

U.S. Army Fort Monmouth
(FTMM)
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes
April 2nd, 2015

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

At 7:01 p.m. the meeting was called to order by James Allen (Co-Chairman). Mr. Allen led the meeting members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

RAB Members Present:

James Allen – (Public Co-Chair)
Wanda Green, (Army Co-Chair)
Linda Range, NJDEP Case Manager
Frank Barricelli, Oceanport Representative
Brian Charnick, Eatontown Representative
William Kaloss, Oceanport Representative (in place of Richard Gruskos)

Comments on old business:

Discussion and approval of meeting minutes.

- July 10th, 2014
- October 2nd, 2014
- January 8th, 2015

Mr. Allen notes only four board members who can vote are present and the gentleman standing in does not have voting capabilities. Mr. Allen requests suggestions from the board on how to proceed with the approval of the meeting minutes since a quorum is needed to vote.

Mr. Charnick: If we need a quorum, we cannot take action and accept them.

Mr. Allen: Understood, thank you for your advice. What is your action?

Mr. Barricelli: I recommend we correct what we can so we can get something done with the minutes.

Mr. Charnick: I object to us spending all this time when we have a recording of the minutes. These comments are generating comments.

Ms. Green: The transcripts are not on the website, the minutes are on the website. The purpose of you being allowed to edit the minutes is so corrections needed, can be made. The minutes from July, January, and October are still here is because both Mr. Charnick and Mr. Dlugosz wanted to read the transcripts before approving. Last meeting Mr. Barricelli had added quite a few comments on the July minutes. It was approved by everyone, but because Mr. Barricelli

was not present, the board wanted to wait. For October they were also tabled so Mr. Barricelli could review as well. The transcripts can be made available if you would like.

Mr. Charnik: Why don't we just attach the transcript to the minutes?

Ms. Green: Everybody in the public will likely not read the entire transcript.

Mr. Allen: Do the board members have any comments on the minutes. Should we table them again? I motion to table.

Mr. Barricelli: First motion

Mr. Charnik: Seconds the motion

All agree. Minutes will be carried to next week.

Mr. Allen: We need to get people to these meetings to keep this going in proper fashion.

Fort Monmouth Environmental Condition of Property Supplemental Phase II Site Investigation Work Plans-- Parsons: Allyson Kriney

Ms. Green: You have received a disk with various parcels. The Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) had divided the installation into various parcels in the Main Post and Charles Woods areas. They were put into Comprehensive, Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) categories such as if an underground storage tank (UST) was removed. What we have done is gone through all of the documents looking for data gaps. The ECP was to identify any gaps. They identified some areas that were not properly closed out, but that could mean just a letter to the state. We have developed an ECP Work Plan and a ECP Addendum Work Plan. This presentation will focus on what we are planning to do.

Supplemental discussion regarding slide 6 of the presentation "Parcel Summary – Parcel 28":

Ms. Green: For this Site (Parcel 28) we had done additional sampling that needed to be completed before the Phase I was transferred to FMERA. You see no data gaps because we have already performed our data research and sent it to the state prior to the transfer of the property. For each slide the Reporting-Results line at the bottom are based on Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Sites because that is how funding is received, not based on parcels.

Questions:

- Mr. Barricelli: Parcel 66: You are conducting investigations along the railroad that is on the outside of the FTMM fence. There is an environmental sign indicating remediation.
- Ms. Green: That is not the same investigation. Each Work Plan explains why we will be further investigating a site. This investigation is not on property belonging to Conrail.
- Mr. Charnik: We have been told that each site has been examined in the past, now apparently they are looking at the Sites again trying to find something that might have been missed. Is this how you are identifying potential gaps?
- Ms. Green: No. If you look at the ECP every parcel was broken down and Shaw recommended additional measures needed to close the parcel. A lot of these are part of an existing IRP site. These are not new; they were identified in the ECP. It could have

been something as simple as samples not being submitted in a formal report. Parsons has been directed to do that so we can close the data gaps. There are some areas where additional sampling does need to be performed in order to obtain a No Further Action (NFA) designation.

- Mr. Charnik: For example in the photo processing plant, Parcel 80, the presentation says a data gap is beryllium. It just happened no one looked for beryllium previously?
- Ms. Green: That may not be the case. There may have been a sample that was collected there and was an exceedance and now a follow up sample is being performed.

Discuss new business – Ms. Green

Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Program up-date:

Ms. Green: Unfortunately things have not changed. I am still waiting for approval from the Public Health Command who have to agree to our RIFS before they can be submitted to the public. The only direction provided was, because we know the remedial action we are planning to take for the landfills, which is a cover for each landfill, we can perform a modified risk assessment for all of the other IRP Sites. They are requesting a full blown risk assessment which is very timely and costly, but in accordance with CERCLA requirements, this is something that is going to be needed as far as transfer of property. This is not needed in obtaining NFAs through the state. The state has their own risk assessment criteria. This is something our legal office is saying we have to do in accordance with Federal Regulations. In doing so it is taking time, I can't come up with an excuse, they are taking time with their reviews.

I also just found out today that Picatinny Arsenal website was hacked and not only environmental website but the whole army website. I am going to have clerical support from Parsons going through the library and ensuring all CDs we have given to them are there and any that are missing will be replaced because now that is the only way the public can received documents.

Also, this may be my last RAB. I have just received an offer from Naval Facilities Engineering Command in California and I am accepting it. I do want to thank all of you, because I truly appreciate the time and dedication you have put into coming out here for this RAB. Many of you went above and beyond and I appreciated working with you. I do not have any direction from the Army as to my replacement. We will get information out to you; the Site manager will also still be here.

Discussion – Frank Barricelli

Ms. Green: Frank would like to reschedule the October RAB meeting from the first week to the second week to avoid a conflict with the Oceanport Borough Council meeting; however we do not have enough people here to vote on that. That is something I can send out in an email and ask. We will also send out to the public. It was also noted that the council members have shown an increased interest since more properties are being sold and the groundwater contaminants. I summarized what FTMM-53 and FTMM-68 (hand-out). We have discussed both of these sites in the past, and I just gave a brief information sheet which Frank can give to the Oceanport Council or present to them. The summary just discusses why we have exceedances and our future plans are. We know there are exceedances at FTMM-68 because when we had the pump

and treat we started drawing in exceedances for tetrachloroethene (PCE) which should not have been because that was a gas station. We are continuing to monitor on a quarterly basis. When you look at the down gradient wells they are well below the state criteria. From that we know the plume is not spreading and migrating into Oceanport residents.

Round Table Discussion - Mr. Allen

Mr. Charnik: I happened to read something in the local papers that the Oceanport Police Department was being asked to move. There was some agreement that Oceanport agreed to conduct some environmental remediation in that area. Can someone say what kind of remediation Oceanport agreed to do?

Ms. Green: I have no idea. There is no need for them to perform any remediation.

Mr. Barricelli: I think they may be confusing that with the 900 Buildings.

Ms. Green: If there was any remedial action to be performed, it would be through FTMM because it is still our property. That Site is a Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL). We leased it to Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA), and FMERA leased it to Oceanport. If they do damage to our property, then they could be responsible for that.

Mr. Barricelli: Oceanport was worried about the quality of the water since most of FTMM went to bottled water. Oceanport was concerned their water was not suitable for drinking or showering. I think Oceanport did test the water themselves and found it safe to use.

Ms. Green: We continue to have environmental compliance here for our safe drinking water and the water is sampled in Buildings 977, the state police, and it is in compliance. If there were issues we would have to notify the public and take action.

2015 Meeting Schedule – Mr. Allen

- The following meeting schedule was confirmed by the RAB:
 - Thursday, July 9, 2015 (Note: Second Thursday of the Month)
 - Thursday, October 1, 2015

Public Comments/Questions

Mr. Tom Mahedy: Before I begin can I ask for some more time?

Mr. Allen: How much more time would you like?

Mr. Mahedy: There is no one else here.

Mr. Allen: Go ahead and let's see how we progress.

Mr. Mahedy: I would like to wish Wanda the best. We did not always agree on things but I do wish you the best. I am a bit skeptical as I have been coming to these meeting and FMERA for 9 or 10 years. I have seen a number of times that when things start happening, key people were moved by the Army. I am sure the decisions are made higher up. It's unfortunate because there

will be additional testing, more in-depth investigations so it is unfortunate Wanda is leaving at this time when expertise is needed. I have seen that time and time again. And now the crash of the website on the exact same day. It brings back to the questions during Sandy when a lot of information that was destroyed by files that were left on the ground in the building. I just wish these incidents didn't happen and I am skeptical they are happening at the same time. That's how it works often with the Army. I did want to talk about the barracks for the state police. You say the water is fine, but my first question is, who tested it? Because I do know folks who worked on the base and collected samples and sometimes when they got the wrong numbers they were told to go back to get different numbers. Hopefully that is not the same thing happening with the barracks. I hope they test the air and soil in that area because of the dumps during Sandy. The water went all the way over and surrounded the barracks. I don't think the water is clean on the base. I also wanted to look at the parcel (28) that is being considered for the veteran housing. Is it still being considered?

Ms. Green: I don't work at re-use so I don't know.

Mr. Mahedy: It is my understanding the veteran housing is going to be there from talk happening at FMERA. My concern as I have stated is that there are dumps in that area and there is also plans to have another 2 or 3 acre dump that they can demolish buildings and put the waste in it, which is basically in the front yard of the veterans housing. We have veterans at this meeting and I hope you would get involved in this situation. I don't think it's fair to put veterans in an industrial area. Secondly, to be in a place where there are already dumps in their front yard and now they want to put another one. It's also right next to the Meyers building and when that is brought down there will be a lot of asbestos and lead and the Army has said they are not responsible for any cleanup of asbestos or lead whether in air or soil. I don't think it is fair to treat veterans that way.

Ms. Green: The board has nothing to do with FMERA. We are strictly here for restoration. We are the Restoration Advisory Board. Those kinds of issues should be addressed at the FMERA meetings.

Mr. Mahedy: The Army is working with them to build another dump right in the front yard of where the veterans will go.

Ms. Green: That is not true. I don't know where you got that information.

Mr. Mahedy: I am trying to put a human face on the clean-up in that area. There are plans to build a dump in that area. I know there is a lot of contamination in that area and Parcel 28 it's a big concern of mine. These are not landfills they are dumps. When the water came across from Sandy the area has not been tested since. They refuse to test the area. I don't think that's right. You did say you want the public to be here, but your actions say otherwise. For Parcel 34 I continue to hear at FMERA the words "carve-out", which means there is a contaminated area they are not planning on cleaning up. I ask you start using the work cover-up instead of carve out because that's what it is. There is contamination under the gas station. There is a community center for children right next door.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Mahedy, your time has lapsed sir.

Mr. Mahedy: If you really wanted to hear from the public you would allow me to speak.

Mr. Allen: You have had your chance to speak.

Ms. Green: You were saying when FMERA refers to carve-out. The reason it is called a carve-out is because the Army still owns it. The environmental issues in those areas is why its considered a carve-out. All of our IRP sites are carve-outs. Portions of these parcels that have been identified in this report will be carve-outs because additional work needs to be performed. You also stated that there have been many changes. There has not been a change in the environmental office as far as who was in charge. The environmental office consists of people who are very familiar with all of the sites. I am still working with the Corps of Engineers who is very familiar with the restoration and compliance. Folks who have been here for years are still involved. This job was not a permanent job for me forever. Whoever takes over will be well prepared on what needs to be done in the future.

Mr. Allen: I am still displeased at not having a quorum at these meetings. It just doesn't make any sense to spend our free time coming to these meetings if we are not productive in the process. Please going forward, try and get to these meetings, or we can just dissolve the RAB. I want to take a motion to adjourn.

- Mr. Baracelli makes the motion
- Mr. Charnik seconds the motion

At 7:59 p.m. the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Allen.

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