

FMERPA Environmental Committee Minutes:

Monday, April 8, 2008 at 7 pm in the FMERPA conference room.

In attendance:

Laurie Cannon, Chair
Frank C. Cosentino, FMERPA Executive Director
Diane Canterbury, FMERPA Project Manager
Ed Dlugosz, Public Member
Rose Estephan, Public Member
Merwin Kinkade, Public Member

Guests present:

Frank Barricelli
Rosemary Brewer
Julie Carver, Matrix Design Group
Joe Fallon, U.S. Army Fort Monmouth
Tom Mahedy
Bill Nordahl, Monmouth County Advocacy Team
Jenna O'Donnell, The Hub
Greg Pollack, Weston Solutions
Dan Schnepf, Matrix Design Group
Jennifer Sokoloski
Fran Varacalli, Monmouth Conservation Foundation

The meeting convened at 7 pm. We opened the meeting by reviewing the notes from the previous meeting (also available on the website).

Dan Schnepf, EDAW's Environmental Consultant from Matrix, began by reviewing the status of their investigation of the Army's cleanup procedures related to the contaminated sites on Fort Monmouth property. He explained that it is important that there is a "close-out" of all environmental issues prior to moving forward. He noted that the Army has done a good job of identifying, investigating, testing, monitoring, etc. and that they have a very good working relationship with the State DEP. Matrix has reviewed all activities related to the cleanup and is reasonably certain the information is accurate. Ultimately, we are looking for a DEP NFA (no further action) status on all sites. Matrix's job is to assist in crafting a reuse plan that is non-intrusive with "like" uses that will be protective of human, health, and the environment.

When it is time to turn the land over to an interested party and a no further action status has not been achieved, three things could happen:

1. The Army could retain the responsibility of the cleanup.
2. A third party could continue the cleanup, which could be implemented by remediation agreement.
3. The Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority (FMERPA) could take over cleanup. However, we are not at the stage of deciding how each of these parcels of land will go forward.

We are now at the stage of identifying *known* environmental constraints and *potential* environmental constraints. The Army is in the Phase II process of the cleanup. A preliminary draft of that report will be available at the end of April and the final report by June. Once the final report is provided to the Environmental Advisory Committee, we can start moving towards the transfer of property. The contaminants, for the most part, are not in the high risk category. This is because of the types of contaminants, and the diligence of the Army in cleaning them up. When you cleanup a site, there are different standards you must adhere to depending on the future use of the property. It all has to do with the anticipated exposure and length of exposure an individual would have on a particular site. For instance, an industrial worker might be exposed 8 hours a day; 6 days a week at his job which would require a more diligent cleanup than an open space area which might only be visited occasionally.

Tom Mahedy asked a question about the landfills: Although they were capped according to DEP requirements at the time of closure, do they meet today's standards? Dan Schnepf answered the question: No landfill, anywhere, after it is closed and given a No Further Action status by the DEP, is reopened unless new problems were to surface. Tom Mahedy then asked if there were liners in all of the landfills. The answer was that at the time of operation, liners were not required. Merwin Kinkade added that the state has not been lowering standards but making it tougher (so the landfills that are currently being reviewed by the DEP will only earn NFA status by today's standards). There are nine landfills with requests to the DEP for NFA status. These were filed with the DEP prior to the Army's decision to close Fort Monmouth. Those sites (landfills) and NFAs are now being evaluated based on what is safe for the public now that the land is being turned over.

The discussion then turned to existing monitoring wells: Monitoring wells could be closed down if there were absolutely no need to continue monitoring. Removing them, however, could be costly if you ever wanted to go back for more testing therefore; not generally recommended.

The next discussion centered on disposition of land and how it relates to environmental stewardship. Under CERCLA, the Army is always responsible for cleanup of the identified areas of environmental pollutants, and the degree of cleanup depends on its current use (meaning today's use). We can also make a choice, through privatization, to cleanup the property to a greater degree than would the Army. It would all depend on how we intend to use the property and/ or what is near it. To foster economic growth, privatization can be a way of professionally dealing with an environmental problem. Merwin Kinkade added that in the commercial sector, privatization is common and there are also federal and state funds available, under the Brownfield Act, to help with the cleanup. It becomes the Army's choice: they can retain responsibility of the cleanup until they get approval from the State DEP or they can give up the responsibility and go with privatization. When a company partners with the Army or the State, the first priority is for the protection of human, health, and the environmental . The second priority is cost.

Dan Schnepf stated that the reuse plan was crafted for the highest and best use of the land and they feel good about the working relationship they have developed with the Army personnel (Joe Fallon, in particular). Matrix feels that they have a thorough understanding of

all the environmental constraints because of this. He added that they also have to look at the potential roadways and the direction of plumes. In the courtyard of the Myers Center, for instance, there is a plume confined to that courtyard. They are testing vapor samples in that building to be sure. They always consider what the nature, extent, and constituents of the pollution. Merwin Kinkade asked who the lead agency was. The answer was the Environmental Protection Agency. A question came up as to whether NJ has a "330 re-opener" law. It was then discussed that 60 - 70% of soil cleanup requirements were slated to change in June. Julie Carver from Matrix stated that they would look into that before the next meeting. They also added that FEMERPA can choose to use a risk management insurance policy as a protection for anything that may come up in the future related to environmental cleanup. It was also stated that there are proposed changes for PCB's/ parts per milligram in soil. Changes in testing requirements and/or standards are common and have to be adhered to although rarely do they have a detrimental impact.

Joe Fallon discussed that at this date in time, the Army has not identified any contaminants going off of their property. Mill Creek, however, and Husky Brook have contaminants coming in from other areas off base which the Army has no control of. A discussion ensued that sometimes, to maximize wet areas, you can incorporate elevated walkways.

Ed Dlugosz inquired if there were any maps available for him to take with him. The presentation to the Eatontown Planning Board was in two weeks and he wanted larger maps. Unfortunately, the 11" by 17" maps available on the website are all that is available at this time. We then discussed the timing of the Phase II report being due in June and if that would slow the process down for the FEMERPA. Joe Fallon reiterated that the draft will be made available to Matrix in April to help that process along based on Army leadership approval.

Frank Barracelli added that he had some input to be considered after the landfill tour that the Environmental committee attended in February. He felt that the landfills were environmentally sensitive areas and that active recreation areas should not be a suggested use for these landfills. Merwin Kinkade added that the natural connectivity of these areas is already in place, which will help the movement and access of wild life.

Tom Mahedy, in reference to Joe Fallon's statement that the Army has not identified any contaminants leaving the property, wondered whether the responsibility for monitoring that should be left up to the Army or another entity, such as the Monmouth County Health Department.

Ed Dlugosz asked if there were any further plans to test the sediment of any of the creek areas. Joe Fallon stated that the Army will do more sediment sampling in areas where the sediment tends to collect. There was questions about Landfills 12 and 14 and if they were emptying into Oceanport Creek. Work on those landfills occurred in 1950 - 1956 and 1965 - 1966, respectively. Joe Fallon stated that for the record, he wasn't alive in 1950 but that plans for further sediment sampling would be discussed at the Army's next Restoration Advisory Board meeting. Can there be a suspected path of sediments coming from these landfills? One of two things can happen: Landfills could infiltrate to the streams or the streams could infiltrate to the landfills; i.e., water moves in and out of landfills based on tidal flow. Further discussion of this will take place at the next meeting.

Tom Mahedy stated his concern about the emphasis on getting insurance and that we may be surprised that these companies have very low caps. He was also concerned about any raised trails over any toxic areas. He reminded us that as a boy scout, we are always trained to clean up our mess and leave it better than we found it.

Our path forward: We are currently waiting for the Phase II data and when we receive it, we will then begin reviewing its impact to our overall plan. Again, the preliminary draft of the Phase II report is due at the end of April. Our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, May 22nd, at 7 pm in the FMERPA conference room. Before the meeting closed, Tom Mahedy asked if there could be a landfill tour for members of the public and Frank Cosentino said that he would send a formal request to Lou Benevides for this purpose.

The meeting ended at 9 pm.