

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary,  
08 MAY 2013

**1. Summary Contents**

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

<b>SUBJECT/ACTION TYPE</b>	<b>SECTION NUMBER</b>
Summary Contents	<b>1</b>
Attendees	<b>2</b>
Meeting Opening / Remarks	<b>3</b>
Purpose of RAB Meetings	<b>4</b>
Meeting Minutes	<b>5</b>
Area B Groundwater Investigation Update	<b>6</b>
Off-Post Private Well Investigation Update	<b>7</b>
Program Status Update	<b>8</b>
Restoration Advisory Board Member Open Discussion	<b>9</b>
Membership	<b>10</b>
General Community Concerns	<b>11</b>
Meeting Closing/Next Meeting	<b>12</b>

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

**Text contained within brackets [ ] has been added for clarification purposes.**

## **2. Attendees**

### Members Present:

LTC James St. Angelo, Fort Detrick, Co-Chair  
Dr. Gary Pauly, Community RAB Member, Co-Chair  
Mr. Robert Craig, Chief, Environmental Management Office, Fort Detrick  
Mr. Joseph Gortva, Environmental Restoration Program Manager  
Mr. Curtis DeTore, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Ms. Jennifer Hahn, Community RAB Member  
Ms. Laurie Haines-Eklund, Army Environmental Command  
Ms. Karen Harbaugh, Community RAB Member  
Mr. Barry Kissin, Community RAB Member

### Others Present:

Mr. John Buck, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Mr. Dale Mercer, Fort Detrick Environmental Office  
Mr. Gareth Buckland, Fort Detrick Environmental Office  
Mr. Nick Minecci, Fort Detrick Public Affairs Office  
Mr. John Cherry, ARCADIS  
Mr. Tim Llewellyn, ARCADIS  
Ms. Shelly Morris, ARCADIS  
Ms. Katrina Harris, Bridge Consulting Corp.  
Mr. James Costello  
Ms. Courtney Mabeus, Frederick News Post  
Mr. George Rudy  
Mr. James Krantz

### Members Absent:

Mr. Charles Billups, Community RAB Member  
Mr. Rolan Clark  
Dr. Henry Erbes, Community RAB Member  
Ms. Alicia Evangelista, Frederick County Health Department  
Mr. Cliff Harbaugh  
Ms. Helen Miller-Scott  
Mr. Robert Thomson, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Mr. Gerald Toomey, Community RAB Member  
Mr. Craig Toussaint, Community RAB Member  
Mr. Thomas Wade, Community RAB Member

## **3. Meeting Opening / Remarks**

Mr. Joe Gortva called the meeting to order. He thanked everyone for attending and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mr. Gortva advised that the meeting would be the final one for LTC St. Angelo who would be retiring. Mr. Gortva thanked LTC St. Angelo for being the Board's co-chair for the past several years. The Board expressed their appreciation for LTC St. Angelo's service. LTC St. Angelo stated that his replacement would be at the next Board meeting.

**4. Purpose of RAB Meetings** presented by Dr. Gary Pauly, Board Community Co-Chair

Dr. Gary Pauly welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced himself as the community co-chair of the Board. He noted that the Board is co-chaired by an Army representative, LTC St. Angelo, and himself. He stated that the Board is comprised of both community members and Army representatives, as well as regulatory agencies--the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Maryland Department of the Environment. Dr. Pauly invited the Board members to introduce themselves.

Dr. Pauly presented the Board's ground rules for the meeting. He noted that the Board discusses matters related to environmental restoration and follows an agenda set up in advance of the meeting. He stated that video recording devices are not allowed in the meetings. He advised that there is time at the end of the meeting for discussion with members of the general public.

Mr. Gortva noted that Mr. Rob Thompson from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency could not be present due to federal government sequestration and EPA's restrictions on travel.

**5. Meeting Minutes** presented by Mr. Joseph Gortva, Fort Detrick

Mr. Gortva noted that the minutes from the February meeting had been distributed for review. Mr. Barry Kissin stated that he thought the minutes were very well done. Mr. Gortva asked for any additional comments to be submitted by the end of the following week and then he would post the minutes on the Fort Detrick web site.

**6. Area B Groundwater Investigation** presented by Mr. John Cherry, Fort ARCADIS

Mr. John Cherry reviewed the topics that he would be covering in his presentation. He stated that he would be providing an update on work completed since the February meeting and upcoming work. He noted that upcoming work includes the groundwater tracer study and additional vapor intrusion work. Mr. Cherry said that he would also review the vapor intrusion work that has been completed and some additional direct push and deep well drilling that will be occurring soon.

Mr. Cherry reviewed the work completed since the Board's February meeting. He reminded the Board that the Draft Conceptual Site Model report had just been distributed to EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment in late January as well as to the Board at the February meeting. Since the February meeting, the Army, the Army Corps of Engineers, Maryland Department of the Environment, and ARCADIS had traveled to Philadelphia for a meeting with EPA personnel, including Kathy Davies and Rob Thompson. Mr. Cherry reminded the Board that all those present at that meeting have been involved continuously in the work since it began. Discussions have been through bi-weekly online meetings and conference calls to review current data. Mr. Cherry said that the regulators are still reviewing the report, and that the Army has not received any comments yet.

Mr. Cherry advised that the vapor intrusion testing had been initiated. He reminded the Board that this work was included in the Remedial Investigation work plan developed in 2010 and

called for sampling at five buildings, four off-post and one on-post, near the primary discharge area along Carroll Creek where there was a potential for vapor intrusion. He advised that the first round of sampling had been completed.

Mr. Cherry said that a stream survey had been initiated since the last meeting, noting that there were additional sections of Carroll Creek which they wanted to investigate for additional seeps and springs which might be potential discharge points and where there might be contamination discharging to the stream. He advised that a significant portion of Rock Creek had also been surveyed, as well as some other areas in and around tributaries. He said that approximately two miles of additional stream had been surveyed. He stated that part of the reason for the stream surveys is the upcoming groundwater tracer study.

Mr. Cherry advised that some progress had been made on the right-of-entry agreements for off-post work, and that he would be discussing the progress later in his presentation.

Mr. Cherry displayed a list of activities included in the original remedial investigation work plan and noted that the tasks completed included the assessment and the repair of existing wells, drilling new well installations, the direct push investigation and collecting direct push samples, the original seep and spring survey, and two comprehensive rounds of groundwater and surface water sampling. Mr. Cherry said that remaining activities under the work plan includes the second round of vapor intrusion sampling to be conducted this summer and the groundwater tracer study which has just been initiated.

Mr. Cherry reminded the Board that the project is still in the Remedial Investigation phase of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process with data collection ongoing and initial development of the Conceptual Site Model completed. He stated that upcoming phases include development of a risk assessment. Mr. Cherry explained that the Army has some interim remedial actions under development. He noted that the future phases of the CERCLA process are the feasibility study where possible remedies are assessed, the proposed plan, the record of decision, and then remedial action.

Mr. Cherry showed a diagram of the Conceptual Site Model for Area B and summarized the information provided by the model. He stated that the B-11 landfill is the principal source area and reminded the Board that there had been a soil removal action in 2004; however, there are still solvents in the bedrock acting as a continuing source of contamination which flows to the southeast. He pointed out the yellow line on the model which gives a general proximity of where the contamination is and its general flow direction to the east/southeast and emerging in the discharge area of Carroll Creek. Mr. Cherry pointed to an area along Fort Detrick's boundary where there are high concentrations of TCE (trichloroethylene) and stated that concentrations drop off significantly at monitoring wells, streams and shallow piezometers sampled to the east. Mr. Cherry pointed out Fort Detrick's boundary and the Waverly property and stated that there is potential for contamination to be skirting the fence, and that he would discuss later in his presentation some of the planned investigation activities for this area to help delineate that contamination.

Mr. Cherry next discussed the groundwater tracer study. He explained that a groundwater tracer study involves introducing a tracer to the sub-surface that can be tracked through groundwater sampling and sampling streams and seeps downstream to help evaluate groundwater flow velocity and direction. In response to a question from Mr. Barry Kissin, Mr. Cherry said that they are working with EPA to make the study as quantitative as is feasible. Mr. Cherry said that it is not possible to recover all of the tracer as some of it may become trapped in the karst geology. Mr. Kissin said that a prior tracer study had identified discharge areas, and it does not make sense to repeat the same investigation. Mr. Cherry agreed and said that the previous study introduced the tracer at much shallower depths than is planned for this study. Mr. Cherry said that the network of monitoring points has also been expanded and looking at a broader set of locations will help better understand the connection between the deep groundwater flow. Mr. Kissin asked if deep wells will be installed on the Waverly property before the tracer study. Mr. Cherry said that they would not be installed in time; however, when the wells are installed on the Waverly property, it will be possible to test for the presence of the tracer, as well as contaminants. Mr. Cherry advised that the exact question had been discussed with the regulators, and the consensus was to move forward with the tracer study and then follow on with the additional drilling efforts.

Mr. Cherry explained that the reason for conducting the tracer study is to evaluate the movement of deep groundwater from the B-11 area and identify locations where groundwater discharges to springs and streams within the study area. Mr. Cherry stated that approximately 90 locations will be monitored during the study over a six-month period.

Mr. Kissin noted that Mr. Cherry's presentation stated that "the tracer study will confirm our understanding of groundwater flow." Mr. Kissin stated that at the previous meeting Ms. Kathy Davies from EPA said that she did not have the same level of confidence in the Conceptual Site Model as ARCADIS as what has to be looked at is what is going on at depth, particularly in the area of the Waverly property. Mr. Kissin questioned the usefulness of a tracer study that did not look at this issue. Mr. Gortva responded that the injected dye will stay in the system and be measurable for a long period of time. Mr. Gortva said that when the wells are completed on the Waverly property, it will still be possible to see if the dye shows up in those wells. Mr. Gortva also said that if the dye trace study was postponed until after the Waverly wells are installed, it would be another year before the tracer study could be done since the desired timeframe is during the spring. In response to Mr. Kissin's question about the timing of the Waverly wells, Mr. Gortva said that the estimated timing is to begin drilling mid-summer and have the wells completed by December. Mr. Gortva said that EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment agree with the approach.

Mr. Cherry next explained how the groundwater tracer study works. He said that a background study is underway which involves collecting samples at all the monitoring well locations to document existing concentrations of potential tracers that could be used during the study. He noted that the exact tracer to be used has not been identified yet as the data on what exists currently in the groundwater is needed first from previous studies or sources. He stated that once the background information is received, it will be reviewed with EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment and an appropriate tracer will be identified. He said that the tracer will be introduced into the groundwater at a few deep locations at the B-11 area and then monitoring

will begin at about 90 different locations. Mr. Cherry advised that samples will be collected on a weekly basis initially and then biweekly or monthly as the study progresses.

Mr. Cherry showed a graphic depicting generalized patterns of groundwater flow based on studies to date. He stated that there have been more than 30 rounds of synoptic water level measurements collected since the late 1990s on Area B from an ever expanding network of monitoring wells. He noted that 29 new wells have been installed over the last few years, and the four rounds of synoptic water level measurements collected by ARCADIS have been from 129 wells from Area A and B wells, 20 staff gauges along surface water bodies, and the network of 39 shallow piezometers. Mr. Cherry said that this extensive network provides a high level of confidence in the depicted groundwater flow pattern. Mr. Cherry said that the network also provides a high level of confidence in the area shown as the primary discharge area (along Carroll Creek) where there is a significant increase in flow, about 1100 gallons per minute, attributed to the extensive number of seeps and springs throughout that area. He stated that wells in Area A show the groundwater flowing towards the primary discharge area, and that prior studies near the Waverly property show groundwater flowing towards Area B. He pointed out the mountain range to the west and noted that groundwater flow from that area would be in an easterly direction.

Mr. Cherry showed a map of the approximate tracer study area. He pointed out where the tracer would be introduced and the zones where the sampling will be conducted over the six-month study.

Mr. Cherry reiterated that the tracer to be used has not been identified yet, pending the results of the background study which will show what is already in the ground. He stated that it will be a non-toxic tracer and something commonly used in groundwater studies. He said that the selection of a tracer will be done in coordination with EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment. Mr. Gortva added that some of the potential tracers can be found in common household products which is another reason for the background study. Mr. Cherry said that it is unlikely the tracer will be visible in wells, springs or surface water from discoloration. He noted that laboratory analysis is required to determine if the tracer is present. He advised that in the 1995 study, the maximum detected tracer concentrations in water samples were only 0.6 parts per billion which is a very low concentration. He said that if any discoloration was noted, it is important to remember the tracer is non-toxic and poses no threat to human health or the environment.

Mr. Cherry advised that EPA and the Maryland Department of the Environment are reviewing the work plan for the tracer study, and that the Army and ARCADIS will be meeting with them soon. He stated that there will be ongoing engagement with the regulators throughout the study, as well as updates to the Board during meetings. He noted that at the end of the project a report will be prepared and submitted.

Ms. Jennifer Hahn asked who within the County was the point of contact Fort Detrick is coordinating with on the work near Montevue. Mr. Cherry stated that they were coordinating with the Health Department. [Coordination also includes Frederick County Office of Property Management] Ms. Hahn stated that the County representatives involved in approving the

development of the Waverly property were not aware of the environmental conditions. Mr. Curtis DeTore stated that he has had two conversations with the Mayor and an Alderman to discuss the property. Mr. DeTore said that the main question the local representatives had were what plans the Army had to conduct environmental work in the future. Mr. DeTore said that he had discussed the plans for deeper wells and getting access to the Waverly property.

Mr. George Rudy referred to Maryland Department of the Environment's issuance of a document saying development of the Waverly property could proceed. He questioned why Maryland Department of the Environment had not changed its position in light of new information being received. Mr. DeTore stated that the document being referred to was issued by the Voluntary Cleanup Program which is separate from the Federal Facilities Division currently overseeing the cleanup at Fort Detrick. Mr. DeTore advised that EPA attorneys also are involved in discussions with the Waverly property developers.

Mr. Cherry next discussed the vapor intrusion work reminding the Board vapors from chemicals in the groundwater under or near structures can rise up through the sub-surface, collect in the sub-slab foundation materials, and infiltrate a building through cracks or sumps in the foundation. He explained that there are also potential sources inside a building, such as a shirt from a dry cleaner that used PCE as a dry cleaning solvent. Mr. Cherry said that sub-slab gas sampling is conducted to test for potential vapor intrusion concerns and sent to the laboratory for analysis. He advised that it [vapor intrusion pathway issues] is similar to radon.

Mr. Gortva asked Mr. Cherry to discuss the potential for vapor intrusion based on contamination being deep in the groundwater with shallower groundwater being clean. [A lens of clean water over a contaminated plume] Mr. Cherry said there would not be a potential for vapor intrusion in the situation posed by Mr. Gortva. Mr. Cherry said that the concern is only when there is contamination in the shallow groundwater, although it could be tens of feet deep below the ground surface. He noted that the work being done in this study is in the area near the primary discharge area of Carroll Creek where there is contaminated groundwater flowing towards that area and then coming back up to the surface and discharging through seeps and springs.

Mr. Cherry stated that if there is contamination above the maximum contaminant levels of [5 ppb for both TCE and PCE] set by EPA, the regulators like to see any buildings within 100 feet tested. Ms. Hahn asked if the levels could change over time. Mr. Cherry said that they could which is why there is periodic groundwater sampling to monitor the levels and look for any change in trends or spikes in contaminant levels.

Ms. Hahn said that a motion was made for vapor intrusion testing to be done at the County building on Montevue Lane before an occupancy permit is issued; she asked for confirmation that it is possible six months or a year from now a repeat of the vapor intrusion test would find the building not clean. Mr. Cherry referenced that the completed direct push shallow groundwater study performed by ARCADIS last spring which involved 50-some locations. He said that the intent of that study was to assess shallow groundwater, and a number of locations were in close proximity to some of the buildings. He stated that there were only a few detections of solvents above maximum contaminant levels in that area, and while they are low concentrations, it is one of the reasons why they have begun the vapor intrusion study in that

area. Mr. Gortva stated that potential changes are taken into account during the investigations, and is one of the reasons sampling is conducted in different seasons. Mr. Gortva said that there have been differences in the groundwater concentrations detected in the southern area, but wide swings in contamination have not been observed.

In response to a question about the potential for a mass release of contamination in the future from buried containers, Mr. Gortva said that based on the fact that the containers were buried in the 1970s, and based on what was seen during the removal action, it is unlikely at this point there are still intact containers that are going to rupture and release their contents. [Ongoing periodic monitoring is conducted at Area B wells and at off-post locations to monitor groundwater in order to assess actual conditions and potential changes.]

Ms. Hahn asked if the Army would still need access to the off-post property on Montevue Lane if it is sub-divided and sold. Mr. Gortva said that there would be interest in monitoring the Carroll Creek floodplain, but a floodplain area would not be sold for development and would likely remain County property. Mr. Cherry said that the detections in the shallow groundwater were at low levels, but it is possible additional monitoring in the future would be warranted. He noted with the extensive monitoring network in place, along with periodic monitoring, a significant change in the groundwater contamination would be able to be detected and appropriate actions could then be taken.

Ms. Hahn asked when the County building on Montevue would be tested for vapor intrusion, and Mr. John Buck from the Army Corps of Engineers said that it would be tested within the next few weeks. Mr. Gortva clarified that the vapor intrusion testing being performed by ARCADIS is only for the area shown in yellow on the map. He said that there is another firm under contract, ECC Watermark, to do vapor intrusion in other areas including this County building.

Mr. Cherry said that for the off-post vapor intrusion testing, a right-of-entry agreement needs to be secured from the property owner. He said that the next step is a building survey to identify possible sources of indoor air contaminants, and he showed several photographs from completed building surveys. Mr. Cherry said that they work with the property owner to identify locations for the sub-slab sampling which is the first step in identifying any concentrations of solvents that are present. He explained that a small hole is cored through the sub-slab, and a sample is collected for laboratory analysis. In response to a question about indoor air sampling from LTC St. Angelo, Mr. Cherry said that the testing is a phased approach, with the sub-slab testing performed first, followed by indoor air sampling, if needed, based on the sub-slab testing results. Mr. Cherry said that there would be two rounds of sub-slab gas sampling to account for any seasonal changes with heating and air conditioning systems. He explained that the results of the sub-slab gas sampling will determine whether there is a need to do indoor air sampling. Mr. Gortva added that the standard set by EPA for contamination in groundwater which triggers the need to look at the potential for vapor intrusion does not mean that there is a problem, only that there is a need to sample. Mr. Cherry added that even if solvents are detected, it does not mean that there is a problem; it means there would need to be a risk assessment to evaluate the results.

Mr. Cherry displayed an aerial photograph showing the sub-slab gas sampling locations. He stated that the sampling had been completed at five commercial buildings in January 2013. He showed the location of the four off-post locations which were identified in the workplan in 2010

before the shallow groundwater work was performed. Mr. Cherry said that the sub-slab samples showed no PCE or TCE detections above commercial/industrial risk-based screening criteria. He said that there were some low detections below the criteria, and the second round of sampling will be performed this summer so there will be two sets of data for analysis.

Mr. Cherry next discussed upcoming work for the balance of 2013. He noted that he had discussed the first two items shown on his list—the groundwater tracer study and the ongoing vapor intrusion sampling. He said that the next item is the shallow direct push drilling which would be conducted after the rights-of-entry agreements are completed this summer. Mr. Cherry said that the last item is additional deep on-post and off-post drilling, which includes the anticipated drilling on the Waverly property.

Mr. Cherry reviewed the supplemental shallow direct push drilling. He explained that a smaller drill rig uses hydraulic pressure to drive steel rods into the ground down to bedrock, about 30 to 40 feet although in some areas bedrock was encountered at 17 to 20 feet. He displayed a map showing the drilling locations. He said that seven shallow direct push locations are south of Area B and across Shookstown Road, three borings are in the development near Shookstown Road and that access has been granted by the homeowners association; and that four additional boring locations are south of Carroll Creek. Mr. Cherry said that good progress has been made with getting rights-of-entry for all these locations, and all the paperwork should be finalized very soon. Mr. Cherry showed an aerial photograph of the locations, noting that this work is a follow-on to work conducted last year which found sporadic, low concentrations of TCE and PCE in the shallow groundwater. He noted that based on those detections, it was agreed with EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment to conduct some additional work in the three areas he had just mentioned.

Mr. Cherry next discussed the supplemental deep on-post and off-post drilling. He noted that progress had been made with the rights-of-entry for the off-post drilling locations, particularly the Waverly property where there has been multiple meetings with the property owner. He advised that there had been a recent meeting with the property owner, the Army, EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment in Philadelphia. Mr. Kissin asked for an explanation of what was being negotiated and whether there were any conditions attached to gaining access or to the resulting data. Mr. Cherry said that the scope of work is being presented to the property owner, for drilling three boreholes with seven nested monitoring wells, along with the geophysical logging and the vertical aquifer profiling. He continued explaining that access to the existing shallower wells is also being requested to conduct any type of needed work including sampling, geophysics, and video surveying. Mr. Llewellyn added that no limitations had been discussed in the meetings. Mr. Gortva said that he was estimating it was possible that the Army would have a signed right-of-entry agreement within a few days. Mr. DeTore added that any data sent to the Maryland Department of the Environment is open to any member of the public to review. Mr. Gortva stated that the data will be presented at a Board meeting, and Ms. Haines noted that it would also be added to the Army's Administrative Record.

Mr. Rudy asked if the right-of-entry agreement will supersede the Maryland Department of the Environment agreement. Mr. Cherry stated that in 2004 the Maryland Department of the Environment Voluntary Cleanup Program issued a no further requirements determination for the

Waverly property which allowed the use of the property but restricted the use of groundwater. Mr. Gortva stated that the right-of-entry agreement allows the Army to conduct work so it is not the property owner performing additional work.

Mr. Cherry advised that the deep drilling locations will be down greater than 325 feet, perhaps 400 or 500 feet deep as needed. Mr. Cherry referenced previous presentations on geophysical logging performed during drilling and stated that the same type of geophysics would be conducted during this drilling. He advised that nested wells will be installed so vertical distribution of any contamination can be tracked. He said that about 11 new wells will be installed.

Mr. Cherry showed a map with the proposed new deep drilling locations noting approximately seven nested wells are proposed for the Waverly property. He noted that the other locations are in an area on Area B where there are some shallow wells and an area east of Carroll Creek to assess whether there is flow at depth beyond the primary discharge area.

Mr. Cherry said that all the deep drilling locations and plans had been discussed with EPA and Maryland Department of the Environment. Mr. Gortva added that the discussions had been numerous and very detailed to ensure the selected drilling locations would help answer the questions that have been posed. Mr. Cherry noted that the Army and ARCADIS will be engaged in discussions with both regulators to make any needed decisions during the drilling process.

Mr. Cherry reviewed the upcoming work schedule for the summer and fall and noted the Board would be kept updated at future meetings.

Mr. Rudy asked about contamination that might be coming from Area A. Mr. Cherry said that it is a consideration and the tracer study includes monitoring locations in Area A. Mr. Cherry said that the supplemental work is primarily designed for contaminants moving towards the primary discharge area.

Mr. Rudy asked if there are any plans for vapor intrusion work at the new County building. [New nursing home] Mr. Gortva responded that nothing is planned based on the results from the shallow monitoring wells. Mr. Gortva referred to one detection of 9.1 parts per billion of perchloroethylene which may be from a local source. [Vapor Intrusion testing was performed at an existing county building that is currently being renovated for office space. This building is located near the shallow well that had a detection of 9.1 parts per billion (ppb) of Perchloroethylene. The results will be presented at the next RAB meeting.] Mr. Gortva stated that the tracer study would include this well location and if the tracer does not show up it would confirm the source is not Fort Detrick.

#### **7. Off-Post Private Well Investigation** presented by Ms. Shelly Morris, ARCADIS

Ms. Morris reviewed the status of project activities noting completed activities include research and public outreach such as mailings, a public meeting, and a door-to-door survey. She advised that the sampling has also been completed, and the preparation of a report is underway.

Ms. Morris discussed tasks completed since the February Board meeting. She stated that validated data had been received for the January 2013 sampling which confirmed very low concentrations of TCE in one well and one low level detection of PCE in one well. She said that a confirmation sample was collected to verify the PCE. In response to a question, Ms. Morris said that the levels were 0.1 and 0.2 parts per billion [These results were flagged as estimated by the testing laboratory indicating they were detected below the analytical method detection limit and is therefore considered an estimated value.] Ms. Morris said that the sampling results have been reported to property owners.

Ms. Morris summarized the sampling results noting that there were no volatile organic compounds detected at or near the Federal drinking water standards. She said that 27 wells did have very low level volatile organic compounds detections with 26 wells having one volatile organic compound detected and one well having two volatile organic compounds detected. She stated that re-sampling confirmed the very low-level presence of TCE in one well, and that the results are pending on the confirmatory re-sampling of a well with a low-level presence of PCE.

Ms. Morris displayed a chart summarizing the sampling results and the number of detections of each chemical as well as the general uses of each chemical. She noted that the most prevalent compound detected was MTBE which is a gasoline additive.

Ms. Morris showed an overview of the sampling locations on an aerial photograph. She noted that the study area was divided into quadrants. She stated that in the northern quadrant 1 only chloroform was detected; and that in quadrant 2, chloroform, MTBE, styrene, and 2-butanone were detected. Ms. Morris said that in quadrant 3, MTBE, chloroform, PCE, and TCE were detected; and in quadrant 4, MTBE, chloroform, 1,2-dichlorobenzene, and benzene were detected.

Ms. Kissin asked if wells on Kemp Lane were sampled. Ms. Morris said that homes on Kemp Lane are regularly sampled so did not need to be included in this study. She stated that the last sampling event of the homes on Kemp Lane was conducted in March 2013, and that there was only one low-level detection of MTBE. Mr. Gortva added that there are five homes tested on a quarterly basis, and that there have been one-time detections of TCE and PCE, both below the drinking water standards. He said that both detections occurred at different times in 2005 but have not been detected again. He said that the five homes are tested because of their proximity to the B-11 site. In response to a question, Mr. DeTore confirmed that Kemp Lane is hydraulically upgradient of Area B.

Ms. Morris summarized the conclusions of the off-post well investigation noting that all the detections are unlikely to be associated with Area B groundwater. She said that this result is based on the groundwater flow being eastward and away from the private wells sampled, and that the distribution of detections is not indicating any pattern and many are one-time detections. She stated that the private wells also are topographically higher than Area B and hydraulically upgradient. She advised that the two residents where there were low level detections of TCE and PCE have agreed to participate in the tracer study to confirm whether the contamination is coming from Area B.

## **8. Program Status Update** presented by Mr. Joseph Gortva, Fort Detrick

Mr. Gortva updated the Board on several key projects.

Mr. Gortva advised that the Area B Phase I Herbicide and Dioxin Site Investigation draft report had been delayed as there had been significant EPA guidance changes during the report development. He reminded the Board that this report provides data from the sampling of a plot at Area B that was identified in historical documents as a possible test site. [For the chemical 2,4,5-T] Mr. Gortva said that he had a draft of the report on CDs which he would be distributing to Board members after the meeting; he noted that paper copies could also be made available.

Mr. Gortva said that the Archive Search Report, Phase I, had been completed about a year ago and addressed the herbicide testing performed at Fort Detrick. He said that the Phase II report should be ready for distribution to the regulators and Board by the time of the next Board meeting or shortly thereafter.

Mr. Gortva discussed the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the possible connection of five residences on Kemp Lane to municipal water. Mr. Gortva stated that these are the five residences discussed earlier where Fort Detrick has been sampling their private wells on a quarterly basis. He said that the document will be provided to the Board members and the public in late May or early June 2013. He said that there will be a public meeting scheduled once the document is released, but no date is set yet; he said that there will also be a 30-day public comment period. Mr. Gortva said that after any comments are reviewed, if the decision is to move forward with the connection to public water, an Action Memorandum would be prepared and that the action probably would occur in the fall of 2013 contingent on funding. Mr. Gortva said that the offer would be extended to the residents, but it will be their decision whether they want to be connected to municipal water. LTC St. Angelo confirmed with Mr. Gortva that if the residents accepted the offer to be connected, the residents would be responsible for future water bills, and Mr. Gortva agreed with this statement. Ms. Haines said that the residents would have to file a claim against the Army to receive compensation for their water bills. In response to a question, Mr. Gortva confirmed that the Army would pay the cost of abandoning the residents' existing drinking water wells.

Mr. Gortva said that an old ash disposal area at Area C has a remedy in place, which is land-use controls. He advised that during a treatment plant upgrade waste was found outside what had been the boundaries of the area so additional sampling is planned to refine the limits and add them to the land-use controls.

Mr. Gortva referenced his comments earlier about a contractor, ECC Watermark, being tasked to do vapor intrusion testing in addition to what ARCADIS is doing under their contract. Mr. Gortva said that if additional buildings are identified related to Area B where vapor intrusion testing is warranted, the work will be performed by ECC Watermark. He said that they will also be doing vapor intrusion testing at some additional buildings near the Building 568 TCE spill site on Area A. Mr. Gortva said that the question has been asked as to why the vapor intrusion work is being done now at this site, and he explained that vapor intrusion is a newer topic for the regulatory community. He said that many sites which have existed and been monitored for many years are now being looked at to see if there are vapor intrusion issues. He said that the Army

does not expect to find any problems as the levels of chemicals in the groundwater around Building 568 are close to the Federal drinking water standard, but that the testing will verify whether there are any issues. LTC St. Angelo asked for confirmation that work at Area A is being done primarily in coordination with Maryland Department of the Environment as the Superfund listing, and thus EPA's involvement, is only for Area B. Mr. DeTore confirmed that EPA is the lead regulatory agency for Area B, and that Maryland Department of the Environment is lead agency for Areas A and C.

Ms. Hahn asked if contamination from Area B moved to an off-post area, would the other area become a Superfund site. Mr. Gortva said that this was a legal question, and he did not know the answer. Ms. Hahn asked to whom this question should be addressed, and Ms. Haines suggested it be directed to Mr. Rob Thompson at EPA.

## **9. RAB Member Open Discussion**

Mr. Gortva advised Ms. Hahn had requested time on the agenda to make some comments, and he invited her to do so.

Ms. Hahn prefaced her remarks by stating that she had been attending City and County meetings and trying to be a conduit for information; she stated that she found it very frustrating when she could not get answers from Fort Detrick. She then read the following comments:

“Provisions of CERCLA typically upheld by EPA are now deferred to the Department of Defense, the current lead agency pertaining to our Superfund Site. Now it is Fort Detrick's responsibility to be the primary party for issuing regular public notices through the local media, including fact sheets sent through the local media, conducting workshops for community groups, making presentations to civic groups and local officials, inviting EPA to attend community events in order to discuss site and proposed plans. (Ms. Hahn stated CERCLA requires an EPA person to be present at the Board meeting, and she would have paid out of her pocket for someone from EPA to attend the Board meeting.) The Army has agreed to comply with all relevant EPA policies in accordance with a community relations program. This says that Fort Detrick shall provide RAB (Restoration Advisory Board) status updates between RAB meetings to facilitate early and continuous flow of information between the community, the Fort, and the regulatory agencies and to provide an opportunity for the RAB members and the public to review and comment on actions. We normally receive the RAB minutes the day of the meeting; this time we had two days. This is unacceptable.

From 33.6.1 of the Federal Facilities Agreement to 33.6.4 it states whose attendance is required at the RAB. These include the Garrison Commander, who I have not yet met, an EPA representative, an MDE representative, and project managers. It also states parties shall encourage representatives from the City of Frederick. If what you are saying here is you have tried, they do not know that. (Mr. DeTore stated he had suggested very strongly on recent conference calls that if the Mayor and the Aldermen cannot attend, a representative from their office should be attending all the RAB meetings.) I would like to know what efforts Fort Detrick has made to encourage City representatives to be present above and beyond what the public's options are so I can tell them they have been asked to attend.

It is very frustrating as an active community RAB member to obtain crucial information needed to represent the facts at a City meeting. It is frustrating due to the time it takes to receive minutes from prior meetings, as well as getting timely answers to questions emailed to Joe, Robert or Lanessa Hill. There needs to be an accessible and informed representative per the Federal Facilities Agreement.

Since the last RAB, I attended many planning commission meetings and an Aldermen meeting. Ironically it seems all the undeveloped land cushioning Area B is up for some sort of vote all at once. Waverly View has a site plan that was approved in 2001 and came before the planning commission for an amendment. At this time, it is arguable whether the planning commission has purview or not to place a condition on development based on information that there is a potential Superfund plume not respecting private property owners' rights. I have the land management code with me, and if anyone wants to look at it, I can point out where they might have had reason to do so. I read from the City and County land management code that their minimum responsibility is to protect the health and safety of the community. I also read from their code that Fort Detrick creates a special need within their code for inter-office communication. So far not Fort Detrick nor the City of Frederick has extended a hand to the other and set up a one-day workshop for various briefings, all inclusive. It is unfortunate because the planning commission has voted recently on the property which is northwest of the plume, the Waverly property, and Montevue. If Montevue goes up for sale, as it was just sub-divided, Fort Detrick will start again at square one should ARCADIS decide it is prudent to test there in the discharge area of the plume; you will be fighting for rights-of-entry. I did manage, only because Meta Nash was present at the second planning commission meeting, to delay occupancy of the old Montevue building until it has a clean vapor intrusion test.

I emailed Fort Detrick over and over to ascertain whether this was important or not before the date of the meeting. I got no response. I did reach Lanessa Hill on the phone the day of the meeting who never got back to me with an answer. I went to the meeting taking a chance that if it was an issue after checking my notes I would make the point strongly enough that there would be a condition put on the property. Later I followed up with Lanessa to find out if I was correct. Meta has written a letter to the Mayor requesting guidance on how to handle the land located near Area B. As of this point, I do not believe she has received a response; she is the chair of the planning committee. The disconnects here are dangerous.

Community members should not have to work this hard to make a difference. Under the Federal Facilities Agreement and CERCLA, I do have rights to be informed and in a timely fashion. There are written guidelines for this that the Army is not following. It is disrespectful and highly unproductive when you have someone like me willing to attend the meetings that you will not attend. I am digesting research and RAB information in the wee hours of the night so that everyone you are responsible for getting the information to is on the same page, and I am doing it with little or no timely response from you. A few Aldermen have informed me they have spoken with Maryland Department of the Environment or EPA or the Garrison Commander. No one is receiving a complete set of information mainly because the topic is so huge that no one even has the right questions to ask. Speaking randomly one at a time is not an efficient way to disperse information. Every separate entity has their own data set of the part they understand.

I'm running in circles trying to fill in the data gaps for the City officials and Aldermen. It is shameful that the Mayor or the Garrison have not orchestrated a roundtable before the officials are allowed one more vote on the land cushioning Area B. You need a liaison; they need a liaison. And you both need one before another six months of books' worth of new, hard to translate information gets relayed. Lanessa did not seem adequately informed; neither did Robert Sperling, the former public information officer. Something needs to change in your daily protocol in order to adhere to the guidelines and CERCLA mandates that you follow in regards to community involvement.

The planning commission folks and Aldermen will be involved in a budget meeting tonight and will not be here. I sent an email asking for their availability in August so they can make an effort to attend the next RAB meeting. RAB meetings should coordinate with the City officials' schedules. Two Aldermen responded their schedules are open on August 28. I therefore requesting August 28 be the next RAB date.

I understand in a workday you are doing what you can to move forward with the site plans. I was your number one fan of believing we were moving in the right direction then all these properties being developed happened all at once which are potentially affected by Area B. I'm now having to spend double time being the bridge between the City and the Army. I'm telling you from someone outside the Fort that the community involvement plan has to be addressed, and the City has to have a more efficient way to be informed. There needs to be a standard of information upheld and available to all, updated regularly and put in laymen's terms. George Bernard Shaw says the single biggest problem with communication is the illusion it has taken place. Let's be smarter than this; we owe it to the whole situation. In addition to this letter, I have 17 questions. Please advise as to who will be answering me and in what timeframe. With all due respect."

Mr. Gortva said that there have been numerous discussions with different representatives in the County and City, including the Mayor, to present the information, and Fort Detrick is glad to meet with any person or group with the City or County to provide the information. He added that the notices of the Board meetings are sent to representatives of the City and County. Mr. Gortva advised that Fort Detrick would be having a change of command in about a week, and that after the new Commander was briefed by Fort Detrick staff, he would be meeting with local officials, along with Garrison staff. Mr. Gortva noted that there are regular discussions with the Mayor and his key staff members to convey environmental and other Fort Detrick information.

LTC St. Angelo commented that the Garrison Commander has the right to co-chair the Board or can delegate the responsibility to a staff member as has been done most recently. LTC St. Angelo stated that the Garrison Commander receives numerous briefings on environmental issues. Ms. Hahn commented that it would be helpful if the Garrison Commander could hear for himself the feedback from the community and understand where there are communication gaps. LTC St. Angelo said that he would discuss Ms. Hahn's comments with the Garrison Commander and would follow-up with the Public Affairs Office as to why Ms. Hahn did not receive a response.

Mr. Gortva invited comments and questions from other Board community members.

Mr. Kissin expressed his appreciation to Ms. Hahn for her hard work.

## **10. Membership**

Mr. Pauly stated that he had an application for membership and he would forward to the Board by email for review and action at the next meeting.

Mr. Pauly said that he would also be communicating with community members regarding members who have not attended meetings for some time.

## **11. General Community Comments**

Mr. Rudy said that he supported Ms. Hahn's comments. He said that there is a total disconnect as to what is happening. He said that ARCADIS is doing an excellent job in bringing the data together. He said that when he and other community members go to planning and other meetings, the officials consider them to be blowing smoke and that the officials have commented that no one is showing up with any credentials. He suggested that ARCADIS be involved in any presentation to local officials.

## **12. Next Meeting**

Mr. Gortva noted that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for August 7, 2013. He said that he was open to changing the meeting night. Ms. Hahn requested the meeting be changed to August 28. Mr. Gortva said that he would check with the regulators on their schedules and email the Board the date of the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:11 p.m.

Reviewed by:

Approved/Disapproved

Enclosures:

Fort Detrick Installation Restoration Program Area B Groundwater Investigation Update Meeting Sign-In Sheet

**DISTRIBUTION:**

Each RAB Member (w/o enclosure)

Each Meeting Attendee (w/o enclosure)