



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF:

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

IMND-MEA-PWE

March 16, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR Restoration Advisory Board Members

SUBJECT: Minutes for the January 15, 2015 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

1. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. at the Marriott Courtyard located at 2700 Hercules Road, Annapolis Junction, Maryland, 20701. The next RAB meeting will be **Thursday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 7 p.m.**, at the Marriott Courtyard, 2700 Hercules Road, Annapolis Junction, Maryland, 20701.

2. The following RAB members were present:

Mr. John Burchette, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Mr. Mick Butler, Fort Meade Co-Chair  
Mr. George Knight, Fort Meade Restoration Manager  
Mr. Martin Madera, Community Member  
Mr. David Tibbetts, Community Co-Chair  
Mr. Brian Chew for Ms. Kerry Topovski, Anne Arundel County Health Dept.  
Mr. Fred Tutman, Community Member

3. Members not present:

Mr. Rusty Bristow, Community Member  
Mr. Wayne Dixon, Community Member  
Ms. Kellyann Few, Community Member  
Mr. Harry Neal, Community Member  
Mr. Howard Nicholson, Community Member

4. Others present were:

Mr. Ola Awosika	Parsons
Mr. Brode Campanell	EA Engineering
Mr. Steve Cardon	Fort Meade BRAC (Calibre)
Mr. Walt Chahanovich	Fort Meade, Office of SJA
Mr. John Cherry	ARCADIS
Mr. Markus Craig	IMCOM BRAC
Ms. Sarah Gettier	URS/AECOM
Dr. Elisabeth Green	Maryland Department of the Environment

Ms. Katrina Harris	Bridge Consulting Corp.
Mr. Michael Hertz	EA Engineering
Mr. Jerry Kashatus	URS/AECOM
Ms. Erin McKinley	Fort Meade Environmental Office (Osage of Virginia)
Ms. Dijon Rolle	Fort Meade Public Affairs Office
Mr. Ali Sadrieh	Plexus
Ms. Jessica Schrader	CBI
Ms. Denise Tegtmeyer	Fort Meade Environmental Office (Osage of Virginia)

5. Announcements and Minutes:

a. Mr. Mick Butler welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Mr. Butler invited all present to introduce themselves and sign in.

b. Mr. Tibbetts made a motion to approve the November 20, 2014, meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted to approve the November 20, 2014, minutes.

6. Old Business:

a. Alternate Community Co-Chair: Mr. Butler stated there had been a discussion at the previous meeting on electing an alternate community co-chair. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to elect Mr. Marty Madera as alternate community co-chair.

b. Charter Revision: Mr. Butler asked Mr. George Knight to give an update on the revision of the Board's charter. Mr. Knight advised the proposed revised charter had been sent out after the last Board meeting to incorporate several changes suggested at the November meeting regarding term limits and what constituted a quorum. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to accept the charter.

7. Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection Update:

a. Mr. Butler introduced Mr. Jerry Kashatus of URS/AECOM, an Army contractor.

b. Mr. Kashatus reminded the Board of the scope of the Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspections. He noted he had presented information on the Northern, Southwest, and Southeast Areas of Interest at previous meetings and would be discussing the Areas of Interest Located South of Route 32 at this evening's meeting.

c. Mr. Kashatus explained a Preliminary Assessment is conducted by looking at information from a site, including historical reports, aerial photographs, charts, figures, and graphs, and assessing whether the information is sufficient to reach a decision that the site is clean enough to recommend no further action; if there is uncertainty and more information is needed, the site moves into the Site Inspection phase where additional samples are collected.

d. Mr. Kashatus displayed a graphic depicting the Superfund/Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. He pointed out these sites were at the very initial stage of the CERCLA process.

e. Mr. Kashatus explained the sites were divided geographically to make them more manageable. He stated the golf course sites were given priority because of pending construction and have been closed out. He explained the other sites were divided into the North, Southeast, Southwest, and South of Route 32. Mr. Kashatus displayed a map showing how the sites were divided into geographic areas.

f. Mr. Kashatus next discussed the Areas of Interest Located South of Route 32. He said there are 10 Areas of Interest. He explained during the Preliminary Assessment phase three sites were approved to need no further action (the Medical Waste Site, Petroleum/Oil/Lubricant Storage Tanks, and Underground Storage Tanks prior to 1984). Mr. Kashatus said field work for the remaining seven sites was completed during the Site Inspection phase. He noted laboratory data had been received and validated and risk-based screening had been performed on the results. Mr. Kashatus said the draft report had been reviewed by the regulators, and responses to the regulators' comments had been submitted that morning.

g. Mr. Kashatus displayed a list of the seven remaining Areas of Interest. He advised three of those sites were recommended for no further action based on the Site Inspection. Mr. Kashatus said he would be discussing the other four sites in his presentation--Ammunition Supply Point 2, Building 9581, Motor Pool-6, and Inactive Landfill 4. He displayed a map showing the locations of the sites.

h. Mr. Kashatus reviewed the risk assessment process for the Site Inspections, noting the Board had been briefed on the process in the past. He explained the process is simpler than the risk assessments done during a Remedial Investigation; therefore, the criteria were very stringent. He stated that once all the chemical data was received from the laboratory, the maximum (not an average) detected concentration for each chemical compound is compared with the most recent residential (to be the most conservative) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) produced by EPA for soil, groundwater and air. Mr. Kashatus said chemicals become chemicals of potential concern if the maximum detected concentration is greater than the Regional Screening Levels. He said all the risks are added together and compared to the site-specific thresholds of  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  for total cancer risk and 0.5 for total non-cancer hazard. Mr. Kashatus explained if the number is less than the threshold, no further action is needed.

i. Mr. Kashatus explained for each of the sites he would be showing figures of the site with its location, historic and recent sampling results, information on why the site is an area of interest, the calculated cancer and non-cancer risk, and what is driving the risk at the site. Mr. Kashatus said he also would present the chemical compounds identified for each site that contribute the most to the elevated risk levels and the comparison numbers for EPA's Regional Screening Levels (soil) and Maximum Contaminant Levels (groundwater).

j. Mr. Kashatus first discussed Ammunition Supply Point 2, noting it is south of Route 32. He advised some sampling had been performed in the past. He explained Ammunition Supply Point 2 is a series of six igloos made of concrete where ammunition was stored. Mr. Kashatus said because the igloos have concrete floors which could not be sampled, surface soils where the small channels exited the igloos were sampled. He said current sampling found a cancer risk lower than the threshold, but an elevated non-cancer risk from metals (iron and cobalt). Mr. Kashatus advised this site has been recommended for a Supplemental Site Investigation for additional sampling for the breakdown products of the chemical agent identification set chemicals which were stored in the igloos.

k. Mr. Kashatus next discussed Building 9581, noting it was a sewage treatment facility. He said some cancer and non-cancer groundwater risk was identified during the PA/SI, both with total metals and dissolved metals (filtered groundwater to remove any sediment) analysis. He advised this site will require additional work. Ms. Green asked if speciation of chromium had been performed at this site, and Mr. Kashatus said it had not, but it might be helpful.

l. Mr. Kashatus reviewed the investigation of Motor Pool-6, noting no sampling had been performed at this site in the past. He advised the current soil sampling found a cancer risk due to chromium and a slightly elevated non-cancer hazard from iron. He stated the groundwater at this area is being addressed under Operable Unit 4. Mr. Kashatus said the site was recommended for a Supplemental Site Investigation for the speciation of chromium in soil to ensure the correct type of chromium is used in the analysis.

m. Mr. Kashatus next discussed Inactive Landfill 4, a former rubble landfill. He advised previous sediment and groundwater sampling had been conducted. He showed two different boundaries for the landfill. Mr. Kashatus said the recent work included a series of test pits to verify it was a rubble landfill. He said recently work also involved an evaluation of previous groundwater sampling which identified no elevated risk. He said the recent work did find an elevated non-cancer hazard in the soil from metals and 2,3,7, 8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. Mr. Kashatus said additional work would be done at this site.

#### 8. Range 17 - Trap and Skeet Range Soil Remediation:

a. Mr. Steve Cardon introduced Mr. Michael Hertz of EA Engineering, a contractor to the Base Realignment and Closure Act (BRAC) Program at Fort Meade. He advised Mr. Hertz would be discussing the remediation of soil at the Trap and Skeet Range 17 as required by a Record of Decision signed for the site in September 2014.

b. Mr. Hertz gave an introduction to his company and the project team. He advised the contract was issued through the Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and calls for EA to achieve response complete at the site by September 30, 2017. He explained that achieving response complete means only minor monitoring and inspections will be left to be performed. Mr. Hertz said they hope to begin the field work this coming spring.

c. Mr. Hertz displayed a map showing the location of the site in the middle of the Patuxent Research Refuge, North Tract.

d. Mr. Hertz reviewed the site background and history, noting the site is about 20 acres. He stated the entire Patuxent Research Refuge had at one time been a training range, so there is the potential for unexploded ordnance. He said the trap and skeet range began operating in the 1970s and closed in the 1990s. He explained the site consists of a trap range (with a high house and a low house) and one skeet range. Mr. Hertz said the activities created soil contamination from metals (such as lead and arsenic), the lead shot, and clay pigeons which contain polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

e. Mr. Hertz displayed aerial photographs of the site and showed the areas of impact down to six to 12 inches below the ground surface.

f. Mr. Hertz advised the Remedial Investigation was completed by URS, and the report was finalized in June 2014 and included risk assessments. He stated the risk assessments found an ecological risk which is driving the cleanup. He said the Feasibility Study did a comparison of technologies and found about 9,960 cubic yards of soil had been impacted by lead, and approximately 6,619 cubic yards of soil had been impacted by PAHs. Mr. Hertz said the recommendation was excavation and off-site treatment and disposal, along with land use controls. He explained the rationale for off-site treatment was to render the soil non-hazardous, so it can be placed in a landfill versus disposing of the soil as hazardous material which would be more expensive. Mr. Hertz noted a public meeting had been held to discuss the proposed alternative, and then a Record of Decision was signed to document the chosen remedy. He said the Record of Decision states the soil will be cleaned up to 260 parts per million for lead; all the other contaminants are co-located, so they will also be addressed. He said the PAHs associated with the skeet will also be addressed.

g. Mr. Hertz showed a graphic of where the site was in the CERCLA process and noted the remedial design is being prepared. He noted after the response is complete, there will be five-year reviews to ensure the remedy continues to be protective.

h. Mr. Hertz reviewed the remedial action objectives which are spelled out in the Record of Decision. He said the first is to control exposure of human and ecological receptors to the site soil contaminated above 260 parts per million of lead. He said the second objective is to reduce soil contaminant concentrations, and the third objective is to prevent potential future off-site migration.

i. Mr. Hertz reviewed the planned remediation. He explained since there is a potential for unexploded ordnance, ordnance technicians will be present during the remediation. He said as the soil comes out of the ground, it will be sampled to determine if it is hazardous and, thus, needs treatment before disposal. He stated the PAH-impacted soil will be excavated from the area near the trap house and skeet house down to 12 inches. Mr. Hertz said the excavated areas will be filled in, revegetated, and then land use controls will be established and entered into the Army's GIS.

j. Mr. Hertz displayed slides showing how the work has been divided into four phases: developing plans (current phase), site preparation and unexploded ordnance investigation/removal, excavation and off-site disposal, and closure report. Mr. Hertz said draft plans have been prepared and are in various stages of review. Mr. Fred Tutman asked if a discharge permit is needed. Mr. Hertz said erosion and sediment controls will be put in place, and he will check the plan to see if a permit is needed. It was later determined that substantive requirements for the NPDES is covered by the E&S Plan that was generated, and it was confirmed that a NPDES permit is not required per MDE correspondence.

k. Mr. Hertz summarized the project schedule noting they hope to begin site preparation in April and perform the excavation from August to December.

l. Mr. Hertz provided a list of contacts.

m. Mr. Butler asked if the truck route was known yet, and Mr. Hertz said it was still being developed.

9. Update on the Nevada Avenue Investigation:

a. Mr. Butler introduced Ms. Denise Tegtmeyer of Osage of Virginia to give an update on the Nevada Avenue investigation.

b. Ms. Tegtmeyer advised she would be giving an update on the monthly sampling results at the three off-post homes as shown on an aerial photograph. She displayed a table and chart showing monitoring results from the last 12 months through December 2014. She stated there some slightly elevated detections at one house, but the detections are still around 1.3 to 2.2 parts per billion.

c. Ms. Tegtmeyer said the report is in the draft final stage with comments from the regulators being resolved. She advised the monthly sampling will continue as will the provision of bottled water.

10. Open Discussion/New Business:

a. Mr. Butler advised that ARCADIS' contract had ended December 31, 2014, and he wanted to thank ARCADIS, EPA, Maryland Department of the Environment, George Knight, Denise Tegtmeyer, and Erin McKinley for all the work done during the last couple weeks of the year to try and finish some work under the ARCADIS contract.

b. Mr. Knight gave an update on the contract status. He noted the sites under the previous ARCADIS contract will be picked up in a new contract, as well as the sites Mr. Kashatus has been discussing that are moving forward to a Supplemental Site Investigation or Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. Mr. Knight said this contract is expected to be awarded by June 2015. He explained another contract will address Operable Units 1, 3, and 5;

IMND-MEA-PWE

SUBJECT: Minutes for the January 15, 2015 RAB Meeting

and that contract will probably be awarded in April 2015. He stated there is a bridge contract to fill the gap until the contracts are awarded. Mr. Butler said ARCADIS was awarded the bridge contract which is primarily focused on operating the groundwater treatment systems.

c. In response to a question about why the Closed Sanitary Landfill Proposed Plan meeting was cancelled, Mr. Knight advised there were a few issues that needed to be resolved and with holiday vacation schedules not everyone was available. He said the site will be part of the new contract, so there will not be a meeting before June.

d. The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

MICHAEL P. BUTLER  
Chief, Environmental Division

CF:  
RAB MEMBERS  
FGGM GARRISON COMMANDER  
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE