

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Conference Center
U.S. Army Soldier System Center
November 30, 2006
Meeting Minutes**

I. Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Robert Campbell	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP)
Joel McCassie	Co-Chair, Environmental, Safety and Health Office (ESHO), U.S. Army Soldier System Center (SSO)
John McHugh	Restoration Officer, ESHO SSC
Dr. Kannan Vembu	Representative of Natick Board of Selectmen
Christine Williams	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Marco Kaltofen	Co-Chair, Community Member
A. Richard Miller	Community Member
Steven Lubic	Representative of Natick Board of Selectman
Neill Osgood	Community Member, Lakewood Association
James Fitzgerald	Community Member
Dr. Harlee Strauss	Community Member

RAB Members Absent:

Dr. Charles Czeisler	Community Member, Lakewood Association
Sid Gantman	Community Member
James Straub	Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Elizabeth McCoy	Employee Member, SSC

Other in Attendance:

Rob Tess	Environmental Consultant, ECC
Jeff Pickett	Environmental Consultant, MACTEC Engineering
Stan Reed	Environmental Consultant, MACTEC Engineering
Kevin Palaia	Environmental Consultant, ICF Consulting
Amy Rosenstein	Environmental Consultant, ICF Consulting
James Connolly	ESHO, SSC
Michelle Bonanca	ESHO, SSC
Anne Marie Desmarais	Environmental Consultant
Charley Mahaney	Community Member
Debi Heims	Recorder, H&S Environmental

II. Handouts:

Agenda

Meeting minutes from April 20, 2006

Meeting minutes from September 28, 2006

Draft Feasibility Study Work Plan for SSC Sediments

Draft Proposed Plan for Buildings 62 and 68 and Former Proposed Gymnasium Site

III. Meeting Minutes:

Mr. McCassie called the meeting to order 7:10 pm and asked if there were any comments, changes or revisions to the September 2006 RAB Meeting Minutes.

The minutes were accepted without amendment.

General Comments:

Mr. Kaltofen commented that there were some outstanding items that needed to be addressed in the meeting this evening. Dr. Strauss said that she had some items to discuss during the Public Comment period.

Draft Feasibility Study Work Plan for SSC Sediments – Mr. Kevin Palaia

Handout

Mr. Palaia provided an update of the Draft Feasibility Study Work Plan for sediments at SSC. He began with a summary of the lake and sediment work performed over the past ten years. He stated that between 1996 and 2003 there was a remedial investigation (RI) along SSC shore line. Mr. Palaia showed a map of the areas where the investigation took place. He commented that the Remedial Investigation included both a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) and an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). The results of the HHRA did not result in unacceptable results for cancer or non-cancer risks from exposure by residential swimming or wading along the shore line. However, the base-line ERA performed as part of these remedial investigations did result in potential ecological risks compared to ecological toxicity benchmarks. In 2001 and 2002, Tier II Ecological Risk Assessments were conducted at two outfalls: T-25 Area and at MSO Outfalls to provide a more detailed assessment. It included more sediment and surface water sampling, toxicity testing, and a benthic survey of organisms living in the sediment. It also included a wildlife survey to determine if a potential food chain pathway existed through higher trophic levels. The results demonstrated that a complete food chain pathway was likely and therefore, the Army proceeded to a Tier III Ecological Risk Assessment in 2004. The Tier III Assessment included a fish tissue and fresh water sample program. Over 250 fish samples were collected targeting primarily largemouth bass, eel and blue gill species. The species were analyzed for a wide range of contaminants. The results of the fish tissue analyses were used to support food chain models to estimate risks to higher trophic level birds and mammals. The Tier III Ecological Risk Assessment concluded that there

was a low level (comparable to background) of ecological risk to mammals and fish. Later in 2004, an ERA Uncertainty Evaluation and Fish Ingestion Human Health Risk Assessment was performed to evaluate exposure parameters. The results concluded that the ecological risk was between “very minimal” to “not of significance” to the population of concern.

The EPA requested that the Army perform a fish ingestion Human Health Risk Assessment for the adult ingestion of large mouth bass. The results showed that PCBs in fish tissue did pose a risk to humans ingesting fish. One concern of both the RAB members and regulators was the potential fish consumption at the lake. In 2005-2006, a site specific Angler Survey of Lake Cochituate was completed. Approximately 200 anglers were interviewed asking specific questions about the usage of the fish. Based upon the results, in 2006 a Revised Fish Ingestion Human Health Risk Assessment was performed. The results demonstrated that the potential non-cancer human health risk from eating fish had an index greater than one. Based on these results, the decision was made by the regulators to perform a Feasibility Study (FS) for sediments. To orient the RAB, Mr. Palaia showed a map illustrating locations of sediment samples collected along the SSC shoreline.

Mr. Palaia continued with the Feasibility Study Objectives:

- Identify Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)
- Develop Remedial Action Objectives (RAO)
- Define Remedial Cleanup Goals
- Screen and evaluate technologies and process options
- Development and detailed evaluation of sediment remedial action alternatives

Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)

To the extent that this practical, the Massachusetts Contingency Plan requires compliance with ARARs during remedial and removal actions.

- **Applicable Requirements:**
Federal or state promulgated standards/criteria that specifically address a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, remedial action or location.
- **Relevant and Appropriate Requirements:**
Federal or state promulgated standards/criteria not applicable to a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, remedial action or location, but address problems/situations similar to those at the site.
- **Information to be considered:**
Non-promulgated guidance and advisories; not legally binding.

There are three types of ARARs:

- Chemical Specific

Chemical, media and concentrations
Human Health or ecological risk-based numerical values
Define acceptable exposure levels of sediment

- Location Specific
Set restrictions on concentrations of hazardous substances or conduct of activity solely because they are in a special location (e.g., wetlands, historic sites, ecosystems)
- Action Specific
Regulate the performance or design of remedial activities
Set restrictions or controls for particular treatment and disposal activities related to management of remedial wastes

Mr. Kaltofen asked if the action specific ARARs would take into consideration the milfoil removal program.

Mr. Palaia responded that he wasn't completely sure and it could possibly fall under the location specific ARARs. He commented that there probably were no federal or state criteria regulating it.

Mr. Miller commented that logically it seemed to fit under both criteria. He asked if it had to be one or the other for the process.

Mr. Palaia responded that he was not sure. He continued that action specific primarily was regulated by the actual performance of remedial alternatives.

Mr. Palaia continued with the next step of the Remedial Process - identifying Remedial Action Objectives (RAO's) and Remedial Goals:

- Remedial Action Objectives (RAO's)
Statement of general goals for protecting human health and environment
Serve as guideline for developing remedial alternatives
Consider current site use, future land use, and available background data
- Remedial Goals
Specific numerical goals are defined for media
SSC cleanup driven by human health risk from fish ingestion

He continued stating that the exposure risk involved at this site was primarily driven by fish ingestion. The baseline Risk Assessment was within the EPA's acceptable range for swimming or wading on the shoreline. He commented that the remedial goals were developed around fish ingestion.

The next step in the remedial process is the Screening and Initial Evaluation of Technologies and Process Options.

- General Response Actions:
 - No Action
 - Institutional controls
 - Monitored Natural Recovery
 - Containment/Capping
 - Removal – dredging, excavation
 - Treatment – ex-situ and in-situ
 - Disposal
- Preliminary screening of available sediment remediation technologies – evaluated for technical feasibility.
- Use available public and private sources, recent studies
- Initial evaluation of technologies that pass preliminary screen for effectiveness, implementability, and cost
- Consideration of beneficial and adverse impacts of the technology-minimize short term health and ecological impacts

A major concern to sediment remediation is the re-suspension of contaminated sediments and the potential impact it could have on the eco-system on a short term basis. He commented that in Natick, the sediments were organic rich and fine grains. He said that any intrusive technology could send sediments up and re-suspend them. He added that there were ways to address this with various technologies.

Dr. Vembu asked if the screening deals primarily with technologies verses process options.

Mr. Palaia responded primarily technologies but there are some institutional and administrative controls. He continued that all the technologies that pass the preliminary screen and initial evaluation go through a more detailed analysis of the technologies and alternatives.

The Development and Detailed Analysis of Alternatives:

- Assemble remedial alternatives designed to reduce potential human health risks
- Alternatives can include combination of technologies
- Evaluate each alternative against 9 CERCLA criteria:
 - Overall protection of human health and the environment
 - Compliance with ARARs
 - Long-term effectiveness and permanence
 - Reduction of toxicity mobility, and volume through treatment
 - Short-term effectiveness
 - Implementability
 - Cost

- State acceptance
- Community acceptance
- Compare alternatives against each other

He commented that technologies are often combined to assemble remedial alternatives. For example, the T25 area groundwater has a combination of four or five different components as its remedy coupled with institutional controls. He stated that it was at this time that a detailed analysis of the actual cost to implement, operate and maintain the technology would occur. He stated that one of the alternatives that would be evaluated under CERCLA is “no action”. It serves as the baseline to which one compares alternatives.

He said that the state and community acceptance is not evaluated until a proposed plan has been produced. He then presented the schedule for the Feasibility Study.

Schedule:

- November 30, 2006: Draft Final Feasibility Study Work Plan
- Comments are due by January 12, 2007
- March 13, 2007: Draft Final FS Report

Dr. Vembu asked why did they have to wait until March 13th?

Mr. Palaia responded that comments are due back on January 12th, and that they were currently working on a Feasibility Study. The goal is to get the signed ROD by September 2007. He stated that this was a compressed schedule, and added that getting three documents completed in eleven months usually doesn't happen.

Mr. Miller added that he was planning to give a SolarBee update during General Comments but thought it was worth commenting that the main reason that the floating circulators possibly might not be used for Milfoil removal was that it could conflict with the best cleanup alternatives. He continued stating that one of the remedial goals needs to be future water use. He questioned if the floating circulators actually do disturb the sediment. He asked if it could be a part of the experiment. He commented that the State of Massachusetts decided against a direct sediment study.

Mr. McHugh commented that there are lot of professionals on the RAB and the Feasibility Study Work Plan is currently being developed so now would be the time to mention any innovative technologies or alternative processes by January 12th. He added from the Army's perspective, they don't want to re-suspend sediments, stating that the risk was being caused by fish ingestion not by wading in the water.

Dr. Strauss commended that a re-suspension would increase concentrations in fish and contamination would spread around the lake so it was a connected problem. She added that in the evaluation of technologies and the ecological impacts of the technology, the spreading of Milfoil could be an ecological impact.

Dr. Vembu asked if somebody could go through the process on how to give feed back on the draft work plan.

Mr. McHugh said that after review of the work plan, if there were any comments they should be emailed to Mr. Connolly.

Mr. Palaia commented that this is not a review of alternatives just the work plan, the process. He stated that the RAB would have an opportunity to review the actual feasibility study in March 2007.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked when the alternative was being selected.

Mr. Palaia responded that the alternative would be selected around June in a draft document.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if that was finalized as part of the ROD.

Mr. Palaia responded affirmatively.

Ms. Williams commented that the regulators public comment period for the draft final was April 19, 2007 and the comment period ends June 2nd. It was a condensed schedule in order to meet the September 30th date for signature.

Dr. Strauss asked if the compressed schedule worked in coordination of the fiscal year, and what was the reason for getting it done by the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. McHugh commented that this had been outstanding for sometime and added that the Department of Defense wants sites addressed across the country.

Mr. Kaltofen asked whether milfoil bio-accumulate PCBs? And if we use Milfoil Weevils, do fish eat the Milfoil Weevils?

Mr. Palaia commented that they did look briefly at the potential uptake capacity of Milfoil plants, but he was unsure about the Milfoil Weevils. He said that they were planning to look at this as one of the alternatives.

Draft Proposed Plan for Buildings 62 and 68 and the Former Proposed Gymnasium Site – Stan Reed

Handout

Mr. Reed stated that the purpose of the presentation was to summarize the site history, to present preferred alternatives for Buildings 62 and 68 and the Former Proposed Gymnasium Site (FPGS), to explain the rationale for preferred alternatives and to identify the next steps.

He would be discussing Step Four of the five Major Steps in the CERCLA Process:

1. Discovery
2. Site Investigation
3. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
4. Proposed Plan
5. Record of Decision (Final selection for the remedy of the site)

He continued that the proposed plan presents the cleanup alternative in a document. It discusses the rationale for the selection of the preferred alternative. It would not however, be selected until the ROD. This step initiates a thirty day public comment period where people are encouraged to provide formal written comments to Jim Connolly. Also during that period, a public meeting and a public hearing would occur. The Army is required by CERCLA to record the comments and respond to them in writing. These comments would be considered as a possibility in the final selection of the preferred alternative. He commented that this presentation was not the issuance of the proposed plan but more of a preview of what it will look like. It was a chance for the RAB members to see it and ask questions. The formal comments will come at a later time. He continued that the proposed plan summarizes the site description and history, discusses alternatives, explains the rationale, and sets the stage for the ROD.

Mr. Reed continued by showing a map of Soldiers System Center. He pointed out the buildings 62 and 68 within the T25 area. He also pointed out the former gymnasium site. He commented that Building 62 was constructed in 1974 and Building 68 was constructed in 1980. Both buildings were almost identical being a 20 x 20 foot building on concrete slab. He stated that the sites were investigated in 2004. Most of the area around the building was a paved parking lot, the soil around the building area had shallow contamination of petroleum hydrocarbons, and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) in the upper 2-3 feet. There was no site-related groundwater contamination found, although these buildings are in the T25 area and were subject to capture contamination in the T25 groundwater extraction system. There was approximately 170 tons of petroleum contaminated soil removed in the fall of 2005. It was disposed of at a permitted asphalt-batching plant. The confirmation samples did not exceed the MCP clean up standards of S-1/GW-1.

Mr. Reed continued showing the proposed Gym site area. The area is 1.6 acres along the SSC eastern boundary. It is a grassy sloped area southwest of the main entrance. It includes a former wet meadow and peaty areas. It also includes part of a large parking lot. There is a drain system in place for seasonally high groundwater.

Mr. Miller asked when was the area a wet meadow.

Mr. Reed responded that he believed it was back in the 1950's.

Mr. Pickett responded that the area was reconfigured when it was converted into a parking lot. It was filled with peat.

Mr. Miller stated historically until 1800s the lake was 13 feet lower than it is now.

Mr. Reed commented that he was unsure of the details but pointing to the map, he suggested that the particular area was wet.

Mr. Mc Hugh commented that area started to be filled in 1938. It was a gravel pit. It was wet then, south of where the interceptor meets the outlet around Lake Cochituate.

Mr. Pickett commented that he believed that this information is located in the RI report.

Mr. Reed continued with the historical uses for the FPGS included a parking lot, helicopter landing pad, and a POL bladder test site. It was proposed as a gym site in the late 1980's but was never developed. It is currently inactive except for the paved parking area. There were no documented spills or releases at the site. The site wasn't developed because remedial investigations in the monitoring well 5 area in 1997-98 resulted in petroleum-like contaminations. He continued that contamination of soil within 20 feet of MW-5 were benzene, chlorobenzene, benzo(a)pyrene, beryllium exceeding S-1/GW-1 standards. The groundwater at monitoring well 5 demonstrated benzene, chlorobenzene, cis-1-2-dichloroethene, ethylbenzene, xylenes. The benzene exceeded the drinking water standards. There was also aluminum, iron, and magnesium. The lake surface water had no exceedances of ambient water quality criteria. The sediments investigated had some volatiles, semi-volatiles, pesticides, petroleum hydrocarbons and metals. No PCBs were found. As a result of the investigations, a removal action was performed in 2002. One thousand two hundred thirty three tons of soil were excavated in an area of 40 x 40 x 10 feet deep surrounding MW-5. The soil was disposed of at a permitted asphalt-batching plant. The clean up levels were based on the MCP S-1/GW-1 standards. Two of the thirty-one confirmation samples exceeded cleanup level for 2-butanone (a common lab contaminant). The confirmation samples did not exceed current MCP standards for remaining site-related chemicals.

Mr. Reed continued that following the removal action, post-removal groundwater monitoring occurred. Results from the analytical testing demonstrated improvement in water quality. Examples are that benzene has decreased from 64ug/L to less than 5 ug/L which is less than the drinking water standard. Other contaminants also demonstrated the same pattern (tetrachloroethene, trichloroethene, cis-1,2-dichloroethene, vinyl chloride, chlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, xylenes were all less than MCLs. There were some elevated concentrations of manganese which appeared to be associated with peat deposits. And there were elevated concentrations of nitrate/nitrite attributed to use of fertilizers. Mr. Reed showed a graphic reflecting the benzene trend before and after the removal action at MW 5 demonstrating a success story.

Mr. Reed said the Human Health Risk Assessment study was re-evaluated Post-Removal of soil. The results demonstrated a non-cancer hazard index was less than the threshold of one. The groundwater was also evaluated, and although there is no current exposure to groundwater, the non-cancer hazard index exceeds the threshold of one was due primarily

to nitrate and manganese, based on hypothetical future residential use. The ecological risk assessment was based on a former RI resulted in that the surface soil and surface water were unlikely to pose a risk however the sediment could pose potential risk to fish and wildlife. Since that time there has been additional studies done, and the sediments no longer pose an ecological risk for the area.

Thus, the preferred alternatives for buildings 62 and 68 are no further action. The rationale behind this is that the soil that was contaminated was removed. The soil does not exceed protective cleanup levels. There is no site related groundwater contamination and any contamination in the area is being captured by T25. It is protective of human health and the environment. It attains applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) it provides both short and long term effectiveness. The removal action reduced contaminant toxicity/mobility/volume. It was easily implemented and cost effective.

For the FPGS the preferred alternative is limited action. The key components are:

- Institutional controls to prevent future potable use of groundwater
- Long-term groundwater monitoring
- Five year reviews

Sediments are being addressed as part of the sediment operable unit. Some of the Key component details are as follows:

- Installation of Master Plan prohibits use of groundwater as a potable water source and Institutional Controls are in place.
- Town ordinance prohibits water well installation west of Main Street.
- Monitoring wells will be sampled as part of existing monitoring program
- Five year reviews will review monitoring data and land-use/exposure scenarios to assess protectiveness

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there was a property transfer would the monitoring continue.

Mr. Reed responded that there would be restrictive language in property transfer documents that would be continuous of the master plan.

In conclusion, the preferred alternative rationale for the FPGS:

- Soil does not exceed protective cleanup levels
- Protective of human health and the environment
- Attains applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs)
- Provides short and long term effectiveness
- Removal action reduced contaminant toxicity/mobility/volume through treatment
- It is easily implemented
- It is cost effective

Finally the next step is that the proposed plan will be issued on or about December 18th. There will be a 30 day public comment period for written comments beginning at that time. There will be a public meeting during the public comment period for oral comments. All comments will be considered and responses included in the

Responsiveness Summary. There will be a preparation of the Record of Decision the signature of Record of Decision will be by the U.S. Army and U.S. EPA with concurrence from the Massachusetts DEP.

Mr. Miller questioned if the original discovery was flawed, maybe that all the data wasn't found or data that was found was not included in the initial reports.

Ms. Williams asked if Mr. Miller thought that there were other contaminants at the gym site that have not been addressed.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that the document being referred to was the 1980 Restricted U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA) Facility Report. The issue in that report was chlorinated pesticides in soils and sediments. The process was flawed.

Mr. Miller asked to what degree was it flawed.

Mr. Reed pointed out that they sampled for full suite of analytical chemistry including volatiles, semi volatiles, pesticides, etc. If there was some type of contamination, it would have been detected and reported.

Mr. Miller asked based on the area and depth of samples taken and analyzed that a thorough evaluation was conducted and any potential problem would have been seen?

Mr. Kaltofen said that he believed that was correct referring to soils and groundwater. He commented that historically during the public meetings some of these materials were made available for public viewing. Maybe some of the older materials should be made available at the upcoming public hearing and individuals can make up their minds as part of the public hearing.

Mr Campbell commented that he understands what Mr. Miller was saying based upon the initial onset of the public process commenting that there were inherent and problematic misunderstandings. He continued stating that all generated documents are available at the depository for review at any time. They cover everything that has been done here including the 1980 document.

Mr. McHugh commented at each site there are records of spills but in all fairness, prior to 1965 there was no record keeping either by the Army or by other industrial or research entities. The 1980 document is in the repository.

Mr. Kaltofen suggested that the updated bibliography be made available at public hearing.

Ms. Williams commented that as a requirement of Record of Decision there is an Administrative Record Index which would be part of the ROD. Every document that the Army, EPA and DEP have used to make a decision is incorporated in the ROD.

Mr. Kaltofen concluded that this site was one of the three sites that brought RAB together in the first place and it is nice to see it getting done and thanked everyone for their efforts.

Public Comment:

Cochituate Rail Trail Right-of-Way

Mr. Miller commented that the town of Natick was considering purchasing the Cochituate Rail Trail Right-Of-Way. Natick started a new group called the Natick Cochituate Rail Trail Task Force who will be studying this purchase. Natick currently has the first right of refusal. Before purchasing, the town will contract out the environmental evaluation work for hazardous contamination at the right-of-way area. He commented that the Rail Trail crosses Kansas Street near this site. The first right of refusal period is 180 days, ending in February with a possible extension of another 180 day period. He said that Natick has money to pursue this with state and federal monies. The Task Force will be having periodic meetings with a possible special town meeting in December to discuss the use of existing funds to fund the initial studies.

SolarBee

Mr. Miller continued that the SolarBees were installed on October 17th and 18th 2006 in South and Middle Pond. They were installed in places where they are easily monitored. One monitoring is to visually look at the system to see if the propeller is turning. Each one has adjacent area of water nearby that should be affected by all the natural issues, independent of the weather or lake environment. The difference of with or without the circulators should be seen. Final data will be compared and reported around December 2007, with some conclusions of the effectiveness of the systems. He commented that there would be no direct measurement of sediment distributions but maybe indirect measurements thus there will be short falls on the floating circulator data. He commented that he had been told that there would be a Milfoil Weevil experiment but that was no longer the case. He had been talking to an expert from Quebec and commented that it was worth looking at the natural increase of the Milfoil Weevils possibly being caused by the circulators. He suggested it could have been measured by the studying the density of weevils before, during and after the circulation.

Mr. Miller continued stating that the Town of Wayland unanimously voted to install circulators on Dudley Pond. Unfortunately they chose the SolarBee Circulator (not the larger circulators). He stated that no knowledge would be gained regarding the larger circulators and will still be unresolved questions a year from now.

Mr. Osgood asked if there was a way to address the significance of the SolarBee circulator against disturbance of sediment.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that the Tufts people, hired by DCR, would measure the suspended material in the vicinity of the SolarBee and then away from the SolarBee for data gathering.

Dr. Vembu commented that based on the SolarBee presentation he believed that there doesn't seem to be an impact on the sediment disturbances. There was no indication that it was pulling sediments from the bottom.

Natick 360 Process

Dr. Strauss stated that the Natick 360 Process has begun. She stated that Natick 360 is a long range strategy planning process that is being undertaken town-wide as a plan/foresight what Natick should look like 20 years from now. She stated that they had input from 350 citizens and 200 citizens who completed an on-line survey discussing what they liked about Natick, what changes Natick should take 20 years from now. The values and visions were compiled and an early draft has been created and will be looked at by various committees of Natick: CONCOM, Board of Selectmen, and School Committee. She continued that she didn't know to what extent Natick Labs has been hooked up with this as an important employer of Natick.

Mr. McHugh said that he would follow up on it. He asked for a point of contact and would let the appropriate parties in the facility know. He commented that the installation is gradually growing, requiring more space so from a demographic standpoint people may be interested.

Dr. Strauss responded that, Mr. Craig Ross – Committee Co-chair, would be the person and would get the contact information for him. She continued to state that the planning process includes environment, jobs, quality of life, open space, and zoning are all fair game topics.

Mr. McHugh commended as an example approximately thirty or sixty days ago the Army out of Washington executed a contract with NSTAR to upgrade the utilities at SSC. NSTAR will be taking over the utilities until 2015. The trucks have been up and down Kansas Street and Route 27. He commented that this interfaces in what Dr. Strauss was discussing.

Dr. Strauss agreed. She continued that the committee will be organizing a work session on February 13th where they would get together major institutions that have an impact on Natick. She commented that NSTAR and Natick Lab should be there.

Mr. Osgood commented that the Kansas Street utility poles were getting top heavy. He asked if this would be a part of the 360 study.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that this was one of the selectman's pet projects. He said that he would let Mr. Osgood know which selectman it was.

Mr. Kaltofen brought up an outstanding comment regarding the last meeting about a comment about possibly doing additional vinyl chloride testing in the HRC® Project area and was it going to be added as a groundwater contaminant. He asked if a decision had been made.

Mr. McHugh commented that they were testing for vinyl chloride in that area but the EPA was going to give a PE sample to be spiked.

Ms. Williams agreed and said that ICF just has to coordinate it.

Schedule

Mr. McHugh discussed dates for the next meetings:

Thursday, January 18th 2007 – Hearing for the proposed plan.

The goal would be to move the location to the library. The hearing would start at 7:00 pm and will be completed by 9:00 pm. A presentation would be made, a legal-like record would occur, comment cards would be available at the door. The capacity is approximately 40 people.

Thursday, March 22, 2007 – RAB Meeting

Thursday, April 12th 2007 – RAB Meeting

Thursday, June 21st, 2007 – RAB Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 pm