

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting,
December 11, 2003

1. Index of Minutes

Items addressed at the meeting are listed below, with corresponding section numbers indicated in the column on the right.

SUBJECT/ACTION TYPE	SECTION NUMBER
Index of Minutes	1
Attendance	2
Meeting Opening	3
Opening Remarks	4
Area B-11 Status	5
Area A Update	6
Area A Water Levels	7
Area B Update	8
Area B Water Levels	9
Area C Update	10
Open Comments	11
Performance Based Contracting	12
Future of the RAB	13
Date for Next Meeting	14
Meeting Closing	15

2. AttendanceMembers Present:

Lieutenant Colonel Donald Archibald, Director, SEIPO

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
December 11, 2003

Mr. Larry Bohn, Frederick County Health Department
Dr. Henry Erbes, Community Member
Mr. Joe Gortva, Environmental Restoration Manager, SEIPO
Mr. Michael Kurtianyk, Community Member
Mr. Tim Llewellyn, Arcadis
Mr. Thomas Meyer, Project Manager, US Army Corps of Engineers,
Baltimore District
Mr. Gary Pauly, Community Member
Mr. Douglas Scarborough, Restoration Oversight Manager, US Army Environmental
Center
Ms. Helen Miller-Scott, Community Member
Mr. Stewart Taylor, Community Member
Mr. Gerald P. Toomey, Community Co-Chairman
Mr. Tom Wade, Community Member

Others Present:

Ms. Liz Babiarz, Frederick New-Post
Mr. Robert Craig, Chief, Environmental Management Division, SEIPO
Mr. Chuck Dasey, Public Affairs Officer, HQ USAMRMC
Mr. David Iseri, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (Shaw E&I)
Mr. Douglas Mayles, Analytical Services, Inc.
Ms. Susan Snyder, Analytical Services, Inc. (Recording Secretary)

Members Absent:

Colonel John Ball, Commander, US Army Garrison, Fort Detrick
Ms. Helen Alexander, Community Member
Mr. Charles Billups, Ph.D., Community Member
Mr. William Effland, Ph.D., Community Member
Mr. Michael Gresalfi, Community Member
Mr. Paul Offutt, Program Manager, Frederick County Health Department
Mr. Dennis Orenshaw, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region III
Mr. Daniel Patton, Safety and Loss Control Manager, City of Frederick
Ms. Linda Robinson, Community Member

3. Meeting Opening

Lieutenant Colonel Donald Archibald convened the meeting at 7:40 p.m., on Thursday,
December 11, 2003, in Conference Room 3, 810 Schreider Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland.

4. Opening Remarks

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
December 11, 2003

Lieutenant Colonel Donald Archibald welcomed everyone to the December RAB meeting and wished everyone a happy holiday. Colonel Ball sent his regrets that he could not attend the meeting. He was briefed about the meeting agenda. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald said this was a good turnout for the meeting and expressed thanks to those attending and being part of the RAB. Later on in the meeting, there will be a discussion about where the RAB is going in the future. The restoration process is coming to an end. The excavation portion of the work is finished, and now we are in the process of milling some more soil. Soon, decontamination will begin. The end date for the project is projected for May 2004. Mr. Tom Meyer gave an update on each of the areas. Prior to the briefing, one RAB member asked why the remediation of Pits 2, 3, and 4, was much shorter than Pit 1. It was explained this was started as a chemical project and there were several events that happened one of which was finding vials. Additionally, Pit 1 involved a freeze wall and the other pits did not. Finally, in Pit 1, we were only able to do 2 roll offs per week, but that increased to 3-4 roll offs per week in the succeeding pits.

5. Area B-11 Status

A Fort Detrick Installation Restoration Program handout (Enclosure) was provided. Mr. Meyer began by saying he was only going to cover changes in the handout from the last RAB Meeting. Pit 4 excavation commenced August 7, and ended November 3. The site was regraded from November 3 through November 17. Forty-two cylinders (twenty intact) were removed from Pits 2, 3, and 4. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald pointed out a substantial accomplishment in that there have been no lost time accidents for 1,044 days. Safety continues to be placed as the primary importance on the job.

Approximately 1,534 tons of soil (nine hazardous overburden roll-offs for Detrick landfill) has been loaded from Pits 2, 3, and 4 into roll-off boxes as of December 11. A new vehicle pass through was ordered due to damage sustained by the original unit from recent storms and high winds. The new structure will arrive on December 15 and be erected the same day. Roll-offs remain inside of the tent, and nothing will be taken out until the new vehicle pass through is assembled and working properly as it serves as a secondary decontamination area.

Ninety-four cylinders were removed from the four pits. Fifty-nine of these were intact. The PINS analysis and x-rays of some recovered cylinders show a liquid, possibly liquefied gas. Subcontractors will not be using the PINS analysis system, as they will be opening the cylinders.

The cylinder disposition schedule was discussed: complete work plans by January 27; prove-out biological sterilization process by January 15; cylinder disposition by March 12; final decon/site restoration by April 30. A question was raised as to what the cylinders are made from. Mostly they are steel, some of which are very rusted and pitted. One or two are stainless steel. The sizes

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
December 11, 2003

and shapes are very different from each other. Very few have markings. Some appear to be custom made. Disposition is fully funded and a contract to Shaw E&I was awarded on September 29, 2003.

Mr. Meyer reviewed the Cylinder Alternative 2 Process Flowchart in the handout. There will be two blowers running throughout the entire process with separate chambers for small and large cylinders passing through HEPA filtration to determine what type of chemical/gas is present. Spore strips will be placed in the cylinder management device to ascertain if the autoclave process worked. Chemical waste will be packed and shipped for disposal. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald stated a number of systems were evaluated, and the state of Maryland and the EPA were asked for input. They agreed the most feasible and safest option of treating the cylinders was onsite. If anything is not able to be autoclaved, the cylinder will be packed in another container and shipped offsite to a certified waste facility. Anything that cannot be stabilized or oxidized on site will also be repackaged. A question was asked as to how large the cylinders were. The largest is 8-inches in diameter by 24-inches long.

6. Area A Update

Mr. Meyer moved to the Area A Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) Update. Final Area A LTM sampling report from May 2003 will be completed in December 2003. Draft Area A sampling from October 2003 will be completed in January 2004. Area A LTM sampling (3rd round) was completed in October 2003.

7. Area A Water Levels

Area A shallow and deep water levels were discussed and the flow to the south and west with draw down influence in the vicinity of building 568, due to pumping wells. Water levels are generally lower than in spring 2003. Groundwater levels of trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetachloroethene (PCE) were considerably higher four years ago and are dropping based on the May sampling.

8. Area B Update

Changes to the Area B Update were discussed. The Background Study completion date is now January 2004 and the Area B-1 Site Close-Out Document (Final Draft) is to be completed in March 2004. The semi-annual Area B sampling (October 2003) results are pending. Additional periodic groundwater monitoring will continue.

9. Area B Water Levels

Area B water levels from October 2003 were discussed. Groundwater elevations are approximately 15 feet lower on the west side of Area B compared to spring 2003. Flow directions and gradients are similar to past events.

10. Area C Update

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting

December 11, 2003

Attention was directed to the Area C Update. A final draft of the Remedial Investigation was completed in October 2003, and is currently under review. The final is scheduled for February 2004.

11. Open Comments

A question was asked as to whether or not it is known what is below the bottom of the pits and the top of the groundwater, and if there are any plans to take samples from that area. Mr. Meyer responded that samples were taken at the bottom of the pits, but sampling below that has not been discussed. At this point, they know only what has been scraped from the soil at the bottom of the pits, not what is 10 feet below that point. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald commented this particular type of action is specifically designed as a hot spot removal, but the question of the ground water is one that we will still have to work through. That is a long-term solution with a lot more work and studies as to the best strategy with the type of geology and chemicals we have here. We reviewed pilot studies to determine what would give us the best results with one being injecting a solution into the aquifers to mitigate the ground water contamination. Before we spend money, we need to take a careful look at what would have the most likelihood of success. A dye trace study will be conducted in 2004 and will be the basis on which we will look at future remediation technology.

12. Performance Based Contracting (PBC)

Mr. Douglas Scarbough, Army Environmental Center (AEC), discussed PBC including an overview and a status of PBC on Fort Detrick. Fort Detrick has been identified as a potential installation for PBC for their Army Restoration Program. A team will recommend, by the beginning of the year, one of three alternatives: against Fort Detrick as a candidate for PBC, a candidate applicable for portions of PBC, or a candidate in total for PBC. PBC is a different type of contracting than the government has used in the past. Typically a contractor is hired, instructed on what to do, and a price is negotiated. Under PBC, the Army tells the contractor what the end result should be and the contractor determines how to do it. This includes gaining regulatory and Army approvals. The contractor bids on it, and when the project is complete and everyone has signed off, the contractor is paid. If there is any rework involved, the contractor is responsible for the cost. This is another mechanism to aid in the Army Restoration Program's goal of cleaning up installations. If Fort Detrick is identified in part or in total as an Army Restoration Program PBC candidate, a team will return, along with regulators, and meet with installation representatives to determine which sites will be included, provided they are within the limits of the program. The scope of the contract will be written, there will be an independent government cost estimate, it will be advertised, the prospective bidders will be brought in to meet with installation representatives, a contract review panel will review the bids, and the contract will be awarded. Here is where a lot of people feel they lose control of the contract under PBC. There are two important people in control under a government contract. They are the Contracting Officer (CO) and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The CO will

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
December 11, 2003

be in the Northern Regional Contracting Center at Fort Eustis, VA. The COR, the technical overseer of the contract, will be selected by Fort Detrick, will be under the installation's control and will work with the PBC contractor. Partnering will continue, the RAB will continue, regulatory involvement will continue, and the Army will continue to fund through the state's participation in regulatory involvement.

This is all part of President Bush's reinvention and privatization of government. The advantage to this is by the contractor selecting the remedy, they share the risk with the government. Currently, the government takes all the risk for the program. Here, we are asking the contractor to share the risk with us. The incentive for the contractor is to complete the project faster since payment is not made until the project is complete.

There were PBC contracts awarded in fiscal year 2003. Forty percent of the Army Restoration Program dollars will be under PBC this fiscal year. Eighty percent of this program will be under PBC by the end of fiscal year 2005. The administration feels that PBC is a way to speed up the Army Restoration Program and fix the government's financial liability. The Army is willing to pay more to achieve these goals.

If PBC functions as it is intended, the state of Maryland's workload will increase because there will be a number of documents for them to review within a compressed timeframe. Maryland is different than some other states in that they have a personnel ceiling. If this becomes a problem, it will be elevated, probably to the level where the Assistant Secretary of Army and the Secretary of the Maryland Department of the Environment will meet to discuss the issue.

Lieutenant Colonel Archibald said that Mr. Scarborough was here to provide a concept of the PBC process and how it is evolving. If in the future you have additional questions, call or email us and we will try to get the answers. Additional information can be found at the AEC Website including Frequently Asked Questions on PBC.

13. Future of the RAB

Lieutenant Colonel Archibald spoke of how RAB member representation is dwindling. Initially, there was a large representation, but currently, fewer RAB members are attending meetings. Do we need to reevaluate who sits on the RAB? What do we need to do to solicit additional members? Mr. Joe Gortva asked the RAB if they were in favor of conducting a membership drive to see if there were people interested in joining. One member stated it is healthy to have some turnover of people in order to bring new ideas and different perspectives to the organization. A question was raised as to where the holes in the membership are. Do we want more professional members or more community representation? In many RABs, there is a fifty/fifty split between professional and community membership. It would be good to have a city representative participating. Essentially, we would like to have more community members who have a vested interest in what is going on at Fort Detrick, especially individuals located immediately adjacent to the installation or from homeowners' associations. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald views the RAB as a mechanism of passing information through the members to the

MCHD-SI

SUBJECT: Minutes from the Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
December 11, 2003

community. Army policy dictates that a survey has to be conducted every two years to see if there is interest in joining a RAB and that effort must be continued even if no interest is generated. One of the reasons for the drop off in membership is the B-11 project has been a very long drawn out process. In the future, there should be more activity, which could generate additional interest in joining. At the next meeting, we will bring the list of members who have not been attending, recommendations for how many members should be on the board, and ideas for recruiting new members.

Prior to the end of the meeting, there were general discussions of the dismantling of NCI's building 478, the Biodefense Campus project, the Environmental Impact Statement for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) project, and the sludge removal.

14. Date for Next Meeting

RAB meetings are held bimonthly on the second Wednesday of the month. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 11, 2004, at 7:30 p.m., at Fort Detrick.

15. Meeting Closing

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Reviewed by:

Donald F. Archibald
Lieutenant Colonel, US Army
Co-Chairman

Approved/Disapproved

John E. Ball
Colonel, US Army
Deputy Installation Commander

Enclosure:

Fort Detrick Installation Restoration Program Handout

DISTRIBUTION:

Each RAB Member (w/o enclosure)

Each Meeting Attendee (w/o enclosure)