The Quarterly RAB meeting was held at Building 455 at Fort Monmouth, Oceanport Avenue, Oceanport, New Jersey.

At 7:02 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Wanda Green (Chairman). Ms. Green led the meeting members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

RAB Members Present:
Wanda Green, (Army Chair)
Linda Range, NJDEP Case Manager
Richard Gruskos, Oceanport Representative
Jonathan Cohen, Tinton Falls Representative
Brian Charnick, Eatontown Representative
William Simmons, Monmouth Co. Health Dept.
Frank Barricelli, Oceanport Representative
Edward Dlugosz, Eatontown Representative
Rosemary Brewer, Little Silver Representative

Comments on old business:
Ms. Green indicated that the meeting minutes from February 7, 2013 were open for review and comments. Mr. Charnick requested a note be made on Page 4; the fifth bullet under the Round table discussion should acknowledge that the standards discussion was in regards to the Monmouth County motor pool site.

- Mr. Charnick motioned the approval of the amended minutes
- Mr. Gruskos seconded the motion
- Vote of final minutes 8 accepted; 1 abstention (Mr. Dlugosz).

Discuss new business:
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Fort Monmouth surveyed landfills for any damage post-Sandy. Jim Moore could not be here. He is now detailed to a special group just for Sandy clean-up. He will present the survey findings at the next meeting. It is a one page report with photographs of the landfills. Ms. Green will email a copy of the report to each of the Board members prior to the next meeting. The report showed nothing unusual, just trees down.

- Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Program update:
  - Parsons completing Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Work Plans (RI/FS WP) for M-22, 53, 59, & 68. Work plans will go to the State soon, still in draft form. RI/FS WP for landfills are also in draft form and will be released soon.
The project is currently set up so Parsons is contracted through the USACE in Huntsville. Parsons will write draft documents and send to USACE in New York and New England (New England has the additional technical expertise). Both entities will review the documents simultaneously. The USACE will send the reviewed documents back to Parsons, who will incorporate the comments. Parsons will then send the document to both Fort Monmouth and Calibre for review. Parsons then incorporates these additional comments. A final draft is then sent back to Fort Monmouth, which then in turn sends to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) for review. Its then finalized and made public. Ms. Green is happy with this process. In the past, reports were many times re-written by Fort Monmouth due to poor quality. Documents are now received in a professional format with minimal changes.

Mr. Gruskos asks if that is the same point the document will be made public. Ms. Green affirms following state approval the document will become public. Mr. Gruskos also asks if Parsons will prepare interim progress reports on the work being performed during the contract. Ms. Green responds in the affirmative. Parsons is not presenting today due to limited information to present, however Parsons will present on the work performed at most RAB meetings, as seen fit.

Mr. Dlugosz asks if documents going forward will be in the new CERCLA format. Ms. Green responds in the affirmative. Each Site will now receive an RI/FS Report. The Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ASCIM) wanted to know where we are on these sites. In an effort to do so, Parsons will take historical documentation and review everything completed in the past and determine its current status.

FTMM-27: CW-5 Former Sanitary Treatment Plant Presentation

- A brief summary of the following reports were presented by Ms. Green:
  - U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency. Water Quality Engineering Special Study No. 24-016-75/76
  - Roy F. Weston, Inc. Investigation of Suspected Hazardous Waste Site at Fort Monmouth, December 1993
  - Roy F. Weston, Inc. Site Investigation Fort Monmouth – Main Post and Charles Wood Area, December 1995

- Questions following presentation:
Mr. Dlugosz asked what boiler blowdown water is. Mr. Barricelli responded it is the water periodically wasted from a boiler to avoid a high concentration of chemicals during continuing evaporation of steam.

Mr. Gruskos asked when the NJDEP became involved in the Site. Ms. Range responded in the late 1970’s/early 80’s.

Mr. Simmons noted copper was the highest metal detected in the hexagon building. Questioned if when the sludge is treated, the metals are treated as well. Ms. Green responded that the reports do not go into any further detail. Copper was addressed though; methodology is addressed in one of the reports. Mr. Barricelli confirmed sand beds removed the metals.

Mr. Simmons noted the units in the reports are inconsistent. He also noted according to the reports, in 235 acres of golf course, the only area that was sampled was the 1.8 acre area around the former sludge disposal site and an area around the former pesticide storage shed. There are three other fairways (8, 10, & 11) which contain additional sludge disposal areas.

Mr. Guskos commented that the stream samples collected were typical of those taken from streams running through normal areas, not potentially impacted areas. Ms. Green responded that the sample parameters were determined based on samples that had been previously collected from the STP, in an effort to compare the sample results.

Round Table Discussion – Ms. Green

Mr. Dlugosz – Posed a question regarding the capping of the landfill and the timing on when that may occur and requested an interim work plan. Ms. Green responded that the work plans with the landfill designs are in progress of being finalized. Documents must go through the CERCLA process.

Mr. Simmons – Who wrote the Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) and is the entire golf course part of the FOST? Ms. Green responded that Calibre wrote the document. The golf course has carve-outs as part of the IRP Sites. The carve-outs will have deeds associated with them. The Army will maintain responsibility of the carve-outs unless otherwise determined if area is sold.

Mr. Barricelli – Recommends there should be an action item to provide comments on the documents discussed today, including the Vapor Intrusion Plan. Comments should be provided within 4 weeks for incorporation into the next meeting. RAB agrees this is a procedural item, not an item to be approved. RAB members are to send all comments to Mr. Barricelli, who will co-mingle them and prepare for distribution to Ms. Green. Ms. Green will provide a comment form to the RAB members for which the Fort Monmouth uses. There will be a form for each document which clearly details what the comment is referring to within a particular document.

Mr. Gruskos – Confirmed CERCLA process with Ms. Green. Questioned at what point the RAB can see the documents to be able to comment before the documents become final. Ms. Green will look into the possibility of releasing the draft documents to the RAB
members, as long as the members understand the document is in draft form and may be changed. If this were to happen, RAB members would not be allowed to release draft document information to the general public.

- Mr. Charnick – Was the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) request resubmitted? Ms. Green responded that she had not received a revised version for re-submittal. Mr. Charnick responded he will provide Ms. Green tonight with the revised document for submittal.
- Mr. Gruskos – Suggested Parsons provide a brief summary on what the next phase is at each meeting to serve as a look-ahead for the group.

**2013 Meeting Schedule – Ms. Green**

- The following meeting schedule was confirmed by the RAB:
  - Thursday, July 11, 2013
  - Thursday October 23, 2013

**Public Comments/Questions**

Mr. Tom Mahedy, Wall, NJ Resident posed the following questions to the RAB:

- Public comment is from April 1st – May 1st. How can I find out more information and participate?
  - Ms. Green – For all FOSTs going forward, a copy can be accessed from the library or from the website listed in the agenda. Send your comments and they will be addressed.
- What does IRP stand for?
  - Ms. Green – Installation Restoration Program
- Do the State Police have access to the information at these sites so they do not contaminate themselves or their families?
  - Ms. Green – The State Police were given information and map of all the IRP areas on Site.
- Why is Parsons not here? Mr. Mahedy thinks it’s very important that they be here. Is their contract that they are only here if they need to give a presentation? Mr. Mahedy feels Parsons should be here to hear the comments from the RAB members.
  - Ms. Green – Parsons is not here today because it was not deemed necessary.
- How are we going to ensure the carve-outs are not harmful to the public?
  - Ms. Green – There are no specifics yet as to how the carve-outs will be handled, this will be determined as part of the design plan and between the Army and the purchaser.
- The lime pit was presented by Joe Fallon. His recollection was that these pits are contaminated. What is the plan for this area?
  - Ms. Green – The Army will be responsible for monitoring and management of these areas.
- The head of the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) did not know about the lime pits. Mr. Mahedy would like to know what the Army is doing to exchange data with FMERA.
o Ms. Green – The Army is in constant contact with FMERA (Bruce) and they have been informed properly.

- Regarding the earlier Hexagon reports, Ms. Green did not have answers regarding the older reports and their incompleteness.
  o Ms. Green – They are old reports, they are incomplete and the current members were not present at the time the reports were written in the 70’s.

- Sludge placed on the golf course was never tested. Why is the Army not testing these Sites?
  o Ms. Green – The sludge was tested where it was stored, at the worst location, so there was no need to sample the sludge where it was placed post-mixing.

- Mr. Mahedy has concern that Parsons is taking the meeting minutes and how can the public be sure Parsons will include information criticizing Parsons in the comments.
  o Ms. Green – Parsons is a professional company and there are no concerns regarding the notes or the inclusion of any important information. There is also a voice recording of the meeting if there is a need to go back.

At 8:30 p.m. the meeting was adjourned by Ms. Green.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Meeting notes taken by A. Kriney of Parsons on behalf of the RAB.