

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Recreation Center
U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center
March 24, 2005
Meeting Minutes**

I. Attendance

RAB Members Present

Joel McCassie, Co-Chair	Environmental, Safety, and Health Office (ESHO), U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center (SSC)
Marco Kaltofen, Co-Chair	Community Member
Stephen Lubic	Representative of Natick Board of Selectmen
John McHugh	Restoration Officer, ESHO, SSC
Leo Pessin	Community Representative
Dr. Harlee Strauss	Community Representative
Dr. Kannan Vembu	Representative of Natick Board of Selectmen
Christine Williams	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

RAB Members Absent

Robert Campbell	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP)
Dr. Charles Czeisler	Community Member, Lakewood Association
Tony Doheny, Jr.	Community Member
Sid Gantman	Community Member
Elizabeth McCoy	Employee Member, Natick Soldier Center
A. Richard Miller	Community Member
James Straub	Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
James Fitzgerald	Community Member

Others in Attendance

Michelle Bonanca	ESHO, SSC
James Connolly	ESHO, SSC
Robin Nesbeda	Recorder, ICF Consulting
Kevin Palaia	Environmental Consultant, ICF Consulting
Jeffrey Pickett	Environmental Consultant, MACTEC
Stan Reed	Environmental Consultant, MACTEC
Steve Reichenbacher	ICF Consulting
Rod Rustad	Environmental Consultant, MACTEC
Harold Prebensen	ESHO, SSC

II. Handouts

- 1.) Buildings 62 and 68 Removal Action, Soldier Systems Center - MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- 2.) Building 14 and Former Building 13 Removal Action, Soldier Systems Center – ICF Consulting, Inc.
- 3.) Site Review Summary – Natick Soldier Systems Center
- 4.) Fiscal Year 2006 Budgeting, March 24, 2005 – Natick Soldier Systems Center

III. Meeting Minutes

Mr. McCassie brought the meeting to order at 7:06 pm and asked if there were any comments, changes, or revisions to the November 18th 2004 meeting minutes. There were none. The minutes were accepted without amendment.

General Comments

Mr. McCassie asked for general comments.

Mr. McHugh stated that he believed the general comment period to the RAB rule had expired last Wednesday. Dr. Vembu commented that he believed it ended March 29th. Mr. McHugh clarified and confirmed that the comment period was still open, and it expires on March 29th, 2005.

Mr. McCassie asked if there were any additional general comments. There were none.

Buildings 62 and 68 Removal Action

Mr. McCassie introduced Mr. Stan Reed and Mr. Rod Rustad from MACTEC.

Mr. Reed showed a slide depicting an aerial photo of the Building 62 and 68 area, and noted that it is located in the southwest corner of the T-25 Area near Building 20 (Warehouse).

Mr. Reed then showed a slide detailing the site description, including:

- Located at T-25 Area northwest of Building 20
- Building 62 constructed 1974-1975, Building 68 constructed 1980-1981
- Each 20 x 20 feet with concrete slab and apron; metal frame, walls, and roof
- Immediate area is grassed
- Drainage swale between buildings connects parking lot to storm sewer
- Elevated access road
- Buried electric utilities

Mr. Reed explained that there is a concrete apron in front of each building that goes out to the parking lot, which is paved. Other site features in the area include an access road located to the north and west, and an asphalt paved drainage swale, which comes off the parking lot, goes between the two buildings, and into a headwall located immediately south of the buildings. There are also buried electrical utilities in the area, that power both buildings. There is grassed area

adjacent to each building with a steep slope going from the access road down to the buildings.

Mr. Reed explained that the buildings were used for hazardous materials and chemical storage until 1991, and that waste oil was also stored on pallets in Building 62. The buildings are presently used to store non-hazardous materials. There are no documented spills or releases associated with the two buildings.

Dr. Vembu asked what types of hazardous materials were stored in the buildings.

Mr. Rustad replied that petroleum-related materials were mentioned in the inventories, but they were not sure if anything else was present.

Mr. Kaltofen added that he believed that the 1980 Installation Assessment prepared by Dames and Moore included an inventory for Buildings 62 and 68.

Mr. Rustad responded that the inventory was also included in the Master Environmental Plan.

Mr. Kaltofen also mentioned a concern over storage of pesticides in the buildings.

Mr. Reed stated that soil gas surveys were performed from 1988 to 1990 for volatile organics, and the results were inconclusive, especially in the area of Buildings 62 and 68. Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were detected in surface soil samples (RA-8 and RA-9) collected in 1993, but no VOC's were detected. In 2004, an SI was performed with extensive soil sampling outside of each building (two depths at nine locations); four concrete-chip samples from the floor in each building; and two subslab soil samples collected through the concrete floor in each building. The borings were drilled to a shallow depth of about two feet below grade, with samples collected from the surface and at about 2 feet deep. All samples were analyzed for volatile organics, semi-volatile organics, pesticides, PCBs, inorganics, volatile petroleum hydrocarbons (VPH), and extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (EPH). The floors in the buildings were in good shape, with no major cracks, no staining, and no evidence of major spillage.

Mr. Reed stated that sampling data from the samples collected were compared to the EPA Region IX Direct Contact Primary Remediation Goals (PRGs), as a screening exercise to determine whether there might be contaminants of concern. No PCB's were detected, and there were no chemicals of potential concern in the concrete chip samples. The contaminants detected were primarily petroleum-related PAH's and EPH at most of the soil sample locations.

Mr. Reed displayed a slide with an aerial photo of the Building 62/68 area and the various sample locations.

Mr. Reed then stated that because of the observed soil criteria exceedances and the potential for risk, the Army is proposing a soil removal action at the site. The clean up levels for the removal action are based on the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) Method 1 (S-1/GW-1) standards; the most stringent of the MCP standards. There were no exceedances of standards for VOC's, inorganics, or VPH, and only one exceedance for a pesticide (DDT). There were numerous exceedances for PAHs. The removal of the soil would eliminate the numerous PAH exceedances and the single pesticide exceedance.

Mr. Reed presented an aerial photo of the site, with the proposed area of soil removal outlined in red. He explained that the proposed action is to remove the top two feet of soil (about 150 cubic yards) in the area highlighted in red on the photo. The area extends for about ten feet behind the buildings and up to the pavement in the other areas, for a total area of approximately 40 feet by

60 feet. Additional confirmation sampling (from the floor and sidewalls of the excavation) will be performed at the end of the removal to determine if the cleanup goals have been met. If there is still contamination shown in the confirmation samples, then additional excavation will be done, to the extent that it can be done within the constraints of the buildings and the parking lot. There are no plans to go underneath the buildings, parking lot, or any other pavement. The excavated soils will be transported to a treatment/disposal facility, and the site will be back filled with clean soil, loamed, and seeded. The drainage swale will be replaced with a new swale to channel the water down to the headwall. A removal action report will be prepared to document the details of the removal. The removal is expected to be completed in summer of 2005

Dr. Vembu asked to be shown the location of the pesticide exceedance on the aerial photo.

Mr. Reed replied that he did not know, and would have to look it up in the SI Report.

Mr. Kaltofen and Dr. Strauss asked what the concentrations were and how many exceedances of the standards were.

Mr. Reed explained that either one or both of the samples from most of the borings had exceedances of PAHs. He stated that the concentrations are included in the SI Report, which RAB members could take a look at if they desired.

Mr. Kaltofen expressed concern over contamination deep in the core, and that unless deeper analysis is conducted, the soil removal action could leave contaminants at depth.

Mr. Reed explained that confirmation samples will be collected during the soil removal, with a 48-hour turnaround time on the results. If the confirmation samples still exceeded cleanup goals, additional excavation would be performed to insure removal of all contaminants. He stated that they were not going to backfill the excavation until they got the results from the confirmation samples.

Dr. Strauss stated that she did not understand why the money was being spent on this removal.

Dr. Vembu agreed, adding that only SS-69 had the highest concentration, so why does the rest of the soil need to be removed.

Mr. Reed explained that SS-69 was the lone exceedance for pesticides, and the removal action is driven by the PAH exceedances.

Dr. Strauss commented that under the MCP you can take the average of the concentrations and that in this case, the standard would not likely be exceeded.

Ms. Williams replied that the Army is looking to ensure they don't have any use restrictions in the future. She went on to explain that because this is a CERCLA site and there are exceedances of EPA Region IX PRG, a risk assessment would need to be performed, which costs money. She suggested that a risk assessment, with a full-blown ground water and soil remedial investigation would cost more than the proposed removal action.

Mr. McHugh confirmed that the cost of the Army doing a risk assessment actually exceeds the cost of removing a small amount of soil. He also stated that the Army would avoid any institutional controls in this area if the soil removal were performed.

Dr. Strauss added that they will be removing clean soil.

Ms. Williams asked if the soil could be recycled through asphalt batching.

Mr. McHugh stated that they would look into that possibility.

There were no further questions.

Building 14 and Former Building 13 Removal Action

Mr. McCassie introduced Mr. Kevin Palaia of ICF Consulting.

Mr. Palaia showed a map and aerial photo of the SSC facility and pointed out the location of Building 14 and former Building 13 in the southwest corner of the T-25 Area. He explained that he would be discussing the proposed soil removal action in the Building 14 and former Building 13 area.

Mr. Palaia explained that Building 14 has historically and is currently being used for vehicle and equipment maintenance, and Building 13 is a former classified paperwork incinerator. Much of the general area is paved, except for the area immediately surrounding the former incinerator and some on the land to the west, which slopes steeply up to the SSC property boundary.

Mr. Palaia then described the history of former Building 13. It was built in 1954 and used as a classified paperwork incinerator. It was used infrequently - generally less than a few hours per week. It was closed in 1985, and dismantled in 1990 leaving behind what is currently present, which is the concrete foundation.

Dr. Vembu asked what type of fuel was used in the incinerator.

Mr. Palaia replied that he believed it was natural gas fire. He went on to describe some of the other activities in the former Building 13 area, including: pesticide mixing and vehicle washing, which mostly occurred on the asphalt pad immediately to the north of Building 13.

Mr. Palaia then discussed the history of Building 14. It was built in 1954 and has been used for vehicle and equipment maintenance. Other activities in and around Building 14 included: administrative offices, heavy equipment storage, vehicle refueling (with associated USTs), insect/rodent control, metal parts and brush cleaning, silk screening, and rubber adhesives thinning. The eastern end of the upper story was historically used for vehicle washing/maintenance and the area had floor drains which flowed to an oil/water separator at the southeast corner of the building. Some of the earlier investigations documented that in the late 1980's to early 1990's, while replacing a steam line, a black stained soil that emitted a fuel/petroleum odor was observed. The cause of the contamination was thought to be overfilling or leakage from the oil/water separator.

Mr. Palaia explained that prior to the 2003 SI, there had been a few other soil borings and monitoring wells installed in the Building 13/14 area. The 2003 SI was the first investigation that focused solely on this area. A supplemental SI was performed at the end of 2004 to provide better delineation of the contamination that was found during the original 2003 SI. A geophysical survey was performed during each SI phase, primarily to identify underground utilities, which are very dense to the south of Building 14 (including a high-voltage electrical line that actually trends goes into and across Lake Cochituate). A total of 26 soil borings were advanced, and from those, a total of 82 subsurface soil samples and 17 ground water samples were collected and sent to an off-site laboratory for a full suite of analyses. Twenty-six surface soil samples were collected

including 21 from the top 6 inches of the ground surface and five from 2 to 3.5 feet below ground. During the supplemental SI on-site EPH and VPH screening analysis was performed on the soil samples to aid in selecting the soil samples to send for off-site confirmatory analysis, but also to better understand the extent of the contamination. Three permanent ground water monitoring wells were installed (two shallow water table wells and one deeper B-interval replacement well for a previous well that was destroyed during the recent storm water upgrade project). All sample locations were surveyed.

Mr. Palaia then showed an aerial photo of the area and pointed out the locations of the SI soil boring, surface soil, and monitoring well locations.

Mr. Palaia described the analytical results of the SI samples, including:

- ◆ Surface Soils
 - PAHs [including benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, and benzo(b)fluoranthene] were detected above MCP S-1/GW-1 standard in several 0-6 inch samples near former Building 13; also one dieldrin and one beryllium exceedance on 0-6 inch samples
 - Beryllium slightly exceeded the MCP S-1/GW-1 standard in two 2-3.5 foot samples
 - PAHs did not exceed criteria in the deeper 2 to 3.5 foot samples
- ◆ Subsurface Soil
 - PAHs, EPH, VPH exceed MCP S-1/GW-1 standard in 5 borings located in a small area to the southeast of Building 14; one PCE detection above standards
 - Exceedances occurred in samples generally at depths less than 15 feet, with the highest concentrations in the four to ten-foot depth range.
- ◆ Ground Water
 - EPH/VPH exceedances above MCP GW-1 standard at one shallow monitoring well location south of Building 14

Mr. Palaia noted that the RAB has received the Final 2003 SI Report and should be receiving the SI Report Addendum soon, which describes the supplemental sampling program.

Mr. Kaltofen asked what the S-1 soil standard was for beryllium.

Mr. Palaia responded that it is 0.7 ppm, and the exceedances were slightly greater than that (0.72 ppm to 0.84 ppm).

Mr. Palaia then described the proposed removal action for Building 14 and former Building 13, and indicated that it is similar to what was presented for Buildings 62 and 68. The MCP S-1/GW-1 residential soil standards will be used as the clean-up goal. The excavation would occur in two phases. The first would address the contaminated surface soils immediately surrounding former Building 13, where the excavation depth is proposed to be one foot (or about 300 cubic yards). The contaminated subsurface soil to the southeast of Building 14 would be excavated at depths up to about 15 feet. Due to the dense utility network, excavation may be performed by some sort of vacuum extraction. Confirmatory sampling will be performed during both removals to confirm that cleanup goals are met. Excavated soils will be transported off-site to a licensed disposal facility, the excavations will be backfilled with clean soil and reseeded or repaved, as appropriate. A removal action completion report will then be performed after that.

Mr. Palaia then showed another aerial photo illustrating the areas of proposed surface and subsurface soil removal actions.

Mr. Palaia discussed the proposed schedule, including: submitting the SI Report Addendum in April 2005; submitting the Removal Action Work Plan in May 2005; and performing the Removal Action in the summer of 2005.

Dr. Vembu asked for clarification of whether or not there was a beryllium exceedance in the former Building 13 area.

Mr. Palaia responded that there were three beryllium exceedances, and pointed out where they were located on a map.

Dr. Strauss asked about the standard and the magnitude of the beryllium exceedances.

Mr. Palaia responded that the beryllium standard is 0.7 ppm, and the exceedances ranged from 0.72 ppm to 0.84 ppm.

Dr. Strauss commented that the exceedances were minimal.

Mr. Palaia agreed, and reiterated that the PAH exceedances were driving the soil removal.

Dr. Strauss asked if the PAH concentrations were detected above 2 to 3 ppm. She added that, with the adjacent parking lot in use, even if new clean soil were put in, you would see the same concentrations in two years.

Mr. Palaia explained that the PAH concentrations in the surface soil in this area were up to an order of magnitude higher than the S-1/GW-1 standards. Some locations had up to 2 ppm, while others were in the 10 ppm range.

Dr. Strauss agreed that concentrations that high deserved action. She commented that these were much higher exceedances than seen in the Building 62 and 68 site.

Mr. McHugh added that Building 15 (located to the south of Building 14) is the facilities barracks.

Mr. Kaltofen mentioned that the house in the upper left corner of the aerial photo has a new resident, and asked if anyone had considered informing that individual of the RAB and this particular removal action.

Mr. McCassie replied that he didn't know, but he could contact them through the lake group.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that they should be informed, before they are surprised. He suggested they might want to be involved with the process and should be invited to observe or join the RAB, and see some of the documentation.

Dr. Vembu wanted to confirm that the Army was removing only one foot of soil in the Building 13 area based on PAH's, even though there were beryllium exceedances to a 3.5 foot depth.

Mr. Palaia responded that that was true, however, the Army may selectively excavate deeper and do confirmatory analysis on those metals. He pointed out that the beryllium exceedances were only slightly above the S-1 standards.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that he wanted it recorded in the minutes to make sure that the resident who lives near the areas of excavation are kept in the loop before the trucks all come out.

Mr. McCassie concurred.

Fiscal Year 2006 Site Ranking Briefing

Mr. McCassie introduced Mr. James Connolly to talk about the fiscal year 2006 site ranking briefing.

Mr. Connolly stated that he was going to provide a site-by-site overview of where the Army is at and what the Army plans to do in fiscal year 2006, and discuss the available budget. He stated that the RAB will have an opportunity to fill out a form and rank which sites they prefer the Army spend time, effort, and money on.

Mr. Connolly briefly discussed the history of the SSC including: SSC has been here since 1953, 78 acres in size, surrounded on three sides by Lake Cochituate, and has been on the NPL since 1994, primarily based on the T-25 Area ground water contamination and proximity to town wells. There have been a total of 17 sites at SSC (at one time or another) that have been entered into the Army environmental database for restoration. Thirteen of the sites are active, and four are closed with no further action required.

Mr. Connolly then presented a map of SSC illustrating various ground water PCE and TCE contaminant plumes and the location of the major outfalls at SSC. He stated that the T-25 Area PCE and TCE plume extends generally north towards the Springvale Wellfield. The Building 22 and 36 PCE plume extends to Lake Cochituate to the north and the west of Building 36 and to the south into the cove near Building 22. The Building 63 and 45 TCE plume extends southward and discharges into the lake. He also pointed out three sediment sites, including the main stormwater outfall, the Building 2 and 45 parking lot outfall, and the T-25 Area stormwater outfall.

Mr. Kaltofen and Ms. Williams requested an electronic copy of the map that Mr. Connolly presented.

Mr. Connolly stated that he would provide it to them electronically.

Mr. Connolly continued with an overview of each site, beginning with the T-25 Area. He presented the status of the T-25 Area including:

- T-25 Area ground water treatment system was installed and started in 1997
- Ground water ROD uses pump & treat with natural attenuation
- More than 188 million gallons of ground water have been pumped from 1997 through December 2004
- 78 pounds of chlorinated solvents recovered
 - approximately 47 pounds TCE
 - approximately 30 pounds PCE
- Up to 70% of original estimated contaminant mass has been recovered

Mr. Connolly then discussed the planned activities for the T-25 Area including:

- Continue to monitor and operate the pump and treatment system to ensure proper containment of contaminated ground water to the vicinity of the facility.
- 5-Year Review due in September 2006.
- One or more off-post wells may be connected to the extraction system for optimization purposes.
- Currently, the model predicts 12 years of active pumping followed by 15 years of monitored natural attenuation in order to reach the cleanup goals. Once cleanup goals are

- reached, 5 years of monitoring are required.
- Based on results of the T-25 Area ground water model update, which the RAB was briefed on last year, an in-situ remedial optimization study to enhance ground water treatment in the T-25 Area is planned for FY06.

Mr. Connolly explained that the existing ROD covers only ground water in the T-25 Area and does not cover soil contamination in the T-25 Area. Soil contamination in the T-25 Area will need to be addressed through a separate decision document.

Mr. Connolly then addressed the status of the three sediment sites including:

- Sediments at three outfalls are contaminated with pesticides, PCBs, and PAHs
- Beginning in 1997, oil/water separators were installed to reduce the potential for future release from the outfalls
- A Draft Sediment Risk Management Technical Memorandum summarizing human and ecological risks was completed last year and presented to the RAB

Ms. Williams commented that she's heard there were no formal comments from the RAB on the Draft Sediment Risk Management Technical Memorandum. She asked if anyone had any comments and whether or not they were in agreement with the conclusion, which was: no action to be taken by the Army for sediments.

Mr. Kaltofen replied that he and the town had comments, but he did not know if it was past the comment period.

Ms. Williams explained that they'd like to hear the comments, because she has to go to EPA management and they ask what the public thinks about the proposed action.

Mr. Kaltofen suggested that he, Christine, and Bob Bois (from the town) meet outside of the RAB to discuss the comments.

Ms. Williams stated that it really needs to be discussed with the RAB, and that it would be nice if Mr. Bois could attend a RAB meeting. Ms. Williams asked Mr. Kaltofen if he had comments from Mr. Bois.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that he does, and that he and Mr. Bois have had extensive discussions. Mr. Kaltofen suggested they discuss the comments off line.

Ms. Williams reiterated that it really needs to be discussed at the RAB, and if Mr. Bois has comments he needs to submit them in writing to the Army.

Mr. Kaltofen apologized for not getting his and Mr. Bois' comments together, and he stated that he would get them in writing to everybody.

Ms. Williams stated that they would definitely need them within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Connolly added that the comment period ended in February, but the Army would rather deal with them sooner than later.

Mr. Kaltofen added that he believed the Board of Health may also have comments.

Dr. Strauss commented that she had not looked at it carefully enough to comment.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that there was an action item from the last RAB meeting, where we were going to be told whether or not the fish consumption survey was done solely in English.

Mr. Palaia confirmed that the survey had only been conducted in English.

Mr. Connolly stated that once the Army gets all the comments, they will review them and incorporate them into the Proposed Plan.

Mr. Connolly discussed the anticipated plans and schedule for the sediment sites including:

- Review comments on Draft Sediment Risk Management Technical Memorandum
- Proposed Schedule
 - Draft Proposed Plan May 2005
 - Tentative date of Public Hearing June 2005
 - Possible Record of Decision September 2005

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the Former Proposed Gymnasium Site including:

- An interim removal action of ~800 cy of contaminated soil was completed August 2002.
- One additional monitoring well (MW-127A-2) installed in December 2003 and sampled starting in January 2004. Two years of quarterly monitoring is in progress - should be completed in January of 2006 sampling round.
- COCs in ground water are currently below MCLs and they were petroleum related.

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for the Former Proposed Gymnasium Site:

- After two years (FY05-FY06) of ground water confirmatory sampling, a final RI and ROD will be prepared.
- ROD will likely encompass multiple sites as described in subsequent slides.

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the Building 14 and former Building 13 site including:

- Draft SI submitted to EPA in March 2004.
- PAH concentrations in soil. Pesticides in shallow surface soil in scattered locations.
- PAH in ground water was confirmed at MW-128A, and the Army continues to evaluate the source of the PAHs.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there was product in that well.

Mr. Connolly responded that there was no product in the well.

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for Building 14 and former Building 13 including:

- An interim removal action is planned for late spring 2005.
- IRA Completion Report September 2005

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the Building T-62 and T-68 site:

- PAH concentrations in shallow soil
- CERCLA action memorandum and IRA work plan submitted for review

Mr. Connolly stated that the Building T-62 and T-68 action memorandum will be sent to RAB members soon.

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for the Building T-62 and T-68 site:

- An interim removal action is planned for late spring 2005.
- IRA Completion Report September 2005.
- Pending IRA results, possibly may be included in Former Proposed Gymnasium Site

ROD in 2006.

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the Building 22 and Building 36 site:

- Draft RI submitted, Draft FS under review.
- PCE concentrations up to 560 µg/L in ground water.
- Contaminated ground water discharging to Lake Cochituate south of Building 22 and west of Building 36

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for the Building 22 and Building 36 site:

- Pump and Treat system to contain the plume with enhanced in-situ bioremediation appears feasible.
- Proposed Schedule
 - Draft Proposed Plan by July 2005.
 - Tentative date of Public Hearing late September 2005
 - Possible ROD January 2006.

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the former post drinking water wells site:

- This area is now referred to as Building 63, 2, & 45.
- Draft SI submitted in 1998.
- Additional investigations completed include wells in Building 2 & 45 parking area, as well as passive vapor diffusion sampling in lake sediment to attempt to delineate the area where ground water might be discharging into the lake.
- TCE concentrations in ground water up to 54 ppb
- Contaminated ground water discharging to the lake southwest of Buildings 2 & 45.

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for the former post drinking water wells:

- Draft Supplemental RI with updated sampling data in June 2005.
- FS will evaluate remedial options, likely including pump and treatment systems, and enhanced in-situ bioremediation, expected in autumn 2005.

Mr. Connolly discussed the Boiler Plant site status:

- Draft SI submitted in 2000.
- 768 cubic yards of soil from former floor drain leaching field excavated and disposed of off-site in 2001.
- MCP risk assessment indicated no significant risk.
- Confirmatory ground water sampling is in progress.

Mr. Connolly discussed the plans for the Boiler Plant site:

- Pending results of confirmatory ground water quarterly monitoring, planned to be included in Former Proposed Gymnasium Site ROD in 2006.

Mr. Connolly discussed the status of the former pit area waste oil storage tank:

- Memorandum documenting prior removal actions submitted to EPA for review.
- No Further Action Planned.

Mr. Connolly provided a brief description of the location of the former pit area waste oil tank, and noted that it was included as a site because it was thought that the tank had contained mercury. However, there has been no evidence of mercury associated with the tank.

Ms. Williams stated that EPA asked for additional data to be included in the former pit area waste oil tank memorandum, and EPA agreed with the no further action recommendation.

Mr. Connolly then distributed a worksheet to each of the RAB members that outlined the Fiscal Year 2006 budget. He stated that a total of \$2,125,000 is budgeted amongst the sites previously discussed. He noted that approximately \$800,000 of the total is ear-marked for T-25 Area ground water activities that the Army is required to do per the ROD, including operating and maintaining the treatment system and conducting quarterly ground water monitoring.

Mr. Connolly asked that each RAB rank the remaining budget items and return the site ranking sheet by April 21, 2005. He said the RAB members input would be considered during the next installation planning meeting.

Mr. McHugh added that he was going to send the site ranking sheet to each RAB member by mail, and possibly by email as well.

Mr. Pessin asked if the installation planning board is the same group that will discuss the plan for improvements for the post.

Mr. McHugh replied no. He stated that he was referring to the U.S. Army Environmental Center, the SSC environmental office personnel, and the regulators.

Mr. Pessin asked if any of the excavations will occur before they begin construction on the new proposed gymnasium site.

McHugh stated that the proposed new gymnasium is in a different location.

Mr. Pessin asked if they expected to find any pollution at the proposed new gymnasium site.

Mr. McHugh explained that prior to construction of any new building, they do soil borings and do a full suite analysis to determine if there is contamination.

Dr. Strauss asked if the Building 14 work listed on the ranking sheet were the removal actions previously referred to in the meeting.

Mr. Connolly clarified that the removal actions were included in the FY 2005 budget, and should be complete by FY 2006.

Mr. Connolly asked if there were any further questions. There were none.

Public Comments

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that at the last RAB meeting, the Army said they would look to see if perchlorate had ever been sampled for at SSC.

Mr. McHugh stated that the Army hasn't tested for perchlorate, but he agreed to look again just to be sure.

Mr. Kaltofen then asked about scheduling for the next RAB meeting.

May 12th was agreed upon as the date for the next RAB meeting.

Mr. McHugh stated that at the May 12th meeting, the intent is to talk about a draft Proposed Plan

for the sediments, assuming that we have RAB member comments on the Sediment Risk Management Technical Memorandum by that time. He commented that the draft Proposed Plan would be discussed with the RAB first, prior to being presented to the town in a public hearing.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that he did not think that we've really established that the fish consumption levels for certain sub-populations are as low as the Army's assessment describes. He stated that if there is not going to be any further cleanup action, we need to insure that there aren't sub-populations that have unusually high fish consumption from this lake. He stated that he would provide his comments in writing.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

Action Items

1. Mr. Kaltofen mentioned that the house in the upper left corner of the aerial photo has a new resident, and asked if anyone had considered informing that individual of the RAB and this particular removal action.

Mr. McCassie replied that he didn't know, but he could contact them through the lake group.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that they should be informed, before they are surprised. He suggested they might want to be involved with the process and should be invited to observe or join the RAB, and see some of the documentation.

2. Mr. Kaltofen and Ms. Williams requested an electronic copy of the map that Mr. Connolly presented.

Mr. Connolly stated that he would provide it to them electronically.

3. Mr. Kaltofen apologized for not getting his and Mr. Bois' comments together, and he stated that he would get them in writing to everybody.

Ms. Williams stated that they would definitely need them within the next couple of weeks.

4. Mr. Connolly stated that the Building T-62 and T-68 action memorandum will be sent to RAB members soon.

5. Mr. Connolly asked that each RAB rank the remaining budget items and return the site ranking sheet by April 21, 2005. He said the RAB members input would be considered during the next installation planning meeting.

Mr. McHugh added that he was going to send the site ranking sheet to each RAB member by mail, and possibly by email as well.

6. Mr. McHugh stated that the Army hasn't tested for perchlorate, but he agreed to look again just to be sure.