

**U.S. Army Garrison Fort Monmouth
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
April 8, 2010 ~ 7:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

1. Attendees:

- The meeting was called to order on April 2, 2010, by James Allen at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance were James Allen, Frank Barricelli, Rosemary Brewer, Brian Charnick, Dan Levine, Larry Quinn, Ed Dlugosz, William Simmons and Tim Rider.
- Dianne Crilly and Jim Modlin were absent.

2. Old Business

- July 9, 2009 minutes approved with the following amendments to be added.
 - Per Mr. Dlugosz, need to add Mr. Shield's comment regarding his objection of changing the name of the Streambank Stabilization project from the Landfill Stabilization project, which was on the original permit. He also objected to the removal of the Birdsall comments from the agenda. He also objected to the minutes not including Ms. Green's explanation of the CFR for explanation of the EA and FNSI requirements.
- January 14th minutes approved with the following amendments to be added.
 - Add Mr. Dlugosz comment on whether or not Vapor Intrusion studies were done during the late 90s when there were high levels of contamination.
 - Add Ms. Green response to Ed's question, that there were not any Vapor Intrusion studies performed in the 90's.

3. New Business Discussion, Board Questions and Answers

a. Wanda Green (Fort Monmouth Environmental Office) - Second Round of In-door Air Quality (Vapor Intrusion) Update:

- Funding has been made available.
- Walk-through will be performed in April 22nd at the five locations; buildings 2700, 283, 1122, 699 and 2567.

b. Harold Hornung (Tecom Vinnel Services) – Unregulated Heating Oil Tanks Update:

- Four UHOTs identified in the Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) were confirmed and removed in Parcel 79. Three of the four tanks were leakers. Contaminated soil was removed and the area was backfilled with clean soil.

- Four additional sites were investigated. Two tanks were found out of the four sites. The two tanks were leakers. The contaminated soil was removed and the areas were backfilled with clean soil.
- Mr. Levine asked if there have been an investigation for tanks where there are old barracks buildings that exist today. If new tanks are found, will they be removed.
- Mr. Hornung stated that we will be performing geophysical surveys of the entire area. If additional tanks are found, can't say if they will be removed or not. It can depend of funding.

c. Dan Duh (Shaw Environmental Inc.) – Baseline Ecological Evaluation

(BEE) Update:

- Discussed the basic elements of a BEE, sources used and steps completed to date.
- Identified environmental sensitive areas and sites from the ECP and the Installation Restoration Program.
- Discussed the BEE Work Plan to be performed
- The path forward for the Fort Monmouth BEE project and report.
- Mr. Charnick asked how do you determine what is a enough samples? Is there are standard guide?
- Mr. Duh stated that there isn't a standard guide. We focus most of the sampling at the landfill sites and a method is used for the landfills. Samples are usually up gradient and down gradient.
- Mr. Dlugosz asked how far down stream will you sample from contaminated sites.
- Mr. Duh stated that this is a screening process. We first look at where we expect the contamination to be found. If it came from the source, it will be found at the source. The contaminant wouldn't jump around.
- Mr. Levine asked how long is this process.
- Mr. Duh stated that the sampling is a two week period. The lab work takes approximately 30 days. Most of the time is taken during the evaluation of the data.
- Mr. Levine asked what will happen if additional work is needed after September 2011.
- Ms. Green stated the Army will continue with environmental requirements and funding until the property is transferred.
- Mr. Dlugosz asked what is the Tier 2 process.
- Mr. Duh stated the Tier 1 is the screening and Tier 2 involves performing additional studies.
- Mr. Quinn stated that in this case, Tier 2 will be performing more of the same because normally, you do not perform sampling in Tier 1.

d. Wanda Green (Fort Monmouth Environmental Office) – Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Discussion:

- Hand-out provided.

- Who qualifies for TAPP.
- Amount funding available for TAPP.
- Kinds of projects qualify for TAPP.
- Projects that are not eligible for TAPP funding.
- Mr. Barcelli asked how should we work the application when there are two or three towns that have the same question.
- Ms. Green stated that the RAB members should work together and complete one application, when they each are asking the same question.

e. **Wanda Green (Fort Monmouth Environmental Office) – National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Discussion:** Hand-out provided.

- NEPA background, process, key points and regulatory references.
- Environmental Assessment (EA) purpose, resources for developing EA and the components of the EA.
- Fort Monmouth EA proposed action and alternatives.
- Fort Monmouth Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) process and components.
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) format, and conditions and actions normally requiring and EIS.
- Mr. Simmons stated that the Health Department had written comments on the EA. He asked what is the responsibility of the RAB with regards to ensuring that the Army continues with necessary clean-up after September 2011.
- Ms. Green stated the RAB will continue after the Fort is closed. If any new sites develop, the RAB will be the venue where the public will be informed and given the opportunity to voice questions and comments. The same would be true for work at existing sites.

4. Round Table Discussion

- Mr. Levine asked who will be here to answer questions after September 2011? Will the person be knowledgeable in the Fort's history?
- Ms. Green stated that she cannot say who will be here after the closure, but that the Army will have a representative who will be responsible for knowing the history of the Fort.
- Mr. Charnick asked if the lab will still be here after the closure.
- Ms. Green stated that the lab will not be here, but sampling will continue and the samples will be farmed out to other labs.
- Mr. Charnick recommended that each member review the EA comments submitted by Mr. Simmons and be prepared to discuss during the July 8th meeting, what are the RAB duties.
- Mr. Dlugosz suggested that all EA comments should be reviewed by the RAB board and be prepared to discuss.
- Mr. Dlugosz requested a tour for his borough.
- Ms. Green stated that RAB members can submit request for tours and will need to give specific reasons for the tour.

5. Discuss 2010 Meeting Schedule

- Thursday, July 8, 2010 at 7:00 pm
- Thursday, October 7, 2010 at 7:00 pm

6. Public Comments and Questions

- Ms. Sara Breslow of Eatontown stated that she has concern that Wampum Lake should be on the list of contaminated sites under the responsibility of the Army before and after the closure. She reference an environmental report entitled "Heavy Metals and Chlordane In The Tissues of Fish from Wampum Lake Eatontown, New Jersey by D. Dorkman, PhD, Professor of Biology, Monmouth College. The report is a result of research and testing performed in 1990 on metals in the sediment and fish in Wampum Lake and believe the metals are from previous activity at Fort Monmouth. She stated TAPP funding should be used to research this further.
- Mr. Tom Menapace, Shrewsbury Councilman, asked for clarification of the BEE process and the difference in the Tiers. Will there be downstream BEE testing be performed if additional work is required? Who will be responsible if the Army contaminated the Creek or land in Shrewsbury?
- Mr. Duh, additional testing could involve downstream testing.
- Ms. Green stated that if the Army is found to be responsible for contamination, the Army will be responsible for clean-up measures.
- Ms. Heather Saffert, staff Scientist with Clean Ocean Action, questioned the effectiveness of the RAB for serving as a conduit for meaningful public input and participation. Concerned that her request for sampling to evaluate wastewater discharge and downstream sampling are not being taken considered. Why should the public and the environmental organizations except the FNSI when they request?
- Mr. Charnick stated that just as mentioned in the NEPA process, the Army is makes the determination to have a FNSI or EIS.
- Mr. Barcelli stated that the NEPA process is to look at if there is significant impact in closing the installation and moving the mission.
- Mr. Tom Mahedy, from the Fort Monmouth Renaissance Peace Alliance, stated that we need to look at what the Army has done at other installations. The RAB should contact their state legislators to ensure that the Army clean-up the Fort. Why don't we have a Technical Review Committee (TRC)? How did the public find out about the FNSI decision? Was there a ceremony on base? What can the towns and organizations do to challenge the FNSI?
- Ms. Green stated that we don't have a TRC because we have a RAB that functions as such. There was a Press Release announcing the FNSI decision and availability, and it was posted on line. The FNSI finalize the NEPA process. You can challenge the FNSI, but it is not the responsibility of the RAB to do so.

7. Meeting adjourned.

- Motion to adjourn was made by Barcelli and second by Charnick.