**U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center**
**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting**
**Grant Conference Center**
**Natick, Massachusetts**
**February 16, 2011**
**Final Meeting Minutes**

## I. Attendance

**RAB Members Present:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert Campbell | Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) |
| Marco Kaltofen | Co-Chair, Community Member |
| Steven Lubic | Natick Board of Selectmen Representative |
| Joel McCassie | Installation Co-Chair, U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center (NSSC) |
| Elizabeth McCoy | Employee Member, U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center (NSSC) |
| John McHugh | Chief of Environmental & Health Office, U.S. Army Garrison Natick |
| A. Richard Miller | Community Member |
| Dr. Kannan Vembu | Natick Board of Selectmen Representative |
| Christine Williams | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) |

**RAB Members Absent:**

| | |
|---|---|
| James Fitzgerald | Community Member |
| Tony Doheny, Jr. | Community Member |
| Neil Osgood Jr. | Community Member |
| Jim Straub | Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (MassDCR) |
| Dr. Harlee Strauss | Community Member |

**Others in Attendance:**

| | |
|---|---|
| James Connolly | Restoration Officer, U.S. Army Garrison Natick |
| Roberta Doocey | ICF International |
| Kevin Palaia | ICF International |
| Steve Reichenbacher | ICF International |
| Bob Reinert | NSSC Public Affairs Department |
| Willard Murray | ECC |
| Robert Johnson | Charter Environmental |
| Jeff Hebb | Charter Environmental |
| Fred Santos | ECC |
| Jill Miller | Visitor |
| Carole Berkowitz | Lake Cochituate Watershed Council, Inc. (LCWC, Inc.) |
| Pat Conaway | LCWC, Inc., President |

## II. Handouts

1. Pegan Cove Sediment Remediation at the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center (NSSC) – PowerPoint presentation by Charter Environmental and ICF International

2. Natick SSC GWETS Construction Update – PowerPoint presentation by ECC

**III. Meeting Minutes**

Joel McCassie called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM and asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the March 30, 2010 meeting. He noted that copies of the minutes were not available at the meeting; therefore, it was agreed that review of the March 30, 2010 meeting minutes would be postponed until the next RAB meeting. Mr. McCassie then asked if there were any general comments, there were none.

**Pegan Cove Sediment Remediation**

Mr. McCassie introduced the first presentation: the Draft Sediment Remedial Action Closure Report presented by Bob Johnson of Charter Environmental and Steve Reichenbacher of ICF International.

Mr. Johnson explained that he had joined the project team as Project Manager for Charter Environmental when the field activities began during the summer. He introduced Jeff Hebb, the Project Superintendent for Charter Environmental, who was present at the site every day, and Steve Reichenbacher of ICF, who was part of the project team. Mr. Johnson outlined the meeting agenda.

- Reintroductions
- Mobilization & Site Preparation
- Dredging & Dewatering
- Confirmation Sampling
- Backfilling
- Load-out of Dewatered Sediment
- Site Restoration
- Adding Site Control Measures
- Green Remediation at NSSC
- Schedule: Remaining Activities

Mr. Johnson presented the first Mobilization & Site Preparation slide and noted that it had been shown at previous RAB meetings. He identified Charter Environmental as the prime contractor, ICF International as the project engineers, and Inner Space Services as the project dredging subcontractor responsible for dredging and dewatering operations during activities over the summer of 2010. The slide illustrated the general locations of the three “hot-spot” dredging areas. The former proposed gymnasium site (FPGS) was presented as “Charter Area North” and the boat launch area as “Charter Area South”.

Mr. Johnson presented additional slides highlighting milestone dates for mobilization activities. He showed plans and photographs of field trailers, storage facilities, temporary fencing, erosion and sedimentation control measures, concrete barrier/earthen berms, a geomembrane liner, geotubes within Charter Area North, HDPE pipe fusing, turbidity curtain installation, storage containers, floating dock sections, caution buoys deployed in Charter Area South, and hydraulic dredge plant mobilization.

Mr. Johnson asserted that the detailed plan showing the general layout of Charter Area North differed somewhat from the original plan in the Remedial Design. Particularly, some changes were required to accommodate the geotextile tubes and the decant water reservoir. Most of the photographs presented

originate from Appendix K of the Draft Remedial Action Completion Report. The photographs presented included images of the decant water reservoir, geotubes, water treatment system to treat the decant water (prior to being discharged back to the cove), sand filters, carbon vessels. The filters and vessels were piped in parallel, and the sand filters included differential switches so that if one of the sand filter skids required backwashing, the other two would remain operational.

Mr. Johnson presented Charter Area South by the boat launch area and discussed how temporary floats and a "No Wake" sign were placed to deter anyone from entering the work zone. He presented photographs showing the launch of the hydraulic dredge plant into the cove. Mr. Johnson highlighted the double silt curtains and the fused dredge slurry pipe used during remediation. He also presented a slide that illustrated each hot spot dredging area.

Mr. Johnson then discussed the dredging and dewatering activities presenting a number of slides that illustrated the double silt curtains and the PVC pipes used to delineate each hot spot prior to deployment of the silt curtains. Additional slides were presented which illustrated the fused dredge slurry pipeline running from Area 3 to Charter Area North then into the Optimizer, and finally into the geotubes. He then presented images of dredging operations calling attention to the double silt curtains deployed in the hot spots and showed photos of the dredge cutterhead.

Mr. Reichenbacher discussed how the project team conducted turbidity monitoring throughout the project and presented photographs of a turbidity compliance monitoring point located approximately 75 feet from the inner silt curtain of Area 3. He explained how a turbidity data logger, attached to an anchored PVC pipe at the compliance point, collected turbidity readings every 10 minutes. Additionally, he noted that project staff would go around each hot spot and monitor the areas between the silt curtains and outside the silt curtains with a hand-held turbidity meter every 2 to 3 hours during dredging. He emphasized that turbidity readings never exceeded the established action threshold value of 16 NTUs between or outside of the curtains during the project. Mr. Reichenbacher also presented photographs showing the collection of hand-held turbidity readings inside the silt curtains during dredging (with a turbidity reading of 105.8 NTUs), a turbidity reading of 5.3 NTU between the silt curtains, and a reading outside the silt curtain of 1.5 NTUs. Mr. Reichenbacher stated that the double silt curtain system had worked very well.

Dr. Vembu asked if these were the highest numbers for each of these areas. Mr. Reichenbacher replied that occasionally he monitored the turbidity inside the dredge areas (even though the project team was not required to do so) and those turbidity readings averaged between 100 and 300 NTUs. He also stated that the turbidity levels were generally less than 10 NTUs between the silt curtains.

Mr. Miller asked about the concurrent typical reading well beyond the silt curtains, and Mr. Reichenbacher responded that the typical reading at the compliance points was between 1 and 2 NTUs. Mr. Miller then asked whether Mr. Reichenbacher had observed no raised sediment suspension outside the silt curtains, whereby Mr. Reichenbacher replied that was correct.

Mr. Johnson presented a slide depicting one of the cross sections of the post-dredge bathymetric survey taken from an appendix of the Remedial Action Completion Report. Mr. Johnson explained that the cross section depicted Area 3 and illustrated three different layers. The first line shown, he explained, is the vegetative layer; the second grouping, from elevation 8 and 9 feet deep, is the dredged sediment layer or

the contamination or target layer. The bottom post-dredge surface is the peat layer. The black line that traverses through the peat layer represents the post-dredge elevation layer. (See the Remedial Action Completion Report for additional cross sections).

Mr. Johnson discussed the dewatering of the dredge slurry and referenced photos illustrating the geotubes during filled, the sand filter backwash lines (which were backwashed back into the geotextile tubes), and the decant water sump. Mr. Johnson explained that water decanted from the geotubes was directed into the sump and then pumped through the water treatment system and discharged back into the lake in Pegan Cove. He also explained that when the system required backwashing, the backwash water was flushed back into the geotubes and subsequently through the water treatment system.

Mr. Reichenbacher spoke about the confirmation sampling performed to determine whether the cleanup goal of 1 mg/kg (1 ppm) had been achieved or if backfilling was required. He presented a slide showing the three hot spot dredge areas and the number of samples collected from each area. He explained that each hot spot area was gridded out with each grid containing five grab sample points. The project team used known GPS coordinates to locate each grab sample point. They would centering over the five sample points in each grid, collect grab samples, and composite the grab samples within each grid square (5 grabs/grid square) and submit for analysis. Mr. Reichenbacher explained how he used the average sediment confirmation sample result for each hot spot into the dataset to determine if the cleanup goal had been achieved. He explained that since the post dredging cove wide PCB average was slightly over the cleanup goal of 1 mg/kg, backfilling each of the hot spot areas was required.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if the team averaged the same number of points for the pre-remediation as for the post-remediation. Mr. Reichenbacher replied that each of the grid nodes was isolated from each hot spot area and the average PCB concentration from the composites taken from each hot spot area was entered into those isolated grid nodes. The cove wide PCB average was then calculated. Mr. Kaltofen noted that his understanding was that the endpoint of the remedial program was the average across the entire cove, not just within the hot spots. He asked if areas outside the dredge area were re-sampled after dredging was completed, and Mr. Reichenbacher replied that they were not.

Mr. Kaltofen additionally asked Mr. Reichenbacher to clarify the following points. (1) Whether the older numbers were used to get the final average for Pegan Cove - Mr. Reichenbacher indicated that was correct. (2) That there were a certain number of samples within the hot spots prior to remediation; Mr. Reichenbacher again indicated that was correct. (3) That those samples were not used again, obviously, because the material had been removed. Mr. Kaltofen asked if the old numbers from outside the hot spots were weighted the same way both times the averages were calculated. Mr. Reichenbacher responded that they were, because the old data had already been incorporated into the kriged nodes and the hot spot nodes were replaced with the backfill concentrations.

Mr. Kaltofen asked to see copies of the data used in calculating averages, and Mr. Reichenbacher replied that he did not have copies of the data with him. Mr. Palaia noted that the data set would be included in the draft final report and that regulator comments have just been received, so the draft final report will probably be distributed in approximately six weeks.

Dr. Vembu asked Mr. Reichenbacher if he could be more precise about the number before backfilling. Mr. Reichenbacher replied that the total cove wide average after dredging, but prior to backfilling, came out to 1.03 mg/kg. He indicated that the team also sampled the clean backfill material for PCBs using the same analysis as for the sediment and used half of that detection limit in the averaging. After the addition of the clean backfill, the average cove-wide PCB concentration came out to 0.997 mg/kg. The backfill material used was clean, washed sand.

Mr. Reichenbacher called attention to the next slide, which illustrated a core (grab) sample of sediment and a composite of sediment grab samples. He described how the project team extruded the top 6 inches of the core sample into a stainless steel mixing bowl, which was composited with other grab samples in the grid and shipped off to the laboratory for analysis.

Mr. Johnson then described the process used to disperse the backfill material by loading washed sand into a wet box and how the dredge pumped the sand through the diffuser pipe to the hot spot. He noted the effectiveness of using single silt curtains for this purpose.

Mr. Johnson discussed how, about one and one-half weeks after the dredging was complete, the geotubes were cut open, and a paint filter test was performed to determine if the dewatered sediment was adequate for shipping or if it needed the addition of a stabilization or solidification agent. The ends of each of the three geotextile bags were cut off. Once there was room to get the excavator into the loading area, the middle bag was cut out and loaded out, and then adjacent bags were cut out and loaded into trailer trucks and shipped to Waste Management Turnkey in Rochester, New Hampshire.

Dr. Vembu asked about the moisture content. Mr. Johnson replied that paint filter tests were conducted and that the material was dry enough to ship. A load of stabilization agent was onsite and incorporated into the material in order to use it up. Mr. Johnson then explained the removal of the liners from the Charter Area North. Mr. Johnson noted that ten trees were planted in Charter Area North to replace the ones that were removed during the site preparation. The area was loamed and hydroseeded as part of the site restoration process and that silt fencing would be removed in the spring once weather permits.

Mr. Kaltofen asked which direction the no fishing signs faced. Mr. Reichenbacher replied that the signs face towards the lake.

Mr. Reichenbacher commented that, although it was not required as part of the project, EPA and DoD have policies on Green and Sustainable Remediation, intended in part to promote minimizing total energy use by maximizing use of renewable fuel, minimizing air emissions and GHG generation, and minimizing impacts to water resources. The process of geotextile tube dewatering used resulted in comparatively lower energy consumption by using passive dewatering, and reducing air emissions and GHG generation. Additionally, bio-based materials were used in hydraulic mechanisms of dredge; low-sulfur diesel fuel was used, reducing emissions; solar power was used to operate sand filter backwash valves and lighted warning buoys and signage; and electricity was supplied by existing NSTAR electrical lines, minimizing generator use. Finally, lake water was used instead of potable water for polymer and coagulant mixtures, double-turbidity curtains were effective, erosion controls were employed, and staff either lived or stayed locally.

Mr. Johnson discussed target dates for the project: the Draft Final Remedial Action Completion Report: 2/28/2011; Final Remedial Action Completion Report: 4/30/2011; raking and hydroseeding Charter South Area: Spring 2011; and removal and disposal of hay bales and silt fencing: Spring 2011.

Dr. Vembu asked to know the standard deviation of the average that Mr. Reichenbacher came up with (0.997 mg/kg). Mr. Reichenbacher replied that he would need to calculate the number.

Mr. Miller expressed concern about the portion of sediment that was not removed, stressing the importance of not using the lake as a receptacle. He noted that the draft report seemed to suggest that the project had been completed and indicated that he found this difficult to understand. He mentioned that ignoring the sediment that was not removed is irresponsible. He suggested that the Army had covered over some areas at higher levels than may be desirable, and noted that currently there is water skiing going on. Mr. Miller commented on the normal hydraulic flow within the lake system and referenced a photograph from 85 years ago that shows a pronounced clean line going through Pegan Cove, suggesting water flow. He asked how much material was not removed and why it could not be removed and disposed of. He asked further, why it is assumed that the cover is thick enough to protect the water from contamination, is the cover thick enough to stay as cover into the future, and how often it will be checked to confirm that it is still in place. He indicated that he realized that the Army would have to give us some probabilities to estimate that, and that there would be some tolerances on that estimate. He indicated that providing some measurement and finding out if it's reassuring is not as good as cleaning it, but is a lot better than ignoring it. He said that he hasn't found any numbers yet to tell me that you did it or intend to do it, and I think that's very regrettable. He stressed the importance of watchfulness, noting that Lake Cochituate is the major recreational lake for eastern Massachusetts.

Mr. Connolly responded that the Army had cleaned up the sediment in the lake and achieved all the Remedial Action Objectives that were agreed to in the Record of Decision and the Remedial Design. Everything on this particular project went according to plan; the Army executed the plan and achieved an average cove-wide PCB concentration of less than the goal of 1 part per million (ppm). He explained that the project did not entail capping contaminated material (such as the way a landfill is capped). Prior to backfilling, the average PCB concentration across the cove was 1.03 ppm, which could have been rounded down to 1.0. Instead, the project team backfilled. According to the plan, nothing was left behind and the Army did what it had agreed to do. The plan all along was to achieve an average across the cove of 1 ppm—and that goal was accomplished. Prior to that, at the request of the contractors, the Army had agreed to an intermediate step of checking before backfilling to see if backfill was really necessary. Cleanup was going well and it was thought that backfilling might be unnecessary, and nothing should be put back into the lake unnecessarily. Prior to backfilling, the average PCB concentration across the cove was 1.03 ppm. Therefore, it was decided to backfill. The project team backfilled with clean washed sand that had previously been sampled for PCBs and other contaminants to prevent the addition of anything detrimental to the lake. Mr. Connolly stressed that the Army did exactly what it was supposed to do. Nothing was left behind. Backfilling was used to restore the grade (not to cover over underlying contaminated materials), and since clean material was used, it improved the overall average.

Mr. Miller indicated that he was still uncertain about the potential for scouring of the backfill and suggested that it may someday be necessary to install milfoil circulators, which could stir things up. He

agreed that headway had been made with the cleanup but believes it necessary for the Army to go back and look at PCB concentrations. Mr. Connolly stated that the 1 ppm average across the cove is consistent with the background to the lake and indicated that there is no reason to do anything more within the cove.

Mr. Miller expressed concern about hot spots. Mr. Connolly responded that although the term "hot spots" has been previously used, technically these areas are not hot spots and do not meet the definition of hot spots. Concentrations of PCBs were not sufficiently higher than those in the rest of the cove to be technically considered as hot spots although that term was commonly used. The reason those areas were selected for dredging was because they were the worst areas found.

Mr. Miller asked about confidence levels. Specifically, if the hot spot areas were ever scoured out; could the average of the cove get to 1.5 ppm instead of 1.03 ppm. Mr. Connolly referred to the slide of the cross section profile explaining how the Army dredged down to and into the peat layer, which is probably the ground surface of the wet layer from before the cove was flooded decades ago. He explained that he cannot give a confidence level, but the plan was to achieve an average across the cove that was consistent with the background of the lake, and that is what the Army did.

Mr. Miller explained that although he agrees with the Army's explanation, he would like to develop a confidence level. He expressed concern that the data are not clear. Mr. Connolly replied that he is not sure a confidence level can be generated based on the available data.

Dr. Vembu asked to look at slide 20, the Confirmation Sampling Plan. He asked how much clean sand was used in remedying the backfill in each area. Mr. Johnson indicated he would have to look up the numbers and that all three areas received post-dredging backfill, progressing from Area 3 to Area 2 to Area 1. Mr. Vembu asked if each hot spot area was backfilled because each hot spot area was greater than 1 ppm. Mr. Johnson indicated that the averaging dataset resulted in a cove-wide average greater than 1 ppm for each area, which required that all three areas be backfilled. He noted that the total backfilling operation required three or four days. Mr. Connolly added that once the backfilling operation began, it made more sense to backfill each area instead of shutting down, re-evaluating the results, and starting up again.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there would be discussion about scouring and any other major issues as part of the five-year review. Ms. Christine Williams of EPA indicated that the site cleanup had met background PCB concentrations, the cleanup is complete, and the site does not require a 5 year review.

Discussion followed about the "No Fishing" signs, with Mr. Connolly indicating that the signs would be left in place. Mr. Miller asked why this was necessary, and Mr. Connolly responded that if the Commonwealth lifts the fishing ban, the signs would be removed. Mr. Miller noted that the signs were in place not because of Pegan Cove but because of Lake Cochituate.

Mr. Kaltofen asked when the draft final report would be completed. Mr. Palaia responded probably in over one month. Mr. Kaltofen then asked if a 95 percent confidence level could be calculated so that it would be known where the average lies with 95 percent confidence. Mr. Palaia responded they would look into calculating the 95 percent confidence level.

Mr. Palaia then further explained the dataset by stating that originally, a geospatial contouring model was used to contour out the entire cove based on approximately 30 initial sample results, which resulted in a grid containing ~ 3,000 grid nodes, with each grid node having a concentration value. That data distribution with the ~ 3,000 nodes is what was used in the averaging process. All of the nodes that fell within the dredged hot spot areas were replaced with the detection limit of the clean backfill. Then an arithmetic average of the ~ 3,000 grid nodes was performed. Mr. Kaltofen asked if a 95 percent confidence level could be performed on that dataset, and Mr. Palaia replied that was something that they would look into.

Mr. Kaltofen thanked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Reichenbacher and introduced the next presentation, an update on groundwater cleanup construction.

**GWETS Construction Update**

Mr. Fred Santos of ECC introduced himself as a Project Manager, indicating that he started on the project as a field team leader in August 2010.

Mr. Santos stated the piping repair for extraction well MW-95B was complete and the well had been placed back online in August 2010 after which time temporary extraction well MW-15B was taken offline. He stated that MW-95B is currently pumping at 25 gallons per minute (gpm). Repairs could not be done from the inside of the building due to the rebar in the concrete wall, thus requiring repairs to be done from the outside. Mr. Santos presented photographs depicting the repair of the MW-95B pipeline at the treatment system building and how the new piping had been tied into the system.

Mr. Santos described the construction and tie-in activities of extraction well MW-39B, which were also completed in August 2010. Extraction well MW-39B-4 is located approximately 200 feet away from MW-95B and was tied into the extraction well network near MW-95B. At present, MW-39B-HP4 is pumping at 15 gpm and MW-95B is pumping at 25 gpm, for a combined flow of 40 gpm from both wells.

Mr. Santos described the extraction well MW-40BR construction and tie-in activities completed in August 2010. MW-40BR replaced MW-40B. MW-40BR was connected to the existing extraction well network near EW-5, successfully trenched behind and between buildings adjacent to utilities. The pumping rate from extraction well MW-40BR is currently 1 gpm. Mr. Santos presented photos showing the manhole for extraction well MW-40BR, the trenching, extraction well EW-5 in front of Building 22 (where extraction well MW-40BR was tied into the network, just outside of EW-5), and additional photos illustrating erosion controls.

Mr. Santos also stated that monitored natural attenuation sampling was discontinued in 2010, as approved in the 2009 Annual Groundwater Sampling Report and documented in Table 1-1 of the October, 2010 Long-term Monitoring Plan Amendment. The table was attached to the handout.

Mr. Kaltofen asked where monitoring wells MW-128 and MW-129 were. Mr. Palaia replied that the wells were located immediately to the south of the Building 14 garage.

Mr. Miller then noted that, although much has been achieved at the site, an overview way of reporting what has been achieved is still needed. Mr. Miller asked if the Army could update the ground water plume

animations that were prepared a number of years ago. Mr. Connolly responded that while the model was updated, the animations have not been and the most recent animations are about 6 to 8 years old. Mr. Miller suggested that updated animations would be appropriate for an annual meeting in town in June. Mr. Connolly indicated that Mr. Miller's suggestion would be considered, but indicated that he is not sure if the modeling software is still available and if the animation can be updated.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there were any other questions concerning Mr. Santos presentation, and there were not. He asked if there were questions about other agenda items.

Mr. Miller noted that he works with open-source software, and that there is a new federal requirement to switch over to open-source software. He indicated that if anyone local is interested in this software, they should speak with him.

Mr. Pat Conaway from LCWC referred to the slide illustrating the depth to which dredging was conducted. Mr. Conaway expressed concern about the possibility of the lake's currents disturbing the clean material that replaced the sediment and enabling "the hot stuff to come back up." Mr. Connolly replied that the water in Pegan Cove is not very turbulent and that any major impact would probably by caused by water skiing. He further clarified that the project team did not put the clean backfill over the peat layer to cap high concentrations of material beneath it; but rather the sand was placed over the peat layer to restore the cove to its pre-remedial depth. Mr. Connolly clarified that the PCB concentrations found in the peat layer were very low to non-detect.

Mr. Palaia noted that when the core samples were taken, the deeper layers (including the peat) had very low PCB concentrations. The composite confirmation samples collected after dredging each hot spot area were found to have PCB concentrations in the range of approximately 0.2 to 0.4 ppm, versus the pre-dredging concentrations of about 3.0 to 4.0 ppm. Dredging of the hot spot areas reduced the PCB concentration by one order-of-magnitude. Mr. Palaia also reiterated that backfilling was not intended to cap highly contaminated sediment. There were some PCBs in the underlying sediment, but they were significantly lower than prior to dredging.

Mr. Connolly then indicated that he understood the concerns about scouring, but it is unlikely that uncovering highly contaminated sediment would occur. Mr. Miller asked that it be quantified, and Mr. Connolly replied that the numbers would be reviewed.

Carol Berkowitz of LCWC asked about the hand pulling program for milfoil, and if hand pulling would be allowed. Mr. Connolly responded that it was never up to the Army to determine whether hand pulling milfoil would or would not be allowed. He indicated that the Army was asked a couple of times over the last seven or eight years whether or not hand pulling milfoil posed a risk, and the answer has always been there is no human health risk from exposure to the surface water or sediment associated with the NSSC site. He stressed that there was no health risk from exposure to the sediment before the dredging, nor after the dredging, and that it is still safe to swim and wade in Pegan Cove.

Mr. Miller raised a question about stormwater management in the FPGS area that was restored after the sediment remediation. The restored area appears to be within an area of fairly high, impervious cover. Mr. Miller asked how runoff from the restored area and the adjacent parking lot was being handled. Mr.

McCassie responded that 95 percent of the stormwater at the site is captured within oil-water separators that are maintained by the Army. Any runoff is captured within the oil-water separators, which are all programmed with alarm systems and maintained as necessary. Mr. Connolly noted that the grass slopes toward the parking lot. If erosion should occur, the eroded material would run into the parking lot and then into an oil-water separator.

**IV. Public Comments**

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there were comments.

One attendee asked what had happened to the silt curtains, and Mr. Connolly replied that they were owned by the dredge contractor.

Mr. Kaltofen adjourned the meeting at 8:20 PM.