



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES ARMY GARRISON
4551 LLEWELLYN AVENUE
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755-5000

IMND-MEA-PWE

MEMORANDUM FOR: Restoration Advisory Board Members

SUBJECT: MINUTES FOR THE MAY 21, 2009 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

1. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on May 21, 2009, at 7:00 p.m. in the Fort Meade Directorate of Information Management (DOIM) conference room, Building 1978. The next RAB meeting will be **Thursday, July 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m. in the DOIM Conference Room.**

2. The following RAB members were present:

Mr. Mick Butler, Fort Meade Co-Chair
Mr. Robert Morton, Acting Community Co-Chair
Mr. Paul Fluck
Ms. Laurie Haines
Mr. Robert Stroud
Mr. David Tibbetts
Ms. Kerry Topovski

Members not present:

Mr. Blight Carter
Mr. Wayne Dixon
Mr. Ed Dosek
Mr. Howard Nicholson
Ms. Kathy Scott

Others present were:

Ms. Alice Brown-Colon	Fort Meade, Environmental Division
Mr. Emanuel Colon	Community Member
Mr. Steve Cardon	Fort Meade, Base Realignment and Closure Division
Mr. John Cherry	ARCADIS, Inc.
Mr. Markus Craig	Base Realignment and Closure Division
Mr. W. Brendan Daley	Fort Meade, Environmental Division
Ms. Lynn Davis	Fort Meade Public Affairs Office
Ms. Mary Doyle	Fort Meade Public Affairs Office
Mr. Jeff Dozier	Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Fort Meade
Mr. Butch Dye	Maryland Department of the Environment
Mr. Matt Fedowitz	Plexus Scientific, Inc.
Ms. Sarah Gettier	URS Corporation
Mr. Adam Gregory	Plexus Scientific, Inc.
Mr. Rick Grills	Maryland Department of the Environment

Mr. Burl Keller	U.S. Architect of the Capitol
Ms. Cathryn Kropp	U.S. Army Environmental Command
Mr. Tim Llewellyn	ARCADIS, Inc.
Ms. Kim McGeehan	Weston Solutions, Inc.
Mr. Jay Mehta	Kemron, Inc.
Mr. Brett Merkel	U.S. Army Environmental Command
Mr. Dan Sheehan	Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.
Mr. Eric Stahl	Weston Solutions, Inc.

3. Announcements and Minutes:

Mr. Robert Morton, the acting community co-chair, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Mr. Morton asked each individual present to introduce themselves.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to approve the March 26, 2009 minutes as presented.

4. Outstanding Items:

Mr. Mick Butler and Mr. Morton concurred there were no outstanding items.

5. Monitoring Wells 125d and 126d:

Mr. Dan Sheehan of Malcolm Pirnie introduced himself and advised he would be giving an update on the groundwater issues related to the monitoring wells 125d and 126d and the Odenton area.

Mr. Sheehan displayed an aerial photograph of the area and pointed out the location of the monitoring wells, Fort Meade, and the Closed Sanitary Landfill. He showed another graphic which displayed a one-mile radius around the two monitoring wells [MW 125d and MW 126d] where contamination had been detected. He explained the one-mile area is the survey area where properties have been identified and research is being conducted to determine if they are on private or public water. Mr. Sheehan advised notification letters had been sent to both property owners and tenants in this area.

Mr. Sheehan summarized the work being done and actions being taken to protect the community. He said the monitoring wells would be sampled twice. He stated a door-to-door survey is being done to identify locations of drinking water wells within the one-mile radius and those wells will be sampled. Mr. Sheehan said bottled water will be provided to those properties with private drinking water wells. He reviewed the public outreach activities noting that letters had been sent, a fact sheet made available, and a public meeting held. Mr. Sheehan advised additional outreach activities will be conducted once sampling information is obtained. He noted the work is being conducted in cooperation with Federal (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), state, (Maryland Department of the Environment) and local (Anne Arundel County Department of Health) agencies.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the residential well sampling flow chart showing the steps he had just discussed.

Mr. Sheehan discussed public outreach activities and state pre-survey notification letters had been sent to residents which explained the program and requested their assistance in providing information and access. He noted the first public meeting had been held, and the next meeting would be scheduled after the fieldwork to share the information gathered. Mr. Sheehan said additional public meetings would be scheduled as needed, and updates would continue to be provided at Restoration Advisory Board meetings.

Mr. Sheehan explained that once drinking water wells had been identified and owners had provided access [Right of Entry], the wells would be sampled two times within a two-month period to ensure the data is accurate and re-producible and to determine if there is any significant variation over that time period. He stated the data would be validated, and the results provided to residents in a timely manner.

Mr. Sheehan advised two additional sampling events were planned for the groundwater monitoring wells, with one event having occurred on 16 April 2009 and the second scheduled for early June.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the results from the shallow and deep monitoring wells sampled on April 16. He advised the analysis of groundwater from the shallow wells did not show any detections of volatile organic compounds which is consistent with previous results. Mr. Sheehan reminded the Board that the 2008 results from sampling of the deep wells showed a noticeable increase in the volatile organic compounds which resulted in the current fieldwork. He stated the 2009 sampling found the levels have decreased some but not to the levels detected in 2005. Mr. Sheehan said no conclusions are being drawn, and another sampling event will be conducted in June. In response to a question from Mr. Tibbetts, Mr. Sheehan explained "NT" means not tested, "ND" means not detected, and "J" indicates an estimated value below the detection limit.

Mr. Sheehan advised that the door-to-door survey was initiated at the end of April with four or five teams of two individuals. He noted that during the first attempt 2,595 homes were visited, and surveys were completed for 807 homes. He stated the second phase is occurring now, and so far 922 homes have been visited and 285 surveys completed. Mr. Sheehan said 47 private wells have been identified with 38 being used for drinking water.

Mr. Morton asked if any of the well owners have declined to participate or denied access. Mr. Sheehan responded that some owners have declined to provide information; he noted a typical response rate for these projects is 60 to 80 percent. Mr. Sheehan said he did not recall any owners who had private wells who declined to participate. He said some homes are in areas where it is known that public water is available. Mr. Butler noted some surveys have been left at homes and not yet returned so the percentages may rise. Mr. Sheehan said the first phase of the visits were done during the day, and the second phase is being done during late afternoon and early evening. Mr. Fluck noted that follow-up phone calls are planned in order to have as thorough an effort as possible, and then the technical team will assess if additional efforts will be effective in providing more information. Mr. Fluck stated that 100 percent participation is not

reasonable, but the team will attempt to get as high a participation as is reasonably possible. Mr. Sheehan added there are some homes included in the number that are currently vacant.

Mr. Sheehan displayed an aerial photograph and pointed out an area downgradient of the site on Old Dairy Farm Road where 7 to 10 deep wells have been identified. He advised these wells will be included in the survey since they are probably screened at the same depths as the Fort Meade monitoring wells where the elevated levels of volatile organic compounds have been detected. Mr. Fluck noted that while these wells are outside of the one-mile radius, their inclusion does not mean the one-mile radius is being extended. He stated they could be very important data points because of their depth and location and that is the reason for including them in the survey.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the next steps that would be taken including completing the surveys and compiling all the data into a data base. He said in about a week bottled water would be provided to properties with drinking water wells. Mr. Sheehan advised Right-of-Entry forms would be requested from properties with drinking water wells and then the wells would be sampled. He said the monitoring wells would be sampled again. Mr. Sheehan explained they would re-assess the vapor intrusion pathway, as requested by the EPA, based on the groundwater sampling results. He said the final step would be the preparation of reports. Mr. Sheehan reviewed the key reports which are part of the project.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the project schedule and the timing of the actions he had spoken about. He noted the final report is due in December 2009.

Mr. Sheehan provided contact data for Mr. Butler and Mr. Fluck for any further questions or information.

Mr. Butler asked Mr. Sheehan to describe the bottled water containers as he had been asked that question. Mr. Sheehan said the water will be in five-gallon containers on top of a dispenser, similar to the water coolers seen in offices.

Mr. Fluck noted that the program will continue until there is sufficient information to answer questions such as, is the drinking water safe and is the interim measure appropriate. He explained the information will dovetail with a broader, area-wide remedial investigation which will be part of the performance-based acquisition Laurie Haines had discussed at the March meeting.

Mr. Rick Grills asked what the schedule is for evaluating the other downgradient deep wells. Mr. Fluck responded they would be sampled as part of the fieldwork planned for late May or early June. Mr. Butler provided some additional information on these wells and advised the existence of these wells became known at the Greater Odenton Improvement Association meeting. Mr. Butler showed a poster used at the meeting which identified the survey radius. He noted that after explaining to the residents the proposed fieldwork, a resident mentioned a private well that was 315 feet deep and installed in 1954 which had been sampled in 2005 but not part of further sampling by the County. Mr. Butler said he also received information from the County on a deep well (390 feet) where sampling showed no detections of volatile organic compounds for several years. He said there is a large area between these two wells, and there are people who

are not participating. Mr. Butler said for these reasons the Army decided to sample the downgradient deep wells outside the one-mile radius to fill the potential data gap.

In response to a question from Ms. Doyle, Mr. Sheehan explained the bottled water distribution. He said the owner would be asked to sign the Right-of-Entry form and to allow sampling. He said the bottled water would be provided in advance of sampling and continue at least until results are received.

Mr. Tibbetts asked about potential long-term remediation methods. Mr. Butler stated if Fort Meade is under a Federal Facilities Agreement at that time, the CERCLA [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act] process would be followed, and all stakeholders would be involved in discussions and approaches. Mr. Butler said some potential options have been preliminarily discussed but more data is needed.

Mr. Fluck added that based on Country information, there appears to be 90-some wells in the survey radius with slightly more than a third currently participating. Mr. Fluck said the sampling would be prioritized with deeper wells and downgradient wells being sampled first, as they may have the highest risk.

Mr. Tibbetts thanked Mr. Butler, Mr. Fluck and Ms. Topovski for participating in the community meetings.

6. Restoration Advisory Board and Community Co-Chair Election Process:

Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Cathryn Kropp, a Public Affairs Officer from the Army Environmental Command and stated he believed Ms. Kropp's presentation would be very helpful to the Board. He stated the former community co-chair, Ms. Zoe Draughon, had resigned and the position is now vacant. Mr. Fluck said he thought it would be beneficial at this time to talk about Restoration Advisory Boards and their guidelines, purpose, conduct, and rules. He noted the discussion would also cover the process of electing a community co-chair. Mr. Fluck said it was timely to have the discussion prior to anyone being offered or nominated for the community co-chair position. He referenced Mr. Morton's statement at the March, 2009 meeting that the business of the Board is serious, and the community co-chair plays a key role.

Ms. Kropp began by noting there are two important points in describing a Restoration Advisory Board. She stated they serve as a forum for discussion and exchange of restoration program information between the Army and the community. She said it is critical that the information flow be a two-way street. Ms. Kropp advised the second point is that it is important the Board reflect the diverse makeup of the community.

Ms. Kropp said the main purpose of the Board is as a public involvement tool for the Garrison Commander, along with the many other tools at his disposal such as meetings, surveys, and public notices. She stated Restoration Advisory Boards are a well-established tool and have been very successful in many instances so the Army encourages Garrison Commanders to use the Boards as a tool. Ms. Kropp said the Board also gives entities other than community members, such as local government, the opportunity to be involved in the restoration process.

Ms. Kropp explained the Board is established by the Garrison Commander, based on a survey of interest. She stated it is important to remember the Board needs to be focused on environmental restoration only, even though there may be many other environmental activities occurring at the installation. Ms. Kropp said the Board is co-chaired, by a representative appointed by the installation, and a community member, who is elected by the community members not appointed. She explained a Board develops ground rules and operating procedures which are formalized in its own unique charter. Mr. Fluck distributed copies of Fort Meade's charter. Ms. Kropp said it is recommended that Boards review their charters every two years to make any necessary updates.

Ms. Kropp next reviewed the roles of various Board members. She explained the Garrison Commander's role includes selecting the installation representatives, serving as the Army co-chair, or appointing an Army co-chair. Ms. Kropp said it is important for the Garrison Commander to identify the diverse community interests and groups to make sure they are represented on the Board if they so choose. She explained community members who live or work in the affected area are given priority for membership on the Board and then membership is open to those outside the immediate area.

Ms. Kropp noted the installation's role is to educate and inform community members about the Defense Environmental Restoration Program and the Army's environmental decision-making process. She stated another role is to make sure there is community participation and the input is productive. Ms. Kropp advised the installation's key role is to help community members understand the Army and how it works for those not familiar with the Army. She explained the installation also provides the community members with cleanup alternatives and the implications of those alternatives so the members can provide input.

Ms. Kropp discussed the community member's role, noting the most important function is to provide input to the Army by reviewing scopes of studies, reports and plans, and participating in meetings. She said another role is documenting decisions and making that information available to the public through web sites, postings at libraries, or other means. Mr. Fluck asked if making information available to the public was done by community members or the Army, and if done by community members, would they create their own web site. Ms. Kropp responded that the topic has gone back and forth, but because of security issues with the military, the preference is that all web-based information be housed on government computers with the information accessible to the public. Ms. Kropp noted it is the Garrison Commander's responsibility to make sure it is available and how it happens is up to the individual Boards. She stated there is no compensation for a community member who wants to do this work, and typically a community member is either proficient at web-sites or works at the library and has an interest in doing the work as a volunteer.

Ms. Kropp reviewed the community co-chair's role and stated it involves coordinating the meeting agenda with the installation co-chair. She said the community co-chair also helps ensure the Board membership reflects the diversity of the community, particularly since the community co-chair may be more aware of the diverse needs of the community than the Army. Ms. Kropp explained another important role is ensuring the community's issues and concerns related to cleanup are addressed, and the community's input is heard, received and documented.

She said the co-chair also ensures that the Board has the opportunity to provide input and participate in the decision-making process.

Ms. Kropp reviewed the community co-chair election process as outlined in the Fort Meade charter. She stated nominations are made from the floor, with the consent of the nominee obtained in advance. She continued that voting is at the discretion of the community members and can be by paper ballot, show of hands, or a voice vote. She advised that in order to be elected, the nominee must obtain a simple majority of the votes cast. Ms. Kropp said if a meeting was not well attended, the Board has the option to postpone the election to a future meeting.

Mr. Butler asked Ms. Kropp to confirm that only community members vote for the community co-chair, and Ms. Kropp confirmed Mr. Butler's statement was correct. In response to a question about whether a county representative could vote for the community co-chair, Ms. Kropp said if the representative is appointed and paid by the County for their participation, they are not a community member and would not vote for the co-chair.

The Board discussed the community co-chair election process and agreed an insufficient number of community members were present to hold the election. Ms. Kropp suggested since there were only a limited number of community members that the Army contact each member, poll them as to their interest in being co-chair, and answer any questions. Ms. Kropp said the results of the poll and the interests should then be documented, perhaps through the next meetings minutes.

Mr. Tibbetts mentioned the current charter discusses term limits for members. Mr. Morton suggested that issue be handled once a new community co-chair is in place and can undertake a review of the charter. The Board agreed with Mr. Morton's suggestion.

Mr. Tibbetts suggested nominees briefly discuss where they see the RAB going, particularly in light of the decline in community members. Mr. Morton suggested at the next meeting nominees could make a verbal statement of their views, and Mr. Tibbetts agreed with this suggestion. Ms. Kropp suggested any interested parties who cannot be present at the meeting be asked to submit a brief written statement.

Mr. Butler asked Ms. Kropp how ties are handled, and she responded the Board would establish a procedure in advance of voting. She stated she has not known this to occur within a Restoration Advisory Board forum; however, in her experience in other forums, an officer, not the co-chair, is selected to break the tie. Ms. Kropp confirmed the community co-chair has to be a current community member.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to hold the election for community co-chair at the next meeting and that the candidates for the position would verbally give a short biography and statement as to the direction they would like to take the Board.

7. Manor View Site Gas Recovery System Update:

Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. Adam Gregory of Plexus Scientific to discuss the current data. Mr. Gregory explained monitoring is being conducted at a landfill area immediately west of Manor View Elementary School and east of the Manor View housing area (Potomac Place). Mr. Gregory said a methane extraction system is in place. Mr. Gregory distributed an aerial photograph of the site with sampling points and recent sampling results. He noted that during the last month, two weeks of monitoring had been conducted. Mr. Butler explained that the contract for the monitoring performed by Plexus had lapsed for two weeks due to the amount of contracting work being performed by the Corps with the new economic stimulus funding.

Mr. Gregory stated the data is consistent with past sampling in that methane was detected in the same locations as in the past. Mr. Gregory noted that with an increase in ambient temperatures, methane concentrations have also increased in certain areas, but these areas are consistent with locations, where methane has historically been detected. He said there have been more methane detections in the northern area near monitoring points VMP 36, VMP 37 and VMP 38. He said these detections have ranged from 1,000 to 3,000 parts per million which is considerably less than the lower explosive limit of 50,000 parts per million. Mr. Gregory advised there have been some increased concentrations on the eastern side of the site at MP-A, as well as in the central area of the site where there normally is an impact from methane.

Mr. Gregory summarized by saying the site conditions have not substantially changed, and the sentinel monitoring points indicate methane has not crossed Hayden Drive.

8. EPA RCRA Unilateral Administrative Order and Federal Facilities Agreement Update:

Mr. Fluck reminded the Board that in August, 2007, Fort Meade received an RCRA 7003 Unilateral Administrative Order from EPA. He advised he would be giving a quick update on the Army's efforts in meeting the short-term requirements of the Order.

Mr. Fluck reviewed the background on the Order, including discussions with EPA and elevating the issue to the Department of Justice and the Office of Management and Budget. He stated the Department of Justice determined the Order was valid on December 1, 2008, and on December 9, 2008, the Army gave EPA notice that it would comply with the Order.

Mr. Fluck discussed the initial deliverables required under the Order. He said six of the seven deliverables have been completed and submitted. Mr. Fluck noted the seventh deliverable, the Pre-Investigation Evaluation of Corrective Measures Technologies Report and RCRA Facilities Investigation Workplan, are due to be submitted to EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment on May 29, and Mr. Fluck said they will be submitted on time.

Mr. Butler advised that the Federal Facilities Agreement is currently being negotiated with the Army, EPA, Patuxent Research Refuge, and the U.S. Architect of the Capitol, and they are working towards a date established by Senator Cardin of mid to late June, of this year. He noted the technical team and legal staff is working hard, and good progress is being made to meet the June date.

IMND-MEA-PWE
SUBJECT: MINUTES FOR THE MAY 21, 2009 RAB MEETING

Mr. Morton asked for any comments or open discussion from the floor.

The Board agreed upon July 23, 2009 as the date for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.



MICHAEL P. BUTLER
Chief, Environmental Division
Directorate of Public Works

DISTRIBUTION:
1-Each member
IC
PAO