

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary, 8 MAY 08

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
Review of Prior Meeting Minutes	4
National Priority List (NPL) Update	5
Area B Presentation	6a
Area B Former Disposal Sites	6b
Area B Groundwater Update	6c
Draft Installation Action Plan (FY08)	7
RAB Membership	8
Open Comments	9
Date of Next Meeting	10
Meeting Closing	11

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 Mary Deutsch, Garrison Commander and Co-Chair
Ms. Linda Robinson, Community Member and Co-Chair
LTC Carl Hover, Director, SEIPO
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. Douglas Scarborough, Environmental Restoration Manager, U.S. Army Environmental Command
Mr. Curtis DeTore, Maryland Department of the Environment
Mr. James Eaton, Community RAB Member
Chuck Gordon, Ft. Detrick Public Affairs Office

Others Present:

Mr. Jeffrey Parks, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Ms. Robin Sims, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Mr. Rob Thomson, Environmental Protection Agency
CPT Ryan Wolfe, OSJA, Ft. Detrick Legal Office
Mr. Barry Kissin, Interested Community Member
Ms. Alicia Evangelista, Frederick County Health Department
Ms. Rebecca Krieg, Frederick County Health Department
Mr. Keith Hoddinott, Surgeon Generals Office

Members Absent:

Dr. Henry Erbes, Community RAB Member
Mr. Charles Billups, Community RAB Member
Mr. Daniel J. Patton, Community RAB Member
Mr. Gerald Toomey Community RAB Member
Mr. Craig Toussaint, Community RAB Member
Mr. Thomas Wade, Community RAB Member

3. Meeting Opening / Remarks

Mr. Robert Craig convened the meeting at approximately 7:30 p.m., on Monday, March 03, 2008, in Conference Room 3 at 810 Schreider Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland. Mr. Craig started by saying that Colonel Mary Deutsch would be a little late to the meeting and that this would be her last meeting. He added that the change of command will occur on July 11th, if anyone would like to attend it. He thanked everyone for coming, asked everyone to sign the sign-in sheet, and to introduce themselves since there were some new attendees. The last meeting's minutes, the draft charter, and a membership application were all available on the table for anyone who didn't already have them. All necessary handouts (including the agenda, the draft charter, and a RAB membership application) were distributed and introductions were made. Those attending for the first time made more detailed introductions explaining what they do. The new attendees were Rebecca Craig of the Frederick County Health Department, Rob Thompson of the EPA, and Chuck Gordon of Public Affairs at Ft. Detrick. Ms. Linda Robinson also welcomed the new attendees to the meeting.

4. Review of Prior Meeting Minutes

Mr. Robert Craig brought up that Mr. Hank Sokolowski, EPA, made comments stating that the prior meeting minutes missed one of Butch Dye's major comments. There was a recorder problem that occurred during the previous meeting. Mr. Scarborough stated that after the Army first heard this comment and could not figure out what they missed, they asked Mr. Dye if he could provide them with a written statement of what they missed so that they could add it to the meeting minutes. However, Mr. Dye has not provided them with that yet. Mr. DeTore said that he would mention something to Mr. Dye. Bob Craig added that if there are no other errors/omissions found then we will accept the minutes with the addition Mr. Dye may add. Everyone agreed.

- Mr. Kissin, community member, asked if this missing statement was about making Area B a national priority list site.
- Mr. Scarborough responded by saying that he thought it was a statement Mr. Dye made around the same time as that discussion. However, that Mr. Dye made some specific comment, which we are unsure of what it is, that he would like included.

5. National Priority List (NPL) Update

This is the 4th RAB meeting in which we have been able to discuss the potential listing of Area B on the NPL. From the Army's perspective, this discussion started on May 2, 2007. On that date Mr. Sokolowski called the Garrison and spoke to their Deputy Garrison Commander, Eileen Mitchell, and advised her that the EPA was considering the recommendation that Area B be placed on the NPL. That started a whole series of actions, negotiations for a mutually-agreeable consent order. Those negotiations did not come to fruition. The process has continued from there. Most recently, on April 4th, in DC, there was a meeting with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Mr. Davis), the Deputy Administrator for the EPA (Ms. Susan Bodine), Senior Reps from the Army Environmental Command (Mr. Jim Daniel), senior people from the Office of Management and Budget, and Hank Sokolowski (from the EPA Region III) in which a 2-hour technical presentation was conducted. During this meeting, Ms. Bodine announced that the EPA will proceed with the listing process. At this time, there may be (on any given date) a publication in the Federal Register that proposes Ft. Detrick Area B for listing on the NPL.

Mr. RobThompson, of the EPA, explained that the listing process begins with a technical package that goes forward for the EPA to sign. Then, it goes to another Federal agency after that and so the EPA does not have much control over it after it leaves their hands.

- Ms. Linda Robinson asked what then happens after it is proposed.
- Mr. Bob Craig responded by saying that twice a year the EPA publishes a register with a list of sites that they propose be listed. That starts a public comment period where the sites that are addressed, the community, and any interested party have a chance to state their opinion on the matter. Then, six months later a decision is made as to whether or not these proposed sites will now be on the NPL. This cycle happens every 6 months. So, right now it is just a waiting game to see if the site is listed.
- Mr. Barry Kissin made a comment that he recalled Mr. Sokolowski saying that the EPA has basically been acting as if the site is already listed.

- Mr. Thompson responded by saying that what Mr. Sokolowski probably meant was that at this point, the EPA is somewhat already involved in the process, like they would be if the site were listed. For instance, Mr. Thompson is a Project Manager that handles several facilities that are on the NPL list. Mr. Scarborough added that they are and always have been following the CERCLA process.

Mr. Bob Craig talked about 4 days of briefings that are occurring with the EPA, in which the EPA team is being brought up to speed in terms of site history. This is leading towards the development of a work plan. We don't have a work plan right now for the groundwater remedial investigation. It still needs to be developed. Our current strategy is to get all the parties into agreement with the contents of the work plan before its written, so that the review/approval process is faster and smoother. The historical process up until now was that the army submitted a work plan and then it could take years for the regulators to review it and ask for edits. Hopefully this new process will alleviate a lot of that wasted time. The groundwater work plan is for all of Area B. That may be the best possible seg-way for Jeff Park's presentation. So, why don't we veer away from the agenda and allow Jeff to present now.

6. Area B Presentation by Mr. Jeff Parks

Mr. Jeff Parks presented a status update on the Fort Detrick Area B Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. The first half of the presentation will be an update on the Area B Former Disposal sites and a schedule update and the second part a discussion of the groundwater.

6b. Area B Former Disposal Sites

The remedial investigations that are complete on these sites only include the soils. The groundwater issues underneath them will be investigated and dealt with in another work plan and RIFS.

The remedial strategy for all of the Area B Former Disposal Sites, except for B-18, is to cap them, which is the EPA presumptive remedy and complies with current Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR) 26.04.07.21 for Sanitary Landfill Closure as a relevant and appropriate requirement.

The Updated Schedule was included in the presentation handout. Final comments are being addressed on B-3. That is the last of the sites where the RIFS needs to be approved. Then we will move to a proposed plan. The proposed plan for B-2 was completed first to gauge what kind of comments would come from it. Now, one proposed plan can be completed for the rest of the sites and will be easier and faster to create since it will be similar to the B-2 plan. However, there is still a 30-day public comment review for that plan. Once that proposed plan is completed, a decision document will be created that incorporates all comments collected during the proposed plan and lays out what has been selected for the decision and remedial process. Once that is done, we would move onto the actual construction plans for the caps. They would be done in the same manner and include an impermeable cap and cover that agrees with the MDE regulations. Shaw is not certain which type of impermeable capping material to use at this time, but once we get closer to the construction day, we will make a decision based on best cost and benefits.

- Mr. Scarborough added that the caps do require regular maintenance and inspection. We don't just cap the areas and then leave and forget about them. Also, the kind of capping materials we are deciding on have been used and proved effective since before WWII.
- Mr. Joe Gortva added that on top of the annual inspections, there are five-year reviews where a larger review is completed to see if all the remedies chosen are being

effective. If any are determined not to be, the whole process would begin again to find a better alternative remedy for that site.

- Curtis DeTore also added that MDE requires these caps so that it is no longer possible for water to percolate through the ground and waste dragging contaminants and depositing them into the groundwater. So, the waste is being dried out, so you no longer have a pathway to go from waste to groundwater. The cap will be sloped and larger than the surface area of the waste.

Mr. Parks ended his schedule discussion by adding that we are hoping to start construction of these caps by the winter of this year.

B-18

This site is basically a small sinkhole in the middle of a grove of trees. There was some visible metallic debris on the surface. The army recommended a site investigation to determine what was there exactly. During the site investigation, 6 cubic yards of metallic debris on the surface of the site were removed. Then, a geophysical study (EM-31) was performed to get a picture of the subsurface and any metal within the soil. The picture Shaw got back is very recent and they haven't fully analyzed it yet. However, it looks as though there is still some metal left in the subsurface soil. The subsurface metal seems to be near-surface and seems to have the characteristics of something like a metal door.

- Mr. Joe Gortva added that this area is a small area that is left that they were unable to investigate earlier due to equipment issues. However, no disposal areas were found anywhere around this tree grove.
- Mr. Bob Craig asks what the implications are of what we just found. Did we just create another RI site here or are we just going to extend the boundary of B-8?
- Mr. Gortva said this is not a new site, that this is included in site B-8. So, this may eventually affect the design of the cap. However, we are in the preliminary steps right now, so we will have to discuss this further with the stakeholders and decide what needs to be done.

Mr. Parks added that the metal shavings later found in one fallen tree's roots, after the preliminary debris removal was completed, do indicate that this site is an old disposal site.

6c. Area B Groundwater Update

Quarterly well sampling is performed at Area B. Over the last quarters there really hasn't been much change in the concentrations at the exit site or of the shape/location of the outer contaminant plume. Mr. Bob Craig pointed out that the interior concentrations appear lower than ever before. Mr. Parks confirmed that the concentrations are going down near the primary source, which would be expected since the primary source was supposedly removed.

- Mr. Gary Pauly, Community Member, asked how deep most of these monitoring wells are.
- Mr. Parks responded by saying that they vary. However, most wells are in pairs, with one being shallow at between 25 and 40 feet, and the other being deeper at between 90 and 180 feet.
- Mr. Pauly then asked if they often notice a differential between what you find at 30 feet versus what you find at 100 feet.
- Mr. Parks responded by saying no, and that is what has led us to believe that this is an unconfined aquifer. It is one aquifer from the top to the bottom, with no confining layers.
- Mr. Pauly then asked if the wells ever go much deeper than 180 feet. The reason he asked is because where he lives, ½ mile away, he has an 80 foot well. But, he can also

drill a 400 ft well and get an entirely different kind of water. He wonders if the Army ever looks into the areas with much deeper groundwater to find out if any contaminants are getting down there.

- Mr. Bob Craig responded by saying that is actually one of the things they are looking into with this final work plan they will develop. This is one of the things that will challenge their current model.
- Mr. Scarborough added that just because someone has a well drilled to 500 feet does not mean that they are getting their water from 500 feet.
- Mr. Gortva pointed out that the geology at Area B is very complex. There are completely different kinds of geology in different parts of the site. In the development of the work plan, the model will be challenged by looking at the geology in depth, different flow paths, and different depths. Within a tenth of a mile of each other, his family has wells that are 178', 278', 460', and 860' deep. So, it all depends where the fractures are within the rock.
- Ms. Rebecca Krieg asked if Shaw is monitoring for the compounds that the plume is degrading down to. Mr. Parks responded that yes, they are monitoring for those breakdown products and it does appear that biological degradation is occurring since they are finding those compounds. In fact, the compounds have broken down all the way to ethane and methane.
- Mr. Joe Gortva added that there is a whole industry out there to sell organisms or food, for the existing organisms, to people to inject into the groundwater to help aid in the degradation of the compounds. Chemical oxidation is another alternative, but has a bad side-effect in that it destroys the natural organisms that conduct the natural attenuation.
- Mr. Doug Scarborough added that there are always negative side-effects to every remedial option. For instance, sometimes the biological entities can over-produce and clog up an aquifer. It is not a simple process. One needs to select a technique and then go into extreme detail to design the remedial process. All the remedial options that are being seriously considered are all well-proven technologies.

Colonel Mary Deutsch entered the meeting room at approximately 8:30pm.

Mr. Parks went on with his presentation, by saying that the conceptual site model is made up of lines of evidence (different types of data). Rigorous tests need to be done to make sure the model answers all the questions. The delivery of this started the dialogue with the Army, MDE, and EPA. The partnering meetings with the aforementioned organizations began on the 28th of February to discuss the best path forward in terms of groundwater and in order to address all the stakeholders' issues. The first completely technical meeting was a two-day meeting on the 16th and 17th of April. The second meeting was on the 6th and 7th of May. All the stakeholders got together and went through the nuts and bolts to determine where there are concerns and where there is agreement and what the best path forward is to satisfy everyone's concerns so that human health and the environment is not being impacted. The third partnering meeting is scheduled for the 1st and 2nd of July 2008. Further meetings are scheduled, but their dates will depend on where we end up with the workplan, through these technical meetings.

- The Army stated that it looks like we really may not have a work plan until Christmas, based on the current schedule and the availability of the EPA's technical expert. So, that means an investigation will start soon thereafter and will probably take about a year at least.
- Mr. Jeff Parks stated that if they developed a work plan in December, it would go through approvals and we would look to the spring to start the investigation. Then, the length of

- the investigation depends on what needs to be done and how long that takes. If a dye trace study is necessary, that may take 3 months to a year by itself.
- Mr. Bob Craig says he believes that it seems a dye trace study will be necessary and so that extends the schedule to at least December of the following year. So, we probably have at least two more years. The schedule is highly dependent on what comes out of these meetings. He responded to a question stating that the landfill caps are a different issue and if everything goes well they should all be in place by this winter.
 - Ms. Robinson asked if all the steps we are taking (including creating a work plan) are defined CERCLA steps.
 - Mr. Parks responded that yes, all the steps we are taking are CERCLA steps. Basically, the CERCLA steps are to first conduct a preliminary site assessment to go out and see if there is a problem, then if there is a problem, a work plan must be developed stating what plans to be done and must be agreed upon by all the stakeholders. Then, once the plan is agreed upon, the investigation may begin. However, there is a “re-do loop” built into the process that allows for edits to the work plan once changes are found to be necessary.
 - Colonel Deutsch asked what will be occurring between this last meeting and the next meeting in July. She stated that we can’t just be sitting around doing nothing.
 - Mr. Joe Gortva stated that Shaw will be doing some data crunching between now and then. But, that the length of time needed between the last and next meeting is due to the unavailability of the EPA’s hydrologist. We are looking at the least 8 full days of meetings. With EPA’s schedule, it will be drawing it out to near Thanksgiving.
 - The Col. Deutsch doesn’t think that the EPA’s unavailability is acceptable. She wants this dissatisfaction to be known, since the EPA and MDE claimed that the Army was not moving fast enough. Now, because of the EPA’s involvement, it appears there will be a two-year process of continuing investigations and never get to a remediation of anything.
 - Mr. Kissin wondered since when has the groundwater problem been viewed as a potential problem.
 - The Army responded by saying 1992. They have been investigating the groundwater since 1993 and have spent 25 million dollars on cleanup actions. Now, they are looking at what needs to be done to finish the cleanup. The source areas were removed and now the concerning areas are down near the bedrock and more difficult to reach.
 - Mr. Joe Gortva explains that this last work plan is a final step to get to where all the stakeholders agree that all avenues have been investigated thoroughly enough so that we can begin on a remedy.

7. Draft Installation Action Plan (FY08) by Mr. Joe Gortva

Mr. Joe Gortva explained that this plan is used to outline the multi-year cleanup program for an installation. It identifies cleanup requirements for each site, proposes a comprehensive installation-wide cleanup approach, includes the schedules for that, and is used to track requirement schedules and budgets. In reality, they don’t come up with an IAP and then run a program according to that. Instead, they run a program and then adjust the IAP to say exactly what they are doing. The Army is required to put this together and want to give the RAB members the ability to comment on it. However, the Army doesn’t like the format of it. They are computer-generated based on their databases and imperfect because of faults in the program. RAB members should send their questions/comments to Joe Gortva by May 23rd. The first half of the IAP is associated with the sites that are currently open (disposal sites, groundwater, and long-

term monitoring sites) and the second half is concerned with the sites that are already closed. Let Mr. Joe Gortva know if you need a copy of this document or if you have any questions/concerns about it.

8. RAB Membership

We only have a few RAB members that show up regularly and some that have not shown up in a while. We are constantly looking for new members from the community to join so that the Army can help explain to the community what is going on and seek guidance/input from the community on the cleanup program. So, if you know anyone who would like to join, please contact them and bring them a copy of the charter and an application. They can attend a meeting and then possibly decide if they'd like to become a member. For informational purposes, copies of the conceptual site model draft document were put on CD in a stack on the meeting table for anyone to take.

9. Open Comments

- Ms. Robinson stated that she believed this meeting was more of a tutorial-style RAB meeting than most she has attended, for whatever reason. It might be because of the juncture that we are at right now. It is probably good, and provoked by the number of new people here who have not heard all the groundwork stated before. However, she thinks it is probably healthy to do that again. She added that they are going to miss Colonel Deutsch and that it was wonderful having her leadership.
- Colonel Mary Deutsch stated that she was overly-optimistic at the first RAB meeting that some of these actions would be closed-out by now. She thought three years would have given them enough time to complete some actions. But, unfortunately that wasn't the case. However, she believes they have made great progress in many areas. Unfortunately, this will be handed-off to the next commander to come in and she will hopefully get to close-out this Area B remediation. However, Colonel Deutsch would anticipate that when the first meeting that Col Robinson will attend, Bob would have prepped her well and given her some historical information of where we are and what we are looking at because this will be very new to her. She can only now express her gratitude to the community members who are going through this with us, and to encourage them to continue to push us forward and continue to keep the dialogue open. The community members being present at the meetings forces us to explain more and delve deeper when we are trying to explain it to other people who aren't working in it. So, that is really the value of the RAB, and the community members' commitment is just incredible to continue with us through this, so thank you. We need to encourage more people to attend these meetings. Col Deutsch added that it was very enlightening for her to come into this with no knowledge at all of this subject and to now see and understand just a little bit of the complexity of these issues that we are trying to push forward. She understands it isn't easy and that it is frustrating how lengthy this process is on all parts and that is the bureaucracy at work. We just need to push forward until we get resolution by all parties involved. So, she really solicits everyone's continued support.

Mr. Bob Craig added that Colonel Deutsch is getting out just in time because on October 1st they are picking up a new property, Forest Glen, in Silver Spring, which is a nuclear reactor.

Mr. Bob Craig then presented Colonel Deutsch with their environmental gold coin, thanked her for all her years of great help to them, and wished her well.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Army will wait until Col Robinson gets here to schedule the next meeting. They believe that more than likely they will be looking to late July or August for the next RAB meeting because they won't have their next meeting with the EPA until July 1st and 2nd, so they won't be prepared to present anything until then. Even then, they aren't sure that they would have anything of interest to present that wouldn't be a waste of everyone's time. So, he thinks there will be a summer break from RAB meetings until they have more progress to present to everyone. It isn't something they want to do, but it seems necessary for right now.

11. Meeting Closing

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

Reviewed by:

Approved/Disapproved

Enclosure:

Fort Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update Slide Presentation

A digital recording of the meeting

Meeting Sign-In Sheet

DISTRIBUTION:

Each RAB Member (w/o enclosure)

Each Meeting Attendee (w/o enclosure)