

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary, 07 MAY 09

1. Summary Contents

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

SUBJECT/ACTION TYPE	SECTION NUMBER
Summary Contents	1
Attendees	2
Meeting Opening / Remarks	3
Ft. Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update and ATSDR Update	4
Administrative Activities	5
RAB Membership	6
Date of Next Meeting	7
Meeting Closing	8

Please note: A PowerPoint presentation was utilized during the RAB meeting. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes and is incorporated into these minutes by this reference.

2. Attendees

Members Present:

COL Judith Robinson, Garrison Commander and Co-Chair
LTC Carl Hover, Director, SEIPO
Ms. Linda Robinson, Community Member and Co-Chair
Mr. Robert Craig, Chief, Environmental Management Office
Mr. Joseph Gortva, Environmental Restoration Program Manager
Ms. Helen Miller-Scott, Community RAB Member
Dr. Gary T. Pauly, Community RAB Member
Mr. Curtis DeTore, Maryland Department of the Environment
Ms. Laurie Haines, US Army Environmental Command
Mr. Brett Merkel, US Army Environmental Command

Others Present:

Mr. Jeffrey Parks, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Ms. Robin Sims, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Mr. Bill Hudson, USEPA Region III
Mr. Keith Hoddinott, USACHPPM
Ms. Denise Robinson, DOD/USACHPPM
Mr. Mark Evans, ATSDR
Ms. Laressa Hill, USAG/PAD
Mr. Gary Zolyak, USAG/OSJH (Ft. Detrick Environmental Attorney)
Mr. Karl Markiewicz, CDC/ATSDR
Mr. Barry Kissin, Community Member

Members Absent:

Mr. Charles Billups, Community RAB Member
Ms. Alicia Evangelista, Frederick County Health Department
Mr. Gerald Toomey Community RAB Member
Mr. Craig Toussaint, Community RAB Member
Mr. Thomas Wade, Community RAB Member
Dr. Henry Erbes, Community RAB Member
Mr. James Eaton, Community RAB Member

3. Meeting Opening / Remarks

Colonel (COL) Judith Robinson convened the meeting at approximately 7:30 p.m., on Thursday, May 07, 2009, in the Community Activities Center (CAC) at 718 Porter Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland. COL Robinson thanked everyone for coming, was glad everyone found the new location, and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

4. Ft. Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update presented by Mr. Jeffrey Parks and ATSDR Update presented by Mr. Mark Evans

Mr. Jeff Parks of Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. began by explaining that his presentation would cover Area A, Area B Groundwater, and the Area B Former Disposal sites. The first section of the presentation covered the Area A – Building 568 TCE Spill Site and the most recent long-term groundwater monitoring data results (Sept '08 and Mar '09).

Area A – Building 568 TCE Spill Site

Area A, Building 568 TCE Spill Site, is undergoing the chosen remedy of plume containment using groundwater extraction and monitoring, which included the continued operation of the existing groundwater extraction system in Building 568 and the long-term monitoring of groundwater every six months since 2002. Groundwater in Area A generally flows to the southwest, toward Carroll Creek. The data shows that trichloroethylene (TCE) concentrations at Building 568 have been decreasing over time, and are close to approaching the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for TCE, which is 5 parts per billion (ppb). Well 568-15A, which is south of building 568, is where PCE has been detected above MCLs a few times, but not anywhere near Bldg 568. Building 568 used TCE in their cooling processes. However, there is no known source of PCE in the area.

The Army is looking into whether the PCE detections near the western Area A boundary may be associated with the Area B plume or if it's a localized source. Most likely it is a local source, like the historic aircraft hanger found there. A dye trace study planned for Area B may be able to determine if the PCE detections are from the Area B plume.

Comments:

- Mr. Barry Kissin asked how long the Army has been pumping groundwater.
 - Mr. Gortva responded by saying that the Army has been withdrawing groundwater at Area A since the 80's. However, the water has been withdrawn for the use of aquaculture studies and filtered after removal for the same reason. It just happens to be serving 2 purposes simultaneously.
- Mr. Kissin then asked why there was such a recent drop in concentration from 10ppb to 6ppb if they've been pumping for so long?
 - Mr. Gortva responded by saying that the concentrations were close to 1000 ppb in 2001. The concentrations have been decreasing steadily over time. The pumping has captured the plume and contained the highest concentrations on site. Based on this trend, the Army hopes it can close-out the site in 2-3 yrs.
- Mr. Kissin asked if anyone had heard of the EPA wanting to bring down the MCL for TCE significantly. He stated that he had read that the EPA recently found TCE to be 40 times more dangerous than originally thought.
 - No one else had heard of this. Mr. Zolyak responded that he keeps well updated on such matters and had not heard of this. Mr. Gortva added that if the regulators were to lower the MCL for TCE, that the Army would certainly address it.
- Mr. Kissin asked if it is possible that contamination has leached into Carroll Creek now that it is possible that Area B is the source of Area A groundwater contamination.
 - The Army's response was that if TCE were leaching into Carroll Creek, it would volatilize quickly and not be detected in analytical testing.

Area B Groundwater Quarterly Monitoring

Quarterly groundwater monitoring is being performed. The most recent sampling events were in December 2008 and March 2009. During these sampling periods, the nearby homeowner wells and Robinson Spring were sampled. Homeowner wells have been sampled since the beginning of the sampling. There have rarely been any detections, with the only ones being less than 1 ppb. Mr. Gortva added that there had been some blank sample contamination problems with the detections. Since then, a new analytical laboratory has been used and those problems

disappeared. However, since the beginning of these investigations, the Army has been supplying the nearby homeowners with bottled water just to be safe.

Area B Groundwater NPL Listing

In Feb '08, the Army submitted a conceptual site model to the MDE and EPA describing site conditions. MDE and EPA expressed concern that further characterization of groundwater was needed, and has proposed the site to be listed on the National Priorities List (NPL). As part of the prospective NPL listing, the ATSDR will be performing a Public Health Assessment. The listing of the site on the NPL became official on April 8, 2009.

ATSDR Presentation of Investigation Results

Mr. Mark Evans with ATSDR explained that their agency is required by Congress to do a Public Health Assessment on a site when it is proposed to be added to the NPL. He said that through their assessment, they examined all plausible pathways of exposure to the offsite community from the Area B contamination. Some of those pathways included consumption of drinking water, surface water exposure, and potential vapor intrusion. They concluded that the only viable pathway is the potential past drinking water exposure in 1 to 2 residences and businesses in the area. The chemicals detected offsite were PCE and TCE. They calculated doses based on how much a potential resident would consume. Calculated doses were based on 1992 data the state collected where the local residents were exposed to 17 and 19 ppb in the drinking water. Then, they conservatively doubled the background doses based on the idea that the public may be breathing the air where drinking water is vaporizing. The agency concluded that there is no apparent public health hazard from Area B. This means there was exposure, but that it was below any harmful concentrations. The ATSDR will extend the public comment period based on the fact that they just finished and presented their findings. The 21st of May will now be the new end of the public comment period. As for offsite detections, a 1time detection of 20,000 ppb of PCE was found. The Army went back to resample the location two weeks later to confirm the detection. This time the concentration found was only 10 ppb. Therefore, there is a possibility that the detection was a false detection or that perhaps there was a single droplet of solvent in the sample. That one solitary detection was odd since the Army never observed concentrations like that anywhere other than the source of the plume at Area B-11.

Comments:

- Mr. Barry Kissin voiced his concern over the validity or trustworthiness of ATSDR's assessments. He read aloud a passage from a March 15, 2009 article from the San Antonio paper citing a report by House Science and Technologies supporting his opinion.
- Mr. Kissin wondered if the EPA decided to put the site on the NPL because the Army was supposedly "dragging its heels".
 - Mr. Gortva responded by saying that the EPA decided to list the site stating it would be a way to ensure that the complex issues at the site would be thoroughly addressed.

Area B Groundwater 2008 Activities and Path Forward

Mr. Jeff Parks continued his presentation by stating that Shaw and the Army are close to being able to develop the Area B groundwater Work Plan. They are and have been working with the EPA and MDE in order to develop the work plan. It has taken the past 10 months in order to bring the EPA Geologist up to speed on 15 years of studies and data. Mr. Joe Gortva added that

this work plan is being produced because of concerns with shortcomings with the groundwater conceptual site model.

Shaw and the Army did not want to sit idle while the EPA Geologist was being updated. So, the drilling of two very deep (325 ft) multiple completion wells at Area B began during this time. These wells were intended to help characterize deep groundwater and determine if the contamination is deeper than originally believed. In the former deepest samples, at 180 ft bgs, the concentrations were around 2-3 ug/L. During the drilling, two sinkholes opened up by the wells. This occurrence is common. There are 60 wells in Area B and almost half of them have drilled into void spaces. That is simply the nature of the karst geology in the area. It seems that the sinkholes opened up because of the surface soil collapsing due to groundwater being withdrawn. The Army proposed that these two wells would be drilled in two weeks and now it is taking over 3 months because of these geologic issues. The deepest well at Area B was 180 ft, before these two wells were drilled. When sampled, these wells showed very low levels of PCE at depth (around 2ppb, which is below MCL). One of the wells is located to the west near the beginning of the plume in order to determine if TCE is found in deep groundwater. The second well is located on post to the east by the bakery and the Area B gate in order to measure if contaminants are getting off-post.

Mr. Joe Gortva added that the Army is potentially looking into installing wells off-post at Carroll Creek. It is possible that an array of new wells may be drilled in the flood plain behind Pizza Hut.

Comments:

- Mr. Kissin asked how long it will take to complete the deep well study at Area B and be ready for remediation.
 - Mr. Bob Craig responded by saying that a dye trace study must be completed first, before remediation begins, and will take at least 3 yrs until the study is complete. The Army did not realize how long it would take to develop the work plan. Therefore, the completion dates previously chosen were not met because of unseen circumstances. Colonel Robinson added that they Army takes this situation seriously and is trying their best to meet completion dates. She will badger those higher up than her in order to help move things along and get things done. The Army is not the only entity involved and it looks to other agencies involved to help move the process along.
- Mr. Kissin made a comment about how it seems the process is being slowed only because of money.
 - Mr. Curtis DeTore with MDE responded saying that with some sites it takes 30-40 years before a NPL site is de-listed.
 - Ms. Laurie Haines, with USAEC, added that the Army has already closed out 29 of 30 sites.
 - Mr. Zolyak added that placing a site on the NPL will often slow down the process
 - Mr. Gortva added to Mr. Zolyak's comment by stating that bringing on new agencies/entities often adds time because you have to bring new individuals up to speed. However, during the last 2 partnering meetings, they have made significant progress.
 - Ms. Haines said that things have seemed to slow down since the listing, but that it is no one's fault. The EPA is now part of the partnering process because they feel they need to ensure environmental concerns are properly addressed. The slow speed of this process is just the nature of the business. The Army is

committed to moving things along as fast as possible. However, they must ensure that all involved parties come to a consensus on what should be done.

- Mr. Evans with ATSDR asked if the rock around the new wells is strong enough to support packers?
 - Mr. Parks responded by saying that yes, the drillers can packer-off below and above the sampling intervals if needed.

- Mr. Bob Craig asked what kind of concentrations had been found in the heart of the plume. When did we reach the benchmark of concentration being below 1000 ug/L?
 - Mr. Parks responded that the last three sampling rounds have concentrated on the homeowner wells. However, the last detection they encountered in the center of the plume was between 500 and 1000 ug/L. Then, a little farther out the concentrations were around 50 ppb. The concentrations decrease rapidly across the plume. The source of the plume has been removed and now they are working on confirming the extents of the plume. That is why these new wells are so deep. We reached the benchmark of levels being below 1000 ug/L in the heart of the plume about 3 years ago.

Area B Former Disposal Sites

Shaw has been investigating them for a few years now. The plan is to install impermeable caps on all the sites. All of the RI/FSs and Decision Documents have been finalized. The capping designs are still under review by the regulators. By the end of May the design plans should be approved. Then, in June construction should hopefully begin. One issue that may cause problems is that a 4% slope must be maintained in order to ensure proper drainage and this requires a lot of soil.

The Western Disposal Area cap plan includes approximately 8 acres of cap. In order to keep the processes moving, Shaw has stockpiled soil on site, until the end of May or whenever the design plans are approved. With these dates in mind, the hope is that construction of all caps will be complete by the end of this September.

5. Administrative Activities

It was announced that the meeting minutes from the last RAB meeting are available. The Army will provide 2 weeks in order for anyone to give comments on them if anything needs to be changed.

Mr. Bob Craig brought up that there may be a possibility of forming a RAB at the Forest Glen Annex. He asked if anyone knew of any interest for one there. Colonel Robinson said she knew of local people around that area that would be very interested in one.

6. RAB Membership

Mr. Barry Kissin, community member, requested to be considered for RAB membership. He was asked to leave the room while current RAB members voted on whether to allow him membership. When Mr. Kissin returned into the room, it was announced that the voting was unanimous in allowing him to become a member of the RAB. He was welcomed to the RAB. The current RAB members were glad someone was interested in joining. They would like even more members.

7. Date of next RAB meeting

It would be best if the next RAB meeting were scheduled for when the caps and the work plan were complete. It was estimated that the work plan may be complete in 3-4 months. June 23-24 is the next partnering meeting. So, it would be determined that possibly sometime in mid-September would be the best date. It would be nice if the RAB meeting could also include a site walk out to a finished cap and also one that is in progress of construction. With this in mind, it would be best to schedule the meeting for an earlier time, like 6 pm. The Army will send out a proposed date in late July/early August when they have a better idea of what exact date would be best.

10. Meeting Closing

Colonel Robinson concluded the meeting by once again welcoming Mr. Barry Kissin to the RAB.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Reviewed by:

Approved/Disapproved

Enclosure:

Fort Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update Slide Presentation
Meeting Sign-In Sheet

DISTRIBUTION:

Each RAB Member (w/o enclosure)
Each Meeting Attendee (w/o enclosure)