

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Fort Detrick Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary, 29 OCT 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
National Priority List (NPL) Update/ATSDR Discussion	4
Ft. Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update	5
Review of Prior Meeting Minutes	6
RAB Membership	7
Open Comments	8
Date of Next Meeting	9
Meeting Closing	10

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
COL 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
Mrs. Laurie Haines; Restoration Oversight, U.S. Army Environmental Center
Dr. Gary T. Pauly, Community RAB Member
Dr. Henry Erbes, Community RAB Member
Mr. James Eaton, Community RAB Member

Others Present:

Mr. Jeffrey Parks, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Ms. Robin Sims, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Mr. Rob Thomson; Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3
Mr. Bill Hudson; Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3
CPT Ryan Wolfe; OSJA, Ft. Detrick Legal Office
Mr. Gary Zolyak, Ft. Detrick Environmental Attorney
Mr. Charles Gordon, Ft. Detrick Public Affairs Office
Mr. Butch Dye, Maryland Department of the Environment
Ms. Alicia Evangelista, Frederick County Health Department
Ms. Laura Pfeiffer, Frederick County Health Department
Mr. Mark Evans; Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Atlanta, GA
Mr. Karl Markiewicz; ATSDR, Philadelphia, PA
Mr. Keith Hoddinott, Surgeon Generals Office
Ms. Denise Robinson; DOD, USACHPPM, APG, MD
Mr. T. Michael White; DOD, USACHPPM

Members Absent:

Mr. Barry Kissin, Interested Community 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
Mr. Curtis DeTore, Maryland Department of the Environment

3. Meeting Opening / Remarks

Colonel Carl Hover convened the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m., on Wednesday, October 29, 2008, in Conference Room 3 at 810 Schreider Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland. Mr. Hover started by saying that Colonel Judith Robinson would be a little late to the meeting because of a prior engagement. He thanked everyone for coming, asked everyone to sign the sign-in sheet, and to introduce themselves since there were some new attendees. He also announced that Ms. Laurie Haines would be here taking Doug Scarborough's place.

4. National Priority List (NPL) Update/ATSDR Discussion

Mr. Robert Craig began discussing the work that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) will be performing soon. He stated that ATSDR will be coming on site to look at the groundwater to do a public health assessment to look for public health concerns. ATSDR then began to explain their agency and what they will be doing on site. Mr. Mark Evans explained that ATSDR is part of the Center of Disease Control (CDC). Their work is required when a site is proposed to be listed on the NPL. Their findings can influence the EPA and their plan of action, but the ATSDR has no direct authority or say over what the EPA decides to do. The ATSDR performs this kind of investigation if a site is proposed for listing on the NPL or if enough community members write them and ask for it to be done. The ATSDR is a public health agency, not a regulatory agency and their work is done to ensure that the public health is being protected.

- Mr. Erbes, community RAB member, asked if this investigation was going to be performed before or after the EPA makes their national priority listing decision. ATSDR responded by saying that their report will probably be completed after the EPA makes their decision. However, their data is available before the EPA makes their decision and can be used by the EPA in order to help make their decision, should they choose to use it.
- Bob Craig made the comment that it might be helpful for the ATSDR to participate in the partnering meetings.

5. Ft. Detrick Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Status Update

Mr. Jeffrey Parks with Shaw Environmental presented information about the progress they are making as well as the status of the site and their work.

Area A

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. The primary issue of concern is the occasional TCE concentrations greater than the MCL in boundary well 568-15A and the presence of PCE in well 568-15A which may indicate an alternate source. A CERCLA five-year review is currently under review by the EPA and MDE to evaluate whether selected remedy continues to be effective and protective.

- Joe Gortva pointed out that the concentrations of TCE in the source area by building 568 have dropped significantly over time, from the thousands down to the teens now. The chosen remedy of hydraulic containment (pumping out the groundwater and contaminants) is working well. He noted that it is possible that historic airplane hanger or nearby auto body shops that probably used degreasers could be the source of the PCE. However, there is not yet enough data to determine the source of the TCE and PCE. They are working on it.
- Bob Craig asked what the five year review plan is for the next five years. Mr. Jeff Parks responded by saying that the plan is to stay the course because the process is working. The on-site facility will continue to clean the groundwater plume because it needs the water to do its amphibian studies, but the Army will continue to monitor the groundwater semi-annually. A sampling ramp-down plan could be implemented once the concentrations are consistently below MCL at the boundaries.

Area B

The remedial strategy for all of the Area B Former Disposal Sites, is to cap them, which is the EPA presumptive remedy for landfills and complies with current Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR) 26.04.07.21 for Sanitary Landfill Closure as a relevant and appropriate requirement. The proposed plan was submitted to MDE and EPA in August and comments back from them were recently received. The Army anticipates finalization of the plan in November with initiation of a 30-day public comment period.

- Mr. Erbes asked if there was a cap planned for B-10 Grove. Mr. Parks responded by saying that there was not a cap planned there because no dumping occurred near the trees there. He recommended that if they were having trouble keeping newly-planted trees alive because of the deer eating them, they should instead plant paw-paw trees because deer do not eat them.
- Colonel Robinson gave her philosophy on Area B. She said that the site being listed as a Superfund site may or may not happen. She isn't worried about that right now. While the Army is waiting to hear if it will be a Superfund site or not, she wants everyone to keep moving along and making progress on issues that they can tackle in the meantime. Then, hopefully the Army can begin the cap construction by March and finish by June 2009.

Area B Groundwater

Quarterly groundwater monitoring is being performed. The most recent sampling events were in March, June, and September 2008. The March sampling event was largely restricted to off-post locations and on-post plume periphery. Results from that sampling event showed that Robinson Spring was the highest observed PCE off-post detection at 11 µg/L, when the MCL is 5 µg/L. The June sampling was limited to five off-post private wells in use. There were no PCE or TCE detections at that time. In September the sampling was limited to five off-post private wells in use, plus two new locations. The five in-use private wells and the new location of unused well DSWRD-11 were non-detect for PCE and TCE. The other new location, bakery basement sump was non-detect for PCE but was found having a TCE concentration of 2.5 µg/L. Mr. Parks added that B-11 disposal pit was the main source of the TCE and PCE in the groundwater. So, since the Army already performed remediation on this source, we should expect to see a continuing downward trend in groundwater concentrations. The EPA and MDE were concerned that the existing wells may not be deep enough to adequately determine whether or not the plume extends beneath the bottom of the existing wells (below 180 feet bgs). The newly-installed proposed wells will extend to 325 ft bgs and monitored at multiple levels of depth.

- Mr. Joe Gortva mentioned that for the capping program, nearly all restorations (41 out of 42 sites) will have a status of Response Complete or Response in Place by the end of the capping construction, hopefully by June 2009.
- Mr. Erbes wanted to know how they would prevent the well water from mixing within the multiple depth zones of depth. Mr. Parks responded by saying that the wells would be packed/sealed in between the sampling depth zones

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.

- Ms. Linda Robinson asked if the two proposed deeper wells was the only further characterization needed or if there was more planned after that. Mr. Parks responded by saying that the two wells is the first step to fill some important data gaps. From there,

they will receive a good amount of additional information that will help them decide on the next logical steps from there. The meetings planned with the EPA and MDE are intended to be used to develop a work plan to address the other issues beyond those data gaps. They are making sure all the parameters are covered. There are still the remaining issues of the detected VOCs and the flood plain well sampling.

- ATSDR asked where the two new deeper wells will be drilled. Mr. Parks responded by saying that one will be near the bakery, but on-post, at the confluence where on-site streams meet Carol Creek. All constituents agreed that the second well will be drilled close to B-18, near the uppermost off-post residential wells. The second well is in an area where there is a great deal of karst geology. The drilling of this well will help us better understand the geology in the area and the groundwater flow patterns at that location.
- Mr. Erbes expressed his concern that the second well near B-18 will create more additional questions than answers. He was concerned that it may not really do them any good.
- Mr. Parks added that the two wells will give them some information and hopefully they will be able to create a better plan from there. He is hoping that the second well will tell them that the B-18 area has nothing to do with the problem at the down-gradient area.
- Mr. Butch Dye of MDE then gave his perspective on the wells. He said he understands Mr. Erbes concern over the spending of money when it is possible that no good answers may come of it. However, the constituents/stakeholders are a smart bunch and think they have determined the best manner in which to collect as much information as possible with the minimum number of wells. He understands the answers may lead to them having to drill more wells in the future, but they need to get the best information they can right now while trying not to spend too much before the ultimate plan is developed

Area B Groundwater 2008 Activities and Path Forward

Between March and October, the Army, MDE, and EPA held six technical working meetings to review the existing site data so that necessary further work could be identified. In November '08, the Army is planning to begin an interim data collection effort to gather valuable information regarding how groundwater flows through the bedrock and to what depth. This preliminary effort is expected to include drilling of two boreholes to 325' below ground, followed by well installation and sampling. On November 18, 2008, the next Army/MDE/EPA technical meeting is scheduled. The goal is to scope a final, comprehensive workplan over the winter to complete site characterization. Investigation activities are expected to occur through 2009.

- Mr. Bob Craig asked if they would have the boring information from those two wells by the Nov. 18 partnering meeting. Mr. Parks responded by saying that they would start drilling the wells around that time and would get the boring data on-the-spot. Whereas they would have to wait a couple months for the analytical data to be received and analyzed. However, once the information from the two wells is received and analyzed, they would tweak the work plan then if necessary. This type of partnering work plan is more flexible to changes, almost like a living document.

6. Review of Prior Meeting Minutes

Mr. Gortva explained that he was handing out the draft RAB minutes from the last RAB meeting in May. If anyone has any changes to it, they can email Joe Gortva. Mr. Erbes commented that the minutes listed him as an absent member and in fact he was there for that meeting.

7. 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.

8. Open Comments

- Ms. Linda Robinson stated that she has high hopes for the projects. She hopes that the partnering meetings cause faster progress. She thinks some of the partnering actions slow down the process a bit because of the additional drilling that was deemed necessary, but overall she thinks it will increase the progress since the regulators are kept as a close resource.
- Mr. Joe Gortva reminded everyone that the overall goal is to collect a sufficient amount of data in order to select the appropriate remedy for groundwater.
- Mr. Bob Craig added that the RAB members will get a chance to look at the proposed plan (PP) before the public does, if they feel a need to review it. However, it will not be much different than the PP document draft they already saw.

Colonel Robinson asked everyone to please re-introduce themselves since she was late to the meeting and missed the first round of introductions. She thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and announced that she will be in her position for at least 3 years since she just signed a contract stating that.

- Mr. Erbes stated that he would like to take another look at the RAB Charter to see if it needs to be altered now that the listing on the NPL is possible and since the EPA is now more involved. He added that he had noticed that when a similar situation occurred at Ft. Meade the Army took the RAB Members thoughts/concerns less seriously once the EPA was involved and it was a listed site.
- Mr. Gary Zolyak responded by saying that he did not notice that occurring at Ft. Meade. Instead, he thought the RAB members seemed feisty and engaged. He saw no difference with how the staff members at Ft. Meade took care in what the RAB members had to say.
- Colonel Robinson added that if the EPA listing occurs, the Army will become the RAB's advocate to the EPA and MDE. Then, if the EPA doesn't seem to listen, the RAB members should get more engaged and make them hear them. Additionally, the EPA will be at the RAB meetings, so they should hear first-hand what the RAB members have to say.
- Mr. Erbes ended his comments by saying that he is just disappointed with the whole dispute process. He feels like the EPA can end up running the whole show because of the levels of command and such.
- Mr. Bob Craig said that they would look at the RAB Charter and membership issues during the next meeting.

9. Date of Next RAB Meeting

The next RAB meeting may not be until January or February because it needs to be when the work plan is complete and they aren't sure when that will be. However, members can of course

go to the public hearing on the proposed plan and the Army will send out a notice as to when that will be. It will be at an off-post location so as to be non-biased.

10. Meeting Closing

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40 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)