



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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

IMNE-MEA-PWE

March 10, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Restoration Advisory Board Members

SUBJECT: Minutes for the January 20, 2011 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

1. The Fort George G. Meade Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on January 20th, 2011, at 7 p.m. at the Captain John Smathers Army Reserve Center, Hwy 175, Fort Meade, Maryland. The next RAB meeting will be **Thursday, March 17th, 7 p.m.**, at the Captain John Smathers Army Reserve Center.

2. The following RAB members were present:

Mr. Mick Butler, Fort Meade Co-Chair
Mr. Paul Fluck, Fort Meade Restoration Manager
Mr. James Fraser, Community Member
Ms. Laurie Haines, Army Environmental Command
Mr. Martin Madera, Community Member
Mr. Howard Nicholson, Community Member
Mr. David Tibbetts, Community Co-Chair
Ms. Kerry Topovski, Anne Arundel County

3. Members not present:

Mr. John Burchette, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Blight Carter, Community Member
Mr. Wayne Dixon, Community Member
Mr. Ed Dosek, Community Member
Ms. Ivana Maksimovic, Community Member
Ms. Kathy Scott, Community Member
Mr. Fred Tubman, Community Member

4. Others present were:

Mr. Frank Anastasia	SCA Associates
Mr. Steve Cardon	Fort Meade, Base Realignment and Closure Office
Mr. John Cherry	ARCADIS, Inc.
Mr. Thomas Crone	ARCADIS, Inc.
Ms. Sarah Gettier	URS Corporation
Ms. Maria Godwin	Fort Meade Environmental Division

Mr. Joe Gorman	Community Member
Ms. Katrina Harris	Bridge Consulting Corp.
Mr. Bill Hudson	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ms. Shelly Kolb	ARCADIS-Malcolm Pirnie
Mr. Tim Llewellyn	ARCADIS, Inc.
Mr. Harry Neal	Community Member
Ms. Karen Nickerson	Bridge Consulting Corp.
Ms. Kristen Parker	Fort Meade Public Affairs Office
Mr. Kurt Scarbro	Maryland Department of the Environment
Mr. Dan Sheehan	ARCADIS-Malcolm Pirnie
Ms. Denise Tegtmeier	Fort Meade Environmental Division
Ms. Pamela Wood	Capitol Gazette

5. Announcements and Minutes:

a. Mr. Paul Fluck opened the meeting. Mr. David Tibbetts, community co-chair, called the meeting to order. Mr. Fluck asked everyone present to introduce themselves.

b. Mr. Fluck thanked everyone present for attending. He expressed the Garrison's continuing appreciation to Col. Ruf and his staff for the use of the facility. Mr. Fluck emphasized the importance of everyone signing in and out and discussed the location of building exits, restrooms, and vending machines.

c. Mr. Fluck advised that hard copies of meeting presentations would be provided to Board members and stakeholders; anyone else who would like a copy can obtain one from the Fort Meade web site (www.fortmeade-ems.org). He noted this would minimize the amount of paper being used for the meetings.

d. Mr. Fluck expressed his appreciation to the Board members for their patience and acknowledged a number of documents had been sent to them recently. He stated the November meeting minutes had only recently been distributed and asked if the Board would like additional time to review the minutes. The Board indicated they were ready to vote on the minutes. Mr. Martin Madera requested the spelling of his name be corrected. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to approve the November 18th, 2010 minutes as presented with the correction of the spelling of Mr. Madera's name.

6. Outstanding Items:

a. Mr. Paul Fluck said an outstanding item is the ongoing receipt and review of applications for Board membership. He stated an application had been received from Mr. Henry Neal. He reviewed the purpose of the Board which is to serve as an instrument for conveying information between the Army and the community. He stated Board members are expected to regularly attend meetings, review and comment on documents, identify projects and priorities, work cooperatively to ensure effective use of time, and take information back to their friends,

families and communities to keep them informed about the environmental program. Mr. Fluck invited Mr. Neal to tell the Board about himself and his experience.

b. Mr. Neal advised he grew up on Fort Meade as his father was in the military. He stated he had a degree in biology from the University of Maryland and lived in Odenton, as did his brother. Mr. Neal said he had read about the ongoing environmental studies of groundwater in the Odenton area and saw that community participation was being sought. He closed by saying he would like to help if the Board feels he can be of use.

c. Mr. Fluck asked the Board if they would like to vote on Mr. Neal's application or schedule a vote for the next meeting. The Board members indicated they were ready to vote. Mr. Fluck reviewed the voting procedures for applicants, noting only existing Board members can vote and a simple majority is required. He continued explaining the Army co-chair would vote if there is a tie. Mr. Fluck distributed ballots to the existing community members. Mr. Fluck collected the ballots and gave them to Mr. Tibbetts. Mr. Tibbetts confirmed Mr. Neal had been elected to the Board.

d. Mr. Fluck noted the election of all community members is subject to the final approval of the Garrison Commander. He advised this will be done soon, and all members will be notified.

e. Mr. Fluck next discussed the Board's charter. He reminded the Board that they had begun discussing revisions to the most recent version of the charter which had been prepared in 2004. Mr. Fluck advised he had reviewed charters from a number of other Department of Defense (DoD) installations and had found a very good one being used at a Navy base. Mr. Fluck noted he had distributed the Navy charter to the Board a few days earlier and said he realized they might not have had enough time to review it. He suggested the Board members take until the next Board meeting to review the Navy charter and let him know if they feel it would be a good template to use for revising the Fort Meade charter. The Board members concurred with Mr. Fluck's proposed course of action.

f. The Board members discussed receiving documents on CDs or through the web site. Mr. Fluck noted the Army can provide documents on CDs to those who prefer to receive them in this format and will also make them available through the web site.

7. Technical Assistance for Public Participation Process (TAPP):

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Laurie Haines from the Army Environmental Command to discuss the Technical Assistance for Public Participation process.

b. Ms. Haines explained TAPP provides a means for Restoration Advisory Boards to obtain help in understanding scientific and engineering issues underlying an installation's restoration activities so they can provide input to the Army. She noted technical assistance can also be provided by in-house Army resources and other government agencies.

c. Ms. Haines stated the Board would first decide what kind of assistance is needed and then design a project scope. She said the scope would be given to the government for approval and for procurement of the technical assistance for the Board. Ms. Haines said the funding limit is \$25,000 or one percent of the cleanup cost, with a lifetime limit of \$100,000 although waivers have been granted with appropriate justification. She emphasized the funding must be used for the Board to better understand technical issues and is not a blank check. Ms. Haines discussed the types of activities the funding cannot be used for and mentioned it cannot be used for any actions against the Army or for any functions which should be carried out by the installation.

d. Ms. Haines gave examples of eligible projects such as reviewing restoration documents and proposed remedial technologies and participating in relative risk evaluations and certain types of technical training. She also gave examples of ineligible projects which would include generating new primary data, re-opening final DoD decisions approved by the regulators, health studies, litigation, and community outreach efforts.

e. Ms. Haines provided a web site address where the TAPP Rule can be found (http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_08/32cfd203_08.html) and noted it can also be found on the Fort Meade web site at (www.fortmeade-ems.org).

f. Ms. Haines discussed the formal application process and advised the application form is available as a pdf document on the web site. She stated the application needs to be specific to the type of assistance required, and if possible, identify one or more providers. She said the application needs to have sufficient details to support a scope of work in order to start the procurement process. Ms. Haines advised the Board would also need to identify a single point of contact to communicate with the installation. She noted the installation co-chair reviews the application to ensure it is complete, describes an eligible project to be funded, and is within budget. Ms. Haines described the appeal process if the application is denied.

g. Ms. Haines reviewed the funding for TAPP projects and stated there is no separate appropriation for TAPP. She said the Army funds TAPP projects from the installation's allocation of environmental restoration funds.

h. Ms. Haines discussed the procurement process and stated an accelerated procurement process is used where a purchase order is issued. She stated federal acquisition regulations need to be followed and a minimum of three bids must be sought. Ms. Haines said Board members can nominate potential providers but should have no further contact with a potential provider once a request for a TAPP is initiated until a contract is awarded. She advised the government has the final decision on which provider is selected, and the criteria are which provider offers the best value to the government. Ms. Haines said the procurement process can take 10 weeks or longer.

i. Ms. Haines highlighted some of the qualifications a TAPP provider should have including knowledge of environmental laws and the cleanup program, academic training in a relevant discipline, the ability to explain technical information in layman's terms, and experience in making technical presentations. Mr. Tibbetts asked if the Board members can talk to potential

contractors before initiating the application, and Ms. Haines encouraged the community members to talk with and interview potential providers.

j. The Board members discussed whether there is a need for a TAPP. Mr. Fluck said some evaluation factors are whether current presentations are adequate and sufficient to address the needs of community members and whether the Board consists of members with enough breathe of knowledge to understand the technical issues being presented. Mr. Tibbetts stated that the presentations are adequate and usually excellent in terms of the Board's ability to comprehend and ask questions. Ms. Kerry Topovski stated there is a significant amount of expertise represented on the Board. She said a TAPP may duplicate work already being done for the Board by the Army's contractors who are brought in for the specific purpose of educating the Board on their project where they are providing the technical expertise and support. She stated if there was a specific need identified by the community members which was not being met she would support a TAPP. Several community members agreed they would not want to see a duplication of effort and would like to discuss the TAPP possibility in greater depth and detail to determine whether there is a need. Mr. Jamie Fraser suggested another possibility is to find a community member with the expertise needed and add them to the Board.

k. Mr. Fluck reminded the Board that he can also access on behalf of the Board a tremendous number of Army resources and centers of excellence such as the Army Environmental Command and the Army Corps of Engineers. He invited the Board to let him know any time they are reviewing an issue where additional expertise would be helpful, and he will find an expert on the matter at no cost to the installation.

l. Ms. Haines added that the guidance does not allow for a scope that just hires a provider to be on call as needed. She stated the scope of work would need to be for specific tasks such as reviewing a specific report and explaining it to the community members through a briefing.

m. Mr. Frank Anastasia noted he has been a TAPP provider for other Boards and stated in his experience the scope of work might state the provider will review and help the community comment on a number of reports coming out over a one-year period.

n. Mr. Fluck closed by saying the decision to go forward with an application is up to the community members.

8. Community Outreach Initiative:

a. Mr. Tibbetts mentioned some other Restoration Advisory Boards have discussed the issue of environmental justice. Mr. Fluck stated it is important to consider what constitutes the affected community, but the installation would welcome new participation on the Board at any time. He emphasized the importance of the community members being local and thus having the best interests of the community in mind. He suggested the Board discuss further at a future meeting.

b. Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Kristen Parker from Fort Meade's Public Affairs Office. Ms. Parker reviewed the outreach activities undertaken to date including direct mailings, press releases, and information at community lunches. She stated information is also being distributed through web site and Facebook updates. She mentioned a recent story in The Capitol newspaper. She offered the continued assistance of the Public Affairs Office and stated that based on recommendations from the Board they can adjust the outreach activities as needed to reach the desired target audience.

9. Update On Operable Unit 4 (OU-4):

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. John Cherry of ARCADIS, a contractor to Fort Meade.

b. Mr. Cherry reviewed the topics he would be discussing including background on Operable Unit 4 for new Board members, a review of the regional geologic structure, a summary of the planned off-post remedial investigation activities, and the next steps to be taken for this site.

c. Mr. Cherry displayed a map and discussed the location of OU-4. He noted it included some buildings in the industrial area, the Closed Sanitary Landfill (CSL), and the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) property.

d. Mr. Cherry explained that elevated detections of solvents in deep monitoring wells 125d and 126d triggered the investigation and eventually led to the current broader evaluation to investigate the groundwater for a number of sites and tie everything together.

e. Mr. Cherry showed an aerial photograph of the sites and buildings, including the former Post Laundry Facility. He noted a remedial investigation was completed in all of the potential source areas, followed by ARCADIS' conducting a supplemental investigation in 2010 to broaden the understanding of the conceptual site model.

f. Mr. Cherry reviewed the project's short-term and long-term objectives. He noted the first objective is to complete the delineation of OU-4 and then to determine the source, nature and extent of solvents in the Lower Patapsco aquifer. Mr. Cherry said the other two objectives are to develop a regional conceptual site model based on a thorough understanding of the geology and hydrogeology, and then to determine and implement appropriate remedies.

g. Mr. Cherry discussed the additional remedial investigation activities performed by ARCADIS since the spring of 2010. He noted 16 boring locations had been installed around known or potential additional source areas over 2,500 linear feet. He advised the borings were as deep as 160 feet below ground surface. Mr. Cherry explained they had worked closely with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) during the work to make adjustments while in the field. He stated much data was collected to help with the understanding of the site geology.

h. Mr. Cherry displayed a graphic showing the regional geologic structure. He discussed the various layers starting at the bottom with the Patuxent Formation. He explained the middle formation is the Arundel Clay and the top layer is the Patapsco Formation which is fairly complicated.

i. Mr. Cherry then demonstrated the regional geologic structure using a 3-D visualization tool. He explained data was entered into the model as work was performed in the field so that the information could be evaluated and decisions made during the field work. Mr. Cherry showed a number of views of the site geology and formations. He showed the contamination in the groundwater and explained how the model can help to estimate the extent of the plumes and develop appropriate remedies.

j. Ms. Topovski asked if the groundwater plumes have been characterized to the extent that they can be connected to monitoring wells 125d and 126d. Mr. Cherry responded the plumes have not been completely characterized yet, but a determination has been made of where additional wells need to be drilled in order to complete the characterization.

k. Mr. Tibbetts said he was concerned about the discrete boring and analysis since there could be different sources of contamination—from the Army and from other places. He questioned what might happen if different compounds from different sources, such as TCE [trichloroethene] and PCE [tetrachloroethene] from the Army and fly ash from an off-post site merged. Mr. Tibbetts provided Mr. Cherry with a copy of a report related to the fly ash. Mr. Cherry noted the fly ash pits are two to three miles away from the site, but he will review the report on the fly ash provided by Mr. Tibbetts.

l. Mr. Cherry discussed the next phase of the remedial investigation work and stated the key objectives are to fully delineate the plumes in the Lower Patapsco aquifer and refine the site conceptual model for the Lower Patapsco aquifer in the off-post areas. He noted the model will be expanded to show the area to the southeast, extending further into Odenton and factoring in data from the residential well logs and rotosonic borings. He stated the additional data will provide a comprehensive and clear understanding of the geology in this area.

m. Mr. Cherry said the Army is working with the County to finalize the right-of-way agreements for the off-post drilling locations. He showed the proposed locations for the additional borings and noted they are hoping to start the drilling next month. He reminded the Board the borings locations could change once they start the field work and begin gathering data. Mr. Cherry advised the drilling would take about six weeks.

n. Mr. Cherry stated a remedial investigation/feasibility study should be completed in the summer of 2011 which will include an evaluation of cleanup alternatives.

o. Ms. Topovski asked if there have been any changes in the levels of compounds detected in wells 125d and 126d since the last Board meeting. Mr. Fluck responded that the wells have not been sampled since 2009. He noted a separate tasking is being contemplated for the sampling of these wells. He advised the levels of compounds detected tended to be generally

steady over the last five years with a slight increase of carbon tetrachloride detected during the last few sampling events.

p. Mr. Fraser asked what the public health risk is for TCE. Mr. Cherry responded that there would need to be a complete pathway where someone would be drinking the groundwater or exposed through vapor intrusion or dermal contact with the contaminated groundwater in order to have a potential health risk. Mr. Cherry advised the levels of TCE detected are above the maximum contaminant level set by EPA of five parts per billion which is why the interim measures have been taken by the Army to ensure there is no impact to the public health. He stated an upcoming presentation would provide more information on the interim measures, but no exceedances have been found in downgradient private wells in that area of Odenton. Mr. Cherry continued explaining that exceedances have been detected in one well on Nevada Avenue which is not downgradient but which the Army continues to monitor. Mr. Cherry advised there is no immediate health risk as no one is drinking the groundwater and because the contamination is so deep, vapor intrusion is not occurring.

q. Mr. Fraser asked if it is possible to trace back to the source and estimate how long until the groundwater might reach the public. Mr. Cherry responded that release information is not available but it is possible to evaluate the groundwater flow which is why there is a focus on delineation of the plumes. In response to questions from Mr. Neal, Mr. Cherry said the groundwater moves about 150 feet a year and while the full extent of the plumes is not yet known, they measure about 8,000 feet in length.

10. Summary of the August 2010 Little Patuxent River Sweep:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. Steve Cardon from the Fort Meade Base Realignment and Closure Act Division.

b. Mr. Cardon displayed an aerial map of the installation and pointed out the location of the Little Patuxent River, noting it runs through Anne Arundel County and the Patuxent Research Refuge-North Track. He reminded the Board the Patuxent Research Refuge-North Track included former range and training areas and was transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1991 and 1993 by the Army under a Congressional mandate. He stated munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and military munitions debris (MMD) are known to exist in the Little Patuxent River in the stretch from 400 feet south of Maryland State Route 198 to the Old Forge Bridge and thus a visual inspection is conducted annually of the banks and bottom of a segment of the Little Patuxent River. He stated magnetometers are used to detect metallic objects that might be MEC.

c. Mr. Cardon advised the Army contracts with URS Corporation to perform the work, and the work is always conducted in August when the water is at the lowest depth.

d. Mr. Cardon displayed an aerial map showing the portion of the River where the inspection is conducted. He also showed several photographs of technicians conducting the sweep.

e. Mr. Cardon explained x-rays are taken of suspicious items to determine their contents. He showed x-rays and photographs of some of the recovered items.

f. Mr. Cardon summarized the items recovered during the most recent inspection and stated 75 items were recovered with 74 items being 2.36-inch rockets and one item being a ballistic counterweight. He advised all items were recovered for the Bend A of the River where items are typically found. Mr. Cardon said 37 of the 74 items were identified as munition debris and 37 were x-rayed and were all confirmed to be expended practice rounds. He advised 205 pounds of munition debris was shipped off-site for disposal.

11. Update on the Manor View Site:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. Tom Crone from ARCADIS.

b. Mr. Crone reminded the Board that this project is for a 10-acre site where construction demolition debris and some municipal solid waste were disposed of from the 1920s to the 1950s. He advised as the waste [organic material] deteriorates it produces methane so a methane extraction system was installed as an interim measure. He stated for the benefit of new members that weekly measurements of methane levels are collected from 52 points, and an update on those levels is given at each Board meeting.

c. Mr. Crone reviewed the most recent four weeks of data and advised it was consistent with historical measurements. He noted elevated levels were detected at vapor monitoring points 22 and 23 which is consistent with past readings and in the area where the majority of the decaying waste is located. He advised there were some unscheduled shut-downs, primarily due to the cold weather. He explained ice was forming in the above-ground pipes and triggering the blower to shut-down. Mr. Crone advised they had responded and cleared the pipes and the system has operated well. He stated the goal is not to have any shut-downs so they plan to install a heat trace on the above-ground lines to prevent ice from forming, as well as applying insulation on another section which will fully winterize the entire system.

d. Mr. Mick Butler asked Mr. Crone to explain how alerts are received when there is an operational issue. Mr. Crone stated the notification system includes phone calls, texts, and emails and by contract ARCADIS responds within four hours.

e. Ms. Topovski asked about the timing for the removal of the dump site. Mr. Crone responded that the monitoring system is just an interim action. He stated a feasibility study is currently under review which evaluates possible final remedies. Mr. Crone said the desired schedule is to excavate the waste [methane producing wastes] at the end of 2011 if the documents are in place by that time as the winter is the best season to conduct the excavation. He further explained the preferred remedy being examined is to excavate the waste generating the methane and transport it by dump truck to an appropriate landfill for disposal. Mr. Tibbetts asked what would happen with the construction rubble, and Mr. Crone advised they are working with the regulators on how to address any material left behind.

12. Update on Groundwater Contamination in Odenton, Maryland:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Shelly Kolb of ARCADIS-Malcolm Pirnie.

b. Ms. Kolb reminded the Board the study area for the project was a one-mile radius around the deep monitoring wells 125d and 126d, as well as Old Dairy Farm Road. She stated the project was initiated when elevated levels of volatile organic compounds were detected in the two monitoring wells. She added that properties along Nevada Avenue and Old Dairy Farm Road were added to the project even though they are outside the one-mile radius.

c. Ms. Kolb stated the purpose of the project was to assess whether community properties with private wells have been impacted by the contamination, and a well survey was initiated in April 2009 to determine who has private wells and whether they are used for drinking purposes. She stated surveys were sent to more than 2,500 properties with 1,695 surveys returned. She advised the surveys confirmed 75 wells were used as the primary source for drinking water. Ms. Kolb said final letters were sent to 12 property owners where information indicated they had private wells with 11 confirmed deliveries. She noted one property on Old Dairy Farm Road was added to the sampling program, one property owner declined sampling, and nine property owners did not respond. Ms. Kolb advised that the well survey was deemed completed in September 2010 by EPA.

d. Ms. Kolb discussed a chart showing the results from several rounds of sampling of monitoring wells 125d and 126d and noted the numbers in bold indicated where exceedances of the maximum contaminant level have been detected.

e. Ms. Kolb reviewed the progress to date and stated the drinking water well survey outreach effort is complete, two rounds of residential well sampling has been performed for all interested properties, the Army continues to provide bottled water to those who have requested it, and monthly sampling of the three Nevada Avenue properties continue. Ms. Kolb discussed the results from the monthly Nevada Avenue sampling and stated there have been a few detections at the maximum contaminant level for PCE and one additional exceedance since the original detection.

f. Ms. Kolb summarized the next steps in the project including upcoming reports. She advised monthly sampling at Nevada Avenue will continue, as well as the installation of up to seven monitoring wells (five deep and two shallow). She noted historical research will be conducted to look for potential sources for the Nevada Avenue detections. Ms. Kolb concluded by saying providing bottled water will continue, as well as ongoing public outreach and reporting.

g. Mr. Neal asked if property owners can still opt into the well testing. Mr. Fluck advised they could if they are located with the one-mile radius and if the well is being used for potable water or irrigation. He said it is late in the project to add a well but the Army is open to considering any wells that should be added.

IMNE-MEA-PWE

SUBJECT: Minutes for the January 20th, 2011 RAB Meeting

13. New Business:

a. Mr. Tibbetts asked if a date had been sent for a site tour. Mr. Fluck suggested the best time for a tour would be in the summer, possibly in place of a meeting. He noted if a summer evening is not possible, arrangements could be made to have the tour on a weekend. He asked the Board members to give some thought to what they might like to see and to let him know. He estimated the tour might last two hours and includes four to six sites. Mr. Fluck said it might be possible to view some ongoing field work if it can be observed safely. Mr. Tibbetts noted he would like to have the Manor View Site included on the tour, as well as Nevada Avenue.

b. Mr. Fluck referred to an article in the Odenton Patch that erroneously connected the DRMO and Operable Unit 4 plumes as a single plume. He said the Army contacted the editor and they were happy to listen and make the correction.

c. Mr. Fluck asked if the Board members were satisfied with the room arrangement, and the Board concurred on the current set-up.

d. Mr. Fluck asked for any future agenda items. None were offered. Mr. Fluck invited Board members to contact him at any time with suggested topics.

14. The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 p.m.



MICHAEL P. BUTLER
Chief, Environmental Division

CF:
RAB MEMBERS
FGGM GARRISON COMMANDER
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE