 402-2209 (Fax)

FOIL Request No. **05-1122**

FOIL FULFILLED 6/24/05

Denise M. Sheehan
Acting Commissioner

Referral Memo

To: Kathy Follett - Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7012

From: Ruth L. Earl

Date: 6/22/2005

The attached FOIL request 05-1122 was received by us on 6/22/2005 . If you have any records which are responsive to this request, please send them directly to the requestor and a copy of your transmittal letter to me.

Kathy Follett - Environmental Remediation

Please let me know before 6/29/2005 if you do NOT have records which are responsive to this request, and/or if you know of ADDITIONAL UNITS, not listed to the right, which may have relevant records. If I have not heard from you before **6/29/2005,** I will send an acknowledgment to the requestor indicating that I have referred the request to you.

To: Ruth L. Earl
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 122331016
(518) 402-8000

From: Kathy Follett

FOIL Request No. **05-1122**

_____ I do not maintain records which are responsive to this request.

_____ There are additional unit(s) / individual(s) who maintain or probably maintain records responsive to this request.

RECEIVED
JUL - 1 2005
REMEDIAL BUREAU B

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

APPLICATION FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS

(See Instructions on Reverse Side)

NUMBER 05-1122

APPLICANT

- **TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:**
  I hereby apply to inspect the following records under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Law:

Record of Decision on Camp Georgetown, site 727010.

After inspection, should I desire copies of all or part of the records inspected, I will identify the records to be copied and hereby offer to promptly pay the established fees. (Cost of reproduction or 25¢ per page as applicable). Contact me if cost will exceed $ 25.00.

Name (Print or type) Rodney L. Aldrich Telephone No. 518-456-4900

Attention of: Sterling Environmental Engineering, P.C.

Mailing Address 24 Wade Road, Albany, NY 12110

Signature Rodney L. Aldrich Date 6/20/05

RECORDS CUSTODIAN

- **TO THE APPLICANT:**

–Records Provided

☐ The reproduction costs for the records provided are $ _____

☐ Records have been (partially, fully) provided. (If not fully provided, date when records are expected to be fully provided: _____)

JUN 22 2005

–Records Not Available

☐ Records cannot be found after diligent search

☐ The Department is not the custodian for records indicated

–Records Denied

I hereby certify that access to the records–or part of the records–circled above has been denied to the applicant for the reason(s) checked below:

☐ Specifically exempt by other statute

☐ Unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

☐ Would impair present or imminent contract awards or collective bargaining negotiations

☐ Are examination questions or answers

☐ Are inter-agency or intra-agency materials that are not:
- statistical or factual tabulations or data
- instructions to staff that affect the public
- final agency policy or determinations; or
- external audits, including but not limited to audits performed by the comptroller and the federal government

☐ Are trade secrets

☐ Could endanger the life of any person

☐ Are compiled for law enforcement purposes and which, if disclosed would:
- interfere with law enforcement investigations or judicial proceedings
- deprive a person of the right to a fair trial or or impartial adjudication
- **identify a confidential** source or disclose confidential information relating to a criminal investigation, or
- reveal criminal investigative techniques or procedures, except routine techniques and procedures

☐ Would jeopardize an agency's capacity to guarantee the security of its information technology assets, such assets encompassing both electronic information systems and infrastructures

Identification of records withheld (attach listing if additional space is required) and/or explanation if appropriate:

Records Custodian Signature _____ Title _____ Date _____

7-27-010

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Remedial Bureau B
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7016
Phone: (518) 402-9768 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9020
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Denise M. Sheehan
Acting
Commissioner

June 24, 2005

Rodney Aldrich
Sterling Environmental Engineering, P.C.
24 Wade Road
Albany, NY 12110

RE: Freedom of Information Request
Camp Georgetown Site
Site No.: 7-27-010

Dear Mr. Aldrich:

As per our telephone conversation and your Freedom of Information (FOIL) request, enclosed is a copy of the Camp Georgetown Site Record of Decision dated March 2005. The cost of reproduction for this came to $6.00. Please remit a check payable to the "New York State Department of Environmental Conservation" in the amount of $6.00.

Please call me if you need further information regarding this FOIL request.

Sincerely,

Ralph Keating, P.E.
Remedial Bureau B
Div. Of Environmental Remediation

bcc: ~~James Quinn~~/ Ralph Keating/file

rk/s

B2

REGION 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE ACTIVITY

10/15/2003

This is to acknowledge that you have filed a **Notification of Hazardous Waste Activity** for the installation located at the address shown in the box below to comply with Section 3010 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Your EPA Identification Number for that installation appears in the box below. The EPA Identification Number must be included on all shipping manifests for transporting hazardous wastes; on all Annual Reports that generators of hazardous waste, and owners and operators of hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities must file with EPA; on all applications for a Federal Hazardous Waste Permit; and other hazardous waste management reports and documents required under Subtitle C of RCRA.

EPA I.D. NUMBER	→	NYD986933562
INSTALLATION NAME	→	NYSDEC CAMP PHARSALIA
INSTALLATION ADDRESS	→	S PLYMOUTH RD AT INTERSECTION W/CENTER RD PHARSALIA, NY 13844
MAILING ADDRESS	→	625 BROADWAY ALBANY, NY 122337014

EPA Form 8700-12AB (4-80)

USEPA - REGION 2
RCRA Programs Branch
290 Broadway, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10007-1866

ATTN: RCRA NOTIFICATIONS
Tel : (212) 637-4106
Fax: (212) 637-3056

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2003
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

TO: NYSDEC CAMP PHARSALIA
or Current Occupant
ATTN: MICHAEL RYAN
625 BROADWAY
ALBANY, NY, 122337014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE ACTIVITY

This is to acknowledge that you have filed a **Notification of Hazardous Waste Activity** for the installation located at the address shown in the box below to comply with Section 3010 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Your EPA Identification Number for that installation appears in the box below. The EPA Identification Number must be included on all shipping manifests for transporting hazardous wastes; on all Annual Reports that generators of hazardous waste, and owners and operators of hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities must file with EPA; on all applications for a Federal Hazardous Waste Permit; and other hazardous waste management reports and documents required under Subtitle C of RCRA.

EPA I.D. NUMBER	NYD982529075
INSTALLATION NAME	NYSDEC CAMP GEORGETOWN
INSTALLATION ADDRESS	CRUMB HILL RD AT INTERSECTION W/RIDGE RD GEORGETOWN, NY 13072
MAILING ADDRESS	625 BROADWAY ALBANY, NY 122337014

EPA Form 8700-12AB (4-80)

USEPA - REGION 2
RCRA Programs Branch
290 Broadway, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10007-1866

ATTN: RCRA NOTIFICATIONS
Tel : (212) 637-4106
Fax: (212) 637-3056

TO: NYSDEC CAMP GEORGETOWN
or Current Occupant
ATTN: MICHAEL RYAN
625 BROADWAY
ALBANY, NY, 122337014

B2

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

CNY Regional Office , 217 South Salina Street, Syracuse, New York 13202

Antonia C. Novello, MD, MPH, Dr.PH
Commissioner

Dennis P. Whalen
Executive Deputy Commissioner

March 10th, 2004

Mr. Tom Haas
824 County Rte 10
East Pharsalia, NY 13758

Dear Mr. Haas:

I am enclosing Fact Sheets for pentachlorophenol, fuel oils, and chlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins for your information. The fact sheets were published by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry of the US Dept. of Health and Human Services.

Questions about occupational exposures to the compounds of concern at Georgetown or Pharsalia should be addressed to PESH, Public Employees Safety & Health, NYS Dept. of Labor. The number for the Syracuse Office is 315-479-3212.

Sincerely,

Henri Hamel

Henriette M. Hamel
Regional Toxics Coordinator

Cc: G. Litwin/G. Laccetti
J. Burke – NYSDEC Region 7
M. Ryan/B. Brown – NYSDEC – Central Office DER

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Public Information Meeting

Georgetown Town Hall
Wednesday, March 10, 2004
7 P.M.

Dear Interested Citizen:

This Fact Sheet is to announce the **Proposed Remedial Action Plan** for the Camp Georgetown site and invite you to a **Public Information Meeting**. If you have any questions or would like more information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Mr. Bradley Brown
Project Manager
NYSDEC
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7014
(518) 402-9564

For site related health questions, please contact the following New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) representative:

Ms. Henriette Hamel
Public Health Specialist III
NYSDOH
217 South Salina Street
Syracuse, NY 13202
(315) 477-8163

Public Comment Period
From: February 26, 2004
To: March 26, 2004

Fact Sheet

Proposed Remedial Action Plan for the Camp Georgetown Site

Public Meeting and Comment Period

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in cooperation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), is proposing a remedy to address contamination at the Camp Georgetown inactive hazardous waste disposal site in Georgetown, Madison County. The site is approximately 6 acres is size, and is located on NYSDEC owned property on the south side of Crumb Hill Road, directly across from the Camp Georgetown State incarceration facility (see site map on back page).

Site History

The Camp Georgetown incarceration facility is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown involved a dip tank process using pentachlorophenol (PCP). The wood treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

The NYSDEC completed a Preliminary Investigation at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The investigation consisted of the collection and analysis of soil, sediment, and groundwater samples. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites as a Class 2 site. A Class 2 site is defined as a site which "presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

for the Camp Georgetown site. The remedial investigation was developed to build on the information generated during the preliminary investigation in order to fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination. The remedial investigation consisted of:

- A ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- Collection of 4 sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

Site Investigation and Proposed Remedial Action

The recently completed Remedial Investigation identified several areas of PCP and dioxin contaminated soil at concentrations exceeding State standards, criteria, and guidance (SCGs), therefore requiring cleanup. The areas are primarily in the vicinity of the former treatment building and nearby drying areas where the wood was staged after treatment. Shallow groundwater contamination was also identified in close proximity to the soil contamination. Samples collected further down gradient at the site confirmed that groundwater contamination has not migrated significantly from the source areas, as expected due to the low permeability of the soil at the site. Sediment and fish samples collected from Mann Brook indicate that the site has not impacted the stream.

The Feasibility Study identifies, screens and evaluates various remedial alternatives to address the identified contamination. Based on the RI/FS, the NYSDEC has developed a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the site. The proposed remedy for the Camp Georgetown site includes:.

- Demolition and off-site disposal of the existing treatment building.
- Excavation of the contaminated soil from several locations and consolidation on the former treatment building area.
- Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over the consolidated soils including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.
- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject, to long term monitoring.
- Since the remedy results in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term groundwater monitoring program would be instituted.

This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the Georgetown. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the Camp Pharsalia site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site would eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option may be further evaluated during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown.

Costs and Funding for the Proposed Remedy

The construction costs for the proposed remedy are estimated at $2,287,000 This includes the cost to construct the cover system and the long term monitoring costs.

Your Opportunities to Comment on the Proposed Remedy

Release of the PRAP begins a process to finalize selection of the remedy for Camp Georgetown. A presentation of the findings of the RI/FS along with the proposed remedy will be made at the Public Information Meeting. ***Your comments and input regarding the proposed remedy are important and encouraged.***

Your oral and written comments on the PRAP are welcome at the public meeting (see sidebar on front page) and during a public comment period which runs until March 26, 2004. Written comments also may be sent to Mr. Brown through the end of the comment period.

What Happens Next

All comments received during the public comment period will be considered as the remedy selection for the Camp Georgetown site is finalized. Public input will be factored into a Record of Decision (ROD) which will describe the remedy selected and why it was chosen. A Responsiveness Summary will be prepared to provide response to public comments received.

Public understanding and involvement are crucial to the success of New York's hazardous waste remedial program. Three locations have been established as document repositories to provide you with access to project information. Various site related documents, as well as the Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, and the Proposed Remedial Action Plan, are available for review at the following locations:

Georgetown Town Hall
Route 26
Georgetown, NY 13072
Attn: Russell Hammond
(315) 662-3782

NYSDEC Central Office
Div. of Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway, 11th Floor
Albany, New York 12233-7014
Attn: Bradley Brown
(518) 402-9564

NYSDEC Region 7 Office
615 Erie Blvd. West
Syracuse, NY 13204
Attn: James Burke
(315) 426-7551

Any **questions or concerns regarding the PRAP** can be addressed by contacting Mr. Bradley Brown, at (518) 402-9564.

For health related concerns regarding this site feel free to contact Ms. Henriette Hamel at (315) 477-8163.


NOTE:
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY WOOD ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.
LEGEND:
WATER SUPPLY WELL
HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
HISTORIC SOIL BORING
SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
MONITORING WELL
SEEP SAMPLES
SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
TEST PIT SAMPLES
HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
SED / A SEDIMENT SAMPLE
1 TREATMENT BUILDING
2 STORAGE SHED
3 DRYING SHED #1
4 DRYING SHED #2
5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
6 METEOROLOGY STATION
7 GARAGE / HYSDEC OFFICE
FORMER ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS
EDGE VARIOUS DEBRIS
APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET
REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCED SUSAN M. WACKER NY STATE LICENSE #050721.
Shaw Environmental, Inc.
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Public Information Meeting

Georgetown Town Hall
Wednesday, March 10, 2004
7 P.M.

Dear Interested Citizen:

This Fact Sheet is to announce the **Proposed Remedial Action Plan** for the Camp Georgetown site and invite you to a **Public Information Meeting**. If you have any questions or would like more information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Mr. Bradley Brown
Project Manager
NYSDEC
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7014
(518) 402-9564

For site related health questions, please contact the following New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) representative:

Ms. Henriette Hamel
Public Health Specialist III
NYSDOH
217 South Salina Street
Syracuse, NY 13202
(315) 477-8163

Public Comment Period
From: February 26, 2004
To: March 26, 2004

Fact Sheet

Proposed Remedial Action Plan for the Camp Georgetown Site

Public Meeting and Comment Period

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in cooperation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), is proposing a remedy to address contamination at the Camp Georgetown inactive hazardous waste disposal site in Georgetown, Madison County. The site is approximately 6 acres is size, and is located on NYSDEC owned property on the south side of Crumb Hill Road, directly across from the Camp Georgetown State incarceration facility (see site map on back page).

Site History

The Camp Georgetown incarceration facility is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown involved a dip tank process using pentachlorophenol (PCP). The wood treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

The NYSDEC completed a Preliminary Investigation at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The investigation consisted of the collection and analysis of soil, sediment, and groundwater samples. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites as a Class 2 site. A Class 2 site is defined as a site which "presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

for the Camp Georgetown site. The remedial investigation was developed to build on the information generated during the preliminary investigation in order to fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination. The remedial investigation consisted of:

- A ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- Collection of 4 sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

Site Investigation and Proposed Remedial Action

The recently completed Remedial Investigation identified several areas of PCP and dioxin contaminated soil at concentrations exceeding State standards, criteria, and guidance (SCGs), therefore requiring cleanup. The areas are primarily in the vicinity of the former treatment building and nearby drying areas where the wood was staged after treatment. Shallow groundwater contamination was also identified in close proximity to the soil contamination. Samples collected further down gradient at the site confirmed that groundwater contamination has not migrated significantly from the source areas, as expected due to the low permeability of the soil at the site. Sediment and fish samples collected from Mann Brook indicate that the site has not impacted the stream.

The Feasibility Study identifies, screens and evaluates various remedial alternatives to address the identified contamination. Based on the RI/FS, the NYSDEC has developed a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the site. The proposed remedy for the Camp Georgetown site includes:.

- Demolition and off-site disposal of the existing treatment building.
- Excavation of the contaminated soil from several locations and consolidation on the former treatment building area.
- Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over the consolidated soils including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.
- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject, to long term monitoring.
- Since the remedy results in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term groundwater monitoring program would be instituted.

This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the Georgetown. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the Camp Pharsalia site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site would eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option may be further evaluated during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown.

Costs and Funding for the Proposed Remedy

The construction costs for the proposed remedy are estimated at $2,287,000 This includes the cost to construct the cover system and the long term monitoring costs.

Your Opportunities to Comment on the Proposed Remedy

Release of the PRAP begins a process to finalize selection of the remedy for Camp Georgetown. A presentation of the findings of the RI/FS along with the proposed remedy will be made at the Public Information Meeting. ***Your comments and input regarding the proposed remedy are important and encouraged.***

Your oral and written comments on the PRAP are welcome at the public meeting (see sidebar on front page) and during a public comment period which runs until March 26, 2004. Written comments also may be sent to Mr. Brown through the end of the comment period.

What Happens Next

All comments received during the public comment period will be considered as the remedy selection for the Camp Georgetown site is finalized. Public input will be factored into a Record of Decision (ROD) which will describe the remedy selected and why it was chosen. A Responsiveness Summary will be prepared to provide response to public comments received.

Public understanding and involvement are crucial to the success of New York's hazardous waste remedial program. Three locations have been established as document repositories to provide you with access to project information. Various site related documents, as well as the Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, and the Proposed Remedial Action Plan, are available for review at the following locations:

Georgetown Town Hall
Route 26
Georgetown, NY 13072
Attn: Russell Hammond
(315) 662-3782

NYSDEC Central Office
Div. of Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway, 11th Floor
Albany, New York 12233-7014
Attn: Bradley Brown
(518) 402-9564

NYSDEC Region 7 Office
615 Erie Blvd. West
Syracuse, NY 13204
Attn: James Burke
(315) 426-7551

Any **questions or concerns regarding the PRAP** can be addressed by contacting Mr. Bradley Brown, at (518) 402-9564.

For health related concerns regarding this site feel free to contact Ms. Henriette Hamel at (315) 477-8163.


NOTE:
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY WOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.
LEGEND:
WATER SUPPLY WELL
HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
HISTORIC SOIL BORING
SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
MONITORING WELL
SEEP SAMPLES
SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
TEST PIT SAMPLES
HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
SEDIMENT SAMPLE
1 TREATMENT BUILDING
2 STORAGE SHED
3 DRYING SHED #1
4 DRYING SHED #2
5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
6 METEOROLOGY STATION
7 GARAGE / HYSDEC OFFICE
FORMER ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS
EDGE VARIOUS DEBRIS
APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET
REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. KNACKER NY STATE LICENSE #50321.
Shaw Environmental, Inc.
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT

CONTRACTOR'S APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT

(Consultant Contract)

Brad Browne

RECEIVED MAY 27 2004 DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

RECEIVED FEB - 4 2004 BUREAU OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

TO BE COMPLETED BY CONTRACTOR		FOR AGENCY USE ONLY
PAYEE NAME SHAW E&I ENGINEERING OF NY, P.C.	COMPTROLLER CONTRACT NUMBER D0003666 -36	ORIGINATING AGENCY CODE 0900
ADDRESS 13 BRITISH AMERICAN BLVD.	APPLICATION NUMBER 62	
CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE LATHAM, NY 12110	WORK PERIOD ENDING 12/31/03	Date Application Recieved
TELEPHONE NUMBER (518) 783-1996	EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 25-1604532	

With Final Payments Attach Labor Affidavits for Payroll Period to Conform to the New York State Labor Law, Section 220A

SCHEDULE I — FINANCIAL STATEMENT

CONTRACT VALUE Line		CONTRACT WORK PERFORMED Line	
1. Original Contract	$ 576,916.24	1. Work performed in previous application (Schedule V-Col 1)	$ ~~869,543.46~~ 868,472.57
2. Amendments (Schedule VI)	$342,396.45	2. Work performed this application (Schedule V-Col 2)	$ 15,867.08
3. Net Contract Amount	$919,312.69	3. Work performed to date (Schedule V-Col 3)	$ ~~885,410.54~~ 884,339.65
4. Maximum Retainage (5% of line 3)	$45,965.63	4. Retainage	$ ~~44,270.55~~ 44216.98
		5. Work performed to date less retainage	$ ~~841,139.99~~ 840122.68
		6. Less previous payments	$ ~~826,066.26~~ 825,048.95
		7. Payment this application	$ 15,073.73

SCHEDULE II — CERTIFICATION BY CONTRACTOR

I (Name) DAVID C. STOLL do hereby certify that I am (Title) PROGRAM MANAGER of the Company/Corporation herein referenced and contractor for the work described in the foregoing application for payment. According to my knowledge and belief all items and amounts shown on the face of this application for payment are correct, all work has been performed and/or materials supplied, the foregoing is a true and correct statement of the contract account up to and including the last day of the period covered by this application.

JAN. 21 2004 — Date

David Stoll — Signature

SCHEDULE III — CERTIFICATION BY ENGINEER/OR PROJECT MANAGER

I certify that I have checked this application for payment; that to the best of my knowledge and belief it is a true and correct statement of the work performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or material supplied in accordance with the contract requirements.

5/6/04 — Date

Brad Browne — Signature and Title

SCHEDULE IV — ENDORSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

EXAMINED AND APPROVED BY RESPONSIBLE DIVISION OR BUREAU		APPROVED FOR PAYMENT BY DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT	
5/21/04	Dorothy Lorick		
Date	Signature	Date	Signature

EXPENDITURES							LIQUIDATION					
Dept	Cost Center	Var	Yr	object	ACCUM Dept	ACCUM State	Amount		Orig Agency	PO/Contract	Line	F/P
Glove Town	671047		96				4414	55				
							-220	73				
Unit	671047		96				11452	53				
							-572	62				

WORK PROGRESS

SCHEDULE V BREAKDOWN OF WORK PERFORMED

WA # Item	TASK DESCRIPTION Type of Work	Contract Budget	Column I Previous Work	Column 2 Work This Application	Column 3 Work Performed to Date
1	**CAMP GEORGETOWN**	321,301.28	367,189.22	4,414.55	371,603.77
2	**CAMP PHARSALIA**	152,444.41	160,617.13	0.00	160,617.13
3	**CAMP SUMIT**	445,566.97	341,737.11	11,452.53	353,189.64
	TOTALS	$ 919,312.69	$ 869,543.46	$ 15,867.08	$ 885,410.54

SCHEDULE VI APPROVED AMENDMENTS

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT

CONTRACTOR'S APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT

(Consultant Contract)

Brad Browne

RECEIVED 2004 DEC ENVIRONMENTAL

TO BE COMPLETED BY CONTRACTOR		FOR AGENCY USE ONLY
PAYEE NAME SHAW E&I ENGINEERING OF NY, P.C.	COMPTROLLER CONTRACT NUMBER D0003666 - 36	ORIGINATING AGENCY CODE 0900
ADDRESS 13 BRITISH AMERICAN BLVD.	APPLICATION NUMBER 64	
CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE LATHAM, NY 12110	WORK PERIOD ENDING 02/27/04	Date Application Recieved MAR 3 0 2004
TELEPHONE NUMBER (518) 783-1996	EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 25-1604532	

RECEIVED MAR 3 0 2004 BUREAU OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

With Final Payments Attach Labor Affidavits for Payroll Period to Conform to the New York State Labor Law, Section 220A

SCHEDULE I — FINANCIAL STATEMENT

CONTRACT VALUE

Line		
1.	Original Contract	$ 576,916.24
2.	Amendments (Schedule VI)	$342,396.45
3.	Net Contract Amount	$919,312.69
4.	Maximum Retainage (5% of line 3)	$45,965.63

CONTRACT WORK PERFORMED

Line		
1.	Work performed in previous application (Schedule V-Col 1)	~~$ 901,311.35~~ 900,240.46
2.	Work performed this application (Schedule V-Col 2)	$ 17,940.~~85~~93
3.	Work performed to date (Schedule V-Col 3)	~~$ 919,252.30~~ 918,181.39
4.	Retainage	~~$ 45,962.64~~ 909.06
5.	Work performed to date less retainage	~~$ 873,289.66~~ 872,272.33
6.	Less previous payments	~~$ 856,245.70~~ 855,228.45
7.	Payment this application	$ 17,043.~~90~~88

SCHEDULE II — CERTIFICATION BY CONTRACTOR

I (Name) DAVID C. STOLL do hereby certify that I am
(Title) PROGRAM MANAGER of the Company/Corporation herein
referenced and contractor for the work described in the foregoing application for payment. According to my knowledge and belief all items and amounts shown on the face of this application for payment are correct, all work has been performed and/or materials supplied, the foregoing is a true and correct statement of the contract account up to and including the last day of the period covered by this application.

3/22/04 — Date

David Stoll — Signature

SCHEDULE III — CERTIFICATION BY ENGINEER/OR PROJECT MANAGER

I certify that I have checked this application for payment; that to the best of my knowledge and belief it is a true and correct statement of the work performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or material supplied in accordance with the contract requirements.

Date — Signature and Title

SCHEDULE IV — ENDORSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

EXAMINED AND APPROVED BY RESPONSIBLE DIVISION OR BUREAU		APPROVED FOR PAYMENT BY DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT	
Date	Signature	Date	Signature
5/21/04	Dorothy Orrick		

EXPENDITURES							LIQUIDATION					
Dept	Cost Center	Var	Yr	object	ACCUM Dept	ACCUM State	Amount		Orig Agency	PO/Contract	Line	F/P
George Town	671047		96				3981	50				
							-199	08				
Summit	671047		96				13 959	43				
							-697	97				

WORK PROGRESS

SCHEDULE V BREAKDOWN OF WORK PERFORMED

WA # Item	TASK DESCRIPTION Type of Work	Contract Budget	Column I Previous Work	Column 2 Work This Application	Column 3 Work Performed to Date
1	**CAMP GEORGETOWN**	321,301.28	375,240.33	3,981.50	379,221.83
2	**CAMP PHARSALIA**	152,444.41	160,617.13	0.00	160,617.13
3	**CAMP SUMIT** .	445,566.97	365,453.89	13,959.43	379,413.32
	TOTALS	$ 919,312.69	$ 901,311.35	$ 17,940.95	$ 919,252.30

SCHEDULE VI APPROVED AMENDMENTS

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT

CONTRACTOR'S APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT

(Consultant Contract)

Brad Browne

TO BE COMPLETED BY CONTRACTOR		FOR AGENCY USE ONLY
PAYEE NAME SHAW E&I ENGINEERING OF NY, P.C.	COMPTROLLER CONTRACT NUMBER D0003666 -36	ORIGINATING AGENCY CODE 0900
ADDRESS 13 BRITISH AMERICAN BLVD.	APPLICATION NUMBER 63	
CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE LATHAM, NY 12110	WORK PERIOD ENDING 01/31/04	Date Application Recieved FEB 27 2004
TELEPHONE NUMBER (518) 783-1996	EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 25-1604532	

With Final Payments Attach Labor Affidavits for Payroll Period to Conform to the New York State Labor Law Section 220-A

SCHEDULE I — FINANCIAL STATEMENT

CONTRACT VALUE

Line		
1.	Original Contract	$ 576,916.24
2.	Amendments (Schedule VI)	$342,396.45
3.	Net Contract Amount	$919,312.69
4.	Maximum Retainage (5% of line 3)	$45,965.63

CONTRACT WORK PERFORMED

Line		
1.	Work performed in previous application (Schedule V-Col 1)	$ ~~885,410.54~~ 884,339.65
2.	Work performed this application (Schedule V-Col 2)	$ 15,900.81
3.	Work performed to date (Schedule V-Col 3)	$ ~~901,311.35~~ 900,240.46
4.	Retainage	$ 45,065.59 45,012.02
5.	Work performed to date less retainage	$ ~~856,245.76~~ 855,228.45
6.	Less previous payments	$ ~~841,139.99~~ 840,122.68
7.	Payment this application	$ 15,105.77

SCHEDULE II — CERTIFICATION BY CONTRACTOR

I (Name) DAVID C. STOLL
(Title) PROGRAM MANAGER
do hereby certify that I am of the Company/Corporation herein referenced and contractor for the work described in the foregoing application for payment. According to my knowledge and belief all items and amounts shown on the face of this application for payment are correct, all work has been performed and/or materials supplied, the foregoing is a true and correct statement of the contract account up to and including the last day of the period covered by this application.

FEB 23 2004 — Date

David C. Stoll — Signature

SCHEDULE III — CERTIFICATION BY ENGINEER/OR PROJECT MANAGER

I certify that I have checked this application for payment; that to the best of my knowledge and belief it is a true and correct statement of the work performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or materials supplied by the contractor, and that the work has been performed and/or material supplied in accordance with the contract requirements.

Date — Signature and Title

SCHEDULE IV — ENDORSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

EXAMINED AND APPROVED BY RESPONSIBLE DIVISION OR BUREAU		APPROVED FOR PAYMENT BY DIVISION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT	
5/21/04	Dorothy Drinks		
Date	Signature	Date	Signature

EXPENDITURES							LIQUIDATION					
Dept	Cost Center	Var	Yr	object	ACCUM Dept	ACCUM State	Amount		Orig Agency	PO/Contract	Line	F/P
George Town	671047		96				3636	56				
							- 181	83				
Summit	671047		96				12,264	25				
							- 613	21				

WORK PROGRESS

SCHEDULE V BREAKDOWN OF WORK PERFORMED

WA # Item	TASK DESCRIPTION Type of Work	Contract Budget	Column I Previous Work	Column 2 Work This Application	Column 3 Work Performed to Date
1	**CAMP GEORGETOWN**	321,301.28	371,603.77	3,636.56	375,240.33
2	**CAMP PHARSALIA**	152,444.41	160,617.13	0.00	160,617.13
3	**CAMP SUMIT**	445,566.97	353,189.64	12,264.25	365,453.89
	TOTALS	$ 919,312.69	$ 885,410.54	$ 15,900.81	$ 901,311.35

SCHEDULE VI APPROVED AMENDMENTS

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Bureau of Western Remedial Action, 11th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7017
Phone: (518) 402-9670 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9679
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

FILE COPY

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

June 24, 2003

Ms. Heide-Marie Dudek, P. E.
Shaw Group
13 British American Boulevard
Latham, New York, NY 12110-1405

Dear Ms. Dudek:

Re: Camp Georgetown Remedial Investigation
Madison County, N.Y., Site No. 7-27-010

Department staff from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Division of Fish & Wildlife have completed a review of the Remedial Investigation (RI) for Camp Georgetown, submitted April 8, 2003. The following are issues identified during their review:

1. **Section 1.3 Site Location, page 2** - An additional figure should be supplied or the figures in the document modified to show a local hamlet and show road names that are mentioned in the text. Specifically Crumb Hill Road should be labeled on the figure.

2. **Section 2.1.8 Biota Sampling, page 11** -
   a. This section should indicate that in addition to determining the concentration of dioxins, the concentrations of lipids, moisture and PCBs in fish was required.
   b. The section implies that the only species sampled were trout. However, other species were caught and should be indicated.

3. **Section 3.2 Nature and Extent of Contamination, page 15** - The Remedial Investigation (RI) states that the NYSDEC *Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments* lists a guidance value of 0.0003 ppb for Wildlife Residue Based criterion for 2,3,7,8- TCDD equivalence concentration of 0.0003 ppb. The NYSDEC guidance document does not contain this guidance value.

4. **Section 3.2.3 Sediment Results, page 17** - It is stated that 4 sediment samples from Mann Brook were analyzed for dioxins and the analytical results are in Table 3 and indicated on Figure 3. Also, it states that the 2,3,7,8,- TCDD equivalent concentrations were well below the location specific benchmark.
   a. The location specific benchmarks in Table 3 are 10 times lower than they should be.
   b. Figure 3 does not contain the analytical results as stated.

5. **Section 3.2.5 Groundwater, page 19 -**
   a. It is stated samples were collected from MW-1 through MW-8 and were analyzed for SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals and dioxins during a groundwater sampling event conducted during the PI and the results are summarized on Table 6. Table 6 does not report PCB or pesticide data. Table 6 should include all the analytical tests performed on samples, even if the results are non-detect. Detection limits should also be shown in the table if a value is non-detect.
   b. It is stated RI groundwater sampling results for 2001 are summarized in Table 7. Table 7 should include all the analytical tests performed on samples, even if the results are non-detect. Detection limits should also be shown in the table if a value is non-detect. No fuel oil or pesticide results are indicated.
   c. It is stated RI groundwater sampling results for November 2002 are summarized in Table 8. Table 8 should include all the analytical tests performed on samples, even if the results are non-detect. Detection limits should also be shown in the table if a value is non-detect. No PCB or pesticide results are indicated.
   d. Table 8 should indicate which samples were filtered/unfiltered.

6. **Section 3.2.6 Biota Sampling Results, page 22 -** It is stated a total of 22 trout samples were collected, submitted for laboratory analysis and the results are in Table 9. However, all the samples in Table 9 are not trout samples. This needs to be corrected to indicate the actual species. Also, Table 9 should indicate:
   a. Sample species
   b. Sample type (i.e. composite or individual fish)
   c. Number of fish in the composite (if applicable)
   d. Sample lengths
   e. Sample weights
   f. PCB concentrations
   g. Percent moisture
   h. Percent lipids

   Also, when stating that 4 samples possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration greater than the 0.0003 ppb guidance value, the reference needs to be cited for the guidance value both in this section and in Table 9.

7. **Section 3.3.2.6 Conclusions, page 29 -**
   a. It is stated "...due to the limited observations that could be made during the site visit, it is inconclusive at this time whether significant ecological impact exists due to site-associated releases to the environment. Additional observation of terrestrial and wildlife conducted during the growing season are recommended." The additional observations should be done to provide a proper Fish and Wildlife Impact Assessment.
   b. The RI should draw a conclusion regarding the influence of the site on the concentrations of 2,3, 7, 8-TCDD and PCBs in fish and Mann Brook and on wildlife in the vicinity of the site.

8. The following must be submitted regarding the fish sampling:
   a. All completed chains of custody
   b. A summary of analytical results, by river location, that includes individual sample results and average values for whole fish and edible fish categories. This is to be reported in table and figure format.
   c. All chemical laboratory analytical data sheets and QA/QC package and any electronic format data provided by the analytical laboratory.
   d. An electronic copy in spreadsheet or database format of the information on the fish collection record, if the information has been placed in such format by the contractor.
   e. The name of the person(s) performing the fish collections and their affiliation.
   f. For each sample in the fish field collection sheets, identify how the sample was processed prior to chemical analysis (i.e. whole body analysis, filet etc.).
   g. A certification that the procedures were followed in the **FISH SAMPLING PLAN FOR CAMP GEORGETOWN, Contractor Responsibilities for Fish Sampling Plan** and APPENDIX I Fish Collection and Sample Procedures, except as noted on a certified exception sheet.

If you have any questions, please contact myself, or Bradley Brown at (518) 402-9670. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Thompson, P.E.
Remedial Section A
Remedial Bureau C
Division of Environmental Remediation

bcc: H. Hamel (NYSDOH)
M. Ryan (BWRA)
B. Brown (BWRA)
R. Koeppicus (DFW&MR)
J. Burke (Region 7)

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Remedial Bureau C, 11th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7014
Phone: (518) 402-9662 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9679
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sal Ervolina, Assistant Director, Division of Environmental Remediation
FROM: Robert W. Schick, Director, Remedial Bureau C
SUBJECT: Proposed Remedial Action Plan - Camp Georgetown, Georgetown (T), Madison County, Site No. 7-27-010

DATE: February 3, 2004

Attached for your review, please find a copy of the draft Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown Site in the Town of Georgetown, Madison County. A PRAP Summary Sheet is also attached.

The project manager for the Camp Georgetown Site is Bradley Brown of Remedial Section A.

A briefing has been scheduled with you for February 6th at 1:00 PM in Conference Room No. 1220. If you have any questions in the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me at 402-9662.

Attachments

cc w/attach: D. Desnoyers
E. Belmore
M. Ryan
B. Brown

ec w/attach: S. Bates (NYSDOH)
G. Laccetti (NYSDOH)
H. Hamel (NYSDOH)



New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation, 12th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7011
Phone: (518) 402-9706 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9020
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dale Desnoyers, Director, Division of Environmental Remediation
FROM: Sal Ervolina, Assistant Director, Division of Environmental Remediation
SUBJECT: Proposed Remedial Action Plan - Camp Georgetown Site, Georgetown (T), Madison County, Site No. 7-27-010

DATE: FEB 2 3 2004

Attached for your approval please find the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown Site, located in the Town of Georgetown , Madison County. This PRAP was prepared by Remedial Bureau C staff. Included please find:

- A PRAP Summary Sheet;
- The NYSDOH concurrence letter; and
- A clean copy of the PRAP ready for release;

There are no unresolved or controversial issues associated with this site. Technical staff from Remedial Bureau C recommend this PRAP be released, and I concur.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to ask.

I approve this Proposed Remedial Action Plan for public release:

Dale A. Desnoyers, Director

Attachments

cc: Project Manager

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Remedial Bureau C, 11th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7014
Phone: (518) 402-9662 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9679
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Perry Tooker, Madison Co Clerk

FROM: Bradley Brown NYSDEC

DATE: 3/4/04

Number of Pages (Including transmittal): ~~8~~ 7

Message: Enclosed are the site notification letter (2/18/00) and the Public Information Fact Sheet sent out last week. If you have any questions, please call me at (518) 402-9564.

For verification or problems call _____ at (518)_____

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Public Information Meeting

Georgetown Town Hall
Wednesday, March 10, 2004
7 P.M.

Dear Interested Citizen:

This Fact Sheet is to announce the **Proposed Remedial Action Plan** for the Camp Georgetown site and invite you to a **Public Information Meeting**. If you have any questions or would like more information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Mr. Bradley Brown
Project Manager
NYSDEC
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7014
(518) 402-9564

For site related health questions, please contact the following New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) representative:

Ms. Henriette Hamel
Public Health Specialist III
NYSDOH
217 South Salina Street
Syracuse, NY 13202
(315) 477-8163

Public Comment Period
From: February 26, 2004
To: March 26, 2004

Fact Sheet

Proposed Remedial Action Plan for the Camp Georgetown Site

Public Meeting and Comment Period

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in cooperation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), is proposing a remedy to address contamination at the Camp Georgetown inactive hazardous waste disposal site in Georgetown, Madison County. The site is approximately 6 acres is size, and is located on NYSDEC owned property on the south side of Crumb Hill Road, directly across from the Camp Georgetown State incarceration facility (see site map on back page).

Site History

The Camp Georgetown incarceration facility is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown involved a dip tank process using pentachlorophenol (PCP). The wood treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

The NYSDEC completed a Preliminary Investigation at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The investigation consisted of the collection and analysis of soil, sediment, and groundwater samples. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites as a Class 2 site. A Class 2 site is defined as a site which "presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

for the Camp Georgetown site. The remedial investigation was developed to build on the information generated during the preliminary investigation in order to fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination. The remedial investigation consisted of:

- A ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- Collection of 4 sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

Site Investigation and Proposed Remedial Action

The recently completed Remedial Investigation identified several areas of PCP and dioxin contaminated soil at concentrations exceeding State standards, criteria, and guidance (SCGs), therefore requiring cleanup. The areas are primarily in the vicinity of the former treatment building and nearby drying areas where the wood was staged after treatment. Shallow groundwater contamination was also identified in close proximity to the soil contamination. Samples collected further down gradient at the site confirmed that groundwater contamination has not migrated significantly from the source areas, as expected due to the low permeability of the soil at the site. Sediment and fish samples collected from Mann Brook indicate that the site has not impacted the stream.

The Feasibility Study identifies, screens and evaluates various remedial alternatives to address the identified contamination. Based on the RI/FS, the NYSDEC has developed a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the site. The proposed remedy for the Camp Georgetown site includes:.

- Demolition and off-site disposal of the existing treatment building.
- Excavation of the contaminated soil from several locations and consolidation on the former treatment building area.
- Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over the consolidated soils including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.
- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject, to long term monitoring.

  Since the remedy results in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term groundwater monitoring program would be instituted.

This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the Georgetown. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the Camp Pharsalia site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site would eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option may be further evaluated during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown.

Costs and Funding for the Proposed Remedy

The construction costs for the proposed remedy are estimated at $2,287,000 This includes the cost to construct the cover system and the long term monitoring costs.

Your Opportunities to Comment on the Proposed Remedy

Release of the PRAP begins a process to finalize selection of the remedy for Camp Georgetown. A presentation of the findings of the RI/FS along with the proposed remedy will be made at the Public Information Meeting. ***Your comments and input regarding the proposed remedy are important and encouraged.***

Your oral and written comments on the PRAP are welcome at the public meeting (see sidebar on front page) and during a public comment period which runs until March 26, 2004. Written comments also may be sent to Mr. Brown through the end of the comment period.

What Happens Next

All comments received during the public comment period will be considered as the remedy selection for the Camp Georgetown site is finalized. Public input will be factored into a Record of Decision (ROD) which will describe the remedy selected and why it was chosen. A Responsiveness Summary will be prepared to provide response to public comments received.

Public understanding and involvement are crucial to the success of New York's hazardous waste remedial program. Three locations have been established as document repositories to provide you with access to project information. Various site related documents, as well as the Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, and the Proposed Remedial Action Plan, are available for review at the following locations:

Georgetown Town Hall
Route 26
Georgetown, NY 13072
Attn: Russell Hammond
(315) 662-3782

NYSDEC Central Office
Div. of Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway, 11th Floor
Albany, New York 12233-7014
Attn: Bradley Brown
(518) 402-9564

NYSDEC Region 7 Office
615 Erie Blvd. West
Syracuse, NY 13204
Attn: James Burke
(315) 426-7551

Any **questions or concerns regarding the PRAP** can be addressed by contacting Mr. Bradley Brown, at (518) 402-9564.

For health related concerns regarding this site feel free to contact Ms. Henriette Hamel at (315) 477-8163.


NOTE:
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.
LEGEND:
WATER SUPPLY WELL
HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
HISTORIC SOIL BORING
SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
MONITORING WELL
SEEP SAMPLES
SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
TEST PIT SAMPLES
HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
SEDIMENT SAMPLE
1 TREATMENT BUILDING
2 STORAGE SHED
3 DRYING SHED #1
4 DRYING SHED #2
5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
6 METEOROLOGY STATION
7 GARAGE / HYSOCC OFFICE
FORMER ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS
EDGE VARIOUS DEBRIS
APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET
REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. SMACKER NY STATE LICENSE #050321.
Shaw Environmental, Inc.
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Flanigan Square, 547 River Street, Troy, New York 12180-2216

Antonia C. Novello, M.D., M.P.H., Dr.P.H.
Commissioner

Dennis P. Whalen
Executive Deputy Commissioner

February 23, 2004

Mr. Dale Desnoyers, Director
Division of Environmental Remediation
NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation
625 Broadway - 12th Floor
Albany, NY 12233-7011

Re: Camp Georgetown
Site #727010
Georgetown, Madison County

Dear Mr. Desnoyers:

Staff reviewed the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the former wood treatment facility at Camp Georgetown in Madison County. Based upon that review, I understand that the plan includes excavation and consolidation of contaminated surface and subsurface soil under a low permeability cap, a long term groundwater monitoring plan, and institutional controls in the form of environmental easements that include prohibiting development of the capped area, restricting the use of groundwater, development of a site management plan, and annual certification of the institutional controls to the NYSDEC. With these actions, I believe that the remedy is protective of public health.

If you have any questions, please contact Geoff Laccetti at (518) 402-7870.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Litwin, Director
Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation

cc: G. A. Carlson, Ph.D.
Mr. G. Laccetti/File
Ms. H. Hamel
Mr. G. Snyder - MCHD
Mr. J. Burke - DEC Region 7

\\CEHNW2\VOL1\CEH\DEHI\BEEI\Bureau\Sites\Region_7\MADISON\727010\DESNOYERLTR.doc

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

13 British American Boulevard
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996
Fax 518.783.8397

Shaw The Shaw Group Inc.™

Date: 1/16/04
Via: Overnight Courier

To: Mr. Brad Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: 11th Floor
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233

Subject: Camp Georgetown RI Final

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☒ For your approval
- ☐ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Enclosed please find the Camp Georgetown Remedial Investigation Report for your file.

If there are any questions please feel free to contact me at (518) 783-1996.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Manager/Geologist

RECEIVED
JAN 20 2004
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

CC. J.Burke, NYSDEC
T. Suozzo, NYSDEC
H. Hamel, NYSDOH

Shaw® Shaw Environmental, Inc.

13 British American Blvd.
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996
Fax 518.783.8397

Date: 11/20/03

Via: Overnight Courier

To: Mr. Brad Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: Bureau of Remedial Action
Bureau C, SectionA
625 Broadway
Albany, New York



Subject: Camp Georgetown Figures

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☐ For your approval
- ☐ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Please find attached an electronic copy of the Georgetown figures as you requested.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Geologist

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

13 British American Boulevard
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996 (Phone)
518.783.8397 (Fax)

Shaw® The Shaw Group Inc.®

Date: 1/23/04

Via: Hand delivered

To: Mr. Bradley Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: **Bureau of Remedial** Action (Bureau C), Section A
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233-7016

Subject: Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final and
Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☐ For your approval
- ☒ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Please find enclosed three (3) electronic copies of the Camp Summit DRAFT FS on CD for your

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you might have on the attached documents.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Manager/Geologist

cc. M.Ryan, NYSDEC
M.Gardner, Shaw - File

TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Rich Koeppicus, DEW
FROM: Bradley Brown, DER
RE: Camp Georgetown, Georgetown (T), Madison County, Site No. 7-27-010
DATE: January 21, 2004

Please find ☐ attached ☐ under separate cover the following document(s) regarding the subject site:

☐ Scope of Work:

☐ Work Plan: _____

☒ RI Report: Revised 10/03

☐ FS Report: _____

☐ Design Documents: _____

☐ QAPP: _____

☐ PRAP: _____

☐ ROD: _____

☐ Our Comments Regarding: _____

☐ Other: _____

These are transmitted :

☐ For your review/approval. Please provide written comments by _____

☒ For your information/records.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact ☒ myself or ☐ _____ at (518) 402-9564.

Remarks:

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

13 British American Boulevard
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996 (Phone)
518.783.8397 (Fax)

Shaw® The Shaw Group Inc.®

Date: 1/23/04

Via: Hand delivered

To: Mr. Bradley Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: **Bureau of Remedial** Action (Bureau C), Section A
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233-7016

Subject: Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final and
Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☐ For your approval
- ☒ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Please find enclosed three (3) electronic copies of the Camp Summit DRAFT FS on CD for your

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you might have on the attached documents.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Manager/Geologist

cc. M.Ryan, NYSDEC
M.Gardner, Shaw - File

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

13 British American Boulevard
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996 (Phone)
518.783.8397 (Fax)

Shaw® The Shaw Group Inc.®

Date: January 22, 2004 **Via:** Hand Delivered

To: Mr. Bradley Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: Bureau of Remedial Action (Bureau C), Section A
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233-7016

Subject: Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final and
Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☐ For your approval
- ☒ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Please find enclosed two electronic copies of the Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final on CD along with two electronic copies on CD of the Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report (text, tables, figures).

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you might have on the attached documents.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Manager/Geologist

cc. M.Ryan, NYSDEC
M.Gardner, Shaw - File

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

13 British American Boulevard
Latham, NY 12110-1405
518.783.1996 (Phone)
518.783.8397 (Fax)

Shaw® The Shaw Group Inc.®

Date: January 22, 2004 **Via**: Hand Delivered

To: Mr. Bradley Brown
Company: NYSDEC
Address: Bureau of Remedial Action (Bureau C), Section A
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233-7016

Subject: Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final and
Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report

These are:

- ☐ Per your request
- ☒ For your files
- ☐ For your approval
- ☒ For your review/comment
- ☐ For use on job
- ☐ _____

Remarks:

Brad,

Please find enclosed two electronic copies of the Camp Georgetown FS Draft – Final on CD along with two electronic copies on CD of the Camp Summit Remedial Investigation Report (text, tables, figures).

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you might have on the attached documents.

Sincerely,
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of New York, P.C.

By: _____
Marc E. Flanagan
Project Manager/Geologist

cc. M.Ryan, NYSDEC
M.Gardner, Shaw - File

RECEIVED
JAN 22 2004
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN
Summary Sheet

Site Name and No.: **Camp Georgetown, Site ID 7-27-010**
Town and County: **Georgetown, Madison County**
Prepared by: **Bradley Brown**

PREPARED BY: NYSDEC

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM:

The Camp Georgetown site is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities in the State currently under investigation by the Department due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects.

At Camp Georgetown the wood treatment plant was operated from approximately 1970 to 1983 as a dip tank process using the pentachlorophenol (PCP). Untreated poles were stored in drying sheds northwest of the treatment building. The poles were moved into the treatment building by rail and then hoisted into one of two empty dip tanks. The dip tank would then be filled with a pentachlorophenol mixture, which would come from one or both of the two 2,000 gallon above ground storage tanks (AST) by gravity flow. The poles were usually submerged in the treatment solution for 24 hours. Wood was treated using a PCP solution consisting of approximately one part PCP, to eleven parts fuel oil. Unused treatment solution would be pumped back into one of the storage tanks for pentachlorophenol /fuel oil mixtures between treatment batches.

After treatment, the poles were hoisted from the dip tanks and allowed to drip back into the dip tank for a period of time. The poles were then moved by rail to the drip pad, located on the southeast end of the building. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. In 1983 the PCP treatment process was discontinued. From 1983 until 1991, the treatment plant was operated as a pressure treatment process using chromated copper arsenate (CCA) solution. Wood treatment operations were discontinued in 1991.

In October of 1997 the Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at all three Camp sites.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria.

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site. The RI was developed to build on the information already generated during the PI and fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination at the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE REMEDY:

The Department is recommending consolidation of contaminated soil to the area of the former treatment building with construction of a modified Part 360 multilayered synthetic cap, combined with site use restrictions, as the preferred remedy at the site. Based on data collected from the RI and PI, the surface and subsurface soils have been impacted by the former treatment operations. A localized impact to groundwater has been observed, however, no completed exposure pathways have been identified. Consolidation and capping of contaminated material, along with use restrictions, is expected to mitigate further groundwater contamination and reduce any future potential contact with the contaminated media.

ISSUES:

Camp Georgetown is a state-owned facility under management by the NYSDEC. The Department is the responsible party because treatment operations were conducted under the oversight and direction of Division of Operations staff. There has been significant interest in the investigation of all three Camps by NYSDEC and NYSDCS employees, CSEA, the State Insurance Fund, as well as several elected officials.

RECORD OF DECISION
Summary Sheet

Site No.: 7-27-010
Name of Site: Camp Georgetown
Town and County: Georgetown, Madison County

PREPARED BY: NYSDEC

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM:

The Camp Georgetown site is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities in the State currently under investigation by the Department due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects.

At Camp Georgetown the wood treatment plant was operated from approximately 1970 to 1983 as a dip tank process using the pentachlorophenol (PCP). Untreated poles were stored in drying sheds northwest of the treatment building. The poles were moved into the treatment building by rail and then hoisted into one of two empty dip tanks. The dip tank would then be filled with a pentachlorophenol mixture, which would come from one or both of the two 2,000 gallon above ground storage tanks (AST) by gravity flow. The poles were usually submerged in the treatment solution for 24 hours. Wood was treated using a PCP solution consisting of approximately one part PCP, to eleven parts fuel oil. Unused treatment solution would be pumped back into one of the storage tanks for pentachlorophenol /fuel oil mixtures between treatment batches.

After treatment, the poles were hoisted from the dip tanks and allowed to drip back into the dip tank for a period of time. The poles were then moved by rail to the drip pad, located on the southeast end of the building. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. In 1983 the PCP treatment process was discontinued. From 1983 until 1991, the treatment plant was operated as a pressure treatment process using chromated copper arsenate (CCA) solution. Wood treatment operations were discontinued in 1991.

In October of 1997 the Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at all three Camp sites.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria.

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site. The RI was developed to build on the information already generated during the PI and fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination at the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE REMEDY:

The Department is selecting consolidation of contaminated soil to the area of the former treatment building with construction of a modified Part 360 multilayered synthetic cap, combined with site use restrictions, as the preferred remedy at the site. Based on data collected from the RI and PI, the surface and subsurface soils have been impacted by the former treatment operations. A localized impact to groundwater has been observed, however, no completed exposure pathways have been identified. Consolidation and capping of contaminated material, along with use restrictions, is expected to mitigate further groundwater contamination and reduce any future potential contact with the contaminated media.

ISSUES:

Camp Georgetown is a state-owned facility under management by the NYSDEC. The Department is the responsible party because treatment operations were conducted under the oversight and direction of Division of Operations staff. There has been significant interest in the investigation of all three Camps by NYSDEC and NYSDCS employees, CSEA, the State Insurance Fund, as well as several elected officials.

SIGN IN SHEET

CAMP GEORGETOWN
PUBLIC MEETING
MARCH 10, 2004, 7:00 P.M.

Name	Address	Phone No.
[illegible]	3145 Ridge	837-4749
[illegible]	3145 Ridge Rd	837-4749

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
Remedial Bureau C, 11th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7014
Phone: (518) 402-9662 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9679
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Salvatore Ervolina, Assistant Director, Division of Environmental Remediation
FROM: Robert W. Schick, Director, Bureau C
SUBJECT: Record of Decision - Camp Summit Site, Fulton (T), Schoharie County, Site No. 4-48-006

DATE: March 24, 2004

Attached for your review, please find a copy of the draft Record of Decision (ROD) for the Camp Summit Site in the Town of Fulton, Schoharie County. A ROD Summary Sheet is also attached.

The project manager for the Camp Summit Site is Bradley Brown of Section A.

The comment period will close on March 31, 2004. A public meeting was held on March 17, 2004. In general, the public was supportive of the proposed remedy. Approximately 30 people attended the public meeting. In general, the public comments received were supportive of the selected remedy. Several comments were received, however, pertaining to the potential exposures of past employees working in the treatment facility. There was no need to change the PRAP remedy.

A briefing has been scheduled with you for March 30, 2004 at 4:00 PM in Conference Room 1220. If you have any questions in the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me at ext. 2-9662.

Attachment

cc w/attach: D. Desnoyer
E. Belmore
M. Ryan
B. Brown

ec w/attach: M. Ellis
S. Bates
M. Van Valkenburg
J. Crua

RECORD OF DECISION
Summary Sheet

Site Name and No.: **Camp Summit, Site ID 4-48-006**
Town and County: **Fulton, Schoharie County**
Prepared by: **Bradley Brown**

PREPARED BY: NYSDEC

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM:

The Camp Summit site is one of three New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) facilities in the State currently under investigation by the Department due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Summit was discontinued in 1975.

The treatment plant was constructed as a dip tank process. The process operated from approximately 1964 to 1975. Initial treatment was with copper napthenate, which began during the fall of 1964, and continued for approximately one year. Pentachlorophenol (PCP) was recommended for use in late 1965 or early 1966, the process consisted of soaking poles and lumber in pentachlorophenol filled dip tanks, hanging the wood over the tanks to allow a majority of the treating material to drip off, and transporting the treated wood on a small rail cart to drip and dry in a staging area outside the building. The plant was shut down in July of 1975 due to a fish kill in the on-site pond, resulting from a spill at the treatment building.

In October of 1997 the Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at Camp Summit.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Summit in 1999. The investigation found pentachlorophenol in subsurface soil around a DEC office, beneath the former treatment building, in former outdoor staging areas, in a drum rinsing area, in surface soil in the former outdoor staging areas, and on surfaces inside the former treatment building. Pentachlorophenol was also found in sediments in the small pond located on site, and in groundwater. Dioxin, a common contaminant of commercially produced pentachlorophenol, was found in surface and subsurface soil, in sediments, in samples of fish and turtle fat from the pond on site, and in groundwater.

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Summit site. The RI was developed to build on the information already generated during the PI and fully delineate the nature and extent of contamination at the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE REMEDY:

The Department has selected excavation, consolidation and capping with limited off-site disposal of contaminated soil, combined with site use restrictions, as the preferred remedy at the site. Based on data collected from the RI and PI, the surface and subsurface soils have been impacted by the former treatment operations. Shallow groundwater has been impacted in the immediate area near the former treatment building. Sediments in the on-site pond have residual contaminants from a 1975 spill at concentrations below action levels. The majority of the excavated material will be consolidated and covered with a modified part 360 multi-layered synthetic cap with the grossly contaminated material to be disposed off-site. This approach, along with use restrictions, is expected to mitigate further groundwater contamination and reduce any future potential contact with the contaminated media.

ISSUES:

Camp Summit is a state-owned facility under management by the NYSDEC. The Department is the responsible party because treatment operations were conducted under the oversight and direction of Division of Operations staff. There has been significant interest in the investigation of all three Camps by NYSDEC and NYSDCS employees, CSEA, the State Insurance Fund, as well as several elected officials.

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Flanigan Square, 547 River Street, Troy, New York 12180-2216

Antonia C. Novello, M.D., M.P.H., Dr.P.H.
Commissioner

Dennis P. Whalen
Executive Deputy Commissioner

March 29, 2004

Mr. Dale Desnoyers, Director
Division of Environmental Conservation
NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation
625 Broadway - 12th Floor
Albany, NY 12233-7011

Re: Record of Decision (ROD)
Camp Georgetown
Site #727010
Georgetown (T), Madison County

Dear Mr. Desnoyers:

Staff reviewed the Record of Decision for the former wood treatment facility at Camp Georgetown in Madison County. I understand the selected remedy includes excavation and consolidation of contaminated surface and subsurface soil under a low permeability cap, a site management plan to address maintenance of the cap, a long-term groundwater monitoring plan, and an environmental easement to prohibit inappropriate future site use. Based on the available information, I concur with the remedy and believe it is protective of public health.

If you have any questions, please call Geoff Laccetti at (518) 402-7871.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Litwin, Director
Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation

cc: G.A. Carlson, Ph.D.
Mr. G. Laccetti/File
Ms. H. Hamel
Mr. G. Snyder, MCHD
Mr. J. Burke - DEC Region 7

P:\Bureau\Sites\Region_7\MADISON\727010\DESNOYERLTR2.doc

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation, 12th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7011
Phone: (518) 402-9706 • **FAX:** (518) 402-9020
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dale A. Desnoyers, Director, DER
FROM: Salvatore Ervolina, Assistant Director, DER
RE: **Recommendation to sign ROD** - Camp Georgetown Site, Georgetown (T), Madison County, ID No. 7-27-010

DATE: MAR 2 9 2004

Attached is a signature-ready copy of the final Record of Decision (ROD) for the subject site. Also attached please find a copy of the final concurrence letter from the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH).

In general, the public is supportive of the proposed. Two people from the public plus one representative from the Town of Georgetown attended the meeting. In general, the public comments received were supportive of the selected remedy. Several comments were received, however, pertaining to the potential option of excavating the contaminated soil at Camp Pharsalia and consolidating that soil beneath the cap at Camp Georgetown. Opinions were mixed regarding the option, with some supportive and others strongly opposed with consolidating the two sites. There was no need to change the PRAP remedy.

Technical staff from Remedial Bureau C recommend that the ROD be signed, and I concur.

Please let me know if you would like to be briefed on this site. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Attachments

cc: Bradley Brown

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Flanigan Square, 547 River Street, Troy, New York 12180-2216

Antonia C. Novello, M.D., M.P.H., Dr.P.H.
Commissioner

Dennis P. Whalen
Executive Deputy Commissioner

March 29, 2004

Mr. Dale Desnoyers, Director
Division of Environmental Conservation
NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation
625 Broadway - 12th Floor
Albany, NY 12233-7011

Re: Record of Decision (ROD)
Camp Georgetown
Site #727010
Georgetown (T), Madison County

Dear Mr. Desnoyers:

Staff reviewed the Record of Decision for the former wood treatment facility at Camp Georgetown in Madison County. I understand the selected remedy includes excavation and consolidation of contaminated surface and subsurface soil under a low permeability cap, a site management plan to address maintenance of the cap, a long-term groundwater monitoring plan, and an environmental easement to prohibit inappropriate future site use. Based on the available information, I concur with the remedy and believe it is protective of public health.

If you have any questions, please call Geoff Laccetti at (518) 402-7871.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Litwin, Director
Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation

cc: G.A. Carlson, Ph.D.
Mr. G. Laccetti/File
Ms. H. Hamel
Mr. G. Snyder, MCHD
Mr. J. Burke - DEC Region 7

P:\Bureau\Sites\Region_7\MADISON\727010\DESNOYERLTR2.doc

33-16-6 (10/97)—q

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

REPRODUCTION REQUEST/PUBLICATION APPROVAL FORM

DISTRIBUTION:
Printing Services Unit—WHITE, YELLOW
Publications Unit—PINK
Originator—GOLD

ORDER NUMBER 13909 | DATE ORDERED 3-29-04 | REQUESTED DUE DATE

COST CENTER 4131010717 | VAR. LI | YEAR 2013 | ACCOUNT CODE 71011 14

DIVISION/OFFICE/REGION DER | AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE Kathleen McDelyse

CONTACT Brad Brown or KDeNyse | TELEPHONE NUMBER 12-9564

GRAPHICS AND DESIGN

PURPOSE
☐ Public Events ☑ Legal Requirements ☐ Hearing/Meeting

WHO IS THE AUDIENCE?

DISTRIBUTION
☐ Mail ☐ Rack Display ☐ Self-Mailer

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION
☐ Disk ☐ Web (☐ Internet ☐ Intranet)

NUMBER OF SCREENS

ILLUSTRATIONS
☐ Photographs ☐ Line Art ☐ None

NUMBER OF PHOTOGRAPHS | PIECES OF LINE ART | NUMBER OF TABLES | SHEETS PER BOOK

☐ Check if assistance is needed for photos or line art ☐ Typesetting needed?

TRIM SIZE
☐ 8½ X 11 ☐ 7 X 10 ☐ 5½ X 8½ ☐ 11 X 17 ☐ Other

MARGINS
Gutter ____ Thumb ____ Head ____ Foot ____

LAYOUT
List actual number of pages including blanks, all front matter pages, all appendix pages.
1-sheets - 8½x11 - color copies
4-sheets - 11x17" - color copies
35-pages - 8½x11 - Black & white copies

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES 40

APPROVALS
Division Director ____ Date ____
Dep./Asst Commissioner ____ Date ____
Asst. Commissioner Public Affairs ____ Date ____
Commissioner ____ Date ____

TITLE AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MATERIAL (Sample if reprint, Form Number if form)
-Camp Georgetown-
7-27-010

NUMBER OF ORIGINALS 40 | QUANTITY ORDERED 25

DATE STAMP (Printing Services Only)

COMPLETED SIZE 8½x11 | INK COLOR Text ____ Cover ____

PRINT TEXT
☐ 1 Side ☐ 2 Sides
☐ 1 Color ☐ 2 Color ☒ 4 Color

STOCK (Inhouse Printing)

TEXT	TEXT COLOR	COVER	SPECIAL ORDER
☑ 20#Sulphite (xerox)	☑ White	☐ Standard	☐ 5 Part NCR Set
	☐ Blue	☒ Other	☐ 4 Part NCR Set
☐ 60#Offset	☐ Green	Blue	☐ 3 Part NCR Set
☐ Card	☐ Yellow		☐ 2 Part NCR Set
☐ Other	☐ Ivory		

BINDERY OPERATIONS REQUIRED
☐ Collate ☐ Sheets per set/book

BINDING
☐ Side Staple (2) ☐ Corner Staple (1) ☐ Booklets
☐ Saddle Stitch ☐ Perfect (Contract only) ☒ Heat Bind
☐ Fold (Specify) ☐ Sets ☐ Tab
☐ Labeling ☐ Mail (Call 457-5738 for details/scheduling)
☐ Punch ☐ 3-Ring Binder ☐ Other (Provide Sample)
☐ Pad Sheets per pad ____ ☐ Perforate (Provide Sample)

PRESSWORK
412 ____ MET ____
DATE FINISHED | OPERATOR

SHIPPING

Date	By	Number of Bundles

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS (Customer Shipping Destination)
11th Floor Kathy DeNyse 7014
2-9564

☐ State Library

33-16-6 (10/97)—q

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

REPRODUCTION REQUEST/PUBLICATION APPROVAL FORM

DISTRIBUTION:
Printing Services Unit—WHITE, YELLOW
Publications Unit—PINK
Originator—GOLD

ORDER NUMBER 13909 | DATE ORDERED | REQUESTED DUE DATE

COST CENTER | VAR. | YEAR | ACCOUNT CODE

DIVISION/OFFICE/REGION | AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

CONTACT | TELEPHONE NUMBER ( )

GRAPHICS AND DESIGN

PURPOSE
☐ Public Events ☑ Legal Requirements ☐ Hearing/Meeting

WHO IS THE AUDIENCE?

DISTRIBUTION
☐ Mail ☐ Rack Display ☐ Self-Mailer

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION
☐ Disk ☐ Web (☐ Internet ☐ Intranet)

NUMBER OF SCREENS | ILLUSTRATIONS ☐ Photographs ☐ Line Art ☐ None

NUMBER OF PHOTOGRAPHS | PIECES OF LINE ART | NUMBER OF TABLES | SHEETS PER BOOK

☐ Check if assistance is needed for photos or line art ☐ Typesetting needed?

TRIM SIZE
☐ 8½ X 11 ☐ 7 X 10 ☐ 5½ X 8½ ☐ 11 X 17 ☐ Other _____

MARGINS
Gutter _____ Thumb _____ Head _____ Foot _____

LAYOUT
List actual number of pages including blanks, all front matter pages, all appendix pages.

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES _____

APPROVALS

Division Director _____ Date _____

Dep./Asst Commissioner _____ Date _____

Asst. Commissioner Public Affairs _____ Date _____

Commissioner _____ Date _____

TITLE AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MATERIAL (Sample if reprint, Form Number if form)

NUMBER OF ORIGINALS 40 | QUANTITY ORDERED

COMPLETED SIZE | INK COLOR Text _____ Cover _____

PRINT TEXT
☐ 1 Side ☐ 2 Sides
☐ 1 Color ☐ 2 Color ☐ 4 Color

DATE STAMP (Printing Services Only)

STOCK (Inhouse Printing)

TEXT	TEXT COLOR	COVER	SPECIAL ORDER
☐ 20#Sulphite (xerox)	☐ White	☐ Standard	☐ 5 Part NCR Set
	☐ Blue	☐ Other	☐ 4 Part NCR Set
☐ 60#Offset	☐ Green		☐ 3 Part NCR Set
☐ Card	☐ Yellow		☐ 2 Part NCR Set
☐ Other	☐ Ivory		

BINDERY OPERATIONS REQUIRED
☐ Collate ☐ Sheets per set/book

BINDING
☐ Side Staple (2) ☐ Corner Staple (1) ☐ Booklets
☐ Saddle Stitch ☐ Perfect (Contract only) ☑ Heat Bind

☐ Fold (Specify) ☐ Sets ☐ Tab

☐ Labeling ☐ Mail (Call 457-5738 for details/scheduling)

☐ Punch ☐ 3-Ring Binder ☐ Other (Provide Sample)

☐ Pad Sheets per pad _____ ☐ Perforate (Provide Sample)

PRESSWORK
412 _____ MET _____

DATE FINISHED | OPERATOR

SHIPPING

Date	By	Number of Bundles

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS (Customer Shipping Destination)

☐ State Library

33-16-6 (10/97)—q

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

REPRODUCTION REQUEST/PUBLICATION APPROVAL FORM

DISTRIBUTION:
Printing Services Unit—WHITE, YELLOW
Publications Unit—PINK
Originator—GOLD

ORDER NUMBER 13909 | DATE ORDERED | REQUESTED DUE DATE

COST CENTER | VAR | YEAR | ACCOUNT CODE

DIVISION/OFFICE/REGION | AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

CONTACT | TELEPHONE NUMBER ( )

GRAPHICS AND DESIGN

PURPOSE
☐ Public Events ☑ Legal Requirements ☐ Hearing/Meeting

WHO IS THE AUDIENCE?

DISTRIBUTION
☐ Mail ☐ Rack Display ☐ Self-Mailer

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION
☐ Disk ☐ Web (☐ Internet ☐ Intranet)

NUMBER OF SCREENS | ILLUSTRATIONS
☐ Photographs ☐ Line Art ☐ None

NUMBER OF PHOTOGRAPHS | PIECES OF LINE ART | NUMBER OF TABLES | SHEETS PER BOOK

☐ Check if assistance is needed for photos or line art ☐ Typesetting needed?

TRIM SIZE
☐ 8½ X 11 ☐ 7 X 10 ☐ 5½ X 8½ ☐ 11 X 17 ☐ Other _____

MARGINS
Gutter _____ Thumb _____ Head _____ Foot _____

LAYOUT
List actual number of pages including blanks, all front matter pages, all appendix pages

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES _____

APPROVALS

Division Director _____ Date _____

Dep./Asst Commissioner _____ Date _____

Asst. Commissioner Public Affairs _____ Date _____

Commissioner _____ Date _____

TITLE AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MATERIAL (Sample if reprint, Form Number if form)

NUMBER OF ORIGINALS | QUANTITY ORDERED

DATE STAMP (Printing Services Only)

COMPLETED SIZE | INK COLOR
Text _____ Cover _____

PRINT TEXT
☐ 1 Side ☐ 2 Sides
☐ 1 Color ☐ 2 Color ☑ 4 Color

STOCK (Inhouse Printing)

TEXT	TEXT COLOR	COVER	SPECIAL ORDER
☐ 20#Sulphite (xerox)	☐ White	☐ Standard	☐ 5 Part NCR Set
☐ 60#Offset	☐ Blue	☐ Other	☐ 4 Part NCR Set
☐ Card	☐ Green		☐ 3 Part NCR Set
☐ Other	☐ Yellow		☐ 2 Part NCR Set
	☐ Ivory		

BINDERY OPERATIONS REQUIRED

☐ Collate ☐ Sheets per set/book

BINDING
☐ Side Staple (2) ☐ Corner Staple (1) ☐ Booklets
☐ Saddle Stitch ☐ Perfect (Contract only) ☑ Heat Bind

☐ Fold (Specify) ☐ Sets ☐ Tab

☐ Labeling ☐ Mail (Call 457-5738 for details/scheduling)

☐ Punch ☐ 3-Ring Binder ☐ Other (Provide Sample)

☐ Pad Sheets per pad _____ ☐ Perforate (Provide Sample)

PRESSWORK
_____ MET _____

DATE FINISHED | OPERATOR

SHIPPING

Date	By	Number of Bundles

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS (Customer Shipping Destination)

☐ State Library

Department of Environmental Conservation

Division of Environmental Remediation

Record of Decision
Camp Georgetown Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site Number 7-27-010

March, 2004

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
GEORGE E. PATAKI, *Governor* ERIN M. CROTTY, *Commissioner*

DECLARATION STATEMENT - RECORD OF DECISION

Camp Georgetown Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site No.7-27-010

Statement of Purpose and Basis

The Record of Decision (ROD) presents the selected remedy for the Camp Georgetown site, a Class 2 inactive hazardous waste disposal site. The selected remedial program was chosen in accordance with the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and is not inconsistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan of March 8, 1990 (40CFR300), as amended.

This decision is based on the Administrative Record of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) for the Camp Georgetown inactive hazardous waste disposal site, and the public's input to the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) presented by the NYSDEC. A listing of the documents included as a part of the Administrative Record is included in Appendix B of the ROD.

Assessment of the Site

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous waste constituents from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD, presents a current or potential significant threat to public health and/or the environment.

Description of Selected Remedy

Based on the results of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site and the criteria identified for evaluation of alternatives, the NYSDEC has selected a Modified Part 360 Multi-layer Synthetic Cap over the primary area of contamination with other areas of concern to be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap. The components of the remedy are as follows:

1. Installation of an impermeable cap to minimize the risk of exposure to contaminants. This would involve placement of a modified Part 360 multi-layer geomembrane cap over the primary area of contamination. The remaining areas of contaminated soil would be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap.

2. Implementation of a groundwater monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the remedy.

3. Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring.

4. The property owner would provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the NYSDEC, which would certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation and maintenance or site management plan.

5. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that would: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

New York State Department of Health Acceptance

The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) concurs that the remedy selected for this site is protective of human health.

Declaration

The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with State and Federal requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action to the extent practicable, and is cost effective. This remedy utilizes permanent solutions and alternative treatment or resource recovery technologies, to the maximum extent practicable, and satisfies the preference for remedies that reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element.

MAR 2 9 2004

Date



Dale A. Desnoyers, Director
Division of Environmental Remediation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECORD OF DECISION

Camp Georgetown Site
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site Number 7-27-010
March, 2004

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF THE RECORD OF DECISION

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), has seleceted this remedy for the Camp Georgetown site. The presence of hazardous waste has created significant threats to human health and/or the environment that are addressed by this remedy. As more fully described in Sections 3 and 4 of this document, past wood treatment operations using pentachlorophenol (PCP) and chromated copper arsenate (CCA) have resulted in the disposal of hazardous wastes, including semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), dioxins, phenols, and metals. These wastes have contaminated the soil and groundwater at the site, and have resulted in:

- a significant threat to human health associated with current and potential exposure to contaminated soil and shallow groundwater.

- a significant environmental threat associated with the impacts of contaminated soil and groundwater.

To eliminate or mitigate these threats, the NYSDEC has selected the following remedy:

- Installation of an impermeable cap to minimize the risk of exposure to contaminants. This will involve placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over the primary area of contamination. The remaining areas of contaminated soil will be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap.

- Implementation of a groundwater monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the remedy.

- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring.

- The property owner will provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the NYSDEC, which will certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that could impair the ability of the

control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation and maintenance or site management plan.

- Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that will: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

- In addition to the remedial components listed above, an option to excavate and consolidate the impacted soils from the Camp Pharsalia site to be included beneath the capped area at Camp Georgetown may be explored. A March 2003 Record of Decision selected a low permeability soil cover remedy for Camp Pharsalia. Due to the similarities in contamination and the close proximity to the Camp Georgetown site, such an option may provide an improved remedial approach for Camp Pharsalia without compromising the effectiveness of this remedy for Camp Georgetown.

The selected remedy, discussed in detail in Section 7, is intended to attain the remediation goals identified for this site in Section 5. The remedy must conform with officially promulgated standards and criteria that are directly applicable, or that are relevant and appropriate. The selection of a remedy must also take into consideration guidance, as appropriate. Standards, criteria and guidance are hereafter called SCGs.

SECTION 2: SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Camp Georgetown is a large complex consisting of a NYSDEC crew headquarters and a New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) active incarceration facility, located in the Town of Georgetown, Madison County (see figure 1). The incarceration facility is operated by the NYSDCS, but is located on property managed by the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS occupies the property north of Crumb Hill Road and does not include any past wood treatment operations associated with the contamination. The NYSDEC occupies the property south of Crumb Hill Road, which includes the area defined as the Class 2 inactive hazardous waste disposal site. This area defined as the site occupies approximately 6.6 acres , as shown on Figure 2. The site is bordered on the northeast by Crumb Hill Road, south by private property, and west by State Reforestation Land.

The area around the site is typified by a mature and eroded plateau that is dissected by a series of valleys several hundred feet deep. This plateau has a rolling, rugged appearance. Approximately 45 percent of Madison County is classified as commercial forest.

SECTION 3: SITE HISTORY

3.1: Operational/Disposal History

Incarceration facility inmates participate in various work programs. One of the work activities formerly performed by the Camp Georgetown inmates was a sawmill and wood treatment operation. The wood treatment plant was operated from approximately 1970 to 1983 as a dip tank process using

the chemical biocide pentachlorophenol. Untreated poles were stored in drying sheds northwest of the treatment building. The poles were moved into the treatment building by rail and then hoisted into one of two empty dip tanks. The poles were strapped in place to prevent the logs from floating during treatment. The dip tank would then be filled with a pentachlorophenol mixture, which would come from one or both of the two 2,000 gallon above ground storage tanks (AST) by gravity flow. The poles were usually submerged in the treatment solution for 24 hours. Wood was treated using a pentachlorophenol (PCP) solution consisting of approximately one part PCP, to eleven parts fuel oil. Unused treatment solution would be pumped back into one of the storage tanks for pentachlorophenol /fuel oil mixtures between treatment batches.

After treatment, the poles were hoisted from the dip tanks and allowed to drip back into the dip tank for a period of time. The poles were then moved by rail to the drip pad, located on the southeast end of the building. The poles would remain in this uncovered area for another 24 hours. Finally, the poles were moved to one of the designated "treated material storage areas." These areas were located around the outside of the treatment building and also along the southwest side of the service road serving the treatment plant and storage buildings.

In 1983 the PCP treatment process was discontinued. From 1983 until 1991, the treatment plant was operated as a pressure treatment process using chromated copper arsenate (CCA)solution. The CCA solution used at Camp Georgetown was comprised of 23.75% chromic acid, 17% arsenic pentoxide, 9.25% cupric oxide, and 50% water. Unlike the dipping process employed for PCP, this process involved placement the wood in a pressurized vessel for treatment.

3.2: Remedial History

In 1999, the NYSDEC listed the site as a Class 2 site in the Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites in New York. A Class 2 site is a site where hazardous waste presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment and action is required. This listing was based on the past use of PCP at the site.

The Camp Georgetown site is one of three NYSDCS facilities in the State currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

In October of 1997 the NYSDEC Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at Camp Georgetown.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The PI consisted of the excavation of 22 test pits, the installation and sampling of 8 monitoring wells and the collection of 26 surface soil, and 22 subsurface soil samples. The investigation found PCP in the

soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites. The site, consisting of the property on the south side of Crumb Hill road, was designated a Class 2 site, which is defined as a site which " presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site. The RI was developed to build on the information generated during the PI and to help fully delineate the extent of contamination at the site.

SECTION 4: SITE CONTAMINATION

A remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) has been conducted to evaluate the alternatives for addressing the significant threats to human health and/or the environment.

4.1: Summary of the Remedial Investigation

The purpose of the RI was to define the nature and extent of any contamination resulting from previous activities at the site. The RI was conducted between October, 2001 and November 2002. The field activities and findings of the investigation are described in the RI report.

The following activities were conducted during the RI:

- Research of historical information, including review of the Preliminary Investigation Report;
- Ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of 2 soil samples within a seep area;
- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- A survey of public and private water supply wells in the area around the site;
- Collection of 4 aquatic sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

To determine whether the soil, sediment, biota, and groundwater contain contamination at levels of concern, data from the investigation were compared to the following SCGs:

- Groundwater, drinking water, and surface water SCGs are based on NYSDEC "Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidace Values" and Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code. *Division of Water Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (TOGS 1.1.1) was used for screening groundwater. The groundwater standard for total phenolic compounds listed in TOGS 1.1.1 is 1.0 part per billion (ppb). Because PCP is the only phenolic compound detected in the groundwater at the site, an SCG of 1.0 ppb has been used. Finally, 6NYCRR Part 700-705 lists a groundwater standard of 0.0007 parts per trillion (ppt) for 2,3,7,8-TCDD. This value has been adopted as the groundwater SCG, with the other forms of dioxins and furans normalized to 2,3,7,8-TCDD using the USEPA's toxicity equivalence factors (TEFs).

- Soil SCGs are based on the NYSDEC "Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum (TAGM) 4046; Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels". For dioxins/furans a cleanup level of 1 ppb 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence has been selected as the soil cleanup objective.

- the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document.

- NYSDEC Technical Report 87-3, *The Niagara River Biota Contamination Project: Fish Flesh Criteria for Piscivorous Wildlife*, July 1987.

Based on the RI results, in comparison to the SCGs and potential public health and environmental exposure routes, certain media and areas of the site require remediation. These are summarized below. More complete information can be found in the RI report.

4.1.1: Site Geology and Hydrogeology

The overburden geology was investigated during the test pit and monitoring well investigations. The top foot of overburden consists of weathered, broken gray shale (i.e., soil and unconsolidated rock fragments) that range in size from gravel to boulders mixed with grey silt and sand or brown sandy topsoil, considered to be non-native fill material most likely originating from a shale quarry located northwest of the site. Underlying the fill material is glacial lodgment till consisting of a silty till with thin sand lenses overlying a clay till with thin sand lenses. Both till layers are very dense and vary in color across the site from grey, tan and brown. Glacial till was observed to a depth of approximately 46 feet bgs (which is the maximum depth of drilling during monitoring well installation during PI activities). Overall thickness of the till was reported to be in excess of 150 feet during the installation of the water supply well, which is approximately 200 feet total depth. The till is very dense as evidenced by high blow counts and difficult drilling conditions. Observations during drilling confirm that the upper 15 feet of the till unit contains numerous thin lenses of more permeable sands and fine gravel that may or may not be interconnected.

Depth to groundwater across the site ranged between 2 to 5 feet bgs during the groundwater sampling events. Gauging data indicates that groundwater flow appears to be in a southwesterly direction, generally following topography and eventually discharging into Mann Brook.
Recharge of the water table is likely provided by precipitation infiltrating areas of the site. Shallow groundwater accumulates in the more permeable sandy lenses found within the till and then appears to disperse slowly into the regional groundwater flow regime. Groundwater recovery rates witnessed during well development and purging activities indicated that the hydraulic conductivity for the till unit is very low.

4.1.2: Nature of Contamination

As described in the RI report, many soil and groundwater samples were collected to characterize the nature and extent of contamination. As summarized in Table 1, the main categories of contaminants that exceed their SCGs are pentachlorophenol (PCP), dioxins/furans, fuel oil, and metals.

PCP is a manufactured chemical (i.e. not naturally occurring) which is a restricted use pesticide and is used industrially as a wood preservative for utility poles, railroad ties, fence posts, and wharf pilings. PCP was used at the Camp Georgetown site in the treatment of wood using a mixture of PCP and fuel oil. The fuel oil was used to dissolve the PCP into solution for a dipping process.

The primary fuel oil constituents of concern at this site are a subset of semi-volatile compounds (SVOCs), known as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

PCP and dioxins/furans have low water solubility and a strong tendency to adhere to soil or sediment particles in the environment. PAHs are also expected to be adsorbed to soil with limited potential for leaching. Therefore, their mobility in the environment is mainly limited to physical (erosional and depositional) mechanisms. Furthermore, PCP breaks down rapidly when exposed to sunlight and is less likely to be present in exposed surface soils.

CCA is a preservative used at Camp Georgetown subsequent to the PCP operations which was the source of the inorganic contamination identified at the site consisting of chromium, copper, and arsenic.

4.1.3: Extent of Contamination

This section describes the findings of the investigation for all environmental media that were investigated.

As discussed in Section 3.2, a Preliminary Investigation (PI) was conducted to assess the conditions at the site and determine if additional investigation was warranted. The PI included soil sampling, both shallow and subsurface, installation of 8 monitoring wells, and collection of 8 groundwater samples. Discussions that follow this section include the data generated during both the PI and the RI.

Much of the soil sample data from the PI presented below is from immunoassay testing, as noted. Immunoassay testing is a screening procedure that allows for efficient and cost effective analysis of

the sample for a specific compound, in this case pentachlorophenol. A percentage of the samples collected were split, with one half undergoing the immunoassay testing, the other half sent to a contract laboratory for verification that the immunoassay tests were producing reliable results and therefore usable data. All immunoassay testing was found to be reliable based on this verification method.

Chemical concentrations are reported in parts per billion (ppb) for water, and parts per million (ppm) for soil and sediment. For comparison purposes, where applicable, SCGs are provided for each medium.

Table 1 summarizes the degree of contamination for the contaminants of concern in surface soil, subsurface soil, sediment, groundwater, and biota and compares the data with the SCGs for the site. The following are the media which were investigated and a summary of the findings of the investigation.

Surface Soil

A total of 88 surface soil samples were collected during the PI and RI from approximately 0 to 2 inches below ground surface (bgs). Seventy-four (74) surface soil samples out of 88 were analyzed for PCP only (PI immunoassay results) or total SVOCs. PCP was the only SVOC detected above a TAGM 4046 guidance value (1.0 ppm) in all surface soil samples sent for laboratory analysis. The PCP guidance value was exceeded in 8 surface soil sample locations The concentrations ranged from 1 ppm to 130 ppm.

PCP was also detected (estimated values) in several additional surface soil samples in the drip pad area, the former AST area, and the area southwest of the former treatment building at levels well below the TAGM 4046 guidance value. PCP was not detected in any of the other surface soils collected from across the site. One potential explanation for the relatively low concentrations of PCP in surface soils is that PCP will readily breakdown by photochemical processes when exposed to the ultraviolet radiation in sunlight.

The highest concentrations of total SVOCs (5.048 ppm) were observed in surface soil sample SS-19. This sample was collected from an apparent drainage area southwest of the former Post Peeler building.

39 of the 88 surface soil samples were also sent for analysis of dioxins. Dioxins and furans were detected at low concentrations in all the samples; only two samples (SS-5 and SS-8) contained 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence above the 1.0 ppb guidance value. Slightly exceeding the PCP guidance value of 1.0 ppm at concentrations of 1.09 ppm and 1.16 ppm, respectively, these samples were collected from the former drip pad area.

A total of 40 of the 88 surface soil samples that were collected from "on site" locations were sent to the laboratory for analysis of metals. Additionally, 10 samples were collected from "background" areas (areas where former treatment operations did not appear to have existed). Of the three metals of concern (chromium, copper, arsenic), 1 out of 40 surface soil samples across the site exhibited chromium concentrations above background levels; 2 out of 40 surface soil samples analyzed for

metals showed copper at concentrations above background; and 27 out of 40 soil samples analyzed for metals possessed arsenic above the average background concentrations.

Two (2) soil samples (SEEP-1 and SEEP-2) were collected from a seep that was located near the end of the south footer drain (downgradient) of the former treatment building. Both samples were sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in SEEP-1. No PCP was detected in SEEP-2. The two seep samples were also analyzed for dioxins. These results are also included in Table 1. SEEP-1 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 3.29 ppb, while sample SEEP-2 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 2.18 ppb. Both of these values were above the site screening level of 1.0 ppb.

Subsurface Soil

Subsurface soil samples were collected from both soil borings and test pits conducted at the site. Results from the soil boring samples are discussed first, followed by the results for the samples collected from the test pits.

A total of 68 soil samples were collected from 34 soil borings across the site during the PI and RI.

The 68 samples were analyzed for SVOCs, 34 of 68 samples were analyzed for dioxins and 11 of 68 samples were analyzed for metals.

PCP was detected in 10 samples above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value, located under the former treatment building. The samples were collected from 1-6 feet bgs. PCP was also detected in GSB02-1 (2-4' bgs), GSB02–3 (2-4', 6-8' and 8-10' bgs), GSB02-4 (6-8' bgs) and GSB02-8 (1-2' and 7-8' bgs) above 1.0 ppm in the area immediately surrounding the former treatment plant, including the former drip pad area, and former AST area.

Forty-seven (47) samples were collected from test pits installed during the PI and the RI. These results are summarized on Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in 7 test pits, 3 located near the former treatment building, 2 located southwest of the former treatment plant within a grid of surface soil samples collected during the PI, and 2 located west of Drying Shed #1. These samples were collected during the PI and are based on immunoassay results.

While several SVOCs were detected in samples collected from the test pits during the RI, none exceeded TAGM 4046 guidance values.

Dioxins were analyzed in 20 of the 47 samples collected, however, no sample exceeded the 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration guidance of 1 ppb.

Sediments

Four (4) sediment samples were collected from Mann Brook and sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1.

No PCP or any other SVOCs were detected above the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document in any of the four sediment samples collected .

Several dioxin and furan congeners were detected in each sample, however, the total 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations were well below the SCGs.

Groundwater

Groundwater samples were collected in three separate sampling events. Samples were collected in 1998 during the PI as well as during the RI in November 2001 and December 2002. Additional monitoring wells were installed after each round of sampling, as needed based on the evaluation of the data. A total of 8 wells were sampled during the PI, 17 wells during the first round of the RI, and 19 wells during the final round of the RI. The NYSDEC potable water supply well located east of the treatment building was also sampled during the PI.

PI Groundwater Results

Samples were collected from MW-1 through MW-8 and were analyzed for SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals and dioxins. Analytical results were below SCGs except for PCP, metals, and dioxin.

Pentachlorophenol was detected in 5 of 8 monitoring wells above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value ranging from 30ppb to 1700 ppb during the PI sampling event.

Dioxins were also detected above the 0.0007 ppt 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence guidance value in all wells (except MW-7) during the PI sampling event.

Chromium was the only metal related to wood treatment activities detected above TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Chromium concentrations above guidance values were detected in 4 wells. Copper was detected in every well, however, it didn't exceed the 0.2 ppb guidance value in any sample analyzed. Arsenic was detected in only one well at concentrations below guidance values.

No SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals or dioxins were detected in the NYSDEC potable water supply well above SCGs.

RI Groundwater Results 2001

A second round of groundwater samples were collected in December 2001as part of the RI. The 8 wells that were installed during the PI were analyzed for fuel oil, SVOCs and dioxins. Nine newly installed wells were analyzed for pesticides/PCBs, VOCs and SVOCs. The new wells were not analyzed for dioxins during this sampling event.

Fuel components, including diesel fuel, were not detected in any of the eight previously installed monitoring wells that were sampled.

PCP was detected above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values for water in 5 monitoring wells ranging from 44 ppb to 160 ppb.

Concentrations of dioxins were found in five of the wells sampled. However only three wells exhibited a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration over the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. These wells are located radially around the former drip pad area and were identified to have dioxins from the PI. Note all water dioxin results are reported in parts per trillion (ppt). Concentrations ranged from 0.000009 ppt to 1.6694 ppt .

The PCB aroclor 1254 was found in three of the nine wells sampled. Concentrations of Aroclor 1254 in MW-9 (15 ppb), MW-12 (1.7 ppb), and MW-15 (2.7 ppb) were above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Aroclor 1254 concentrations were randomly distributed near the outer perimeter of the Site; MW-9 is north and upgradient, MW-12 is located downgradient to the southeast, and MW-15 is downgradient to the southwest. PCBs are not known to be a site-related contaminant of concern. No pesticides were detected in any of the monitoring wells sampled.

RI Groundwater Results 2002

A third round of groundwater samples were collected in November 2002. Unfiltered samples were collected from 19 wells for analysis of SVOCs, fuel oil, dioxins and pesticides/PCBs. Six (6) of the 19 wells were filtered and analyzed for the same parameters in an attempt to determine if high turbidity in groundwater was a contributing factor in elevated concentrations of contaminants. Groundwater from MW-5, MW-9, MW-12, MW-15, MW-18 and MW-19 was filtered via a 0.45 micron in-line filter.

No PCBs were detected in any of the monitoring wells. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected above the TOGS 1.1.1 0.6 ppb guidance value in all samples collected except MW-15 (filtered). Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is believed to be a laboratory artifact.

Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value in MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-5 filtered, MW-6, MW-7 and MW-11. Concentrations ranged from 1 ppb to 370 ppb .

Fuel oil components (e.g. diesel range compounds) were detected in MW-4, MW-6 and MW-7.

Groundwater samples collected from MW-4, MW-7 and MW-8 exhibited 2.3.7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations above the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. Concentrations ranged from 0.0009 ppt in MW-8 to 0.0215 ppt in MW-4.

Groundwater results from all three rounds of sampling are summarized on Table 1 and Figure 3.

Biota (Fish)

A total of 22 fish samples were collected from upstream and downstream locations within Mann Brook, located west and hydraulically down gradient of the site. Fish samples were collected by

electroshock sampling methods and were submitted for laboratory analysis of dioxins. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Eleven of the fish samples were collected upstream of the site. Another eleven samples were collected downstream of the site.

2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations are reported as wet weight concentrations in parts per trillion (ppt) and ranged from below detection limits (BDL) to 0.12 ppt, all below the SCG of 2.3 ppt.

Summary

Evaluation of the analytical data generated during the PI and RI resulted in the identification of several areas of concern with soil and localized groundwater contamination exceeding the SCGs. As shown on Figure 4, those areas include:

- Entire area beneath the former treatment building and immediately to the south of the building;
- The area of the former above ground storage tanks;
- The area across the access road to the south west of the former treatment building, and;
- An area across the access road to the north west of the former treatment building associated with a staging area for the drying of treated logs.

4.2: Interim Remedial Measures

An interim remedial measure (IRM) is conducted at a site when a source of contamination or exposure pathway can be effectively addressed before completion of the RI/FS.

There were no IRMs performed at this site during the RI/FS.

4.3: Summary of Human Exposure Pathways:

This section describes the types of human exposures that may present added health risks to persons at or around the site. A more detailed discussion of the human exposure pathways can be found in Section 3.3 of the RI report.

An exposure pathway describes the means by which an individual may be exposed to contaminants originating from a site. An exposure pathway has five elements: [1] a contaminant source, [2] contaminant release and transport mechanisms, [3] a point of exposure, [4] a route of exposure, and [5] a receptor population.
The source of contamination is the location where contaminants were released to the environment (any waste disposal area or point of discharge). Contaminant release and transport mechanisms carry contaminants from the source to a point where people may be exposed. The exposure point is a

location where actual or potential human contact with a contaminated medium may occur. The route of exposure is the manner in which a contaminant actually enters or contacts the body (e.g., ingestion, inhalation, or direct contact). The receptor population is the people who are, or may be, exposed to contaminants at a point of exposure.

An exposure pathway is complete when all five elements of an exposure pathway exist. An exposure pathway is considered a potential pathway when one or more of the elements currently does not exist, but could in the future.

There are no complete exposure pathways currently at the site. Potential pathways include:

- Direct contact with contaminated surficial soils in the former drip pad area and seepage areas of footer drains of the former treatment building. There is currently an institutional control, in the form of fencing, which serves to alert personnel to avoid impacted areas. Inmate access of these portions of the site has been restricted since the Preliminary Investigation.

- Direct contact with contaminated subsurface soils by construction or utility workers in the future.

- Ingestion of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater in the immediate area of the former treatment building is a potential future pathway should a well be installed.

4.4: Summary of Environmental Impacts

This section summarizes the existing and potential future environmental impacts presented by the site. Environmental impacts include existing and potential future exposure pathways to fish and wildlife receptors, as well as damage to natural resources such as aquifers and wetlands.

The Fish and Wildlife Impact Analysis, which is included in the RI report, presents a detailed discussion of the existing and potential impacts from the site to fish and wildlife receptors. The following potential environmental exposure pathways and ecological risks have been identified:

- Terrestrial animal contact with chemicals present in the surface soil, groundwater (at seep areas);

- Ingestion of chemicals from surface soil, groundwater and food sources, and;

- Direct uptake of chemicals in soil or groundwater by terrestrial and aquatic plants

Samples of the creek sediments and biota in Mann Brook, which receives drainage from the site, did not contain elevated levels of any site related contaminants, therefore a completed exposure pathway to fish and wildlife receptors within the streamwas not identified.

SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF THE REMEDIATION GOALS

Goals for the remedial program have been established through the remedy selection process stated

in 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.10. At a minimum, the remedy selected must eliminate or mitigate all significant threats to public health and/or the environment presented by the hazardous waste disposed at the site through the proper application of scientific and engineering principles.

The remediation goals for this site are to eliminate or reduce to the extent practicable:

- exposures of persons at or around the site to PCP, dioxins/furans and metals in soil and groundwater;
- environmental exposures of flora or fauna to PCP, dioxins, and metals in surface soil and groundwater;
- erosional transport of contaminated soil;
- the release of contaminants from soil into groundwater that may create exceedances of groundwater quality standards; and

Further, the remediation goals for the site include attaining to the extent practicable:

- ambient groundwater quality standards , and ;
- compliance with all applicable SCGs and cleanup goals.

SECTION 6: SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The selected remedy must be protective of human health and the environment, be cost-effective, comply with other statutory requirements, and utilize permanent solutions, alternative technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Potential remedial alternatives for the Camp Georgetown Site were identified, screened and evaluated in the FS report which is available at the document repositories identified in Section 1.

A summary of the remedial alternatives that were considered for this site are discussed below. The present worth represents the amount of money invested in the current year that would be sufficient to cover all present and future costs associated with the alternative. This enables the costs of remedial alternatives to be compared on a common basis. As a convention, a time frame of 30 years is used to evaluate present worth costs for alternatives with an indefinite duration. This does not imply that operation, maintenance, or monitoring would cease after 30 years if remediation goals are not achieved.

6.1: Description of Remedial Alternatives

The following potential remedies were considered to address the contaminated soil and groundwater at the site. The alternatives below are numbered sequentially for simplicity and do not necessarily correspond to the numbering system in the FS.

Alternative 1: No Action

Present Worth: *$714,000*
Capital Cost: *$0*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$55,000*

The No Action Alternative is evaluated as a procedural requirement and as a basis for comparison. It requires continued monitoring only, allowing the site to remain in an unremediated state. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Alternative 2: Excavation and Off-site Disposal

Present Worth: *$13,125,000*
Capital Cost: *$12,701,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-5: *$28,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacted soil would be addressed by excavation and off site disposal. The areas of concern delineated in Figure 4 would be excavated using conventional methods and equipment. The treatment building would be demolished as part of remedial activities.

The estimated removal volume would be 6,270 cubic yards of soil, measured in place. A 20% bulking factor yields roughly 7,530 cubic yards of soil that would be managed. Additionally, stabilization of saturated soils would be necessary (estimated 30% by volume), which would require approximately 1,520 cubic yards of ash or similar product. The slab under the former treatment building would be removed and crushed as part of this remedial alternative. The slab would produce roughly 180 cubic yards of waste that would require disposal. Consequently, the total volume requiring disposal would be approximately 9,230 cubic yards. Excavated soils would be transported to a permitted hazardous waste landfill and may require treatment prior to disposal due to the presence of dioxin.

Since the water table at the site is typically at 2 to 5 feet bgs, excavation operations would require dewatering. Groundwater would be containerized as needed and transported for off site disposal.

Alternative 3A: – Modified Part 360 Multi Layered Synthetic Cap

Present Worth: *$2,287,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,845,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a modified 6NYCRR Part 360 cap across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern

(shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material. The treatment building would be demolished and disposed off site as part of remedial activities, The modified Part 360 cap would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and prevent rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. The cap would consist of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion and infiltration of precipitation;

- Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of porous material (sand) that enhances lateral drainage of any precipitation that infiltrates through the vegetative layer; the vegetative and drainage layers help protect the underlying barrier layers from the environmental stresses of wetting/drying and freezing/thawing;

- Synthetic Barrier – low permeability membrane (at least 20 mil thickness) that represents the final impedance to precipitation infiltration;

- Subgrade Layer – approximately 12 inches of sand or other porous material that serves as the foundation for the cap. A gas collection system is not incorporated into the cost estimate for this alternative.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring, including groundwater sampling, would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative would be expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted.

Alternative 3B: – Low Permeability Cover System (LPCS)

Present Worth: *$2.330,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,888,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this containment alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a LPCS across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern (shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material The LPCS would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and greatly reduce rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. A LPCS typically consists of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion;

- Low Permeability Layer – approximately 12 inches of compacted clay to reduce infiltration into the impacted media.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative is expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted and a clay LPCS has been assumed.

6.2 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

The criteria to which potential remedial alternatives are compared are defined in 6 NYCRR Part 375, which governs the remediation of inactive hazardous waste disposal sites in New York State. A detailed discussion of the evaluation criteria and comparative analysis is included in the FS report.

The first two evaluation criteria are termed "threshold criteria" and must be satisfied in order for an alternative to be considered for selection.
1. Protection of Human Health and the Environment. This criterion is an overall evaluation of each alternative's ability to protect public health and the environment.

2. Compliance with New York State Standards, Criteria, and Guidance (SCGs). Compliance with SCGs addresses whether a remedy would meet environmental laws, regulations, and other standards and criteria. In addition, this criterion includes the consideration of guidance which the NYSDEC has determined to be applicable on a case-specific basis.

The next five "primary balancing criteria" are used to compare the positive and negative aspects of each of the remedial strategies.

3. Short-term Effectiveness. The potential short-term adverse impacts of the remedial action upon the community, the workers, and the environment during the construction and/or implementation are evaluated. The length of time needed to achieve the remedial objectives is also estimated and compared against the other alternatives.

4. Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence. This criterion evaluates the long-term effectiveness of the remedial alternatives after implementation. If wastes or treated residuals remain on-site after the selected remedy has been implemented, the following items are evaluated: 1) the magnitude of the remaining risks, 2) the adequacy of the engineering and/or institutional controls intended to limit the risk, and 3) the reliability of these controls.

5. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume. Preference is given to alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of the wastes at the site.

6. Implementability. The technical and administrative feasibility of implementing each alternative are evaluated. Technical feasibility includes the difficulties associated with the construction of the

remedy and the ability to monitor its effectiveness. For administrative feasibility, the availability of the necessary personnel and materials is evaluated along with potential difficulties in obtaining specific operating approvals, access for construction, institutional controls, and so forth.

7. Cost-Effectivness. Capital costs and operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs are estimated for each alternative and compared on a present worth basis. Although cost-effectiveness is the last balancing criterion evaluated, where two or more alternatives have met the requirements of the other criteria, it can be used as the basis for the final decision. The costs for each alternative are presented in Table 2.

This final criterion is considered a "modifying criterion" and is taken into account after evaluating those above. It is evaluated after public comments on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan have been received.

8. Community Acceptance - Concerns of the community regarding the RI/FS reports and the PRAP have been evaluated. The responsiveness summary (Appendix A) presents the public comments received and the manner in which the NYSDEC addressed the concerns raised. In general, the public comments received were supportive of the selected remedy. Several comments were received, however, pertaining to the potential option of excavating the contaminated soil at Camp Pharsalia and consolidating that soil beneath the cap at Camp Georgetown. Opinions were mixed regarding the option, with some supportive and others strongly opposed with consolidating the two sites.

SECTION 7: SUMMARY OF THE SELECTED REMEDY

Based on the Administrative Record (Appendix B) and the discussion presented below, the NYSDEC has selected Alternative 3A, Multi layer geomembrane cap as the remedy for this site, as shown in Figure 5. The elements of this remedy are described at the end of this section. The selected remedy is based on the results of the PI, RI and the evaluation of alternatives presented in the FS.

Alternative 3A has been selected because, as described below, it will satisfy the threshold criteria and provides the best balance of the primary balancing criteria described in Section 6.2. It will achieve the remediation goals for the site by effectively preventing direct contact or potential ingestion of contaminated soil (the potential human health pathways) and erosion or infiltration (the primary mechanisms for contaminant migration).

Because Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B all satisfy the threshold criteria, the five balancing criteria are particularly important in selecting a final remedy for the site.

Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B would all have short-term impacts. The impacts associated with construction would be more significant with Alternative 2 which requires significanlty more excavation and handling of the contaminated media. Alternatives 3A and 3B, which leave the contaminated media in place, would have considerably fewer short-term impacts. The containment alternatives could be implemented without special handling requirements or transport of contaminated media.

Achieving long-term effectiveness would best be accomplished by Alternative 2, which would result in a pre-disposal scenario by removing the contaminated media for offsite disposal. Alternatives 3A and 3B, though contingent on long-term monitoring, would be effective in the long term as contamination would be contained, eliminating the potential for contaminant migration. Each of these alternatives would reduce or eliminate the potential for human and environmental exposure to contaminated soil.

Alternative 2 would require a great deal of coordination. The contamination identified at this site would require disposal as hazardous waste and, depending on the contaminant concentration, pre-treatment may be required. This alternative would require a predesign sampling program to quantify which material would be disposed as hazardous waste, which material would require pre-treatment (e.g. incineration), and which material could be disposed as non-hazardous waste.

Alternative 3A could be implemented using standard construction techniques. Alternative 3B would be the least complicated of these alternatives to implement. Placement of the soil cover system could be completed using standard construction techniques and system design would be straightforward.

Alternative 2 would greatly reduce the mobility, toxicity and volume of contaminants. Alternatives 3A and 3B would not reduce the toxicity and volume of contaminants, but would greatly reduce the mobility of contaminants.

The cost of the alternatives varies significantly. Although Alternative 2 results in greater reduction in toxicity, mobility and volume of contaminated soils,Alternative 3A and Alternative 3B would be more readily implemented and at significantly less costs.

Because each of these alternatives can achieve the remedial goals, the implementation and cost criteria weigh heavily in this evaluation. Alternative 2 is permanent remedy.. This alternative is the most costly of the alternatives evaluated. Alternatives 3A and 3B, coupled with monitoring, present similar protectiveness at much lower cost with fewer short term impacts during construction.

The primary purpose of a cap would be to eliminate the potential for exposure to surface and subsurface soils, eliminate erosional transport of contaminated soils, and prevent the infiltration of precipitation. Of the containment options, Alternative 3A would be only slightly more complex to construct, but at a lower cost. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Alternative 3A is the NYSDEC's preferred remedial alternative.

The estimated present worth cost to implement the remedy is $2,287,000. The cost to construct the remedy is estimated to be $1,845,000 and the estimated average annual operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs for 30 years is $29,000 per year.

The elements of the selected remedy are as follows:

1. A remedial design program will be implemented to provide the details necessary for the construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the remedial program.

2. Demolition and offsite disposal of the former treatment building its contents.

3. Excavation of areas B through G, consolidating the material onto area A for covering with the cap.

4. Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over area A including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.

   This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the site. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site will eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option will be further explored during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown, including an evaluation of applicable laws to ensure compliance with current regulations.

6. The site will be restored by grading to insure proper drainage, placement of additonal topsoil as necessary, and seeding.

7. To address the identified groundwater contamination and since the remedy will result in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term monitoring program will be instituted. Groundwater samples will be collected annually for a period of at least 30 years. This program will allow the effectiveness of the cap to be monitored and will be a component of the operation, maintenance, and monitoring for the site.

8. Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring; and (c) prohibit redevelopment or use of the capped area.

9. The property owner will provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the Department, which will certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that could impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation an maintenance or soil management plan.

10. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that will: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and

development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

SECTION 8: HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

As part of the remedial investigation process, a number of Citizen Participation activities were undertaken to inform and educate the public about conditions at the site and the potential remedial alternatives. The following public participation activities were conducted for the site:

- Repositories for documents pertaining to the site were established.
- A public contact list, which included nearby property owners, elected officials, local media and other interested parties, was established.
- A fact sheet was sent on February 23, 2004 detailing the Proposed Remedial Action Plan and announcing both the start of the comment period and a public meeting.
- A meeting was held on March 8, 2004 with onsite staff from the NYSDEC and NYSDCS. The purpose of the meeting was to present the RI findings, the proposd remedy, and answer questions concerning the remedial program.
- The public meeting was held on March 10, 2004 to present and receive comment on the PRAP.
- A responsiveness summary (Appendix A) was prepared to address the comments received during the public comment period for the PRAP.

TABLE 1
Nature and Extent of Contamination
May 1998 - November 2002

SURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND - 0.36	0.224	1 of 49
	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl)Phtalate	ND - 68	50	1 of 49
	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 130	1	8 of 76
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 0.003822	0.001	4 of 46
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	5 - 104	7.5	30 of 50
	Chromium	7.8-171	50	1 of 50
	Copper	7.4-59.5	25	1 of 50

SUBSURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Pentachlorophenol	1.1 - 123	1	24 of 116
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - .0024951	.001	1 of 49
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	8.4 - 33	7.5	8 of 21
	Chromium	7.4 - 68.1	50	1 of 21
	Copper	ND - 32.4	25	3 of 21

Table 1 (Con't.)

GROUNDWATER	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppb)[a]	SCG[b] (ppb)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 1700	1	16 of 44
	Fuel Oil Compounds	ND-820	NA[c]	3 of 10
PCB/Pesticides	Aroclor 1254	ND - 15	0.009	3 of 9
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 1.6694	0.0007	14 of 29
Inorganic Compounds	Chromium	24.5 - 155	50	4 of 7
	Lead	8 - 84.1	25	6 of 7

[a] ppb = parts per billion, which is equivalent to micrograms per liter, ug/L, in water;
ppm = parts per million, which is equivalent to milligrams per kilogram, mg/kg, in soil;
ug/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter

[b] SCG = standards, criteria, and guidance values; {list SCGs for each medium}

[c] Results compared to detection limit of 303 ppb

ND = Compound not detected

Table 2
Remedial Alternative Costs

Remedial Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual OM&M	Total Present Worth
No Action	$0	$55,000	$714,000
Excavation and Off-Site Disposal	$12,701,000	$28,000	$13,125,000
Modified Part 360 Multi Layer Cap	$1,845,000	$29,000	$2,287,000
Low Permeability Cover System	$1,888,000	$29,000	$2,330,000

APPENDIX A

Responsiveness Summary

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Camp Georgetown Site

Proposed Remedial Action Plan

Georgetown, MadisonCounty

Site No.7-27-010

The Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown Site was prepared by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) and issued to the local document repository on February 23, 2004. This Plan outlined the preferred remedial measure proposed for the remediation of the contaminated soil and groundwater at the Camp Georgetown Site. The preferred remedy is a Modified Part 360 Multi-layer Synthetic Cap over the primary area of contamination with other areas of concern to be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap. The remedy would also include monitoring and institutional controls.

The release of the PRAP was announced via a notice to the mailing list, informing the public of the PRAP's availability.

A project briefing for the Department of Correctional Services was held on March 8, 2004 to present the PRAP to those working at the site. A public meeting was held on March 10, 2004, which included a presentation of the Remedial Investigation (RI) and the Feasibility Study (FS) as well as a discussion of the proposed remedy. The meetings provided an opportunity for on-site employees and the general public to discuss their concerns, ask questions and comment on the proposed remedy. These comments have become part of the Administrative Record for this site. No written comments were received during the public comment period for the PRAP, which ended on March 26, 2004.

This Responsiveness Summary responds to all questions and comments raised at the March 8th and March 10th meetings.

The following are the comments received, with the NYSDEC's responses immediately following:

Question 1: What buildings are planned for demolition as part of construction of the remedy?

Response 1: The main treatment building will be emptied of its contents and demolished down to the concrete slab. The demolition debris will be sent off site for disposal at a permitted construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The concrete slab will

subsequently be broken up for disposal beneath the cap.

Question 2: Why will it cost $714,000 for the no action remedial alternative?

Response 2: The no action alternative is evaluated for all sites to serve as a baseline alternative as required by the National Contingency Plan. The no action alternative for the Camp Georgetown site includes 30 years of groundwater monitoring, which accounts for the estimated costs of $714,000.

Question 3: The PRAP states that transporting contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site for disposal beneath the cap at the Camp Georgetown site may be considered. Does the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) feel there is a benefit to combining two hazardous waste sites into one larger site?

Response 3: The NYSDEC believes there are significant benefits to combining the two sites that warrant further consideration.

The Camp Pharsalia site is a much smaller scale, but very similar, wood treatment site also owned by the NYSDEC located approximately 15 miles from Camp Georgetown. A Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in March 2003 selecting a cap remedy for the 1/4 acre site with continued groundwater monitoring for the next 30 years, the same as would be required at Camp Georgetown. The total volume of soil impacted with pentachlorophenol (PCP) and dioxins at Camp Pharsalia is estimated at 860 cubic yards. The estimated volume of contaminated soil at Camp Georgetown is 9,200 cubic yards.

The contamination is essentially the same at the two sites, therefore there would be no additional requirements for the Camp Georgetown remedy other than a modification to the design of the cap to accommodate the approximate 10% increase in volume of soil that would result from including the soil from Camp Pharsalia. Combining the two sites would eliminate the need for extended groundwater monitoring at Camp Pharsalia since all contaminated soil would be removed from the site. Full removal at Pharsalia would also eliminate the need to place permanent use restrictions and environmental easements on the property

Combining the sites at Camp Georgetown would require an amendment to the Camp Pharsalia ROD, which would include another public comment period at that time.

If an amendment is made to the Camp Pharsalia ROD, the Camp Georgetown mailing list would be included in the notification of the amendment and associated public comment period. Evaluation of applicable laws to ensure compliance with current regulations would be necessary prior to moving forward with plans to amend the ROD.

Question 4: What are the public health impacts associated with PCP and dioxin?

Response 4: There are currently no significant exposures to PCP and dioxin occurring at the Camp Georgetown facility. Levels in surface soils are quite low and very localized. According to ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry) studies in workers show that exposure to high levels of PCP in industrial settings can cause increases in body temperature, liver effects, damage to the immune system, reproductive effects, and developmental effects. Exposure to large amounts of dioxins may cause chloracne, and serious skin effects. Former workers at the treatment facility may direct their questions about occupational exposures to PESH, Public Employess Safety & Health. (see Response 8 for contact information).

Question 5: Are PCP and dioxins cancer causing compounds?

Response 5: The US Environmental Protection Agency considers PCP to be a probable human carcinogen. The US Dept. Of Health and Human Services has determined that dioxins, which are present in PCP as contaminants from its manufacturing, may reasonably be anticipated to cause cancer.

Question 6: How deep is the contamination?

Response 6: Soil contamination was found in the upper 10 feet of soil at the site.

Question 7: How deep are the wells at the site?

Response 7: Monitoring wells installed at the site were 14 feet or less in depth.

Question 8: What is being done for past employees who may have been exposed to the PCP and dioxins?

Response 8: Former employees who are concerned that they may have been exposed should

contact the Public Employee Safety and Health (PESH) Bureau, which oversees workplace protection of public employees at the State and local level. Alternatively, employees can contact one of the New York State Department of Health Occupational Health Clinics. Contact information is as follows:

PESH District Office - Binghamton
44 Hawley Street 9th Floor
Binghamton, NY 13901
Tel. (607) 721-8211
Fax (607) 721-8207

New York State Department of Health
Network of Occupational Health Clinics
Syracuse/Binghamton/Utica
Central New York Occupational Health Clinical Center
6712 Brooklawn Parkway, Suite 204, Syracuse NY 13211
Tel. (315) 432-8899
Fax (315) 431-9528

Question 9: Who will mow the grass on the cap?

Response 9: It is anticipated the NYSDEC Division of Operations will be responsible for mowing the cap.

Question 10: Will it be okay to walk on the cap once in place?

Response 10: Yes, the cap will be suitable for pedestrian traffic as well as the machinery necessary to keep it mowed.

Question 11: We do not want the Camp Pharsalia wastes brought to Camp Georgetown.

Response 11: Initial reactions to the idea of combining the two sites have been mixed. As stated in RESPONSE 3 above, if it is determined to be a feasible approach after evaluation of applicable laws, the ROD for Camp Pharsalia would be amended. A public comment period of 30 days would be associated with the amendment, at which time concerns and comments would be accepted. As with any remedy for an inactive hazardous waste disposal site, community acceptance is one of the evaluation criteria that is

considered.

Question 12: Were there any drums found during the remedial investigation?

Response 12: Anecdotal evidence suggested there may have been drums buried in the wooded area immediately to the south of the treatment building. A geophysical method known as ground penetrating radar (GPR) was employed over the area in an effort to locate any buried metallic objects. If the GPR indicated the presence of buried metal, that area was excavated with a backhoe to determine if a drum was present. There were no drums containing wastes identified as a result of this effort. Metal identified with the GPR included concrete reinforced with steel, empty buckets, and lids from drums. Subsequent soil sampling did not find any contamination in these areas.

Question 13: Fuel oil has made it through the ground surface from past operations. Is the groundwater contaminated?

Response 13: Low level PCP and dioxin contamination has been identified in the groundwater in monitoring wells immediately adjacent to the treatment area. Specific methods for screening for fuel oil did not identify fuel oil in the groundwater. Based on the results from the groundwater sampling conducted at the site, it does not appear that contamination is migrating significantly beyond the monitoring wells located closest to the treatment building. The proposed remedy is expected to eliminatefuture contaminant impacts to groundwater and includes continued groundwater monitoring.

APPENDIX B

Administrative Record

Administrative Record

Camp Georgetown Site
Proposed Remedial Action Plan
Georgetown, MadisonCounty
Site No.7-27-010

1. Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the Camp Georgetown site, dated March 2004, prepared by the NYSDEC.

2. Preliminary Investigation Report, May 1999, NYSDEC.

3. Camp Georgetown Remedial Investigation Report, October 2003, Shaw Environmental, Inc.

4. Camp Georgetown Feasibility Study, January 2004, Shaw Environmental, Inc.

5. Fact Sheet announcing the PRAP, March 2004.

6. Responsiveness Summary for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (Appendix A of the Record of Decision)



Scale: 1:24,000

Reference:
DeLorme 3-D Topo Quads, 1999
Yarmouth, Me.
Datum WGS84

NYSDEC

Figure 1
Site Location Map
Camp Georgetown



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 — TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 — STORAGE SHED
- 3 — DRYING SHED #1
- 4 — DRYING SHED #2
- 5 — POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 — METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 — GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE

REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. KNACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK


N
MW-9
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00006378 J | 0.0000023 J
MW-19
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NA | 0.000001834 J | 0.00000324 J
MW-10
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000045476 J
MW-1
PI | 2001 | 2002
BDL | BDL | BDL
0.00224 | BDL | BDL
MW-2
PI | 2001 | 2002
370 D | BDL | 1 J
0.00137 | BDL | 0.000017884 J
MW-18
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | NA | BDL | NA
NA | NA | 0.0000013 J | 0.00002609 J
MW-11
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | 540 D | 370
NA | NS | 0.00048059 J
MW-3
PI | 2001 | 2002
120 D | BDL | 1 J
0.01221 | BDL | 0.00034828
MW-12
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00000232 J | NS
MW-13
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000000978 J
MW-14
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | BDL
MW-5
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
1700 | 44 J | 41 | 27
0.00308 | 0.0000058 | 0.00000036 J | 0.0001988 J
MW-8
PI | 2001 | 2002
ND | BDL | BDL
0.00188 | 0.0008339 J | 0.00087987 J
MW-7
PI | 2001 | 2002
370 D | 160 | 13 J
0.00391 | 1.999% JOCON | 0.020856 J
MW-17
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00008063 J
MW-6
PI | 2001 | 2002
BDL | 920 D | 690
0.00017 | 0.001184 | 0.00028578 J
MW-4
PI | 2001 | 2002
30 | 85 | 130
0.00091 | 0.020725 | 0.0214887
MW-15
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000000864 J | 0.0000038 J
MW-16
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00000147 J
NOTE:
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.
LEGEND:
HISTORIC SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
MONITORING WELL
SEEP SAMPLES
WATER SUPPLY WELL
HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
SOIL BORING
BGM 1 SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
TEST PIT SAMPLES
HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
SED 1 SEDIMENT SAMPLE
1 TREATMENT BUILDING
2 STORAGE SHED
3 DRYING SHED #1
4 DRYING SHED #2
5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
6 METEOROLOGY STATION
7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
MW-5
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002 DATE
1700 | 44 J | 41 | 27 PCP ug/L (ppb)
0.00308 | 0.0000058 | 0.00000036 J | 0.0001988 J DIOXIN ng/L (ppt)
NA NOT AVAILABLE
BDL BELOW DETECTION LIMIT
NS NOT SAMPLED
PCP > 1.0 ug/L
DIOXIN > 0.0007 ng/L
NOTE: GROUNDWATER FLOW FOLLOWS TOPOGRAPHY AND FLOWS IN A SOUTHWEST DIRECTION.
Edge of Creek
SHOOTING RANGE
Top of Bank
Wet Area
Rivulet
Lodge
Top of Bank
APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET
REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.
Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
FIGURE 3
GROUNDWATER CONCENTRATION MAP
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK



APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 30 60 90 FEET



APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 30 60 90 FEET



APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 30 60 90 FEET



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOOI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 — SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- IMPACTED AREA

REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 4
IMPACTED AREA SUMMARY MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK



ENLARGEMENT OF THE AREA REQUIRING REMEDIATION

Volume Report Berm 01/28/2004 10:51
Comparing GRID file: O:/PROJECT/B30271/EXB30271D81.GRD
and GRID file: O:/PROJECT/B30271/BERMB30271D81.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.08,11712.48 to 11755.06,12656.48
Grid resolution X: 4.12, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 646.9 S.F., 0.01 Acres
Area in Fill: 19,541.2 S.F., 0.45 Acres
Total inclusion area: 20,188.1 S.F., 0.46 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.00
Average Cut Depth: 0.17 Average Fill Depth: 1.82
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 8.76
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 2844.59
Cut volume: 108.7 C.F., 4.06 C.Y.
Fill volume: 35,595.1 C.F., 1,318.34 C.Y.

Volume Report Cell 01/28/2004 10:57
Comparing GRID file: O:/PROJECT/B30271/MERS.GRD
and GRID file: O:/PROJECT/B30271/DESIGNB30271D81.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.08,11712.48 to 11755.06,12656.48
Grid resolution X: 4.12, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 757.3 S.F., 0.00 Acres
Area in Fill: 32,528.8 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Total inclusion area: 32,885.9 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.00
Average Cut Depth: 0.07 Average Fill Depth: 2.78
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 0.53
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 4428.80
Cut volume: 10.8 C.F., 0.40 C.Y.
Fill volume: 89,722.7 C.F., 3,323.08 C.Y.



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- PROPOSED AREAS OF EXCAVATION
- PROPOSED AREA OF CONCERN
- CONTAINMENT; PROPOSED LIMITS OF IMPACTED SOIL



TYPICAL MULTI LAYER GEOMEMBRANE CAP
"NOT TO SCALE"



TYPICAL LOW PERMEABILITY COVER SYSTEM
"NOT TO SCALE"

APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET

Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 5
EXCAVATION AND CONTAINMENT OF IMPACTED SOIL PRELIMINARY DESIGN
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK

REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN

Camp Georgetown

Georgetown, Madison County, New York

Site No. 7-27-010

February 2004



Prepared by:

Division of Environmental Remediation
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN
Camp Georgetown
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site No. 7-27-010

February 2004



Prepared by:

Division of Environmental Remediation
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN

Camp Georgetown
Georgetown, Madison County, New York
Site No. 7-27-010

February 2004

SECTION 1: SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PLAN

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), is proposing a remedy for the Camp Georgetown site. The presence of hazardous waste has created significant threats to human health and/or the environment that are addressed by this proposed remedy. As more fully described in Sections 3 and 4 of this document, past wood treatment operations using pentachlorophenol (PCP) and chromated copper arsenate (CCA) have resulted in the disposal of hazardous wastes, including semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), dioxins, phenols, and metals. These wastes have contaminated the soil and groundwater at the site, and have resulted in:

- a significant threat to human health associated with current and potential exposure to contaminated soil and shallow groundwater.
- a significant environmental threat associated with the impacts of contaminated soil and groundwater.

To eliminate or mitigate these threats, the NYSDEC proposes the following remedy:

- Installation of aimpermeable cap to minimize the risk of exposure to contaminants. This would involve placement of amulti layer geomembrane cap over the primary area of contamination. The remaining areas of contaminated soil would be excavated and consolidated beneath the cap.
- Implementation of a groundwater monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the remedy.
- Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); and (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring.
- The property owner would provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the NYSDEC, which would certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation and maintenance or site management plan.
- Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that would: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or

process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

- In addition to the remedial components listed above, an option to excavate and consolidate the impacted soils from the Camp Pharsalia site to be included beneath the proposed capped area at Camp Georgetown may be explored. A March 2003 Record of Decision selected a low permeability soil cover remedy for Camp Pharsalia. Due to the similarities in contamination and the close proximity to the Camp Georgetown site, such an option may provide an improved remedial approach for Camp Pharsalia without compromising the effectiveness of this proposed remedy for Camp Georgetown.

The proposed remedy, discussed in detail in Section 7, is intended to attain the remediation goals identified for this site in Section 5. The remedy must conform with officially promulgated standards and criteria that are directly applicable, or that are relevant and appropriate. The selection of a remedy must also take into consideration guidance, as appropriate. Standards, criteria and guidance are hereafter called SCGs.

This Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) identifies the preferred remedy, summarizes the other alternatives considered, and discusses the reasons for this preference. The NYSDEC will select a final remedy for the site only after careful consideration of all comments received during the public comment period.

The NYSDEC has issued this PRAP as a component of the Citizen Participation Plan developed pursuant to the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and Title 6 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York (6 NYCRR) Part 375. This document is a summary of the information that can be found in greater detail in the October, 2003 Remedial Investigation Report (RI Report), and the February 2003 Feasibility Study (FS), and other relevant documents. The public is encouraged to review the project documents, which are available at the following repositories:

NYSDEC Central Office
Division of Environmental Remediation
625 Broadway, 11th Floor
Albany, New York 12233-7014
(518) 402-9564
Attention: Bradley Brown

NYSDEC Region 7 Office
615 Erie Blvd. West
Syracuse, NY 13204
Attn: James Burke
(315) 426-7403

Georgetown Town Hall
Route 26
Georgetown, NY 13072
Attn: Russell Hammond, Town Supervisor
(315) 662-3782

The NYSDEC seeks input from the community on all PRAPs. A public comment period has been set from February 26, 2004 to March 26, 2004 to provide an opportunity for public participation in the remedy selection process. A public meeting is scheduled for March 10, 2004 at the Georgetown Town Hall beginning at 7:00 P.M.

At the meeting, the results of the RI/FS will be presented along with a summary of the proposed remedy. After the presentation, a question-and-answer period will be held, during which verbal or written comments may be submitted on the PRAP. Written comments may also be sent to Mr. Brown at the above address through March 26, 2004.

The NYSDEC may modify the preferred alternative or select another of the alternatives presented in this PRAP, based on new information or public comments. Therefore, the public is

encouraged to review and comment on all of the alternatives identified here.

Comments will be summarized and addressed in the responsiveness summary section of the Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD is the NYSDEC's final selection of the remedy for this site.

SECTION 2: SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Camp Georgetown is a large complex consisting of a NYSDEC crew headquarters and a New York State Department of Correctional Services (NYSDCS) active incarceration facility, located in the Town of Georgetown, Madison County (see figure 1). The incarceration facility is operated by the NYSDCS, but is located on property managed by the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS occupies the property north of Crumb Hill Road and does not include any past wood treatment operations associated with the contamination. The NYSDEC occupies the property south of Crumb Hill Road, which includes the area defined as the Class 2 inactive hazardous waste disposal site. This area defined as the site occupies approximately 6.6 acres , as shown on Figure 2. The site is bordered on the northeast by Crumb Hill Road, south by private property, and west by State Reforestation Land.

The area around the site is typified by a mature and eroded plateau that is dissected by a series of valleys several hundred feet deep. This plateau has a rolling, rugged appearance. Approximately 45 percent of Madison County is classified as commercial forest.

SECTION 3: SITE HISTORY

3.1: Operational/Disposal History

Incarceration facility inmates participate in various work programs. One of the work activities formerly performed by the Camp Georgetown inmates was a sawmill and wood treatment operation. The wood treatment plant was operated from approximately 1970 to 1983 as a dip tank process using the chemical biocide pentachlorophenol. Untreated poles were stored in drying sheds northwest of the treatment building. The poles were moved into the treatment building by rail and then hoisted into one of two empty dip tanks. The poles were strapped in place to prevent the logs from floating during treatment. The dip tank would then be filled with a pentachlorophenol mixture, which would come from one or both of the two 2,000 gallon above ground storage tanks (AST) by gravity flow. The poles were usually submerged in the treatment solution for 24 hours. Wood was treated using a pentachlorophenol (PCP) solution consisting of approximately one part PCP, to eleven parts fuel oil. Unused treatment solution would be pumped back into one of the storage tanks for pentachlorophenol /fuel oil mixtures between treatment batches.

After treatment, the poles were hoisted from the dip tanks and allowed to drip back into the dip tank for a period of time. The poles were then moved by rail to the drip pad, located on the southeast end of the building. The poles would remain in this uncovered area for another 24 hours. Finally, the poles were moved to one of the designated "treated material storage areas." These areas were located around the outside of the treatment building and also along the southwest side of the service road serving the treatment plant and storage buildings.

In 1983 the PCP treatment process was discontinued. From 1983 until 1991, the treatment plant was operated as a pressure treatment process using chromated copper arsenate (CCA)solution. The CCA solution used at Camp Georgetown was comprised of 23.75% chromic acid, 17% arsenic pentoxide, 9.25% cupric oxide, and 50% water. Unlike the dipping process employed for PCP, this process involved placement the wood in a pressurized vessel for treatment.

3.2: Remedial History

In 1999, the NYSDEC listed the site as a Class 2 site in the Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites in New York. A Class 2 site is a site where hazardous waste presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment and action is required. This listing was based on the past use of PCP at the site.

The Camp Georgetown site is one of three NYSDCS facilities in the State currently under investigation by the NYSDEC due to former wood treatment operations. Each of the three sites is an active incarceration facility operated by the NYSDCS, and located on property under the jurisdiction of the NYSDEC. The NYSDCS provided the funding for building construction at the Camps and provides for the maintenance and security. The NYSDEC provides the work programs, technical forestry staff to supervise work, and tools and equipment required to carry out the work. The wood treatment programs were developed to provide lumber and round poles for NYSDEC construction and maintenance projects. The pole treatment plants, however, are no longer in operation. Wood treatment at Camp Georgetown was discontinued in 1991.

In October of 1997 the NYSDEC Division of Operations requested that the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER) perform an environmental investigation at Camp Georgetown.

The DER completed a Preliminary Investigation (PI) at Camp Georgetown in 1999. The PI consisted of the excavation of 22 test pits, the installation and sampling of 8 monitoring wells and the collection of 26 surface soil, and 22 subsurface soil samples. The investigation found PCP in the soil directly below the treatment building and the area extending to the west of the building. The soil under the building was also tested for dioxin, a common impurity in PCP, which was found to be above cleanup criteria. Based on these findings, in December of 1999, the NYSDEC listed the Camp Georgetown site on the State's Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites. The site, consisting of the property on the south side of Crumb Hill road, was designated a Class 2 site, which is defined as a site which " presents a significant threat to the public health or the environment."

In 2001, the NYSDEC initiated a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Camp Georgetown site. The RI was developed to build on the information generated during the PI and to help fully delineate the extent of contamination at the site.

SECTION 4: SITE CONTAMINATION

A remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) has been conducted to evaluate the alternatives for addressing the significant threats to human health and/or the environment.

4.1: Summary of the Remedial Investigation

The purpose of the RI was to define the nature and extent of any contamination resulting from previous activities at the site. The RI was conducted between October, 2001 and November 2002. The field activities and findings of the investigation are described in the RI report.

The following activities were conducted during the RI:

- Research of historical information, including review of the Preliminary Investigation Report;
- Ground penetrating radar survey to assist in locating buried metal debris, including possible drums;
- Excavation of 24 test pits to assess shallow geologic conditions and collect subsurface soil samples;
- Collection of 2 soil samples within a seep area;

- Collection of surface soil samples (from 0 to 2 inches below the ground surface) from 54 locations;
- Installation of 20 soil borings and 11 new monitoring wells for analysis of soils and grounwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions;
- Sampling of 19 new and existing monitoring wells;
- A survey of public and private water supply wells in the area around the site;
- Collection of 4 aquatic sediment samples, and ;
- Collection of fish samples from Mann Brook.

To determine whether the soil, sediment, biota, and groundwater contain contamination at levels of concern, data from the investigation were compared to the following SCGs:

- Groundwater, drinking water, and surface water SCGs are based on NYSDEC "Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidace Values" and Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code. *Division of Water Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (TOGS 1.1.1) was used for screening groundwater. The groundwater standard for total phenolic compounds listed in TOGS 1.1.1 is 1.0 part per billion (ppb). Because PCP is the only phenolic compound detected in the groundwater at the site, an SCG of 1.0 ppb has been used. Finally, 6NYCRR Part 700-705 lists a groundwater standard of 0.0007 parts per trillion (ppt) for 2,3,7,8-TCDD. This value has been adopted as the groundwater SCG, with the other forms of dioxins and furans normalized to 2,3,7,8-TCDD using the USEPA's toxicity equivalence factors (TEFs).
- Soil SCGs are based on the NYSDEC "Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum (TAGM) 4046; Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels". For dioxins/furans a cleanup level of 1 ppb 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence has been selected as the soil cleanup objective.
- the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document.
- NYSDEC Technical Report 87-3, *The Niagara River Biota Contamination Project: Fish Flesh Criteria for Piscivorous Wildlife*, July 1987.

Based on the RI results, in comparison to the SCGs and potential public health and environmental exposure routes, certain media and areas of the site require remediation. These are summarized below. More complete information can be found in the RI report.

4.1.1: Site Geology and Hydrogeology

The overburden geology was investigated during the test pit and monitoring well investigations. The top foot of overburden consists of weathered, broken gray shale (i.e., soil and unconsolidated rock fragments) that range in size from gravel to boulders mixed with grey silt and sand or brown sandy topsoil, considered to be non-native fill material most likely originating from a shale quarry located northwest of the site. Underlying the fill material is glacial lodgment till consisting of a silty till with thin sand lenses overlying a clay till with thin sand lenses. Both till layers are very dense and vary in color across the site from grey, tan and brown. Glacial till was observed to a depth of approximately 46 feet bgs (which is the maximum depth of drilling during monitoring well installation during PI activities). Overall

thickness of the till was reported to be in excess of 150 feet during the installation of the water supply well, which is approximately 200 feet total depth. The till is very dense as evidenced by high blow counts and difficult drilling conditions. Observations during drilling confirm that the upper 15 feet of the till unit contains numerous thin lenses of more permeable sands and fine gravel that may or may not be interconnected.

Depth to groundwater across the site ranged between 2 to 5 feet bgs during the groundwater sampling events. Gauging data indicates that groundwater flow appears to be in a southwesterly direction, generally following topography and eventually discharging into Mann Brook.
Recharge of the water table is likely provided by precipitation infiltrating areas of the site. Shallow groundwater accumulates in the more permeable sandy lenses found within the till and then appears to disperse slowly into the regional groundwater flow regime. Groundwater recovery rates witnessed during well development and purging activities indicated that the hydraulic conductivity for the till unit is very low.

4.1.2: Nature of Contamination

As described in the RI report, many soil and groundwater samples were collected to characterize the nature and extent of contamination. As summarized in Table 1, the main categories of contaminants that exceed their SCGs are pentachlorophenol (PCP), dioxins/furans, fuel oil, and metals.

PCP is a manufactured chemical (i.e. not naturally occurring) which is a restricted use pesticide and is used industrially as a wood preservative for utility poles, railroad ties, fence posts, and wharf pilings. PCP was used at the Camp Georgetown site in the treatment of wood using a mixture of PCP and fuel oil. The fuel oil was used to dissolve the PCP into solution for a dipping process.

The primary fuel oil constituents of concern at this site are a subset of semi-volatile compounds (SVOCs), known as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

PCP and dioxins/furans have low water solubility and a strong tendency to adhere to soil or sediment particles in the environment. PAHs are also expected to be adsorbed to soil with limited potential for leaching. Therefore, their mobility in the environment is mainly limited to physical (erosional and depositional) mechanisms. Furthermore, PCP breaks down rapidly when exposed to sunlight and is less likely to be present in exposed surface soils.

CCA is a preservative used at Camp Georgetown subsequent to the PCP operations which was the source of the inorganic contamination identified at the site consisting of chromium, copper, and arsenic.

4.1.3: Extent of Contamination

This section describes the findings of the investigation for all environmental media that were investigated.

As discussed in Section 3.2, a Preliminary Investigation (PI) was conducted to assess the conditions at the site and determine if additional investigation was warranted. The PI included soil sampling, both shallow and subsurface, installation of 8 monitoring wells, and collection of 8 groundwater samples. Discussions that follow this section include the data generated during both the PI and the RI.

Much of the soil sample data from the PI presented below is from immunoassay testing, as noted. Immunoassay testing is a screening procedure that allows for efficient and cost effective analysis of the sample for a specific compound, in this case pentachlorophenol. A percentage of the samples collected were split, with one half undergoing the immunoassay testing, the other half sent to a contract laboratory for verification that the immunoassay tests were

producing reliable results and therefore usable data. All immunoassay testing was found to be reliable based on this verification method.

Chemical concentrations are reported in parts per billion (ppb) for water, and parts per million (ppm) for soil and sediment. For comparison purposes, where applicable, SCGs are provided for each medium.

Table 1 summarizes the degree of contamination for the contaminants of concern in surface soil, subsurface soil, sediment, groundwater, and biota and compares the data with the SCGs for the site. The following are the media which were investigated and a summary of the findings of the investigation.

Surface Soil

A total of 88 surface soil samples were collected during the PI and RI from approximately 0 to 2 inches below ground surface (bgs). Seventy-four (74) surface soil samples out of 88 were analyzed for PCP only (PI immunoassay results) or total SVOCs. PCP was the only SVOC detected above a TAGM 4046 guidance value (1.0 ppm) in all surface soil samples sent for laboratory analysis. The PCP guidance value was exceeded in 8 surface soil sample locations The concentrations ranged from 1 ppm to 130 ppm.

PCP was also detected (estimated values) in several additional surface soil samples in the drip pad area, the former AST area, and the area southwest of the former treatment building at levels well below the TAGM 4046 guidance value. PCP was not detected in any of the other surface soils collected from across the site. One potential explanation for the relatively low concentrations of PCP in surface soils is that PCP will readily breakdown by photochemical processes when exposed to the ultraviolet radiation in sunlight.

The highest concentrations of total SVOCs (5.048 ppm) were observed in surface soil sample SS-19. This sample was collected from an apparent drainage area southwest of the former Post Peeler building.

39 of the 88 surface soil samples were also sent for analysis of dioxins. Dioxins and furans were detected at low concentrations in all the samples; only two samples (SS-5 and SS-8) contained 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence above the 1.0 ppb guidance value. Slightly exceeding the PCP guidance value of 1.0 ppm at concentrations of 1.09 ppm and 1.16 ppm, respectively, these samples were collected from the former drip pad area.

A total of 40 of the 88 surface soil samples that were collected from "on site" locations were sent to the laboratory for analysis of metals. Additionally, 10 samples were collected from "background" areas (areas where former treatment operations did not appear to have existed). Of the three metals of concern (chromium, copper, arsenic), 1 out of 40 surface soil samples across the site exhibited chromium concentrations above background levels; 2 out of 40 surface soil samples analyzed for metals showed copper at concentrations above background; and 27 out of 40 soil samples analyzed for metals possessed arsenic above the average background concentrations.

Two (2) soil samples (SEEP-1 and SEEP-2) were collected from a seep that was located near the end of the south footer drain (downgradient) of the former treatment building. Both samples were sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in SEEP-1. No PCP was detected in SEEP-2. The two seep samples were also analyzed for dioxins. These results are also included in Table 1. SEEP-1 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 3.29 ppb, while sample SEEP-2 possessed a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence of 2.18 ppb. Both of these values were above the site screening level of 1.0 ppb.

Subsurface Soil

Subsurface soil samples were collected from both soil borings and test pits conducted at the site. Results from the soil boring samples are discussed first, followed by the results for the samples collected from the test pits.

A total of 68 soil samples were collected from 34 soil borings across the site during the PI and RI.

The 68 samples were analyzed for SVOCs, 34 of 68 samples were analyzed for dioxins and 11 of 68 samples were analyzed for metals.

PCP was detected in 10 samples above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value, located under the former treatment building. The samples were collected from 1-6 feet bgs. PCP was also detected in GSB02-1 (2-4' bgs), GSB02–3 (2-4', 6-8' and 8-10' bgs), GSB02-4 (6-8' bgs) and GSB02-8 (1-2' and 7-8' bgs) above 1.0 ppm in the area immediately surrounding the former treatment plant, including the former drip pad area, and former AST area.

Forty-seven (47) samples were collected from test pits installed during the PI and the RI. These results are summarized on Table 1. Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppm TAGM 4046 guidance value in 7 test pits, 3 located near the former treatment building, 2 located southwest of the former treatment plant within a grid of surface soil samples collected during the PI, and 2 located west of Drying Shed #1. These samples were collected during the PI and are based on immunoassay results.

While several SVOCs were detected in samples collected from the test pits during the RI, none exceeded TAGM 4046 guidance values.

Dioxins were analyzed in 20 of the 47 samples collected, however, no sample exceeded the 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration guidance of 1 ppb.

Sediments

Four (4) sediment samples were collected from Mann Brook and sent for analysis of SVOCs and dioxins. The analytical results are summarized in Table 1.

No PCP or any other SVOCs were detected above the NYSDEC "Technical Guidance for Screening Contaminated Sediments" guidance document in any of the four sediment samples collected .

Several dioxin and furan congeners were detected in each sample, however, the total 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations were well below the SCGs.

Groundwater

Groundwater samples were collected in three separate sampling events. Samples were collected in 1998 during the PI as well as during the RI in November 2001 and December 2002. Additional monitoring wells were installed after each round of sampling, as needed based on the evaluation of the data. A total of 8 wells were sampled during the PI, 17 wells during the first round of the RI, and 19 wells during the final round of the RI. The NYSDEC potable water supply well located east of the treatment building was also sampled during the PI.

PI Groundwater Results

Samples were collected from MW-1 through MW-8 and were analyzed for SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals and dioxins. Analytical results were below SCGs except for PCP, metals, and dioxin.

Pentachlorophenol was detected in 5 of 8 monitoring wells above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value ranging from 30ppb to 1700 ppb during the PI sampling event.

Dioxins were also detected above the 0.0007 ppt 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence guidance value in all

wells (except MW-7) during the PI sampling event.

Chromium was the only metal related to wood treatment activities detected above TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Chromium concentrations above guidance values were detected in 4 wells. Copper was detected in every well, however, it didn't exceed the 0.2 ppb guidance value in any sample analyzed. Arsenic was detected in only one well at concentrations below guidance values.

No SVOCs, VOCs, pesticides/PCBs, metals or dioxins were detected in the NYSDEC potable water supply well above SCGs.

RI Groundwater Results 2001

A second round of groundwater samples were collected in December 2001as part of the RI. The 8 wells that were installed during the PI were analyzed for fuel oil, SVOCs and dioxins. Nine newly installed wells were analyzed for pesticides/PCBs, VOCs and SVOCs. The new wells were not analyzed for dioxins during this sampling event.

Fuel components, including diesel fuel, were not detected in any of the eight previously installed monitoring wells that were sampled.

PCP was detected above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values for water in 5 monitoring wells ranging from 44 ppb to 160 ppb.

Concentrations of dioxins were found in five of the wells sampled. However only three wells exhibited a 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentration over the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. These wells are located radially around the former drip pad area and were identified to have dioxins from the PI. Note all water dioxin results are reported in parts per trillion (ppt). Concentrations ranged from 0.000009 ppt to 1.6694 ppt .

The PCB aroclor 1254 was found in three of the nine wells sampled. Concentrations of Aroclor 1254 in MW-9 (15 ppb), MW-12 (1.7 ppb), and MW-15 (2.7 ppb) were above NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 guidance values. Aroclor 1254 concentrations were randomly distributed near the outer perimeter of the Site; MW-9 is north and upgradient, MW-12 is located downgradient to the southeast, and MW-15 is downgradient to the southwest. PCBs are not known to be a site-related contaminant of concern. No pesticides were detected in any of the monitoring wells sampled.

RI Groundwater Results 2002

A third round of groundwater samples were collected in November 2002. Unfiltered samples were collected from 19 wells for analysis of SVOCs, fuel oil, dioxins and pesticides/PCBs. Six (6) of the 19 wells were filtered and analyzed for the same parameters in an attempt to determine if high turbidity in groundwater was a contributing factor in elevated concentrations of contaminants. Groundwater from MW-5, MW-9, MW-12, MW-15, MW-18 and MW-19 was filtered via a 0.45 micron in-line filter.

No PCBs were detected in any of the monitoring wells. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected above the TOGS 1.1.1 0.6 ppb guidance value in all samples collected except MW-15 (filtered). Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is believed to be a laboratory artifact.

Pentachlorophenol was detected above the 1.0 ppb TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value in MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-5 filtered, MW-6, MW-7 and MW-11. Concentrations ranged from 1 ppb to 370 ppb .

Fuel oil components (e.g. diesel range compounds) were detected in MW-4, MW-6 and MW-7.

Groundwater samples collected from MW-4, MW-7 and MW-8 exhibited 2.3.7,8-TCDD

equivalence concentrations above the 0.0007 ppt TOGS 1.1.1 guidance value. Concentrations ranged from 0.0009 ppt in MW-8 to 0.0215 ppt in MW-4.

Groundwater results from all three rounds of sampling are summarized on Table 1 and Figure 3.

Biota (Fish)

A total of 22 fish samples were collected from upstream and downstream locations within Mann Brook, located west and hydraulically down gradient of the site. Fish samples were collected by electroshock sampling methods and were submitted for laboratory analysis of dioxins. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Eleven of the fish samples were collected upstream of the site. Another eleven samples were collected downstream of the site.

2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalence concentrations are reported as wet weight concentrations in parts per trillion (ppt) and ranged from below detection limits (BDL) to 0.12 ppt, all below the SCG of 2.3 ppt.

Summary

Evaluation of the analytical data generated during the PI and RI resulted in the identification of several areas of concern with soil and localized groundwater contamination exceeding the SCGs. As shown on Figure 4, those areas include:

- Entire area beneath the former treatment building and immediately to the south of the building;
- The area of the former above ground storage tanks;
- The area across the access road to the south west of the former treatment building, and;
- An area across the access road to the north west of the former treatment building associated with a staging area for the drying of treated logs.

4.2: Interim Remedial Measures

An interim remedial measure (IRM) is conducted at a site when a source of contamination or exposure pathway can be effectively addressed before completion of the RI/FS.

There were no IRMs performed at this site during the RI/FS.

4.3: Summary of Human Exposure Pathways:

This section describes the types of human exposures that may present added health risks to persons at or around the site. A more detailed discussion of the human exposure pathways can be found in Section 3.3 of the RI report.

An exposure pathway describes the means by which an individual may be exposed to contaminants originating from a site. An exposure pathway has five elements: [1] a contaminant source, [2] contaminant release and transport mechanisms, [3] a point of exposure, [4] a route of exposure, and [5] a receptor population.

The source of contamination is the location where contaminants were released to the environment (any waste disposal area or point of discharge). Contaminant release and transport mechanisms carry contaminants from the source to a point where people may be exposed. The exposure point is a location where actual or potential human contact with a contaminated medium may occur. The route of exposure is the manner in which a contaminant actually enters or contacts the body (e.g., ingestion, inhalation, or direct contact). The receptor population is the people who are, or may be, exposed to contaminants at a point of exposure.

An exposure pathway is complete when all five elements of an exposure pathway exist. An exposure pathway is considered a potential pathway when one or more of the elements currently does not exist, but could in the future.

There are no complete exposure pathways currently at the site. Potential pathways include:

- Direct contact with contaminated surficial soils in the former drip pad area and seepage areas of footer drains of the former treatment building. There is currently an institutional control, in the form of fencing, which serves to alert personnel to avoid impacted areas. Inmate access of these portions of the site has been restricted since the Preliminary Investigation.

- Direct contact with contaminated subsurface soils by construction or utility workers in the future.

- Ingestion of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater in the immediate area of the former treatment building is a potential future pathway should a well be installed.

4.4: Summary of Environmental Impacts

This section summarizes the existing and potential future environmental impacts presented by the site. Environmental impacts include existing and potential future exposure pathways to fish and wildlife receptors, as well as damage to natural resources such as aquifers and wetlands.

The Fish and Wildlife Impact Analysis, which is included in the RI report, presents a detailed discussion of the existing and potential impacts from the site to fish and wildlife receptors. The following potential environmental exposure pathways and ecological risks have been identified:

- Terrestrial animal contact with chemicals present in the surface soil, groundwater (at seep areas);

- Ingestion of chemicals from surface soil, groundwater and food sources, and;

- Direct uptake of chemicals in soil or groundwater by terrestrial and aquatic plants

Samples of the creek sediments and biota in Mann Brook, which receives drainage from the site, did not contain elevated levels of any site related contaminants, therefore a completed exposure pathway to fish and wildlife receptors within the streamwas not identified.

SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF THE REMEDIATION GOALS

Goals for the remedial program have been established through the remedy selection process stated in 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.10. At a minimum, the remedy selected must eliminate or mitigate all significant threats to public health and/or the environment presented by the hazardous waste disposed at the site through the proper application of scientific and engineering principles.

The remediation goals for this site are to eliminate or reduce to the extent practicable:

- exposures of persons at or around the site to PCP, dioxins/furans and metals in soil and groundwater;

- environmental exposures of flora or fauna to PCP, dioxins, and metals in surface soil and groundwater;

- erosional transport of contaminated soil;

- the release of contaminants from soil into groundwater that may create exceedances of groundwater quality standards; and

Further, the remediation goals for the site include attaining to the extent practicable:

- ambient groundwater quality standards , and ;
- compliance with all applicable SCGs and cleanup goals.

SECTION 6: SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The selected remedy must be protective of human health and the environment, be cost-effective, comply with other statutory requirements, and utilize permanent solutions, alternative technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Potential remedial alternatives for the Camp Georgetown Site were identified, screened and evaluated in the FS report which is available at the document repositories identified in Section 1.

A summary of the remedial alternatives that were considered for this site are discussed below. The present worth represents the amount of money invested in the current year that would be sufficient to cover all present and future costs associated with the alternative. This enables the costs of remedial alternatives to be compared on a common basis. As a convention, a time frame of 30 years is used to evaluate present worth costs for alternatives with an indefinite duration. This does not imply that operation, maintenance, or monitoring would cease after 30 years if remediation goals are not achieved.

6.1: Description of Remedial Alternatives

The following potential remedies were considered to address the contaminated soil and groundwater at the site. The alternatives below are numbered sequentially for simplicity and do not necessarily correspond to the numbering system in the FS.

Alternative 1: No Action

Present Worth: *$714,000*
Capital Cost: *$0*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$55,000*

The No Action Alternative is evaluated as a procedural requirement and as a basis for comparison. It requires continued monitoring only, allowing the site to remain in an unremediated state. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Alternative 2: Excavation and Off-site Disposal

Present Worth: *$13,125,000*
Capital Cost: *$12,701,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-5: *$28,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacted soil would be addressed by excavation and off site disposal. The areas of concern delineated in Figure 4 would be excavated using conventional methods and equipment. The treatment building would be demolished as part of remedial activities.

The estimated removal volume would be 6,270 cubic yards of soil, measured in place. A 20% bulking factor yields roughly 7,530 cubic yards of soil that would be managed. Additionally, stabilization of saturated soils would be necessary (estimated 30% by volume), which would require approximately 1,520 cubic yards of ash or similar product. The slab under the former treatment building would be removed and crushed as part of this remedial alternative. The slab would produce roughly 180 cubic yards of waste that would require disposal. Consequently, the total volume requiring disposal would be approximately 9,230 cubic yards. Excavated soils would be transported

to a permitted hazardous waste landfill and may require treatment prior to disposal due to the presence of dioxin.

Since the water table at the site is typically at 2 to 5 feet bgs, excavation operations would require dewatering. Groundwater would be containerized as needed and transported for off site disposal.

Alternative 3A: – Modified Part 360 Multi Layered Synthetic Cap

Present Worth: *$2,287,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,845,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a modified 6NYCRR Part 360 cap across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern (shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material. The treatment building would be demolished and disposed off site as part of remedial activities, The modified Part 360 cap would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and prevent rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. The cap would consist of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion and infiltration of precipitation;
- Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of porous material (sand) that enhances lateral drainage of any precipitation that infiltrates through the vegetative layer; the vegetative and drainage layers help protect the underlying barrier layers from the environmental stresses of wetting/drying and freezing/thawing;
- Synthetic Barrier – low permeability membrane (at least 20 mil thickness) that represents the final impedance to precipitation infiltration;
- Subgrade Layer – approximately 12 inches of sand or other porous material that serves as the foundation for the cap. A gas collection system is not incorporated into the cost estimate for this alternative.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring, including groundwater sampling, would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative would be expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted.

Alternative 3B: – Low Permeability Cover System (LPCS)

Present Worth: *$2.330,000*
Capital Cost: *$1,888,000*
Annual OM&M:
Years 1-30: *$29,000*

In this containment alternative, the PCP and dioxin impacts would be addressed by installing a LPCS across the primary area of concern in the vicinity of the former treatment building (shown as area A on Figure 5) and above ground storage tanks. All other areas of concern (shown as areas B through G on Figure 5) would be excavated and placed beneath the cap, with the excavations backfilled with clean material The LPCS would eliminate the potential for direct contact with impacted media and greatly reduce rainwater infiltration into the area of concern. A LPCS typically consists of the following layers:

- Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion;

- Low Permeability Layer – approximately 12 inches of compacted clay to reduce infiltration into the impacted media.

All future site development would account for the capping requirements of the site in their design. Monitoring would continue for at least 30 years. Institutional controls would be implemented to limit site access and usage.

Design and construction of this alternative is expected to take 12-24 months. For cost estimating purposes, a 30 year post-remedial operational, maintenance and monitoring period has been adopted and a clay LPCS has been assumed.

6.2 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

The criteria to which potential remedial alternatives are compared are defined in 6 NYCRR Part 375, which governs the remediation of inactive hazardous waste disposal sites in New York State. A detailed discussion of the evaluation criteria and comparative analysis is included in the FS report.

The first two evaluation criteria are termed "threshold criteria" and must be satisfied in order for an alternative to be considered for selection.

1. Protection of Human Health and the Environment. This criterion is an overall evaluation of each alternative's ability to protect public health and the environment.

2. Compliance with New York State Standards, Criteria, and Guidance (SCGs). Compliance with SCGs addresses whether a remedy will meet environmental laws, regulations, and other standards and criteria. In addition, this criterion includes the consideration of guidance which the NYSDEC has determined to be applicable on a case-specific basis.

The next five "primary balancing criteria" are used to compare the positive and negative aspects of each of the remedial strategies.

3. Short-term Effectiveness. The potential short-term adverse impacts of the remedial action upon the community, the workers, and the environment during the construction and/or implementation are evaluated. The length of time needed to achieve the remedial objectives is also estimated and compared against the other alternatives.

4. Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence. This criterion evaluates the long-term effectiveness of the remedial alternatives after implementation. If wastes or treated residuals remain on-site after the selected remedy has been implemented, the following items are evaluated: 1) the magnitude of the remaining risks, 2) the adequacy of the engineering and/or institutional controls intended to limit the risk, and 3) the reliability of these controls.

5. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume. Preference is given to alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of the wastes at the site.

6. Implementability. The technical and administrative feasibility of implementing each alternative are evaluated. Technical feasibility includes the difficulties associated with the construction of the remedy and the ability to monitor its effectiveness. For administrative feasibility, the availability of the necessary personnel and materials is evaluated along with potential difficulties in obtaining specific operating approvals, access for construction, institutional controls, and so forth.

7. Cost-Effectivness. Capital costs and operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs are estimated for each alternative and compared on a present worth basis. Although cost-effectiveness is the last balancing criterion evaluated, where two or more alternatives have met the requirements of the other criteria, it can be used as the basis for the

final decision. The costs for each alternative are presented in Table 2.

This final criterion is considered a "modifying criterion" and is taken into account after evaluating those above. It is evaluated after public comments on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan have been received.

8. Community Acceptance - Concerns of the community regarding the RI/FS reports and the PRAP are evaluated. A responsiveness summary will be prepared that describes public comments received and the manner in which the NYSDEC will address the concerns raised. If the selected remedy differs significantly from the proposed remedy, notices to the public will be issued describing the differences and reasons for the changes.

SECTION 7: SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED REMEDY

The NYSDEC is proposing Alternative 3A, Multi layer geomembrane cap as the remedy for this site, as shown in Figure 5. The elements of this remedy are described at the end of this section. The proposed remedy is based on the results of the PI, RI and the evaluation of alternatives presented in the FS.

Alternative 3A is being proposed because, as described below, it would satisfy the threshold criteria and provides the best balance of the primary balancing criteria described in Section 6.2. It would achieve the remediation goals for the site by effectively preventing direct contact or potential ingestion of contaminated soil (the potential human health pathways) and erosion or infiltration (the primary mechanisms for contaminant migration).

Because Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B all satisfy the threshold criteria, the five balancing criteria are particularly important in selecting a final remedy for the site.

Alternatives 2, 3A and 3B would all have short-term impacts. The impacts associated with construction would be more significant with Alternative 2 which requires significanlty more excavation and handling of the contaminated media. Alternatives 3A and 3B, which leave the contaminated media in place, would have considerably fewer short-term impacts. The containment alternatives could be implemented without special handling requirements or transport of contaminated media.

Achieving long-term effectiveness would best be accomplished by Alternative 2, which would result in a pre-disposal scenario by removing the contaminated media for offsite disposal. Alternatives 3A and 3B, though contingent on long-term monitoring, would be effective in the long term as contamination would be contained, eliminating the potential for contaminant migration. Each of these alternatives would reduce or eliminate the potential for human and environmental exposure to contaminated soil.

Alternative 2 would require a great deal of coordination. The contamination identified at this site would require disposal as hazardous waste and, depending on the contaminant concentration, pre-treatment may be required. This alternative would require a predesign sampling program to quantify which material would be disposed as hazardous waste, which material would require pre-treatment (e.g. incineration), and which material could be disposed as non-hazardous waste.

Alternative 3A could be implemented using standard construction techniques. Alternative 3B would be the least complicated of these alternatives to implement. Placement of the soil cover system could be completed using standard construction techniques and system design would be straightforward.

Alternative 2 would greatly reduce the mobility, toxicity and volume of contaminants. Alternatives 3A and 3B would not reduce the toxicity and volume of contaminants, but would greatly reduce the mobility of contaminants.

The cost of the alternatives varies significantly. Although Alternative 2 results in greater reduction in toxicity, mobility and volume of contaminated soils,Alternative 3A and Alternative 3B would be more readily implemented and at significantly less costs.

Because each of these alternatives can achieve the remedial goals, the implementation and cost criteria weigh heavily in this evaluation. Alternative 2 is permanent remedy.. This alternative is the most costly of the alternatives evaluated. Alternatives 3A and 3B, coupled with monitoring, present similar protectiveness at much lower cost with fewer short term impacts during construction.

The primary purpose of a cap would be to eliminate the potential for exposure to surface and subsurface soils, eliminate erosional transport of contaminated soils, and prevent the infiltration of precipitation. Of the containment options, Alternative 3A would be only slightly more complex to construct, but at a lower cost. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Alternative 3A is the NYSDEC's preferred remedial alternative.

The estimated present worth cost to implement the remedy is $2,287,000. The cost to construct the remedy is estimated to be $1,845,000 and the estimated average annual operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs for 30 years is $29,000 per year.

The elements of the proposed remedy are as follows:

1. A remedial design program would be implemented to provide the details necessary for the construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the remedial program.

2. Demolition and offsite disposal of the former treatment building its contents.

3. Excavation of areas B through G, consolidating the material onto area A for covering with the cap.

4. Placement of a multi layer geomembrane cap over area A including: (a) Vegetative Layer – approximately 6 inches of topsoil that serves to reduce erosion, (b) Frost Protection/Drainage Layer – approximately 24 inches of permeable soil (sand) to promote drainage and frost protection, and (c) Impermeable Geomembrane - a geosynthetic liner to serve as a impermeable containment barrier between the clean and contaminated materials.

5. This type of consolidation and containment remedy may be suitable to include similarly contaminated soil from the Camp Pharsalia site located approximately 15 miles from the site. Camp Pharsalia was also operated as a wood treatment facility by the NYSDEC on a smaller scale, resulting in an estimated 860 cubic yards of PCP and dioxin/furan contaminated soil. An in-place capping remedy utilizing a low permeability soil cover was selected for the site in March, 2003. Excavation and consolidation of the contaminated soils from Camp Pharsalia to the Camp Georgetown site would eliminate the need for long term monitoring and institutional controls at the Camp Pharsalia site, resulting in unrestricted future use of the property as well as significant cost savings. This option will be further explored during the remedial design for Camp Georgetown, including an evaluation of applicable laws to ensure compliance with current regulations.

6. The site would be restored by grading to insure proper drainage, placement of additonal topsoil as necessary, and seeding.

7. To address the identified groundwater contamination and since the remedy would result in untreated hazardous waste remaining at the site, a long term monitoring program would be instituted. Groundwater samples would be collected annually for a period of at least 30 years. This program would allow the effectiveness of the cap to be monitored and would be a component of the operation, maintenance, and monitoring for the site.

8. Development of a site management plan to: (a) maintain the capped area (mowing, erosion repairs, etc); (b) restrict use of shallow groundwater in the area subject to long term monitoring; and (c) prohibit redevelopment or use of the capped area.

9. The property owner would provide an annual certification, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or environmental professional acceptable to the Department, which would certify that the institutional controls and engineering controls put in place, are unchanged from the previous certification and nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment or constitute a violation or failure to comply with any operation an maintenance or soil management plan.

10. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that would: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan, (b) prohibit use and development of the capped area; (c) restrict use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water; and, (d) require the property owner to complete and submit to the NYSDEC an annual certification to insure compliance with the use restrictions.

TABLE 1
Nature and Extent of Contamination
May 1998 - November 2002

SURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND - 0.36	0.224	1 of 49
	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl)Phtalate	ND - 68	50	1 of 49
	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 130	1	8 of 76
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 0.003822	0.001	4 of 46
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	5 - 104	7.5	30 of 50
	Chromium	7.8-171	50	1 of 50
	Copper	7.4-59.5	25	1 of 50

SUBSURFACE SOIL	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppm)[a]	SCG[b] (ppm)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Pentachlorophenol	1.1 - 123	1	24 of 116
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - .0024951	.001	1 of 49
Inorganic Compounds	Arsenic	8.4 - 33	7.5	8 of 21
	Chromium	7.4 - 68.1	50	1 of 21
	Copper	ND - 32.4	25	3 of 21

Table 1 (Con't.)

GROUNDWATER	Contaminants of Concern	Concentration Range Detected (ppb)[a]	SCG[b] (ppb)[a]	Frequency of Exceeding SCG
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)	Pentachlorophenol	ND - 1700	1	16 of 44
	Fuel Oil Compounds	ND-820	NA[c]	3 of 10
PCB/Pesticides	Aroclor 1254	ND - 15	0.009	3 of 9
Dioxins/Furans	2,3,7,8 - TCDD TEF	ND - 1.6694	0.0007	14 of 29
Inorganic Compounds	Chromium	24.5 - 155	50	4 of 7
	Lead	8 - 84.1	25	6 of 7

[a] ppb = parts per billion, which is equivalent to micrograms per liter, ug/L, in water;
ppm = parts per million, which is equivalent to milligrams per kilogram, mg/kg, in soil;
ug/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter

[b] SCG = standards, criteria, and guidance values; {list SCGs for each medium}

[c] Results compared to detection limit of 303 ppb

ND = Compound not detected

Table 2
Remedial Alternative Costs

Remedial Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual OM&M	Total Present Worth
No Action	$0	$55,000	$714,000
Excavation and Off-Site Disposal	$12,701,000	$28,000	$13,125,000
Modified Part 360 Multi Layer Cap	$1,845,000	$29,000	$2,287,000
Low Permeability Cover System	$1,888,000	$29,000	$2,330,000



Scale: 1:24,000

Reference:
DeLorme 3-D Topo Quads, 1999
Yarmouth, Me.
Datum WGS84

Shaw

NYSDEC

Figure 1
Site Location Map
Camp Georgetown

NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 ▲ SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE

FORMER ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS

EDGE VARIOUS DEBRIS

APPROXIMATE SCALE

0 100 200 300 FEET

REFERENCE:

BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 2
SAMPLE LOCATION AND SITE MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK


N
MW-9
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00006378 J | 0.0000023 J
MW-19
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NA | 0.000001834 J | 0.00000324 J
MW-10
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000045476 J
MW-1
PI | 2001 | 2002
BDL | BDL | BDL
0.00224 | BDL | BDL
MW-2
PI | 2001 | 2002
370 D | BDL | 1 J
0.00137 | BDL | 0.000017894 J
MW-18
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | NA | BDL | NA
NA | NA | 0.0000013 J | 0.00002609 J
MW-11
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | 540 D | 370
NA | NS | 0.00048059 J
MW-3
PI | 2001 | 2002
120 D | BDL | 1 J
0.01221 | BDL | 0.00034828
MW-12
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00000232 J | NS
MW-13
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000000978 J
MW-14
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | BDL
MW-5
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
1700 | 44 J | 41 | 27
0.00308 | 0.0000059 | 0.00000036 J | 0.0001988 J
MW-8
PI | 2001 | 2002
ND | BDL | BDL
0.00188 | 0.0008339 D | 0.00087987 J
MW-7
PI | 2001 | 2002
370 D | 160 | 13 J
0.00391 | 1.8994 JDCDN | 0.020656 J
MW-17
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00008063 J
MW-6
PI | 2001 | 2002
BDL | 920 D | 690
0.00017 | 0.001184 | 0.00028578 J
MW-4
PI | 2001 | 2002
30 | 85 | 130
0.00091 | 0.020725 | 0.0214887
MW-15
PI | 2001 | 2002(F) | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.000000064 J | 0.0000038 J
MW-16
PI | 2001 | 2002
NA | BDL | BDL
NA | NS | 0.00000147 J
NOTE:
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MOON ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.
LEGEND:
HISTORIC SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
MONITORING WELL
SEEP SAMPLES
WATER SUPPLY WELL
HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
SOIL BORING
SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
TEST PIT SAMPLES
HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
SEDIMENT SAMPLE
1 TREATMENT BUILDING
2 STORAGE SHED
3 DRYING SHED #1
4 DRYING SHED #2
5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
6 METEOROLOGY STATION
7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
DATE
PCP ug/L (ppb)
DIOXIN ng/L (ppt)
NA NOT AVAILABLE
BDL BELOW DETECTION LIMIT
NS NOT SAMPLED
PCP > 1.0 ug/L
DIOXIN > 0.0007 ng/L
NOTE: GROUNDWATER FLOW FOLLOWS TOPOGRAPHY AND FLOWS IN A SOUTHWEST DIRECTION.
Edge of Creek
SHOOTING RANGE
Top of Bank
Wet Area
Rivulet
Ledge
SEED 2
SEED 1
SEEP SAMPLE 1
SEEP SAMPLE 2
AREA GPR 1
AREA GPR 2
APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET
REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.
Shaw Environmental, Inc.
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
FIGURE 3
GROUNDWATER CONCENTRATION MAP
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK









REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY MODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 • SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 △ SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- IMPACTED AREA

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 4
IMPACTED AREA SUMMARY MAP

CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK



ENLARGEMENT OF THE AREA REQUIRING REMEDIATION

Volume Report Berm 01/28/2004 10:51
Comparing GRID file: C:/PROJECT/830271/EXB830271D81.GRD
and GRID file: C:/PROJECT/830271/BERM830271D81.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.08,11712.48 to 11755.08,12886.48
Grid resolution X: 4.32, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 646.9 S.F., 0.01 Acres
Area in Fill: 19,541.2 S.F., 0.45 Acres
Total inclusion area: 20,188.1 S.F., 0.46 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.00
Average Cut Depth: 0.17 Average Fill Depth: 1.82
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 8.76
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 2844.59
Cut volume: 109.7 C.F., 4.06 C.Y.
Fill volume: 35,595.1 C.F., 1,318.34 C.Y.

Volume Report Cell 01/28/2004 10:57
Comparing GRID file: C:/PROJECT/830271/MERG.GRD
and GRID file: C:/PROJECT/830271/DESIGN830271D81.GRD
Grid corner locations: 10891.08,11712.48 to 11755.08,12886.48
Grid resolution X: 4.32, Y: 4.87 Grid cell size X: 2.00, Y: 2.00
Area in Cut : 157.3 S.F., 0.00 Acres
Area in Fill: 32,528.6 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Total inclusion area: 32,685.9 S.F., 0.75 Acres
Cut to Fill ratio: 0.00
Average Cut Depth: 0.07 Average Fill Depth: 2.76
Cut (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 0.53
Fill (C.Y.) / Area (acres): 4428.60
Cut volume: 10.8 C.F., 0.40 C.Y.
Fill volume: 89,722.7 C.F., 3,323.06 C.Y.



NOTE:

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DATUMS ARE BASED ON A PREVIOUS SURVEY DONE BY WODI ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS, AND ARE ASSUMED.

LEGEND:

- WATER SUPPLY WELL
- HISTORIC SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- HISTORIC SOIL BORING
- SOIL BORING
- SURFACE SOIL SAMPLES
- MONITORING WELL
- SEEP SAMPLES
- BGM 1 — SURFACE SOIL BACKGROUND SAMPLES
- TEST PIT SAMPLES
- HISTORIC TEST PIT SAMPLES
- SED 1 — SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- 1 TREATMENT BUILDING
- 2 STORAGE SHED
- 3 DRYING SHED #1
- 4 DRYING SHED #2
- 5 POST PEELER AND ROLLWAYS
- 6 METEOROLOGY STATION
- 7 GARAGE / NYSDEC OFFICE
- PROPOSED AREAS OF EXCAVATION
- PROPOSED AREA OF CONCERN
- CONTAINMENT; PROPOSED LIMITS OF IMPACTED SOIL



TYPICAL MULTI LAYER GEOMEMBRANE CAP
"NOT TO SCALE"



TYPICAL LOW PERMEABILITY COVER SYSTEM
"NOT TO SCALE"

APPROXIMATE SCALE
0 100 200 300 FEET

REFERENCE:
BASE MAP SOURCE: SUSAN M. ANACKER
NY STATE LICENSE #50321.

Shaw
Shaw Environmental, Inc.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

FIGURE 5
EXCAVATION AND CONTAINMENT OF IMPACTED SOIL PRELIMINARY DESIGN
CAMP GEORGETOWN
MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK