

### NASJRB WILLOW GROVE RAB MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 15, 2000  
Meeting Time: 6:00 p.m.  
Meeting Place: Navy Conference Room, Building 1, NASJRB Willow Grove

Attendance:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
	Thomas Hibbs	RAB Member
	Eric Lindhult	RAB Member
	John C. Martin	RAB Member
	Jim Vetrini	RAB Member
	Kaye Maxwell-Martin	RAB Member
	Rich Peffall	RAB Member
	Dan McCaffrey	RAB Member
	Jack Dunleavy	RAB Member
	Elaine Hughes	Horsham Environmental Council
	Greg Van Hook	
	Sherrri R. Jones	NASJRB Willow Grove
	Jim Edmond	NASJRB Willow Grove
	CDR Gilbert Viera	NASJRB Willow Grove (Co-Chairperson)
	Major Marge McGlenn	ARS Willow Grove
	Charanjit Gill	ARS Willow Grove
	Col. Dana Marsh	ARS Willow Grove
	Hal Dusen	ARS Willow Grove
	Larry Bishop	Montgomery Watson
	James Colter	NORTHDIV
	Dan Goode	USGS
	Russ Turner	Tetra Tech Nus, Inc
	Carl Reitenbach	EA Engineering and Science
	April Flipse	PADEP
	Pamela Reigh	PADEP

Jim Edmond opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Mr. Edmond mentioned that in accordance with continuing efforts to enhance health, safety and environmental protection on the Air Station, the Navy is planning to design and construct a new building for storage and controlled distribution of hazardous/flammable materials. Items to be stored range from cleaning supplies to petroleum product oils and lubricants used in aircraft operation and maintenance. Generally, products with material safety data sheets (MSDSs) will be stored in the new building in segregated compartments. Construction is anticipated to begin in the August-September timeframe. Mr. Edmond also mentioned that the Navy is embarking on a two-year project to implement the international environmental standard, ISO 14001. ISO 14001 is commonly used in industry as a standard for firms doing business overseas. The program is becoming more prevalent in the States, but the Department of Defense (DoD) is just beginning to take an interest in the advantages of the standard.

As happened last year, the Air Station will host the Keystone State Dog Trials (June 2 through June 4) for sheepdog competitions. The public is also invited to attend the Air Show the Air Station will host the 16<sup>th</sup> through 18<sup>th</sup> of June. Both events will be advertised widely. Information is available on the world wide web at [NASJRB WillowGrove.navy.mil](http://NASJRBWillowGrove.navy.mil).

A final announcement was made that Elaine Hughes, RAB member and co-chairperson of the Horsham Environmental Board, is organizing a stream bank restoration project along Horsham Road near the Air Station. The group will be putting in grasses and shrubs to restore the stream bank and encourage biodiversity. Interested individuals can speak with Ms. Hughes to get involved.

Charanjit Gill introduced Larry Bishop, of Montgomery Watson, to summarize the status of design activities for the Air Force storm water retention basin. The 2.5 acre retention basin was constructed in 1957. The basin receives storm water runoff from about 95% of the Air Force Reserve property and about 5% of the Naval Air Station Property. The Air Force intends to remove about 1 to 1.5 feet of sediment that has accumulated over the years. As part of the remedial design for the basin, the Air Force wants to make the location less attractive for Canadian Geese to nest and reside by converting the basin to a dry basin.

Mr. Bishop advised the group that the basin has been investigated in a phased approach since about 1996 to characterize local and potential downstream impacts. A bird aircraft strike hazard (BASH) evaluation performed in 1997, and the sedimentation issue were the reasons for the Air Force to undertake the project. The BASH survey noted two vulture hits, two deer collisions, one red-tailed hawk strike, and one mallard collision.

A feasibility study was performed to address the sediments and BASH history. Five alternatives considered different criteria, such as the effect on local drainage, improvement of hydraulics, sediment removal and implementation of best management practices (BMPs). The Air Force wanted to improve the manual operation of the water level control sluice gate that had to be operated during rainstorms to avoid flooding.

In preparing the selected design for the "dry pond", the Air Force considered effects upstream and downstream on existing basins. Approximately 5,000 cubic yards of sediment will be disposed in an off-site Subtitle D (non-hazardous waste) landfill. The remaining land surface will be regraded into the "dry pond". Sediment sumps will be added to collect future sediment for easier collection and disposal. Lined drainage channels and a new weir will handle future storm water flows. The outfall structure will be improved to include a baffle to restrict discharge of floatable objects and any floating petroleum product, should a spill occur. Mr. Bishop mentioned that the Air Force hopes to initiate construction of the plan this Spring in March or April.

A RAB Member asked over what timeframe was the BASH survey? Mr. Bishop stated that the period was as long as the Air Station had been keeping animal strike records.

A RAB Member asked if this design isn't in conflict with what EPA is forcing others (developers) to do? It looks like you (the Air Force) is going to just run the storm water through without allowing for percolation like everyone else must do with basins. Mr. Bishop clarified that just the low flows will flow through the flumes without detention (to avoid stagnation). In the event of a big storm, the overflow will build up and attenuate in the pond, and percolate out like EPA requires.

A RAB Member expressed skepticism that there could be such a thing as a dry pond. It sounds like a contradiction in terms. Mr. Bishop mentioned that the required amount of percolation has been engineered into the design, for instance by the selection of permeable soil for construction of the basin. Mr. Edmond suggested thinking of the new storm water basin as a retention basin rather than as a "pond." Compared to the Navy's recreation pond, which also acts as a detention basin, the Air Force basin is strictly a detention basin. The Navy Pond has fish and a beaver. In the case of the Air Force detention pond, when a deluge of rain falls, the basin will fill up. The water will be gradually released within guidelines from the State or EPA. The Air Force is also collecting sediments, so that in some future time the government won't have to pay again to dispose of collected sediments.

A general discussion of storm water control, detention and percolation ensued. One of the issues agreed upon was that to avoid standing water in the area of the Air Force detention basin may discourage water fowl from nesting in this area so close to the aircraft taking off and landing.

Ms. Hughes suggested that someone from the Air Force should visit or speak with the consultants from the Heritage Conservancy when they begin the stream bank restoration to learn

about naturalized storm water basins using plants as living filters as advocated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Mr. Bishop replied that because of the limited space available, bioengineering processes are not an option, but will be looked into. A RAB Member agreed that something like a biological filter would certainly help the absorption process. But he also agreed that if the vegetation attracts nesting water fowl that can be a threat to human life because of the close proximity of the aircraft, then he certainly doesn't want to undermine human life.

Mr. Edmond mentioned that a tour of the area would have helped the RAB members picture this relatively industrialized zone better for greater understanding of the constraints the Air Force is dealing with.

Mr. Edmond introduced Jim Colter, the Navy remedial project manager, to provide a summary of work underway and future work planned on the Navy side. Mr. Colter informed the group that plans to proceed with the feasibility study (FS) for Site 5 - Fire training Area groundwater were premature. The EPA has concerns that must be addressed before the FS will be accepted. The effects of off-site pumping of groundwater from Horsham Township well number 26 (H-26) was not fully investigated. In addition, EPA requested that additional monitoring wells be considered to further define the limits of the known solvent groundwater plume originating in the area of the former fire training area. A shutdown test was performed on H-26 in January/February of this year. Results of the H-26 shutdown test will be available to discuss at the next RAB meeting. In addition, in the winter the Navy has been preparing to install three new monitoring wells and collect groundwater samples from the Site 5 area to refine the definition of conditions below the surface. This information will be used to finalize the FS, which has already been partially completed, and develop recommendations on how to remedy the situation at Site 5 groundwater.

The other thing the Navy did over the winter was prepare to address EPA concerns at Site 1 - Privet Road Compound Area. Rather than install costly new monitoring wells to further investigate groundwater quality upgradient of the Site 1 area, the Navy developed a plan to use the two existing Navy production well boreholes to investigate hydrogeologic conditions in the area. This work entails alternating shut down of each production well pump, removing the existing antiquated Navy well pump, performance of an eight-hour pump test, geophysical logging of each borehole, groundwater sampling of each water bearing zone using packer technology, and installation of a new production well pump. When the first production well is back on line, the Navy will move on to the second well. By mid May both Navy production wells will have been investigated and retrofitted with a new pump.

At the request of a RAB Questionnaire comment, Mr. Colter said that he would prepare a schedule of future planned activities. The schedule should be ready for the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Colter discussed continued operations of the oil recovery system at the Navy fuel farm, which has been in operation for about two years. A copy of the annual report of operations will be given to Liz Gemmill to be available to any interested RAB member. The report shows that the system recovered only about 46 gallons in 1999. The system may recover more oil if the following year is drier, but the system appears to be costly for the small amount of oil being removed from the environmental. Cost based decisions may be in order in the next year to consider other alternatives. For instance, a system of oxygen-releasing compounds, similar to what the Air Force is experimenting with, may be better.

A RAB Member suggested that the oil recovery system could be shut down during dry weather Mr. Colter replied that it was thought that continued pumping would artificially depress the water table and result in the oil running into the well. Either most of the oil has been removed or the system is not working as it should.

A RAB Member asked about the pulling of the Navy production well pumps, use of packer technology to obtaining samples near the Privet Road site, and the plan to obtain a sample off-strike, near the runway at Site 5. Considering the fractured structure, what is the likelihood of hitting those fractures, or how confident is the Navy that they can get data they can use? Would a long (like a 40 foot open case section) well screen be installed? Mr. Colter replied that the Navy will present a work plan to address the

concerns of EPA showing how the Navy plans to respond to the technical issues of data collection at each of the study areas. In any case, before packer zones are selected for sampling, and monitoring well construction specifications are set, USGS will obtain geophysical parameter testing and the results will be analyzed. Mr. Turner added that the hydrogeologist, Kevin Kilmartin, has prepared a discussion of the issues for EPA review. The Navy believes that after review of the geophysical logs, the major flow zones can be selected in the Navy production wells for packer studies. A long well screen (typically, 10 foot screens have been installed) is not anticipated to be needed in the new monitoring well to fill the data gap near the runway at Site 5.

A RAB Member asked if someone from the EPA was at the meeting? (no) "Is there any reason they have all of these concerns but they don't come to the meetings?" Mr. Colter replied that the EPA RPM has been at the last couple of meetings, but that she had a conflict of schedule at the last minute. The Navy has responded to most of the EPA concerns, and has prepared plans to proceed with field work now that the construction season is approaching. Significant progress at Site 5 should be possible over the next six to nine months moving into the feasibility study and possibly an interim remedial action decision. The Navy would like to see a remedy in place over the next 12 to 18 months.

Mr. Edmond made various announcements before a short break. The Navy nature trail is available for tours by community, scout, or school groups. If anyone is interested, call the public affairs officer, Ms. Sherri Jones, 443-1779, to set up a tour.

(A short recess ensued)

Jim Edmond announced that he had sent out 20 RAB Questionnaires and received 12 responses. A summary of the responses was handed out to RAB members. The group proceeded to discuss the items one by one.

- An overall restoration strategy and time line (schedule) will be prepared by the Navy and updated as plans develop.
- Attempts have been made to increase community involvement. For instance, when Jack Dunleavy (RAB member) was still with the Navy, he, Jim Edmond and Jim Colter knocked on doors and left handouts in mail boxes to ask people to attend the RAB meeting. In addition local environmental interest groups were contacted and now attend.

A RAB member suggested that he would like to be more a part of how something happens and once in a while have a more technical RAB meeting. He would like to be part of a technical subcommittee meeting that was actually more involved in the decision making process.

A general discussion of the topic ensued. Some RAB members would like to be invited to participate in technical subcommittee meetings, but others would not be interested. The Navy or Air Force will try to arrange a technical subcommittee meeting in the evening to gauge RAB interest.

- The Navy and Air Force have been trying to minimize unneeded military personnel and keep the meetings informal. Minimum military, civilian employees, and contractors must attend to be able to answer the concerns of the RAB.
- Effort will continue to be made to keep information in the simplest terms possible.
- Better commitment from community RAB members. This comment comes from the community. The Navy and Air Force appreciate the level of commitment shown by the group. A RAB member asked where are the doughnuts?
- Have fewer meetings and put them in a more informal place (e.g., school, library, or municipal building). Mr. Edmond mentioned that this was the original intent at the start of the RAB three and one half years ago, but nothing more convenient (with all of the required

audio/visual services) than Building 1 was found. If someone can arrange for a more convenient location for the community, the meeting place could be changed if the group agrees. The ability to do site tours is an advantage to remaining in Building 1.

- To hold to a minimum the mailing of unwanted documentation to RAB members, the Navy and Air Force will provide one or two copies of documents to be made available to the RAB to share among interested parties.
- RAB members would like to have a social type meeting to get to know one another better. It may be possible to have a picnic and tour the nature trail and see the Navy's recreational pond in the summer months.
- To promote community involvement in the decision making process is the reason the RAB exists.
- Opportunities to partner with the community are always being looked for.
- The RAB helps to monitor the environmental process on the Air Station.
- Involve the community RAB members in the decision process. Ask for agenda items. Participate in the Horsham Environmental Advisory Board Meetings.
- Continue providing status updates to RAB members.
- The RAB wants more updates on groundwater status.
- The RAB would like to have a historical presentation on previous and present RI efforts.
- How does this base (and RAB) compare to other DoD installations in the States? April Flipse mentioned that there are maybe two or three community RAB members at meetings at the former NAWC in Warminster now, but they are afternoon meetings. Mostly township officials attend. A RAB member mentioned that no one from the township attends the NASJRB Willow Grove RAB meetings. Jim Edmond replied that Elaine Hughes is a member of the Horsham Township Environmental Advisory Board.

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for June 7, 2000, at 6:00 p.m.

AGENDA FOR  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
FOR  
NAS JRB / ARS WILLOW GROVE  
15 March 2000

- 6:00-6:15      Welcome  
                  Community Member Agenda Items/Comments
- 6:15-6:40      Contaminated Sediment Removal Action at Air  
                  Force Site #3
- 6:40-7:00      Update on Navy Well Survey & Future Site  
                  Work
- 7:00-7:10      Break
- 7:10-7:45      Discussion on RAB questionnaire
- 7:45-8:00      a.) Questions & Comments  
                  b.) Set Date for Next RAB Meeting  
                  (7 June 00)  
                  c.) Meeting Adjourned