



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:

IMND-MEA-PWE

November 4, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Restoration Advisory Board Members

SUBJECT: Minutes for the September 15, 2011 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

1. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on September 15th, 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, November 17th, 7 p.m.**, at the Captain John Smathers Army Reserve Center.

2. The following RAB members were present:

Mr. Tim Berkoff, Community Member (provisional)
Mr. Rusty Bristow, Community Member
Mr. John Burchette, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Mick Butler, Fort Meade Co-Chair
Mr. Wayne Dixon, Community Member
Mr. Paul Fluck, Fort Meade Restoration Manager
Mr. Martin Madera, Community Member
Mr. Harry Neal, Community Member
Mr. Howard Nicholson, Community Member
Mr. David Tibbetts, Community Co-Chair
Ms. Kerry Topovski, Anne Arundel County

3. Members not present:

Mr. James Fraser, Community Member
Ms. Laurie Haines, Army Environmental Command
Ms. Ivana Maksimovic, Community Member
Mr. Kurt Riegel, Community Member (provisional)
Mr. Fred Tubman, Community Member

4. Others present were:

Mr. Steve Cardon	Fort Meade, Base Realignment and Closure Program (Versar)
Mr. Tom Crone	ARCADIS Inc.
Ms. Amanda Duggins	ARCADIS Inc.
Ms. Elisabeth Green	Maryland Department of the Environment
Ms. Katrina Harris	Bridge Consulting Corp.

Mr. Bill Hudson	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Daniel LaHart	Anne Arundel County Schools
Mr. Tim Llewellyn	ARCADIS Inc.
Mr. Scott McClelland	URS Corporation
Ms. Corrine Salin	ARCADIS Inc.
Mr. Dan Sheehan	ARCADIS-Malcolm Pirnie
Ms. Denise Tegtmeyer	Fort Meade, Environmental Division (Versar)
CPT Daniel Wilmoth	Ft. Meade, Office of the Staff Judge Advocate

5. Announcements and Minutes:

- a. Mr. Dave Tibbetts, community co-chair, called the meeting to order. Mr. Mick Butler welcomed everyone and invited all present to introduce themselves.
- b. Mr. Fluck made a motion to adopt the July 21st, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted to approve the July 21st, 2011 minutes.
- c. Mr. Fluck welcomed Ms. Green from the Maryland Department of the Environment who is replacing Mr. Scarbro. Mr. Fluck expressed appreciation for the work performed by Mr. Scarbro and wished him well in his retirement.

6. Outstanding Items:

- a. Mr. Fluck asked for any feedback on the recent tour of various environmental restoration sites. Mr. Rusty Bristow expressed interest in a visit in the future since he was not able to attend. Mr. Fluck invited Mr. Bristow to let him know when he is available and said he would be glad to do a tour for him, as well as for any other Board member. Mr. Tibbetts commented that the tour was highly educational, and it helped to see the geography and sites in perspective.
- b. Mr. Fluck reviewed the current membership status. He noted there are 15 community members, with two members still provisional and three members who have not attended meetings in many years. Mr. Fluck stated the current Board charter provides opportunity for the Board to take action if a member has not attended 25% of meetings in a calendar year. He asked if the Board would like to take a vote on the members who have not attended for several years, and the community members indicated they would like to vote. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to discontinue the membership of Mr. Blight Carter. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to discontinue the membership of Mr. Ed Dosek. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to discontinue the membership of Ms. Kathy Scott. Mr. Fluck advised the Board Mr. Jones had withdrawn his application for membership. Mr. Fluck noted Fort Meade's Public Affairs Office will continue to send media advisories about Board meetings to media outlets to keep the community informed of the meetings.
- c. Mr. Fluck noted the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) had provided a very good briefing on the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) at the last meeting, and questions had been raised about the difference between

CERCLA and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). He advised he had researched definitions and found ones he thought would be helpful:

- RCRA: to protect human health and the environment by establishing a comprehensive regulatory framework for investigating and addressing past, present, and in some cases, future environmental contamination at hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities.
- CERCLA: to protect human health and the environment by establishing a comprehensive regulatory framework for investigating and remediating uncontrolled wastes and hazardous substances.

d. Mr. Fluck advised it had been a year since the last community co-chair election, and the charter requires an annual election. The Board discussed whether provisional members should be able to vote and agreed provisional members would abstain from voting. Mr. Fluck reviewed the responsibilities of the community co-chair including serving a one-year term, assisting in the execution of Board meetings, assisting in the distribution of information to the public, ensuring membership reflects diversity of the community, ensuring ideas and concerns discussed at meetings are afforded robust discussion, and assisting in maintaining Board membership. Mr. Fluck explaining the nomination and voting procedures and asked if the Board would like to vote at this meeting or the next. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to vote at this meeting. Mr. Tibbetts was nominated. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to elect Mr. Tibbetts as the community co-chair.

7. Anne Arundel County's Role at Fort Meade Cleanup Sites:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Kerry Topovski, Environmental Health Director from the Anne Arundel County Department of Health. Ms. Topovski summarized her background as 26 years of experience in environmental health and a Board member [Ft. Meade RAB member] for six years. She stated she initially became involved through meetings with Messrs. Fluck and Butler during a groundwater investigation when Fort Meade had taken the appropriate steps to notify the County of the issues.

b. Ms. Topovski stated the County Charter establishes the function and authority of the Department of Health which operates under the County Health Officer. She said most of the authority comes from various delegation agreements with the State. Ms. Topovski showed the mission statements of the Department and noted they extend to emergency preparedness and response as well as environmental health.

c. Ms. Topovski advised the environmental health of the County's residents is protected through providing education, inspecting food service facilities, assuring private wells meet drinking water standards, permitting private septic systems, responding to complaints, monitoring beaches throughout the County, and implementing a property maintenance code.

d. Ms. Topovski stated most of the County programs operate under various enforcement authorities which have the capability of issuing notices or citations with fines through the County Office of Law or through the State Attorney Generals Office.

e. Ms. Topovski said most of the groundwater investigations have been done in coordination with Fort Meade's Environmental Office, with the County coordinating notice to the off-post residents. She said the County may conduct the actual testing or Fort Meade may perform the testing with County oversight. Ms. Topovski said the County also can provide access to public sewer and water information. Ms. Topovski said the County assists its Federal and State partners with groundwater investigations by conducting the field testing or defining the scope of the investigation, providing property information, producing maps, and reviewing public information materials.

f. Ms. Topovski reviewed some of the key activities conducted by the County Department of Health including looking at human health risks, environmental reports, cancer registry data, and emerging pathogens that are of significant concern to the County and to residents. She said the Department also works hard to educate the public through issuing press releases on a regular basis, posting information on the web site (www.aahealth.org), and participating in public meetings. She stated the Department also can place signs in communities if there is an immediate or imminent health risk such as a sanitary sewer system overflow. Ms. Topovski invited Board members to review the many environmental health programs posted on the web site.

8. Manor View Dump Site/Non-Time Critical Removal Action:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. Tom Crone of ARCADIS to discuss the work plan for the removal action.

b. Mr. Crone said he would be starting with a general review of CERCLA and the non-time critical removal action process, followed by a brief history of the Manor View Dump Site. He stated he would then preview the draft work plan for the removal action and the objectives of the action.

c. Mr. Crone showed a map and pointed out the location of the Manor View Dump Site in the central portion of the Installation. He also displayed an aerial photograph showing the site features, including the methane extraction system. He stated the site is about 10 acres, with a small area being the source of the methane generated by the decomposition of waste. He advised this smaller source area is the focus of the removal action.

d. Mr. Crone stated the regulation governing the environmental action is CERCLA which was enacted in 1980 as a result of conditions at Love Canal. He explained CERCLA authorizes two types of response actions: remedial responses (long-term) and removal responses (short-term).

e. Mr. Crone discussed the process for a long-term remedial response action, noting it is a linear process which moves from step one through step nine. He stated it begins with a Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation where site conditions are assessed and environmental data is

gathered. He said the next step would be a Remedial Investigation with a full characterization of the environmental conditions; he noted such an investigation is underway at Manor View Dump Site. Mr. Crone said the next step in the process is a Feasibility Study where remedial alternatives are evaluated to address environmental problems, followed by a Proposed Plan which recommends an alternative. He advised after public comments are received, the formal decision is documented through a Record of Decision. Mr. Crone said the Remedial Design/Remedial Action is the next step where the selected remedy is implemented and then documented in the Remedial Action Report. He explained that depending on the site, there may then follow a period of long-term monitoring. Mr. Crone stated the last step in the process is deletion from the National Priorities List. Mr. Crone explained the Manor View Dump Site will be going through the remedial action process while a removal action [buried methane generating wastes] is taken simultaneously.

f. Mr. Crone next discussed removal response actions which he explained are authorized by CERCLA when there is an imminent and substantial danger to public health which needs to be addressed. He displayed a list of the eight factors which are used to determine whether an imminent and substantial danger to public health exists. He advised the first factor-- exposure to humans, animals, or food chain from hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants, and the sixth factor—threat of fire or explosion—are the two most relevant to the Manor View Dump Site.

g. Mr. Crone reviewed the three types of removal response actions: emergency response, time critical, and non-time critical. He stated the installation of the methane monitoring system is an example of an emergency response. He advised the major difference between a time critical removal action and a non-time critical removal action is the amount of planning time available with a non-time critical removal action having the availability of six months or more for planning. Mr. Crone said the removal action at Manor View is a non-time critical response action.

h. Mr. Crone reviewed the steps in the process for a non-time critical removal action noting there is an Approval Memo which documents the need for the action followed by an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). He stated the EE/CA is similar to a Feasibility Study, and the public has the ability to comment during a formal public comment period. Mr. Crone explained after the comment period, the decision would be documented in an Action Memo. He stated a response action work plan would then be prepared prior to taking the action, followed by an interim response action report after the action is completed.

i. Mr. Crone showed how the removal action integrates into the longer-term CERCLA remedial action. He stated removal actions can be taken at any time; however, at the Manor View Dump Site, the work is currently at the Feasibility Study stage.

j. Mr. Crone briefly discussed site history at Manor View, noting waste was discovered in 2003 during a construction project. He advised the Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation was completed in 2003, and the Remedial Investigation was completed in 2005. He reminded the Board a methane recovery system was installed in 2005, which continues to be monitored weekly, and the nearby military housing units on Hayden Drive and Phelps Ave. had been evacuated. Mr. Crone stated the draft Feasibility Study was developed in the Fall of 2010.

k. Mr. Crone said the non-time critical removal action process was initiated in 2011. He stated the first step, the Approval Memorandum, has been completed for a removal action to remove the source of the hazard (the methane-generating waste) rather than continuing to treat the symptom (the methane collection system). He said the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis is undergoing review and will be released for public comment in the October/November timeframe. Mr. Crone stated the Action Memorandum would then be finalized, along with the workplan, prior to starting the action. He showed on the tentative schedule that the action is planned to begin in December 2011 or January 2012.

l. Mr. Crone discussed the workplan noting it will describe how the Army plans to eliminate or reduce the hazards posed by methane above the lower explosive limit. He said the waste which is generating the methane is on a one-acre portion of the site, and the waste is approximately 8 to 15 feet below ground surface. He said the other buried waste, construction debris and fill, will be addressed in the Feasibility Study in 2012.

m. Mr. Crone gave a general preview of how the work will be conducted, noting approximately seven feet of soil will be removed, stockpiled, and utilized as backfill after the waste is removed. He said approximately 7,200 cubic yards of waste will be excavated and taken by truck to a permitted off-post landfill. Mr. Crone advised all work will be conducted in accordance with Maryland's soil erosion and sediment control requirements, and a permit package has been submitted to the Maryland Department of the Environment. He stated elimination of the methane-generating wastes will be confirmed during a post-removal monitoring period similar to the current monitoring program. He said the workplan describes how the monitoring program will be scaled back if the results indicate no methane is being detected.

n. Mr. Crone next discussed the safeguards in the work plan for reducing and monitoring noise, monitoring on-site and at the perimeter for dust, using suppression techniques to reduce odor, controlling truck traffic routes and timing, and monitoring for methane. In response to a question about the potential for encountering asbestos, Mr. Crone explained the workplan has several contingency plans which include the possibility of encountering asbestos. He advised the other contingency plans cover the potential for encountering drums, unexploded ordnance, and cultural resources.

o. Mr. Crone showed photographs of current site conditions and an artist's rendering of what the site will look like after the action.

p. Mr. Crone summarized the schedule again, noting the needed documents are being prepared with an anticipated timeframe of December or January to begin the action.

q. Mr. Wayne Dixon asked about long-term plans for use of the site. Mr. Butler responded that the land had been transferred to Picerne for construction of military housing but was transferred back to the Army when the methane issue was discovered. Mr. Butler said discussions are ongoing between the Army and Picerne as to what will be the best use of the land. He said the environmental cleanup process would probably end with the restoration to a grassy field, and other funding sources used for any future plans.

r. Mr. Tibbetts asked about the coordination with the elementary school. Mr. Fluck responded that there has been and will continue to be extensive conversations and coordination with the school system. Mr. Daniel LaHart (Supervisor of Operations, Anne Arundel County Schools) noted probably greater than 90 percent of the population who attends Manor View Elementary School lives on Fort Meade. He added that Fort Meade has done a good job in the past with getting information out and working with the school system, and the School Board, teachers and parents will be well informed about meetings Fort Meade will hold on the removal action.

s. Mr. Fluck stated more detailed information will be provided at the November Board meeting.

9. Update on the Manor View Site Gas Recovery System:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Ms. Amanda Duggins of ARCADIS. Ms. Duggins stated the readings over the past two months have been relatively consistent with slight fluctuations due to the heavy rain in August and early September. She said the readings for methane above the lower explosive limit remain within the footprint of the methane-generating waste as shown on a map she displayed. Ms. Duggins advised there had been one shutdown since the last update and it occurred during heavy thunderstorms and power fluctuations. She said when ARCADIS responded the automatic re-start on the system had kicked in and the system was operating.

b. Mr. Neal asked if the readings increase or decrease with heavy rain. Ms. Duggins responded that the readings do not change, but there is a shift in where the methane is detected.

10. Update on the Odenton Groundwater Contamination Interim Measures Project:

a. Mr. Fluck introduced Mr. Dan Sheehan of ARCADIS/Malcolm Pirnie.

b. Mr. Sheehan stated the project has been discussed at each Board meeting for some time, and he would be providing a brief update. He displayed a site map and reminded the Board the study area for the project encompasses a one-mile radius around the deep monitoring wells 125d and 126d where volatile organic compounds were detected in the deep groundwater.

c. Mr. Sheehan showed the most recent results from the sampling of several wells on Nevada Avenue where low levels of tetrachloroethene (TCE) have been detected. He stated the most recent results show detections below the level permitted for drinking water in one well.

d. Mr. Sheehan said the final version of the project report is being prepared. He noted they are still working with property owners on rights-of-entry for the installation of additional monitoring wells. Mr. Neal asked if the Army had a good understanding of the groundwater flow in the Nevada Avenue area or if any work is planned to gather further information on the groundwater flow. Mr. Sheehan responded that the upcoming work would include examining in more detail the groundwater flow.

12. New Business:

a. Mr. Tibbetts asked Mr. Neal about his inquiry about a Technical Assistance Grant from USEPA. Mr. Neal said he had asked whether there would be money available to construct a three-dimensional representation of the area showing all the contamination and monitoring wells, both on-site and off-site. Mr. Neal said he was envisioning a tabletop model that would make it easy for the community to better understand the groundwater issues. Mr. Fluck stated the Army could provide this information on a site-by-site basis but it may be difficult contractually to do something so broad as the Army would need to demonstrate that such a model would advance the cleanup of sites. Mr. Bill Hudson explained a Technical Assistance Grant could only be used to retain a technical advisor to interpret existing data or reports for the community, but he would be glad to discuss further with Mr. Neal. Mr. Tibbetts suggested that there be another look at the available grants. Mr. Fluck said he would add this topic to the next meeting agenda. Mr. Tibbetts also suggested there be ongoing metrics for the community outreach efforts, and Mr. Fluck stated he would add this as an agenda item for the next meeting.

b. Mr. Fluck asked for any future agenda items. Mr. Fluck invited Board members to contact him at any time with suggested topics or any other suggestions.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.


MICHAEL P. BUTLER
Chief, Environmental Division

CF:
RAB MEMBERS
FGGM GARRISON COMMANDER
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE