U.S. Army Soldier System Center RAB Meeting Minutes for March 22, 2007

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Conference Center
U. S. Army Soldier System Center
March 22, 2007
Draft 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
Christine Williams	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Marco Kaltofen	Co-Chair, Community Member
Dr. Kannan Vembu	Representative of Natick Board of Selectmen
A. Richard Miller	Community Member
Neill Osgood	Community Member, Lakewood Association
Elizabeth McCoy	Employee Member, SSC
Dr. Harlee Strauss	Community Member
James Fitzgerald	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)

Others in Attendance:

Amy Rosenstein	Environmental Consultant, ICF International
Lianyang Zhang	Environmental Consultant, ICF International
Kevin Palaia	Environmental Consultant, ICF International
Robert Tess	Environmental Consultant, ECC
Fred Santos	Environmental Consultant, ECC
Willard Murray	Environmental Consultant, ECC
Jeff Pickett	Environmental Consultant, Mactec
Debi Heims	Environmental Consultant, H&S Environmental
Stacy Greendlinger	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Cornell Rosiu	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Carole Berkowitz	Protect Our Water Resources

SDMS DocID 505574

Handouts

Agenda
Meeting minutes from November 22, 2007
Plume Capture/Remediation Buildings 22/36 & Blds. 63/2/45
Draft Final Feasibility Study for SSC Sediments

III. Meeting Minutes

Mr. Fitzgerald announced that he would be acting as community co-chair since Mr. Kaltofen was delayed. Mr. Fitzgerald called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm and asked if there were any comments, changes or revisions to the November 2006 RAB Meeting Minutes.

Ms. Williams asked on the first page of the November 2006 Minutes, it reads, "Over 250 fish samples were collected targeting primarily largemouth bass….." She asked if it should read 250 sediment samples.

Mr. Palaia responded that there were both sediment and fish samples so the minutes should be corrected to reflect that.

Ms. Williams also noted that on the second page it reads, "…the Massachusetts Contingency Plan requires compliance with ARARs during remedial and removal actions." Ms. Williams stated that it should be National Contingency Plan.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there were any general comments.

Mr. McHugh mentioned that there was a hearing on March 15, 2007 regarding the Proposed Plan for Buildings 62 and 68 and the Proposed Gymnasium Site.

Mr. Pickett responded that he just received the transcript.

Ms. Williams asked whether any other comments have been received on the Proposed Plan.

Mr. McHugh said no additional comments have been received so far, but that the comment period was open until April 16, 2007.

Proposed Groundwater Containment System Expansion Status Update – Mr. Rob Tess - ECC

Handout

Mr. Tess began by stating that the purpose of this upgrade is to capture two existing plumes of PCE and TCE by groundwater extraction and to treat the water with the existing treatment facility.

Background: Building 22/36 Area PCE Plume is identified in the silt layer. The plume's contaminant concentration ranges from 0.3 ug/L to 100 ug/L. Building 63/2/45 Area has an identified plume of TCE in the silt layer and contaminant concentration ranges from 0.3 ug/L to 300 ug/L.

History of Planning: The Draft Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) was submitted to the RAB in April 2006. The Draft Final ESD was submitted to the RAB in August 2006. Authorization to proceed with construction was given in early October 2006. The Final Work Plan was issued in January 2007.

Work Plan Highlights: The main activities in the work plan were to conduct a Geoprobe investigation for additional plume delineation at Blds. 63/2/45. Following this, ECC was to install seven extraction wells with an optional 8th if necessary, to install fifteen monitoring wells and seven piezometers, to install piping to tie all wells into existing treatment plant and to upgrade instrumentation and controls at the existing treatment plant.

Bay State Piping was hired to perform the piping work. The work started on November 29, 2006. The majority of the 3000+ feet of piping and conduit was installed by traditional excavation. There were two areas where utilities and structures would not allow access for conventional trenching. Directional drilling was performed in these areas to bypass the obstructions from below. The piping is approximately 85% complete.

Initial well installation was started concurrent with the piping installation. Extraction wells (EW-) 3 and 7 and their associated monitoring wells and piezometers were installed, one each in the area of Buildings 22 and 36 and the area of Buildings 63, 2 & 45 to support an aquifer test in each plume area. . Each well was pumped at increasing flow rates to determine the maximum flow rate that could be achieved at each well. Each well continued to pump at a reduced rate for 3-5 days to determine if the anticipated drawdown would occur. The installation and development was completed on December 29, 2006.

Ms. Williams asked if ECC had the results.

Mr. Tess responded that, in general, they have confirmed it is working as anticipated and that they did not have to relocate of any other extraction wells.

Dr. Strauss asked if they got draw down.

Mr. Tess responded affirmatively.

Mr. Willard Murray of ECC commented that the preliminary design was adequate to capture both plumes. He also stated that after the aquifer test, ECC performed the planned geoprobe survey to confirm the location of the plume in the 63/2/45 area.

Ms. Williams asked if there were plans to put in the optional well.

Mr. Tess responded that the optional well is not currently planned to be installed, pending laboratory results from the geoprobe sampling to confirm what they were seeing.

Mr. Tess continued, saying that the remaining well installation (EW-2, -4, -5, -6, and EW-8) began on March 5, 2007. He stated that all monitoring wells and piezometers and extraction wells were installed with the exception of three monitoring wells which will require a special off-road drill rig for installation. He stated that well development began Monday, March 19, 2007 and will run for about 2 weeks. He stated that on Monday, March 26th the Piping subcontractor will re-mobilize to the site and start the process of tying the extraction wells to the installed piping. He stated that the next two weeks the electrical subcontractor will mobilize and pull electrical cables, install fans and pumps and upgrade the computer that runs the treatment plant. The plan is to start the system late April 2007.

Mr. Osgood asked if there was a rough estimate of gallons per minute being added to the system.

Mr. Tess responded that they were only adding 7-8 wells and on average each well produces two to three gallons a minute with a maximum of five gallons a minute per well. The treatment plant as it is currently configured has excess capacity of over 50 gallons per minute. He stated that most of the upgrades are operational and for efficiency.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there were soil samples taken.

Mr. Tess responded no.

Mr. McHugh stated that NSTAR plans to put in new electrical underground utility conduit extending across much of the installation. In preparation for their excavation NSTAR collected over sixty soil samples and found minor contamination at one location. All other samples were clean.

Mr. Tess commented that samples were screened as they were digging around the area of Building 22 and 36. Prior extensive soil sampling had already occurred in that area. He concluded that they did not anticipate a problem nor did they find a problem.

Dr. Strauss asked if headspace screening was used.

Mr. Tess responded both headspace screening and visual screening were used.

Draft Final Feasibility Study for SSC Sediments – Ms. Amy Rosenstein

Handout

Review of Sediment Investigations:

1996-2003: Remedial Investigations (RI) of SSC shoreline areas. The remedial investigations included Human Health Risk Assessment with direct sediment contact with swimming or wading. It was noted that no unacceptable findings occurred.
2001: Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) at T-25 Area Outfall
2002: Tier II ERA at MSO. The Ecological Risk Assessments concluded that there was limited potential for incremental ecological risk
2004: Tier III ERA for SSC shoreline sediments
2004: ERA Uncertainty Evaluation and Fish Ingestion Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA)
2005-2006: Open Water Angler Survey of Lake Cochituate
2006: Revised Fish Ingestion HRA
2006-2007: Sediment Feasibility Study (FS) is based on the non-cancer human health risks associated with fish ingestion from SSC shoreline. The cancer risk estimates were within the EPA's acceptable limits. Following the Sediment Feasibility Study the proposed plan will be presented in Summer 2007 and the ROD will follow in Fall 2007. The Feasibility Study was conducted in compliance with EPA and CERCLA Guidelines combined with the approved FS work plans.

Ms. Rosenstein showed a map of sampling locations for fish, water, surface water and sediment at the Soldier Systems Command at Natick.

Ms. Rosenstein continued discussing the Sediment Risk Assessments Results. She stated that the only risk to be considered unacceptable was the non-cancer risk for ingestion of native fish on SSC shoreline.

- Site Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME) hazard index = 6.0, (EPA's acceptable level is one). This assumes an individual would catch and eat native fish exclusively from the SSC shoreline (100% site use)
- Site Central Tendency Hazard Exposure (CTE) hazard index = 0.9 (33% site use)
- Reference locations: RME HI = 4.6 CTE HI = 0.6

She noted that during the angler survey, the majority of the boaters that were interviewed at the lake responded that they were catch and release fishermen. She commented that the estimated incremental cancer risks are within or below EPA's acceptable risk range and that the ERAs indicated limited potential for incremental ecological risks.

Feasibility Study (FS) Objectives:

- Identify ARARs (Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements) and discuss compliance with ARARs for each alternative. The National Contingency Plan requires compliance with ARARs during remedial actions to the extent

practical. Types of ARARs could be chemical-specific (specific numerical values to protect human health or the environment), location-specific (are specific to a location) or action-specific (regulate the remedial action itself).

- Develop Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs). Remedial Action Objectives are general goals to protect human health and the environment. They take into consideration current and future uses. The RAO for SSC sediment is: *to reduce the potential for sediment associated human health risks due to PCBs in fish caught near the SSC shoreline currently and in the future.*
- Define Remedial Cleanup Goal. The established remedial goal for total PCBs in sediment is to reduce the potential non-cancer risks associated with the ingestion of native fish caught near the SSC shoreline. The two steps involved for setting the sediment remedial goal:
    (1) Estimate an "acceptable" level of total PCBs in fish, using both Central Tendency Exposure and Reasonable Maximum Exposure human health risk parameters such as the amount of fish consumed and the size of the fish consumed.
    (2) Derive a remedial goal for sediment that relates the "acceptable" level of PCBs in fish to sediment concentrations. Site specific data was used to develop a biota-sediment accumulation factor (relating to the concentration of total PCBs in sediment to the concentration of total PCBs in fish). An alternate method shown in the FS is the Gobas food chain model using many assumptions about uptake of PCBs through the food chain in Lake Cochituate.

    - Total PCB sediment = 0.3 ppm (CTE) which is protective for individuals who may catch and consume fish near the SSC shoreline
    - Total PCB sediment = 0.07 ppm (RME). This may be technically impracticable to attain from an engineering perspective (it is also lower than South Pond reference concentrations).

She noted that the reduction of PCBs in SSC shoreline sediments may not substantially reduce the PCBs in fish caught near the SSC shoreline as fish caught here could take up PCBs from sediments at other non-Army locations in South Pond. She commented that Remedial Goals at other New England PCB sites are 1 ppm or higher. She added that the cleanup goals are currently under discussion between the Army and the EPA.

She continued that the Feasibility Study discussions are based on a cleanup goal of 0.3 ppm. She stated that the <u>average</u> sediment PCB concentrations were considered. She pointed out that the T-25 Area, Former Proposed Gym Site, Buildings 2/16/36, Boiler Plant = 0 to 0.3 ppm and the MSO and ARIEM areas = 1.5 ppm. Ms. Rosenstein continued referencing the average sediment PCB concentrations (non-Army) from South, Middle, North and Fisk Ponds = 0 to 0.3 ppm. She noted that Birch Road Outfall non-Army site was 1.1 ppm. She concluded that the proposed area for sediment risk management will focus on the shoreline sediments at the MSO and ARIEM locations.

Ms. Rosenstein showed a map with the estimated cleanup areas associated with the 1.0 and the 0.3 ppm remedial goals. Assuming a two foot depth, the 0.3 ppm sediment cleanup goal would require approximately 775,000 square feet of sediment to be removed or capped (approximately 57,400 cubic yards of material to be dredged). The 1.0 ppm sediment cleanup goal would require approximately 577,600 square feet of material to be removed or capped (approximately 42,750 cubic yards of material to be dredged).

Mr. Kevin Palaia continued with the Feasibility Study Objectives

- Screening and Initial Evaluation of Technologies and Process Options. He stated that there are general categories of the types of remedial actions that can be performed on contaminated sediments. They are referred to as General Response Actions.

General Response Action:

- No Action – A required response that must be included in a Feasibility Study under the National Contingency Plan
- Institutional Controls- Administrative and legal controls
- Monitored Natural Recovery – physical, biological or chemical breakdown and recovery of contaminated sediments. It includes bio-degradation, dispersion, or burial of contaminated sediments etc.
- Containment/Capping – physically isolating the contaminated sediments by placing an impermeable or semi-permeable barrier over the contaminated sediments.
- Removal- dredging, excavation alternatives.
- Treatment – *ex-situ* (contaminated sediments are physically removed from the lake and treated outside of the water body) and *in-situ* (treated in place by biological or chemical addition to reduce the toxicity of the contaminants prior to removal).
- Disposal the contaminated sediments at a licensed landfill or containment in various disposal units.

Mr. Palaia continued that the preliminary screenings of available sediment remediation technologies are evaluated for technical feasibility *only*. For those technologies that are considered feasible, the next step is the initial evaluation of technologies passing a preliminary screen of Effectiveness, Implementability and Cost. One must consider beneficial and adverse impacts of the technology to minimize short term health and ecological impacts as well as site specific characteristics. He gave the following example, that the sediments at this site are fine-grain, moist and have an organic-rich consistency. He commented that it is difficult to get water to settle out of these sediments. He added that another consideration would be the depth of water off the shoreline from the main outfall. At the SSC, the depth of water is generally less than ten feet, probably ranging from five to eight feet. He added that the space of land area on

shore to implement the remedies must be considered. He added that these were just some site specific factors that must be considered when you go through the evaluation.

- Develop and evaluate sediment remedial action alternatives

Mr. Palaia continued that in the Initial Evaluation Phase you begin to look at the Effectiveness, Implimentability and Cost of the various technologies. The Effectiveness - is the technology able to handle the media (sediment) and the volumes one anticipates, is the process reliable, are there impacts from construction or implementation, are there short term health or environmental impacts. Implimentability, administrative or technical, are the types of material, services, and equipment available to implement the technologies. He added that cost is considered on a qualitative basis. Is it a low, medium or high cost? He stated that as the alternatives are assembled there will be a more detailed analysis of costs. During this initial evaluation one must consider both beneficial and adverse impacts that the technology might have. He sited that dredging often times, particularly with fine grain sediments can re-suspend its sediments into the water column, potentially causing short term adverse impact to the existing biota. Thus, need to be considered in the evaluation.

He continued stating that the remaining technologies that do "pass" the preliminary screening and initial evaluation get assembled into alternatives. The alternatives are designed to meet the remedial action objectives that were stated earlier in the Feasibility Study. There are eight alternatives that address the Remedial Action Objective that are stated in the Feasibility Study.

Alternative 1: No action – required by National Contingency Plan with 5 year reviews.

Alternative 2: Limited Action/Institution Controls (ICs) – Institutional Controls are used to reduce exposure to fish by signage, public outreach, maintain current fencing, and security monitoring. A cooperative agreement between the Army and the State is required. There are also five year reviews required with this alternative.

Alternative 3: Institutional Controls/ Monitored Natural Recovery. Institutional Controls are used to reduce exposure to fish as mentioned in Alternative 2 but also long-term monitoring of PCB concentrations in sediment, water and fish to evaluate natural recovery. There would be an active data collection period over 30 years based on CERCLA regulations.

Alternative 4: Clay Capping/Monitoring/ICs. Pre-remedy survey, clay cap, long-term operations and maintenance and monitoring. The maintenance program would insure that the integrity of the cap is maintained over time. Institutional Controls are used to reduce exposure to fish and minimize cap damage. A Cooperative Agreement between the Army and the State would be required identifying the geographical extent of the capping as well as who is responsible for implementing, maintaining and monitoring the controls. There would also be a five year review. Based on preliminary calculations, the clay cap would be approximately twelve inches thick.

Alternative 5 Composite Capping/Monitoring/ICs (very similar to Alternative 4). It uses a geotextile fabric and a twelve inch sand layer cap. There is a product called AquaBlok™ which is a hydrated bentonite like pellet that is physically placed on the contaminated sediment. As it becomes hydrated, it expands and becomes the impermeable layer limiting the exposure to the contaminated sediment. Institutional Controls are used to reduce exposure to fish and minimize cap damage. A Cooperative Agreement is required as well as a five year review.

Alternative 6: Sediment Stabilization/Mechanical Dry Dredging/Off-Site Disposal
Pre-remedy survey, silt curtains would be installed (fabric materials from the top of the water to the bottom of the lake with the intent to limit any sediment and other material transport); cofferdam would be installed; dewatering with high volume pumps; stabilization of sediment; dredging, off-site disposal, a ten year long term monitoring program would be incorporated. Institutional Controls and cooperative agreement with the state will be implemented coupled with a five year review.
Alternative 7: Hydraulic Dredging/Geotextile Tub Dewatering; Off-site Disposal/ICs
Pre-remedy survey; silt curtains; hydraulic dredging performed from a barge; dewatering sediment using geotextile tubes dewatering system where the sediment is pumped; the water is detained and tested and if it meets discharge criteria, it would be pumped back into the lake. The left over sediment is "dry" and would be sent off-site for disposal. Mr. Palaia noted that the average concentrations of PCBs are 1.5 ppm and would not be considered hazardous waste. He added that at some landfills it may be considered daily cover. Monitoring would be performed 10 years after the removal action.

Alternative 8 Hydraulic Dredging/ Mechanical Dewatering/Off-Site Disposal/ ICs
This alternative uses a mechanical dewatering system called a filter press. He commented that it is labor intensive. It also uses the same pre-remedy survey, and silt curtains of prior dredging alternatives. Mr. Palaia showed two slides of examples of Hydraulic Dredging Alternatives and dewatering alternatives.

He continued discussing that each alternative must be evaluated 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

Mr. Palaia showed a slide/chart of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives of the eight alternatives and compared it to the nine CERCLA Evaluation criteria. The solid dot =

meets/exceeds criteria; half moon = partially meets criteria; the circle = does not meet criteria. He stated that all of the alternatives meet the ARARs. He commented that the dredging options demonstrate the largest impact on short-term effectiveness i.e., it would stir up the sediment which could have impacts to human health and it could have in increase of trucks carrying sediment through the town. He stated that all alternatives are implemetatble to certain degree. Each alternative described has been used at other contaminated sediment sites. He added that capping may be more difficult to consider due to the recreational use of the lake and there would be institutional controls restricting anchoring and wake zone areas. Costs are extremely varied throughout the eight alternatives due to capital costs and long term maintenance and monitoring costs ranging from $185,000 with the no action alternative to $17,000,000 for the hydraulic dredging and off-site disposal. He concluded that the State and community acceptance will be fully evaluated after the Public Comment Period.

Dr. Vembu asked if it was correct that alternatives 6-8 are based on long term monitoring of 10 years verses alternatives 3-5 are based on 30 years of monitoring.
Mr. Palaia responded affirmatively.

Dr. Strauss asked if the costs are based on 0.3 ppm cleanup goal.

Mr. Palaia responded affirmatively.

Dr. Strauss asked if an alternative analysis was done for the 1.0 ppm cleanup objective.

Mr. Palaia wasn't sure if it had actually been calculated but it was approximately two-thirds the area so it would be somewhat proportional.

Dr. Strauss asked when was the last time PCBs were discharged. When was the source of the problem?

Mr. McHugh answered that the PCB problem was traced to transformer explosion that occurred 1984-1985. The transformer was replaced in 1990 with a non-PCB unit. He added that the soil around the area was removed and the transformer pad was scarified and sealed in 1992. This would have ended PCB releases into the storm drain system related to the transformer release. High-capacity oil/water separators were installed on the storm water outfall in 1998, which intercept sediment, including PCBs before they are released to the Lake.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that despite the soil removal it is likely in his opinion that there would still have been PCB-containing sediment in the storm drainsystem that would have continued to be released to the lake for a few years after the soil cleanup in 1992.

Dr. Strauss wanted to know how many years of natural attenuation have occurred.

Ms. Williams commented that it has been more than twenty years since the explosion. But it has been 10 years since the source of release to the Lake was removed.

Mr. Miller commented that it would be good to see a second version of chart with the other cleanup objectives (i.e., 0.3 ppm vs. 1 ppm) to compare the two.

Mr. Palaia commented that this Feasibility Study just addresses 0.3 ppm. He added that there are other sites in the area that have clean up goals of 1 ppm. This Feasibility Study demonstrates the most conservative scenario.

Mr. Miller commented that process is not clear, it should be about getting the contamination out of water verses out of land. He added that water has ability to dilute. He stated that he was not clear on the procedure, and wanted to go on record that he was not clear.

Mr. Connolly commented on Mr. Miller's comment saying that if this was on land in Massachusetts, and PCBs were discovered in soil (as opposed to in sediment), this would not be a clean up site. He added that one would be able to build houses and grow and eat vegetables but since it is a lake and since the fish in the lake accumulate PCB and people eat fish then regulations require some sort of action.

Mr. Miller commented that when it was on land we did clean it up but now it is in water and it may prohibitive to clean it up and that was his concern. Mr. Miller expressed concern that the easy part had been done and now the hard and expensive part might not be done.

Mr. Palaia continued with the Schedule:

March 13, 2007:	Draft Final Sediment Feasibility Study Report submitted
April 27, 2007:	Deadline for receipt of comments on Draft Final Sediment FS Report. The Army will respond to comments.
May 12, 2007:	Submit Final Sediment FS Report
Spring 2007:	Submit Draft Proposed Plan to regulators and RAB for review
Summer 2007:	Issue Proposed Plan to public and hold Public Hearing
Fall 2007:	Complete SSC Sediment ROD

Mr. McCaisse asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if this whole situation is from a transformer.

Mr. McHugh commented that the main outfall drains the area of the transformer into the Lake. There is no other known source.

Mr. Palaia explained through a picture the sample locations and showed the area of concern. He continued by stating that there was a data gap thus the need for a pre-

remedy survey and additional sampling to identify both the horizontal and vertical extent of contamination.

Mr. Miller commented on the Milfoil Study at Pegan Cove that the growth density is strikingly low especially in the area where power boats run.

Mr. Palaia commented that they have looked at some of the bathymetry mapping from the Milfoil studies to get another sense of the depths of the area. He commented that the depth of lake is approximately 8 feet.

Dr. Strauss asked what fraction of cove is affected.

Mr. Palaia commented about half which was a conservative estimate and stated that they would perform a pre-remedy survey and additional sampling and analyses.

Dr. Strauss asked if they capped the area, could it close Pegan Cove to boating.

Mr. Palaia responded that it could and that this would need to be discussed as a potential a part of the Cooperative Agreement between the Army and the State as the State has jurisdiction of the lake.

Dr. Strauss asked what would be monitored in natural attenuation alternative.

Mr. Palaia said that it would be sediment, fish and the water column. He added that it would be annual for the first 5 years and then once every 5 years as required by CERCLA.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there was data that implies how long it would take for natural attenuation to occur.

Mr. Palaia said that they could not put a time on it stating that PCBs are generally persistent. He added that monitored natural recovery does not just include biologic or chemical breakdown it includes burial with cleaner sediments and decaying organic materials thus reducing exposure.

Dr. Katlofen commented that a lot has been done in 10 years. Some have more impact then others such as getting the drinking water cleaned up in the community. He commented that the contaminated fish has to stop based on remedy selected. It is not negotiable. He said that we need to stop the anglers from eating contaminated fish, and that is the only acceptable outcome.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Miller commented that the Town of Wayland has been working on their Milfoil issues at Dudley Pond. Originally, the town planned to try the Solar Bee® technology.

Mr. Miller made a case to go with (EcoGuide International). Wayland reconsidered and they will be acquiring three floating circulators to be installed on Dudley Pond at the end of April. He commented that he has been spending time trying to get the State to take interest on the study vs. ignoring it. He is optimistic that the feed back will provide more useful information about the existing technologies. He added that an expert who has been using these circulators mostly in Canada and France will come to discuss the technology.

He commented that a Solar Bee® Circulator had drifted on the lake is now in open water and he assumes that it is now turning.

Mr. Miller commented that a second topic of discussion is the update of the negotiations between CSX Railroad (it owns the right-of-way that goes across Kansas Street near the intersection of North Main Street) and the Town of Natick. The hope is to turn the area into the Cochituate Rail Trail. But currently the negotiations are very far apart (as are the other three major trails working with CSX). Mr. Miller said that he got a phone call from CSX this morning and that they plan to remove the rails and ties with in two weeks. He said that CSX believed that an agreement to go before the Natick Conservation Commission for the removal of the rails had already taken place.

Mr. McHugh said that there was a meeting scheduled for April 12, 2007. He will reconfirm the date.

Motion to adjourn at 8:34 pm was approved.