

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst (JB MDL)
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes
Meeting No. 41 – 21 February 2013

SUBJECT: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting No. 41 – Meeting Minutes

- 1) Place: Edward Holloway Senior Citizen Community Center, 5 Cookstown Browns Mills Road, Cookstown, New Jersey
- 2) Date/Time: Thursday, 21 February 2013; 6:30 PM
- 3) Co-Chairs: CAPT William A. Bulis, Deputy Joint Base Commander, JB MDL
Mr. Michael Tamn, Resident, Pemberton Township, New Jersey

4) Attendees:

Ms. Theresa Lettman	Pinelands Preservation Alliance, RAB Member
Mr. Doug Pocze	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region II
Mr. Phil Cole	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Mr. Joseph Marchesani	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Mr. Thomas Besselman	Pemberton Township
Mr. Matt Csik	Ocean County Health Department
Ms. Pidge Carroll	Congressman Chris Smith's Office
Mr. Chris Archer	JB MDL, 87 CES, Deputy Civil Engineer
Mr. Ken Smith	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Chief, Environmental Division
Mr. Curtis Frye	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Chief, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. Michael Figura	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. King Mak	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. G. Michael Brown	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Environmental Restoration Program (BB&E)
Mr. Michael Wierman	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Environmental Restoration Program (BB&E)
Mr. John Potosnak	JB MDL, 87 CES/CEAN, Environmental Restoration Program (BB&E)
Mr. Greg Kendall	ECC
Mr. Doug McClure	ECC
Ms. Kiran Gill	Pars Environmental
Mr. Constantine Tsentas	Pars Environmental
Mr. Ola Awosika	Parsons
Mr. Ali Sadrieh	Plexus Scientific
Mr. Michael Brewin	Plexus Scientific
Mr. James Richman	CB&I (formerly Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure)
Mr. Peter Naumoff	URS
Mr. George Leahy	URS
Ms. Christine Germann	Unknown Affiliation

5) Handouts

- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Meeting No. 40, 15 November 2012, Draft Meeting Minutes
- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Meeting No. 41, 21 February 2013, Agenda
- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Meeting No. 41, 21 February 2013, Presentation Slides
- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Document Availability List, February 2013
- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Acronyms Abbreviations List, February 2013
- Public Notice for Public Review and Comment, Munitions Response Site Priority Protocol Scoring Worksheet, Former Skeet Range and Former Ordnance Storage Area

6) Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by CAPT Bulis, who welcomed everyone to the meeting. CAPT Bulis briefly discussed the likely impacts which might occur with the pending potential government sequestration. The DoD will not have any disruption in defense capability and the programs associated with the ERP are fully funded. There may, however, be some difficulty getting in touch with ERP program staff if the furlough of civilian employees takes place. CAPT Bulis also highlighted that JB MDL has been recognized in Washington D.C. in association with Hurricane Sandy support, proving the strength of the Joint Base organization.

7) Minutes of Previous Meeting and Review of Agenda Items:

Mr. Tamn asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the 15 November 2012 RAB meeting. Ms. Theresa Lettman requested that dialogue associated with green acres diversion of public open space be captured in association with the 5th bullet of the BOMARC Site OT-16 Update, "Questions on the OT-16 presentation generated the following information". On the issue of whether CB&I would need to obtain a Pinelands permit for construction activity, Ms. Lettman wanted to ensure that the diversion of open lands be captured in the discussion. Mr. Frye indicated that this issue would be discussed at future meetings with the NJDEP and the contractor..

Mr. Tamn requested a motion to approve the last meeting's minutes; Mr. Phil Cole made the motion which was seconded by Mr. Doug Pocze; the minutes were approved.

8) Review of Action Items from the November 2012 RAB:

Mr. Curtis Frye, Chief, JB MDL Environmental Restoration Program, provided a brief overview of the responses to Action Items from the November 2012 RAB.

Draft Community Involvement Plan (CIP)

- Mr. Frye noted that Doug Pocze provided comments on the draft plan and made a "Last Call" request for any additional comments from RAB members to be provided soon. Mr. Frye will then work with the EPA to finalize the CIP.

JB MDL was asked to compile information for the JB MDL ERP budget from the past two years. The budget for the programmed and actual dollar amounts for fiscal years (FY) 11 and FY12 for the JB MDL ERP were presented. The following items were discussed during the presentation:

- While this is considered a 'Joint Base', from a budgetary perspective, the ERP is viewed separately, therefore the dollar amounts are presented separately for the respective JB MDL components (McGuire, Dix, and Lakehurst).
- Across the Joint Base, for FY13, we expect to spend approximately \$10M
- A typographical error was noted on Slide 3 of the presentation; the total Actual amount for FY12 was incorrectly listed as \$6.8M, and should be \$8.8M.
- The significant difference between the programmed and actual figure for McGuire's FY11 budget was due to a significant amount of the Shaw contract being deferred from FY11 to FY14. This would be discussed further during the Performance Based Remediation (PBR) presentation.
- Dollar amounts awarded in a given FY are for expended over the life of a project tasking, often beyond the year of award, as work progresses. For example, in the current FY13, the work being performed includes work awarded in previous years (FY08, FY09, FY10, FY11, and FY12). Money

is generally good for a five year period; for example the money awarded in FY11 may be expended between FY11 and FY16.

- The “Programmed” amount represents the estimated requirement at the beginning of the fiscal year (01 October); the “Actual” amount shows the dollar value of projects actually awarded. The difference shows how the program changes throughout the year as projects are added, deleted, deferred, or awarded.
- Generally, the ‘Steady State’ amount awarded per year on the ERP is expected to be between \$5M-\$15M

9) Air Force Performance Based Remediation (PBR) Strategy:

Mr. Curtis Frye, JB MDL ERP Chief, provided a presentation on an Air Force initiative for the PBR, discussing the initiative itself, the implementation schedule, and a basic understanding of key PBR components. Key points included:

- The PBR represents a major shift in how the JB MDL ERP does business, changing from attaining the goal of Remedy in Place (RIP) to Accelerated Site Closure (ASC). This will reduce out-year costs and free up property encumbered with environmental liability.
 - Sites with RIP are still incurring significant financial expenditure associated with remedial systems’ operating costs (pump and treat systems, land use control management, and continuous monitoring).
- The PBR contract works best when the number of unknowns at a given site is reduced, in other words, when the remedial investigations are complete. For this reason, the Air Force decided to hold off on awarding the JB MDL PBR until FY14 when the majority of remedial investigation work for the McGuire sites will be complete.
 - Many of the preliminary activities required prior to award the PBR have begun and will continue through this year in order to award the contract in the summer of 2014
 - Of JB MDL’s approximate 200 ERP Sites, approximately 100 will be part of the PBR.
- Key terms were defined: Remedy in Place (RIP), Response Complete (RC), Site Closure (SC), Minimum Performance Objective (MPO), Statement of Objectives (SOO), and Optimized Exit Strategy (OES).
- PBR Contracts Basic were discussed:
 - PBR contract tells the contractor “What” the desired end-state goal is, but not “How” the end state should be achieved.
 - The contract will stipulate what the minimum performance objectives (MPOs) are; however, contractors will be encouraged to exceed MPOs.
 - For each site that does not reach Site Closure, contractor is required to reach the MPO and present an Optimized Exit Strategy (OES) for attaining Site Closure.
- Sites were excluded from the PBR for various reasons: SC has already been achieved, the sites are on path to SC, or the sites are administratively closed.
- PBR contracting does not shift environmental liability away from the Air Force nor does it change the Air Force role as Lead Agency:
 - Contractors may not negotiate on behalf of the Air Force.
 - The Remedial Project Managers (RPMs) are required to be present during all regulatory discussions.
 - Under a PBR contract, the contractor assumes additional risk, so contract works best when the contractor is granted additional flexibility to exercise their expertise in achieving the MPOs.

- Goal of PBR contract is to optimize the overall life-cycle cost of ERP site clean-up and make a business case for Site Closure where it is feasible and possible. This goal will have the consequence of successfully closing what Mr. Tamn noted as the prolonged AF/DoD study/site investigation that has been the history of the ERP.

10) Comprehensive Site Evaluation (CSE) of McGuire Military Munitions Response Program Sites:

Mr. King Mak, JB MDL ERP Project Manager, provided a presentation on the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Sites on McGuire. Key points included:

- CSE Phase I investigated 14 Munitions Response Areas (MRAs), resulting in the identification of two MRAs requiring further investigation: Those sites are the Ordnance Storage Area (XU874) and the Former Skeet Range (TS875). A site history and site figures were presented.
- The CSE Phase II information was presented for each site, which included the following key points:
 - XU874 is located in the center of the McGuire airfield triangle. With the broad use of the term ordnance during WWII, it is unclear exactly what ordnance was contained in the 260-acre area of the site.
 - By 1955, the Ordnance Storage Area was no longer visible.
 - A 3-inch stokes mortar was found during 8 different instances between 1995-2010.
 - TS875, which was operational during WWII, is a Former Skeet Range approximately 29 acres in size. Field screening sample results of the soil indicated the presence of lead at levels above USEPA/NJDEP screening level of 400 mg/kg.
 - The shape of the Former Skeet Range and the location of the former firing point are based on the professional judgment of the investigators, since there is no visible evidence of the range still in place.
 - The Remedial Investigation (RI) is underway and the RI Work Plan is expected to be submitted for regulatory review in approximately 6-8 weeks.
 - The cleared area to the north of TS875 is agricultural land.
 - Portions of TS875 extend beyond the JB MDL facility boundary to the north.
 - While the RI Work Plans are being prepared and subsequently reviewed, the JB MDL ERP is concurrently in the process of requesting access to this property in order to conduct RI sampling.
 - Mr. Pocze indicated that if access to the private property is expected to be delayed, potentially EPA could delay their review of the Work Plan in lieu of other JB MDL ERP document review demands. Mr. Frye agreed that this is something that could be considered.

11) Munitions Response Site Priority Protocol (MRSPP):

Mr. Mike Figura, JB MDL ERP Project Manager, provided a presentation regarding what the MRSPP is, how the MRSPP is used, and how it applies to JB MDL MMRP sites. Key aspects of the presentation include:

- MRSPP is promulgated by Federal law, must be reviewed annually, and is used as one aspect in prioritizing, sequencing, and funding determinations for MMRP sites for response actions.
- MRSPP consists of three evaluation modules: Explosives Hazard Evaluation (EHE), Chemical Warfare Material Hazard Evaluation (CHE), and Human Health Evaluation (HHE).
 - EHE and CHE are evaluated for the following characteristics when determining the hazard level: the type of munitions used (high explosive/small arms), the source of the hazard, the

- location (surface/subsurface), ease of area access, property status (DoD/public), population density, population proximity, site structures, ecological risks at the site.
 - HHE evaluates the levels of munitions constituents at the site, and calculates score associated with risk to human health.
 - Scores range from 1-8, with 1 being the highest risk which is only attainable in association with the highest chemical hazard, otherwise EHE and HHE begin with the highest risk value of 2.
- Site Sequencing is dependent on the EHE/CHE/HHE values in combination with other factors (legal, impact to public safety, mission considerations (location and impact to the Air Force Mission). This determines the sequence of funding and addressing sites.
 - Site scores were presented for McGuire MMRP sites XU874 and TS875
- MMRP MRSPP Annual Review: the MRSPP must be reapplied if: new site information is collected, if response actions are completed, if MRS is subdivided, or if MRS is classified with a rating of “Evaluation Pending”.

12) BOMARC Site OT-16 Update

Mr. Jim Richman, Program Manager, CB&I, provided an update with regard to site OT-16, TCE groundwater plume. Jim noted that Shaw Environmental, was recently acquired by the firm CB&I, however this will have no impact on the work being performed under the current contract. The following are the presentation’s key points:

- A meeting between JB MDL, NJDEP, and CB&I held after the last RAB meeting resulted in changes to the path forward for OT-16, including the following:
 - OT-16 Permeable Reactive Barrier (PRB) remedy will change to an Interim Remedy.
 - Concurrently, the PRB will be installed as part of a pilot study.
 - A Focused Feasibility Study for the peat-zone source areas will be prepared.
 - The draft Pilot Study Work Plan which was submitted to the NJDEP on 12 February 2013 and a copy was provided to Mr. Tamm.
 - Future Actions include: Prepare an Interim Record of Decision (ROD), a Focused FS for peat zone areas, as well as a Draft ROD which will formalize the full OT-16 site remedy including other sites within the BOMARC facility.
- Pilot Study Performance Objectives were presented, and pre-injection, injection, and post injection activities were discussed.
 - Zero-valent Iron (ZVI): A ZVI sample was passed around for the RAB members to see. After being mixed with a prescribed amount of water, this material creates a “slurry” that will be injected to form the PRB.
 - After the ZVI injections, a report will be prepared, followed by PRB Long-Term Performance Monitoring (LTPM), and site-wide Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) which will be continued until remediation goals are achieved.
- Figure descriptions: Mr. Richman presented figures of the OT-16 site while describing details associated with the OT-16 Phase I & II injections, including:
 - The area of the existing road that will be expanded and improved to provide a stable road surface for semi-trucks to transport the project’s 400,000 lbs. of ZVI for injections.
 - The specific area of injection, details of the numerous injection points, and the upgradient and downgradient groundwater monitoring locations.
 - A cross section of the proposed project depicting the expected outcome of groundwater plume behavior as it passes through the PRB.
- Long-Term Planning and System Maintenance:
 - Monitoring will occur post-injection to determine when re-injection will occur (expectation is that re-injection will occur every 5-years at approximately 25% of injection points).
 - A monitoring well network will have quarterly and semi-annual sampling to determine success of the remediation system, and determine if system modifications are required.

- Slug tests during the baseline, Phase I, and Phase II fieldwork will help determine aquifer permeability before, during, and after injection to ensure oxidized iron does not clog the aquifer.
- Classification Exception Area (CEA): A figure defined the NJDEP required CEA, an area in which certain types of groundwater use is restricted for the protection of human health. The CEA is established as part of the Remedial Action Report.
 - The monitoring wells outside of the CEA will be monitored as part of LTM to ensure that as time passes, contamination does not pass outside the CEA protective boundary.
- The projected schedule was presented regarding project work between April 2013 and March 2015.
- Mr. Tamn inquired about nomenclature on the last Figure presented, indicating “Proposed Deed Notice/MOA Land Use Restriction”. This led to some discussion between Mr. Tamn, and Ms. Lettman, resulting in the following conclusions:
 - Deed Notice / Deed Restriction are essentially the same thing; does not limit use of the public land in a way that is not currently used now. It does, however, preclude anyone from installing a drinking water well.
 - Access agreements currently exist between the Air Force and the NJDEP to allow the AF to access the land for remediation purposes.
 - The entire site is located within the Pinelands, and the Pinelands organization is copied on all investigation documents.
 - The Deed Notice and CEA will follow what is prescribed in coordination with the NJDEP.
 - The Deed Notice for the site in relation to this environmental contamination is a legal requirement, regardless of whether or not existing Deed Notices preclude the same type of activity for other reasons.
 - The Green Acres Rules/Restrictions will be investigated further.

13) Public Comments:

- Mr. Tamn suggested that other locations be considered periodically for RAB meetings, possibly a college or municipal location maybe once or twice a year, such as the Pemberton or Mt. Laurel campus of Burlington County College.
- Mr. Tamn suggested revising the Legal Notice in the newspaper; he suggested that for a nominal increase in costs we could ensure that the advertisement appear in a section of the newspaper that is more widely read than the legal notices, and that the notice/advertisement be more legible by purchasing a larger, possibly 3x4 inch area.
 - Mr. Phil Cole echoed that in his experience that for a few dollars more you can get a double column and larger font which will be noticed more. Mr. Cole did indicate that while there is a requirement to have the notification in the legal notice section, there are things that could be done to make the information more noticeable.

14) Meeting Adjourned:

- Mr. Michael Tamn, RAB Co-Chair, adjourned the meeting at 8:15 PM.