FORT MONMOUTH RESTORATION
ADVISORY BOARD

IN RE:

FORT MONMOUTH RESTORATION
ADVISORY BOARD

Thursday, July 10, 2014
455 Wade Avenue
Building 455
Oceanport, New Jersey
7:00 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF:
PROCEEDINGS

Job No. NJ1865921

B O A R D M E M B E R S:

BRIAN CHARNICK

DAVID SORENSEN

RICHARD GRUSKOS

FRANK BARRICELLLI

TIMOTHY RIDER

WANDA GREEN

JAMES ALLEN

LINDA RANGE

EDWARD DLUGOSZ

FRANCES OWENS

ALSO PRESENT:
Allan Motter - Bureau of Environmental Evaluation and Risk Assessment
Ann Charles - Bureau of Environmental Evaluation and Risk Assessment
Allyson Kriney - Parsons
Scott Anderson - Parsons

MR. ALLEN: Okay. I'd like to call the meeting to order of the Restoration Advisory Board for the U.S. Army Fort Monmouth. Will you please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

Okay. This is not on the agenda, but I've been notified by Wanda that there is a resolution she'd like to read at the start of our meeting. Wanda, the floor is yours.

MS. GREEN: Well, it's not so much a resolution, it's just something that I want to remind everyone of and I want to read it because I don't want to miss anything and I want her to be able to record it all.

"The mission of the Restoration Advisory Board is to serve as a medium for community involvement in the restoration program at the U.S. Army Fort Monmouth in New Jersey.

The Restoration Advisory Board is a broad-based group of individuals who reflect the diverse interests in the community. Everyone who attends this meeting must remember to treat everyone else, whether a board member or public member with respect and in a professional manner. Name-calling

such as calling another board member a "henchman," sending derogatory emails, or acts of personal attacks will not be tolerated. If you are unable to conduct yourself in a professional manner then you may want to remove yourself from this Board.

"As I have stated on many occasions, I will make myself available to help anyone on the Board who would like further explanation of any aspect of the Fort Monmouth Installation Restoration Program, the 'IRP' program.

"I am reminding all members of the Board that you are representing the township which you are a resident of. It is important that you do not deliberately mislead, make false accusations, or misconstrue the truth. Members of your community and the mayors of your respective towns are relying on you to give them the facts.

"Everyone is entitled to their own opinion. Comments will be made respectfully and noted in the minutes. I will remind the public if you have questions, you should sign the form in the back so that you may be recognized at the end of the meeting during the Public Comment period. Please prepare your questions regarding any presentations to be asked during that time.

"This command is committed to being proactive and protecting the environment through the use of Best Management Practices, and ensuring environmental, health, and safety measures will continue to be implemented for all aspects of our environmental program."

MR. ALLEN: Thank you, Ms. Green. Does anyone have a comment with regard to that?

If not, I'd like to make a point or two points. There's a gentleman joining us tonight, Mr. Frank Owens. Frank, thanks for coming. And the other gentleman is Mr. David Sorensen. He's standing in for Joel Grimm.

With that, unless there's any questions, I will move on to the approval of the minutes for April 3rd, 2014. If you haven't read them, there's copies available; if you'd like some time to read them, please let me know so we can take the time.

(Board members reviewing.)

MR. ALLEN: Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes and are there any questions regarding the minutes?

Hearing none and seeing none, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes of the April 3rd, 2014, meeting.

MR. BARRICELLI: Move.
MR. ALLEN: Frank moves to approve.
MR. OWENS: Second.
MR. ALLEN: Frank Owens second.
Discussion?
Hearing no discussion, all those in favor of approving the minutes for April the 3rd, please signify by saying "I."
(All members respond in the affirmative.)
MR. ALLEN: Those opposed in opposition to the minutes, please signify by saying "Nay."
Hearing no other comments, the minutes are passed with regard to April the 3rd, 2014. Thank you.
The next item on the agenda is the presentation by NJDEP for the Fort Monmouth Ecological Evaluation: Linda Range, Ann Charles, and Allan Motter. I will turn it over to Linda. Is that correct?
MS. RANGE: Yes.
MR. ALLEN: Thank you.
MS. RANGE: Well, as many of you know, there have been ongoing discussion points as far as the ecological evaluation that was performed at the

Fort and the decision by the Department that the Army did not need to do further ecological evaluation so to answer some of the questions, what we did was generate a presentation to explain the decision-making process as to why we agreed that Fort Monmouth did not need to do additional investigation in regard to the ecological sampling performed at Fort Monmouth.

The people that the case manager called on are from another bureau, the Bureau of Environmental Evaluation and Risk Assessment. The personnel are Ann Charles and Allan Motter, they're research scientists whose primary job function is to provide scientific and regulatory support on contaminated site remedial issues and to develop regulations, guidance, and policies for the Site Remediation Program.

Allan has a master's degree in environmental management in ecotoxicology from Duke University. He's worked in the environmental field for 25 years, both in private consulting and the government. He is experienced in offering state regulations and guidance documents, chairing committees regarding state policy concerning sampling analysis, monitoring and remediation of hazardous

waste sites.

Mr. Motter reviews and performs ecological risk assessments for environmentally sensitive areas that have been impacted by hazardous waste sites and has recently overseen the remediation of two large sediment remediation projects totaling over $56 million.

Ann Charles has a master's in environmental science from Miami University of Ohio. She has been with the Department for 26 years and worked in environmental consulting prior to her career with the Department -- prior to her career with the Department, she's worked on the Department's committees responsible for offering primary regulations for the Site Remediation Program, such as soil remediation standards and the technical requirements for site remediation. She oversees scientific and technical aspects of hazardous waste sites, investigations and cleanup throughout the state that have included complex, large-scale investigations of ecological issues at publically funded and responsible parties' remediation projects.

Now, without further adieu, your presentation.

MR. MOTTER: Thank you.

MS. RANGE: Just one more thing. If we could hold all questions until the end of the presentation.

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MR. MOTTER: Thank you.

All right. The first part of the presentation is basically a paired down version of the Rutgers course that I give every year to just go through what the eco evaluation process is, the regulations, and guidance documents that guide that policy. So the tech regs were initially promulgated in 1992, the most recent version is 2012, and we also have the Ecological Evaluation Technical Guidance document. The most current version is 2012, that was originally put out in 2011. And prior to that, we have the 1998 guidance document, but basically the process that we follow has been in place since '92.

The ecological evaluation is applicable to all sites in the Site Remediation Program. The two specific chapters that deal with environmental evaluation are the receptor evaluation under N.J.A.C. 7:26E, which is the technical requirement for site remediation, 1.16, which requires an ecological evaluation and a remedial investigation of ecological receptors in Chapter 4.8. This is the guidance

document, and the committee responsible for putting the guidance together.

Basically an ecological evaluation consists of three steps. The first step is, Do I have contaminants of ecological concern on my property. What does that mean? Well, it means if you have site-related contaminants that are higher than the ecological screening criteria or background. Site-related contaminants. The reason we say "ecological screening criteria or background" is we cannot require somebody to cleanup below background levels. Also, screening criteria are very conservative, they are based on the most sensitive receptors and we basically do the literature search to find these from laboratory studies conducted on the organisms. They are intended to be conservative because if they're below that, then you're completely finished.

Environmentally sensitive natural resources. There is a definition under N.J.A.C. 7:1E-1.8, which is the discharge of petroleum and other hazardous substances, and they have about a five-page list of environmentally sensitive receptors. So rather than reinventing the list, we just cite those and also climate. So you look for if

you have contaminants and if you have environmentally sensitive natural resources, and then finally you look to see, Do you have a contaminant migration pathway that could take your contaminants to the environmentally sensitive areas. So you're looking for, Do I have contaminants? Do I have sensitive areas? And the mechanisms to get those contaminants to the sensitive areas.

The first two steps are completed during the site investigation portion of the investigation and the third step is completed during the remedial investigation. That's when you do your delineation.

After you complete the portion in the ESI, which is, Do I have contaminants? Do I have receptors? You look -- you draw conclusions from the data gathered and if the answer is no to either of the questions, you don't have contaminants or you don't have receptors, then no further action would be appropriate; however, if you have those contaminants and receptors, then you would evaluate the migration pathway during your RI.

Once you get to that stage, if all three conditions are present, in other words, you have contaminants, you have receptors, and a migration pathway, then you would conduct a further evaluation

in accordance with 4.8.

It's important to note that if any of the three conditions are not present, in other words, you don't have contaminants, you don't have migration pathway, you don't have receptors, then NFA is appropriate otherwise, you would proceed onto the ecological risk assessment.

And finally, you present everything in a written, concise summary document.

All right. This is the first page of our ecological screening criteria. If you go on our SRP Website and look this up, you'll actually find my name as the contact because I compiled all of these numbers for the Department. And what it is, we have surface water, sediment, soil screening criteria and -- for both surface water, sediment -- we have freshwater and salt water numbers. And like I said, we scanned the literature and, you know, got some of the most conservative numbers we could find to put on this table.

You'll notice that sometimes we have more than one criteria available based on different receptors. There's footnotes. If go to the end of the table, you could see what the studies are based on.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Could I just make a suggestion?

MR. ALLEN: You want to wait till the end?

MR. DLUGOSZ: It's going to make a difference for our understand. All I want, if there's an acronym, could you speak it out?

MR. MOTTER: Sure. What acronym were you having trouble with?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Well, I didn't have trouble, but in the past we've had trouble so if you come to an acronym, just --

MR. MOTTER: Sure.

MR. DLUGOSZ: -- spell it out, please.

MR. MOTTER: Yeah, ecological screening criteria I'll be referring to as "ESC."

So the ecological screening criteria, they are not promulgated. The only thing that is promulgated is some of the surface water standards are promulgated; however, not everything on this table is. And if you read the footnotes, you can tell the difference between what's promulgated and what's not. The fact that they're not promulgated, they are not standards, they are not what you have to cleanup, they are not what you have to meet. They

are what you use to do an initial screening. And as I said, they are very conservative numbers.

This is a flow chart taking you through the process. As I said, every site in SRP has to have an ecological evaluation conducted. The first step is you look to see if you have sensitive receptors or contaminants. If the answer to either is no, no further ecological evaluation. That's what the NFEE stands for, no further ecological evaluation. If both are present, then you go to the -- looking at the migration pathway, and that's where you pick up on this flow chart.

If you have a contaminant migration pathway, you take the contaminant to the sensitive area. If the answer to that is no, there's no migration pathway, again, no further ecological evaluation. If the answer is yes, you can either -- if it's a hotspot, you can either conduct a remediation to the greater of ESC, which is ecological screening criteria or background or in the majority of cases, you would go to an ecological risk assessment and determine if there's an unacceptable risk. And as I stated, screening criteria are very conservative. You may not have those receptors present, they may not be present year-round, so on

and forth, so there's a lot of things that go into a risk assessment.

Once you go through the full risk assessment process, you may find that although you exceed the screening criteria, there's no risk, and if that's the case, no further ecological evaluation is appropriate. If you do exceed -- if you do have unacceptable risk, you would then develop ecological risk-based remediation goals. You would then determine if they're appropriate for your site, because sometimes they would -- to meet those goals, you would actually have to destroy the entire habitat in which case, we would do a risk management decision. I'm sorry, a risk management decision over here, which balances habitat preservation and risk reduction. So you do some removal to get an acceptable risk reduction, and then conduct your cleanup from there.

These are just some examples of where we've gone through the ecological evaluation process. Long Branch Coal Gas, not too far from here. There was free product and semi-volatile organic contaminants.

Troutman's Creek, which required excavation of the creek to 16 feet in depth on the

site, 12 feet off the site between Seaview and Joline Avenues except the last 50 feet was only two feet, and then at that point the SVOCs became background levels and no further remediation was required.

ExxonMobil Lail property in Mantua Creek. There is PCB contamination, 2 percent levels and there's about a 16-acre embayment, it required excavation to about 12 feet. Cleanup was one part per million for PCBs.

And Fort Dix had lead and copper contamination in Hanover Lake. Lead levels were approaching 100,000 parts per million. The risk-based remediation goal was 250 parts per million and required cleanup of the dam area in Dow's Brook.

All right. Now, this is the Fort Monmouth part. I just gave all the other stuff as a background. This is the Fort Monmouth site. There's also a poster of that over here. The main post area, the Charles Wood area is a -- there's Wampum Lake, this is the Charles Wood area of Fort Monmouth. The area in this sort of orangish color is the R&D area, the Research and Development area. This is the barracks area, housing area, and this is the golf course.

There are two creeks that flow through

the site. I've heard them referred to by different names, seen different names on different maps. For the purposes of this presentation, I'm going to use the names that are on this figure, which came from the ecological evaluation that was conducted for this site. This creek, which is referred to as "Shrewsbury" or "Parkers Creek," I'm gonna refer to it as "Parkers." This creek that's on the southern portion is referred to as "Wampum Brook." I'm gonna refer to that as "Wampum Brook."

There's also an intermittent stream which forms in this wooded area, crosses Hope Road, travels through this area where some samples were collected, and then crosses over the railroad and meets up with Martin Brook.

This is an aerial of the site that we just looked at with the railroad. Hope Road, Pearl Harbor -- excuse me, Maxwell Road, Tinton Avenue, and Pinebrook Road. This is the same figure with some of the surrounding properties.

Okay. This is the same area. A 1930 -- the previous one was from 2007. This is a 1930 aerial photograph map, and you'll note that the railroad was already in existence. In fact, upon walking the railroad, we saw a date stamp on the rail

itself that said 1927, the year the rail was manufactured. At that time when they were manufactured, they were generally installed within a year or two, so it was probably built in, like, '28, '29. You'll notice that the R&D area, the barracks, everything over here is undeveloped. The housing area is undeveloped, the golf course.

I don't expect people to be able to read this figure on this slide; however, we do have a poster of it over here if anybody's interested in looking at it at a later time. The reason we have this on here is to note that Parkers Brook was sampled off property, as it enters the property, and the R&D area as well where it exists the property. Wampum was sampled where it enters the property and where it exits the property, and the intermittent stream was sampled in this area prior to crossing the railroad.

So what does the data tell us? All right. First of all, everything was analyzed for the complete total analytic list, which is 23 metals. Of those 23, the only ones that exceeded screening criteria were these five. These are the screening criteria. Again, they're very conservative numbers. If you look at the background levels, they're around

five-and-a-half parts per million. So the exiting site, six. Barely above screening criteria. Statistically speaking, analytically speaking, these are all the same number, okay?

Cadmium: The screening criteria .6; background up to 1.08; exiting the site 1.15. Again, all indicative of background. Analytically speaking, they're all the same number.

Chromium: Screening criteria is 26; background 97.60; leaving the site 32.

Lead: Screening criteria 31; background is 36; leaving the site 32.

Mercury: Screening criteria .2; background .251; leaving the site .249.

As you can see, everything here is indicative of background levels.

Okay. For Wampum Brook, again, Cadmium: .6; background .38, leaving the site 1.3. One point three barely exceeds the .6 criteria. Indicative of background.

Chromium: Twenty-six screening criteria, background 75, leaving the site 50.

Nickel: Screening criteria is 16; background 56; leaving the site 29.

So everything's indicative -- everything

that exceeds any criteria is indicative of background.

To put this in perspective because, again, we're looking at ecological screening criteria for human health, residential direct soil contact numbers, let's assume that you are in your yard eight hours a day, 250 days a year. Assuming you're gardening, actively being in the -- getting the dirt on you, ingesting dirt, inhaling the dust, okay? For sediment, you would not have that much exposure, so the -- if we developed standards for sediment, it would actually be higher than the soil counts, but as a point of comparison, you could see the eco screen criteria compared to the soil remediation standards. Screening criteria are basically anywhere from 1 to 4 or just a magnitude lower. So human health is not really a concern.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Repeat that, sir.

MR. MOTTER: Pardon?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Repeat what you just said.

MR. MOTTER: Sure. The human health standards are anywhere from 1 to 4 orders of magnitude higher than the screening criteria. The eco screening criteria. So human health, direct contact with sediments would not be of concern.

Okay. This is different areas of the site. This is the southwest corner of the site, these are the R&D buildings where they did some metal work. And metal work consisted of bending, a little bit of grinding, some welding.

All right. The railroad is located next to them, and Wampum comes up through here, past the Metallurgical site and through the woods here.

MS. RANGE: Do you want the light off?

MR. ALLEN: It might help a little.

MR. MOTTER: It's up to you.

MR. ALLEN: Could we dim the lights, please?

MR. MOTTER: Does anybody want me to go back to the previous slide with the lights dimmed?

All right. So -- I'm sorry. Can you go back.

Okay. Again, this is the R&D buildings, the railroad is right next to them, Pinebrook Road, and Wampum Brook. This is the R&D building which is standing right in front of the buildings, looking across the railroad is Wampum Brook. You could see that the railroad is elevated. This is looking down along the buildings. You could see again the railroad is elevated and there are storm drains here

that drain into the wooded area where the intermittent creek would initiate.

These two shots are standing on Pinebrook looking across to the buildings. Again, you could see the railroad is elevated. The reason that's important is we look at migration pathways. Any metal grinding or anything that came off here would not be able to flow up over the railroad down into Wampum Brook. They would, in fact, go into the storm sewer.

This is following Wampum -- excuse me, one up.

This is Hope Road, and, again, the railroad, housing area. Wampum flows between the railroad and the housing area. The intermittent stream, which originates over here, goes under Hope Road. And here, this is the vicinity where it was sampled. It merges out of the woods, under the railroad, and hooks up with Wampum.

These are shots where Wampum Brook comes onto the property. The first two shots are off site before it enters the property, these two shots are on site where it enters the property. Notice that the stream's about the same. Both of them, you could see a lot of iron staining. There's naturally occurring

iron.

This is the intermittent stream, this is the vicinity of where it was sampled, and this is the area where it emerges from the woods, and then travels under the railroad to meet up with Wampum.

Okay. Wampum then continues on -- excuse me, the housing area here and on up through. These are some shots from the housing area. You can see on the other side of the fence, the housing area would be where we're standing looking across and you could see the rail yard in the background. Wampum then continues up past the rail yard, past the DPW through -- past Fiori Paving through the DPW and hooks up with Parkers before it closed. Before it closed to Wampum lake.

These are some shots of the western end of Wampum and the area where Wampum Brook flows past Fiori Paving. This is Parkers where it enters the site here, flows through the wooded area. This is the stream where it enters the site. These two, again, are off site, these two are on site. The stream, again, looks about the same in both and you can note the iron staining. The stream stays channelized as it flows up through past the buildings and hooks up with Hope Road. The stream is

channelized with the golf course, and then as it flows over Maxwell Road and off the site, there's also a small pond here on the property that has a little tributary which flows across Maxwell.

This is the pond on the golf course, this is the channelized brook on the golf course, and then this is where the channelized brook flows off the golf course. This set of photos was last year. The other set was from this year. There was a great blue heron at the time. The tributary flows along between the railroad and Fiori Paving, hooks up with Parkers. That flows under the railroad, hooks up with Wampum, and then onto Wampum. These are some shots of the little tributary as it's on the site, and then where it exits past Fiori Paving.

So the conclusions are levels of contaminants that exceed ecological screening criteria on Fort Monmouth are indicative of background levels. And, again, we look at the higher of screening criteria or background. So anything that exceeded would be background. There was no elevated threat to ecological receptors for environmentally sensitive natural resources on Fort Monmouth or anything on Fort Monmouth for that matter. So therefore, in accordance with the

regulations and guidance, no further ecological evaluation was required for the Fort Monmouth site.

MR. ALLEN: We will now take questions from the Board.

MR. DLUGOSZ: My question is, these tests that you -- when were they taken?

MR. MOTTER: Those samples were from 2005.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay. What is the -- among the pathways that you mentioned, both above and north and south of the railway, you mentioned the intermittent stream, which until this point in time I've been calling the "unnamed stream" 'cause it doesn't have a name.

MR. MOTTER: We can call it whatever you want.

MR. DLUGOSZ: But the water also flows further down along the railway bed and there's actually another conduit at the very end and with the testing in 2005, 2007, and whatever, those tests precede -- succeeded or followed by years, some of the testing that was done by the Monmouth County Health Department. The Monmouth County Health Department took sampling of the Wampum Lake in 1990, and found elevated findings.

MR. MOTTER: Could you pull up this one right here?

Okay. You're referring to this chart?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Yes. That's one of the ones that I'm referring to, correct.

MR. MOTTER: This is part of the 20-lake study?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Correct.

MR. MOTTER: Okay. This is a very poor --

MS. GREEN: Would you let him finish his question first?

MR. MOTTER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Yeah, with time and with the nature of -- of streams and the dynamics involved in heavy metals and other sediments flowing downstream over time and found further downstream over that time, since the original creation of the -- Fort Monmouth on Charles Woods happened after 1940, and the sewage treatment plant and the other sources of the contamination, is it possible that the sampling that was taken in 2005 doesn't represent the height of the levels of contamination that were passed through? Because if you do look at the criteria and the levels that were taken in 1990 by

the Monmouth County Health Department, they are very high, okay.

Like the Grand Canyon, sediments and effluence and everything else flows downstream and what was once, you know, at the -- at the point at which the unnamed stream or the intermittent stream and Wampum meet was on the order of 30 years prior to that, from 19 -- 1953, '54 to 1980 or so when the sewage treatment stopped flowing. At that time, the level of flow was 400,000 gallons a day, and that intermediate stream was not intermediate at that time 'cause now the immediacy of that -- that creek is based on rain events, storm events, as opposed to a steady stream of water that had been processed and -- with heavy metals as described in the documentation that the Fort has provided us. Is there any possibility that those findings, those metals that are in the stream could have come from an earlier point in time, not 2005, not 1990, but 1980, 1970, 1960, all the way back to the '53 time frame that the hexagon was made? Is there a possibility that sediment flowed further downstream in those 50 years prior to the present testing?

MR. MOTTER: Yeah, I'd like to answer that in two parts. First of all, you know, is there

a possibility that sediment flowed downstream? Sure. But they also conducted sampling on the sludge material and the levels were not very elevated. And sampling in other portions of the site, you really do not show extremely elevated contaminant levels.

I've worked on numerous DOT sites and this is by far the cleanest site that I've seen. It's quite extraordinary, actually.

The second part I would like to address is this bar chart. I'm sure the people who put this together were well-intensioned; however, this is riddled with flaws. For instance, they put TPH, metals and VOCs all in the same draft where toxicologically speaking should never be done. This portion of the graph represents TPH and makes it look really high. That's 583 parts per million. We wouldn't be concerned until you're over 1,700 parts per million. So you're 1/3 of a level of concern, and yet it's that big area.

This portion of the graph represents Mercury, which is incorrect by two orders of magnitude. If you look on the Department of Health's Website -- I mean, the Monmouth County Health Website, you'll see that they issued a correction to that data. This is not 69, it's .69. So they made

an error when they were entering the data.

Second of all, it doesn't take into account the different toxicological effects. These are not all synergistic, so you can't just add them up like this; however, because they did this, I put together a chart. If you could just hit the next arrow, it should come up.

This takes out the TPH and corrects the Mercury data. Where is Wampum now? It's right here. Okay. So you could say, Well, it's still one and three high, but it's really not that much higher than everything else. And if you look at these lower level ones, Asopink, Allar, Rising Sun (phonetic) -- I'm very familiar with Asopink, I've collected that many times. That's in the middle of the state park. In fact, all of these lower ones are in the middle of the state park, they're not subject to the same runoff that Wampum and these other lakes are. So if you eliminate those, the metals are about the same as they are in any other lakes.

We even talked to our fishery people who post the fishery advisories for the state of New Jersey and shared data with them and they had no concern about this lake.

MR. BARRICELLI: One item of

information. The 1927 rail is a fairly new replacement rail, that rail line opened up in 1860.

MR. MOTTER: Oh, did it? I had no idea. But there is a date stamp there, 1927.

MR. BARRICELLI: But there's a rail -- I have the history books of the rails and they were in 1860.

MR. MOTTER: I appreciate that. I did not do research on that.

MR. BARRICELLI: Yeah. Your slide on human health concerns, I just want to make one clarification. You said human health, residential standards were of no concern. I think what you're trying to say is because the other -- the levels are so low, that those are not even approached by the measured levels.

MR. MOTTER: That's correct.

MR. BARRICELLI: Not that we don't -- we're not ignoring the human health criteria, but they're not even approached.

MR. MOTTER: That's correct. The contaminant levels that we saw out there are orders of magnitude lower than the human health numbers, that's correct. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Charnick had a question.

MR. CHARNICK: Hi. I had a few questions if you'd just bear with me.

MR. MOTTER: Sure.

MR. CHARNICK: 'Cause I guess I've been the biggest protagonist here trying to get something done.

Did you review the comments by Bill Simons in the Monmouth County Health Department report regarding the Sewage Treatment Plant report that the Army delivered? Spills and the creation of what was in the sludge, those metals in the treatment plant years ago before these samples were taken and the sludge was spread around the golf course seem to match the same metals that are in the lake, as opposed to other type metals. Did you have a chance to read that report or... that was delivered to the commissioner of DEP by myself.

MR. MOTTER: Yeah, since I do the eco, no I did not; however, I'm gonna defer that to --

MS. RANGE: I did. Oh, sorry. I did review it. I did -- I believe I spoke to you about it, we reviewed it. As far as the sludge exhibiting the same constituents, there were no exceedances in the sludge.

MR. CHARNICK: Yeah, okay. But the

question he asked then is that in order for the Fort Monmouth Sewage Treatment Plant to be connected to the Northeast Regional Sewer Authority, they had to do tests of their ethanol and identified the same metals that appear in the lake, which are different than some of those other lakes and came from the hexagon area, not the metal processing, where the battery and electronics labs were. Similar-type metals that ended up in the sludge. And the question he had is that if it came from the sewer plant, was in the sludge and your samples show it's not there now, where did it go?

MS. RANGE: But it was not there above criteria.

MR. CHARNICK: No. But nobody sampled it in the '50s when this happened. There were no standards for how to process this sludge. That was one of the questions years ago when this was being done.

MS. RANGE: But I'm not sure what the question is.

MR. ALLEN: Neither am I.

MR. CHARNICK: The question is, it was identified in the output of the sewage treatment plant, the sludge. That sludge was spread on the

golf course.

MS. RANGE: Right. And that sludge was sampled.

MR. CHARNICK: And it's not there now.

MS. RANGE: What's not there now?

MR. CHARNICK: Those same metals aren't there now.

MS. RANGE: We sampled the sludge. The Army sampled the sludge. There were no exceedances.

MR. CHARNICK: Exceedances, okay.

MS. RANGE: I'm not saying there's -- everything was non-detect, but there were no exceedances of our cleanup criteria.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay. So that relates, again, to another layman's simple question. The ecological test you did, did it have to do with humans living there or breathing?

MS. RANGE: The sludge that was sampled, that was actually compared to human exposure rather than ecological.

MR. CHARNICK: But if that ends up in the lake and the fish absorb that, is that a different issue? That was one of the issues that was of concern, pollution of the lake itself, not people breathing it or something.

MS. RANGE: When the sludge was sampled on the golf course, it was compared to the criteria for human exposure because that was the concern, human exposure.

MR. CHARNICK: Right.

MS. RANGE: It was nowhere near the lake nor should it have reached the lake by any means. So yes, it was compared strictly to human criteria.

MR. CHARNICK: Again, so your "no further action" relates to everything on Fort Monmouth property, right? That's what he said.

MS. RANGE: No. The presentation that he just gave was for ecological issues only.

MR. CHARNICK: Yeah, for the property owned by the owner, not for Wampum Lake.

MS. RANGE: Right. No.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay.

MS. RANGE: The ecological evaluation was for Fort Monmouth.

MR. CHARNICK: Property on the Fort.

MS. RANGE: Yes.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay. Was there any hexavalent chromium that came up in your analysis?

MR. MOTTER: We didn't analyze for hex chrome because chrome levels were so low, you

wouldn't see it.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay. So that if there is hexavalent chromium in the lake, that's a safe level?

MR. MOTTER: I did not review -- reviewing the lake data is beyond my purview. I looked at the data as a courtesy, and the levels of metals in the lake are comparable to other lakes in the state that are in the same type of situation with, you know, industrial and commercial runoff.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay. Because it came up in a response. The Army all of a sudden said there was a hexavalent chromium contaminant that didn't seem to be in the original sewage treatment plant and identified these heavy metals and things so I was just wondering if you were aware of any hexavalent chromium. So you're saying there's no problem there, okay.

MR. ALLEN: Anything else?

MR. CHARNICK: So is there an answer to anybody about where did the original -- so instead of saying, you're not worried where it went, you're just saying it was a low enough level that we don't have to worry about it, the original sludge metals that were identified by the Army's own report when they

applied for connection to the Regional Sewer Treatment Plant and that sludge was spread all over the golf course.

MS. RANGE: Well, that's two different issues there. Can you hear me?

MR. CHARNICK: Yes.

MS. RANGE: There's two different issues there. The presentation that Allan just gave was strictly for the ecological evaluation done by the Army on the Charles Wood area, it had nothing to do with the sludge, per se. It was an ecological evaluation of the entire Charles Wood area.

The sludge investigation that was done at -- what was it, CW-9?

MS. GREEN: CW-5.

MS. RANGE: The golf course area.

MR. DLUGOSZ: The pile where they --

MS. RANGE: Yes, where they staged it temporarily.

MS. GREEN: I've given a presentation, a complete presentation that has all the history of the sludge and everything that was done, how treatment was processed in a previous RAB. I can forward that information to you if you don't have it because you are going back and forth and you're mixing things up

here where you're talking about the sludge and the metals that were detected, but what you're not talking about is the treatment that was performed and that the metals -- the samples that were taken after the treatment. And that is what Linda is telling you and what I have shown you in our reports in -- I think it was the CW-5 report that showed that they were -- that the metals were not above state criteria.

So I think you're getting things mixed up with what was done before the treatment and you keep saying we spread the metals all over the golf course. We spread the sludge that was left over that was tested that did not have metals that were in exceedance of the state criteria.

MS. RANGE: Right.

MS. GREEN: That's it.

MR. CHARNICK: But this was done many years before any tests, right? Sludge was going on in the '50s, when was your sampling done in 1950?

MS. RANGE: I think there's three issues. CW-5 was where the sewage treatment plant was. We sampled that. No exceedances at the discharge point or of the sludge at that point. We NFA'd -- CW-9 was at the golf course. We did

numerous sampling locations. No exceedances.

MR. CHARNICK: Right.

MS. RANGE: We can't go back to the 1950s and sample at that time, so what we did was the next best thing, and sampled what we think was the worst case possible location. There were no exceedances.

MR. CHARNICK: That's why the question came up about old pollution that might have moved out of the area. But I think you explained it, that even if it did move, it's not a threat to human health wherever it is. I guess that's what he's trying to say.

MR. MOTTER: Right. The lake is roughly equivalent to all the other lakes in New Jersey.

MR. CHARNICK: That's all we're really concerned about. I mean, no one's looking for any trouble. If you're here tellin' us the lake is okay and the fish are okay, I think the residents of Eatontown are very happy.

MR. ALLEN: The lake is not on his --

MS. RANGE: Right.

MR. ALLEN: -- presentation. He said that about six times so can we move a little bit off that?

You had a question, Richard?

MR. GRUSKOS: This is just a question about the sampling, entering the property and leaving, how it's typically done. You mentioned, like, on some of the other projects you worked on, you had to remove -- break down some materials 60 feet or something, I think you said, in Long Branch. When they sampled the sediment in the creeks entering and leaving, is this done at various depths in the streambed, or can you talk about that part of it?

MR. MOTTER: Yeah, it was zero to six-inch, which is biologically the active zone.

MR. GRUSKOS: It's biologically the active zone?

MR. MOTTER: Correct.

MR. GRUSKOS: Okay. And the other thing I was gonna ask about is your graph that you presented with the updated or corrected figures after the Monmouth County Board of Health misstatement. Is that something you can make available, or that's just a little beyond your -- just as a courtesy?

MS. RANGE: I believe a decision was made it was not going to be available.

MR. MOTTER: The thing is, I can give you the Website for the database. And all this is,

it's an Excel table, it's very easy to generate.

MR. GRUSKOS: Okay. Just to be candid, I understand, like, trying to restrict the discussions to the matter at hand --

MS. RANGE: Part of the problem is that's not the correct way to do it.

MR. MOTTER: Right.

MR. GRUSKOS: Right. That's why I was interested in the correct way to present it.

MR. MOTTER: We would never sum the metals like that. Never.

The people who did this, like I said, I'm sure they're well-intensioned. But they obviously were toxicologists.

MR. ALLEN: Any other questions?

Did you have anything else you wanted to present?

MR. MOTTER: No, I'm finished.

MR. ALLEN: You will be here for the public section?

MS. RANGE: I believe they're going to leave.

MR. ALLEN: Oh, really?

MR. MOTTER: If we need to stay, we can.

MR. ALLEN: Would you? Yeah. I don't

know how many public are here, I haven't got the list yet, but I would respectfully request that you stay.

MR. MOTTER: Sure. That's not a problem.

MR. ALLEN: Hearing no other questions with regard to this item, we'll move on to Parsons. That has to do with the Fort Monmouth Ecological -- strike that. That has to do with the Fort Monmouth Landfill Design and Construction. Allyson Kriney and Scott Anderson.

MS. GREEN: Before they actually get started, I just want to let you know that I was approved for funding for the landfill covers, and what I asked Parsons to do is just give a brief presentation so that you will understand the whole process for getting a landfill cover because some were under the impression, including folks within the Army, that, Well, if you get the money, you could get it done, like, tomorrow. But it takes a little more than just getting the money and making it happen. So what I asked them to do is just to give a presentation to help you understand the whole process.

MS. KRINEY: Okay. So today we are going to present on the landfill design and the

construction. You can go to the next slide.

My name is Allyson Kriney with Parsons. I'm going to go over an overview of the regulatory documentation process that's required to close out the landfills, and then Scott Anderson is gonna take over, and he's gonna go through the location of the landfills, the landfill cover system design components, and the landfill cover construction steps. Next slide.

There's nine landfills and there's five report steps that really need to happen in order to close out the landfills. The first is the Remedial Investigation Feasible Study Report, which in many cases we call the "RIFSs." They're to characterize the nature and extent of the site, they assess the risk of human health in the environment, they develop and evaluate the remedial alternatives, they select the preferred remedial alternative selection, and then at the end, we have to obtain NJDEP acceptance.

Once that occurs, we'll go on to the proposed plan which identifies preferred remedy and explains the rationale, then we go into the remedial alternatives which are evaluated. Following that, there's a 30-day public comment period, and then the document will again go in to NJDEP for review and

acceptance.

Next, the process is the decision document and it will provide a summary of the site conditions, the selected remedy, and the reason for the remedy we selected, and then again it will go in to NJDEP for acceptance. Next slide.

Next we have the Remedial Action Work Plan. There's a lot of components to this one. It includes a summary of findings and recommendations, detailed description of the remedy, required permits: air monitoring plan, health and safety plan, soil reuse plan, quality assurance plan, plans that we have to evaluate the effectiveness of the remedy, site restoration plan, performance specifications and drawings, and the construction schedule. Then after that, we will send it through NJDEP for acceptance. Next slide.

And finally, the Remedial Action Completion Report. The components are -- the document basically goes through the remedial objectives to ensure they've been met, it documents the effectiveness of the remedial action, it documents the source, the type, the quantities and the location of the fill that was used, any as-built drawings from the remedy, operation, maintenance and

monitoring plan, description of the permits obtained, and any institutional controls, which in this case would be a copy of the D notice that was filed, and then again following that, it will go in to NJDEP for acceptance. Next slide.

Scott's gonna go through the landfill locations next.

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. As Allyson stated, there are nine landfills total on the site. The main post -- there's eight landfills located throughout the site. Up to the north there are five located there, there's one located to the west, and 12 -- Landfills 12 and 14 are located to the east. The landfills are in various vegetative states. Some are grass -- have good grass cover, some have brush, and some are slighted wooded. For the most part, the landfills are gradually sloped, and some of the areas -- in most cases, they're on flat grade. Next slide, please.

In the Charles Wood area there's one landfill and that's located to the west. That's approximately two and a half acres. The landfills range anywhere from one and a half acres to approximately eight acres. Next slide.

The components of the cover system. The

cover function is to provide safety for future nonresidential use. The cover system selected for the landfills is a noncontact cover, meaning that we're gonna have a separation layer of soil two foot in thickness. Beneath the soil will be a delineation fabric, so the components from the bottom to the top will be a delineation fabric. And typically that could be an orange mesh or it could be an orange filter fabric. It's just so that if somebody happens to dig down and they hit this fabric, they know that they're at the bottom of the cover system.

Above that there will be 18 inches of certified clean fill. This will have permeability of one time tenth the amount of size centimeters per second, which is a low permeable cover. And above that it would have a six-inch layer of certified clean topsoil for vegetative establishment. The final vegetative surface would be -- typically would be a grass surface and it will be sloped to promote runoff. It would have enough of a grade where you would take into account long-term settlement. The idea is to try to maintain the current grade and scheme that exists out there presently. Next slide.

This here is a concept cross section of what the landfill would look like showing a 3 percent

grade to promote runoff so we don't have any ponding over the landfill surface which would allow for infiltration. And these are the layers shown graphically from the previous slide, they have the delineation fabric down below. We have the 18 inches of cover soil, the six inches of topsoil, and then, of course, the final vegetative establishment.

The existing landfills presently have a soil cover on them and they're at various thicknesses. The two foot of cover that we're proposing over here would be over that and above what is currently out there. Next slide.

This is pictures of various stages of the construction steps that are involved in the landfills. On this slide we're showing the construction of erosion sediment and controls. We want to keep the perimeter controls to contain any sediment from migrating from the landfill site during construction, so they place these erodent controls before they start construction. This would also provide an opportunity for staging of certain areas like stockpiling of materials, stone construction entrances to keep from tracking soils from the individual landfill sites to the surrounding roadways, and just a general staging for construction

equipment.

MS. GREEN: And this is an example, this is not Fort Monmouth, your pictures.

MR. ANDERSON: Correct. These are from other projects. Next slide, please.

In this case we would be performing clearing and grubbing. The reason we have clearing and grubbing fall by topographic survey is some of them -- some of the sites have a lot of woods and it will be difficult to do a good topographic survey so we propose to do clearing initially so we can just do our topographic survey, and then when we start construction we get into the grubbing process. The idea here is we would take the clearing materials and we set them aside and we'd grind them up, and then put them in a thin layer before we put in the final landfill cover and spread it around to a thin layer and that's the way we would lose the material on site. Next slide, please.

All right. Here where we have flat grades that exist out there, particularly in landfills FTMM 12 and 14, it's a very flat grade so we'd have to provide -- we'd want to provide a subgrade to promote runoff from over the landfilled surface. So what we'd do is we'd have placement of

subgrade material or regrading of existing material to slope that subgrade surface prior to placement of the delineation fabric and that would set the tone for what the final grade of the landfill would look like after the final cover is put on. Next slide.

Here is a typical placement of clean fill. This is a common fill layer that was done on another job site. Typically you spread it in lifts, anywhere from 6 to 12 inch lifts, and then you would follow that with compaction. The material would have to undergo sampling and analysis to make sure that it's certified clean according to the NJDEP standards. Next slide.

Here we're showing a piece of equipment that's doing a top soil layer. It's basically taking any rocks or twigs or large organics from the surface and prepping it for final hydroseed so we can have vegetation establishment. Next slide.

Here is after the topsoil is prepped. They hydroseed the surface for vegetative growth. If there were steep slopes, they would also include -- we would also include things like erosion control fabric to keep erosion from occurring from along those steep slopes. The landfills out there presently don't have long, steep slopes so for the

most part it would just probably require just your basic hydroseeding. And the last slide.

This is a typical landfill that was done with the grass surface established, good vegetative growth, guards against long-term erosion, and in general, that's how the landfill would be constructed. Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Ed is up first. Go ahead, Ed.

MR. DLUGOSZ: On the Fort Monmouth property, they've already created a stream side reinforcement with riprap of a certain size and there was a -- a fabric put before the -- you know, underneath the rock before they were laid, but it's still fairly porous that geo mesh. How are you going to handle digging or handling that situation? Because, you know, what I understood from a number of engineering firms was that the usual process is to do the capping, and then reinforcing the -- the stream side, as opposed to doing it this way. Is there gonna be excavation inside those -- inside that -- that riprap?

MR. ANDERSON: The idea would be to leave the riprap in place. That riprap is there for erosion purposes, which it functions very well doing.

We don't want to have erosion of the surface and exposing any material that could potentially be underneath there. Our approach would be to bring the fill material up to the edge of that riprap and keep the fill material to make that smooth transition to the riprap. The idea is to have a final vegetation surface or a final surface that doesn't erode and the riprap still serves as a functioning separation layer and that's where we would key in the landfill.

MR. DLUGOSZ: In your presentation you talked about the key idea is to have runoff off of the capping or the covering material, as opposed to infiltration, and then expose --

MR. ANDERSON: It minimizes infiltration. By sloping you're minimizing infiltration. You don't leave ponded water on top of the surface.

MR. DLUGOSZ: And my last question at this point is with the M-8, probably your most, I'll call "mountainous" area. Because of the construction materials that were placed there, you can see chimneys and siding and all kinds of stuff there. Is there going to be an active removal of any of that stuff that's so close to the surface? When we took our tour on a number of occasions, you know, it

was -- it was horrendous. You couldn't cap it as it was.

MR. ANDERSON: You could work that material into the surface and you just want to make sure that there's no nesting of that material where you could create voids in there which could eventually create sinkholes.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Right.

MR. ANDERSON: So the idea is you'd work that material into the -- into the landfill, and then place your final cover over there. We'd be putting two foot of cover material over the top of that.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay. With that in mind, I have one final question. Is there any idea of -- before you do the two or three phases of capping, is there any look-see to see what's underneath where you're gonna be capping the material? Is there any -- is there going to be any survey, whether it's downward facing radar or...

MR. ANDERSON: No. The idea is -- what we want to make sure is -- when working the equipment, you gotta make sure you have a stable subsurface. The equipment running over, you'll know that right away, particularly in 8. I wouldn't -- I didn't see any real -- anything that looked evident

of a soft area that you'd be concerned about. Again, I'd be more concerned about nesting of the -- of the materials on the surface to make sure that you don't have that sinkhole effect.

MR. DLUGOSZ: According to the documentation that we do have from the Army, there are -- there are barrels and possibly even tanks underneath some of this property which would, you know, cause a sinkhole. So the working of the machinery would -- would obviate any -- any sinkholes that might be there? Your compacting would eliminate any problems?

MR. ANDERSON: It should minimize it. I don't -- to what extent the materials are in there, you'd know it when you're running your equipment. I don't think this is any different than any other landfill we've worked on. You've got materials at various states.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHARNICK: I have one.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Charnick.

MR. CHARNICK: After the last step or the final vegetation cover, are there any, like, long-term restrictions on this? Like, what happens? Can someone 20 years from now come here and plant

tomatoes in this place?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, there would be restrictions put in place, I would assume, to some extent.

MS. GREEN: For all landfills you have land use controls so that would continue on. Whoever is the new developer, if the Army is no longer the owner of the property, then those land use controls would still be in place through the state.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: So in other words, the land -- if I may. In other words, the landfills are closed and in perpetuity, that location stays as a landfill on any ID, whether it's ten years from now or 50 years from now. People who go to that property to own it know that it was, at some point in time, a landfill. Is that correct?

MS. GREEN: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

Okay. Does anyone have anymore questions for this gentleman and lady?

MR. GRUSKOS: I'm just wondering if any, like, sampling wells could be left on these landfills or does that not really apply in this case?

MR. ALLEN: That's an interesting

question.

MS. RANGE: I don't know about all of them. I'm currently reviewing the Groundwater Monitoring Report which actually does have recommendations to close out the wells at certain of the landfills. I cannot remember if it recommends closing out or leaving open the wells at all of the landfills.

MR. GRUSKOS: So during the various review points in here, those are just items that fall into the joint evaluation by the DEP.

MS. RANGE: Yeah, what is going to be determined are the analytical results. If the analytical results show that there's no need to leave the wells open, then we would take a look. And if we agree, we would allow them to be closed. And that's -- that's not going to happen without substantive proof that there's nothing there and we don't anticipate anything showing up in the future either.

MR. GRUSKOS: And I had another question just related to the plant process and its execution. When work like this is being done, like closing out a landfill, is that somewhere where DEP typically has people on site looking at the work in process or is

that not normally witnessed?

MS. RANGE: It's not normally witnessed because we don't have the manpower. We'll review the proposal, but we don't typically witness.

MR. GRUSKOS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MR. DLUGOSZ: What time frame do you expect this whole process to take?

MS. GREEN: Probably a couple of years. As he showed in the chart, the various phases that you have to go through, all of the reviews, and I will speak to where we are even in the IRP program. It could take up to two years. We are trying to move things along faster now. We're still in the IRP/FS phase as we have not finalized a report yet. We have one of the landfill reports that our legal has agreed to and we're hoping to get that out in a couple of weeks.

Once we get that one, it will kind of be like a boilerplate for the other landfills pretty much to follow. They do have various issues where, you know, one landfill might have contaminants and the other one, they don't. But as far as the process for the IR/FS, once we get that one finalized and published, then we would move along quicker with

that. You have to go through your design phase and all -- every phase that they said that we had listed there, we have to review. We, the Army, has to review, the state has to review and agree with it. So it does take some time.

And we have been trying to push things along, but everything is being done in accordance with CERCLA'S regs now. But we've got the money, so that's the good part. So it will be -- it will be done.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you, sir.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: We appreciate it very much. Good report.

MR. ANDERSON: Have a good evening.

MR. ALLEN: There may be some questions from the public. Will you be here for a few more minutes?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you very much.

No. 5, discuss the IRP status, and that's Wanda Green.

MS. GREEN: And that's what I pretty much just said, how the M-4 landfill will be the first -- the M-4 landfill will be the first RIFS that

will be -- and "RIFS" is Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study -- that will be published. And as I said, we're hoping to get that out within a couple of weeks. The week of July 21st is what I was told and once you get that, it will be your boilerplate that will help you understand what we are planning to do and how we're planning to do it.

The other landfill areas, we have eight other landfills, I believe, that are complete. The reports are complete and now being reviewed. It has to be reviewed by, as I stated before, the Army, the Corps of Engineers have approximately about six to seven people who are reviewing the documents simultaneously, we have the Public Health Command, which you may recall it used to be called CHPUM. And I forgot what that acronym is for. It's the Center of Health -- well, I don't remember. But it's the same thing as the Public Health Command.

MR. CHARNICK: Prohibited materials.

MS. GREEN: That's not funny. That's not it.

But they have to review it, our legal office has to review it, and it's a lot of going back and forth with our comments. But as I stated and keep saying, that once we get this M-4 landfill RIFS

completed, I'm pretty sure that they will start rolling into your office at least every three to four weeks. That's what we are hoping.

When I get the final report -- as I have explained, every time I get a final report, I will have them come in and explain everything to you. You'll get copies of it. You'll have an opportunity to then ask questions, and that's where we are with the IRP program.

You will notice that you have a -- oh, you have a question?

MR. GRUSKOS: I just had one question. The Army part of it and the others, like, they dovetail together. The 30-day public comment period, like, how is notification of that sent out?

MS. GREEN: We have a Website. The Picatinny Website that -- I believe it's -- yeah, it's on your agenda. That's the Website you will be given. But also, whenever we have a 30-day, I always send -- or you'll get an email from Joe Pierson of Caliber when it's a FOSSIL that you need to review. You will be getting also courtesy emails from me, but it's in -- you send out a press release, I believe. Our public affairs office sends out a press release and it will let you know that it's the --

MR. GRUSKOS: And that would be, like, in this case with Parsons. When they get to those stages for a proposed plan, for example --

MS. GREEN: Yes.

MR. GRUSKOS: -- that 30-day public comment period, that's sort of circulated through your own efforts, you're saying.

MS. GREEN: Yes.

MR. GRUSKOS: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Any other question for Wanda with regard to --

MS. GREEN: I'm not finished.

MR. ALLEN: You're not finished? Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. GREEN: You have a disk that is entitled "Environmental Condition of Property Addendum on Regulated Heating Oil Tanks." I didn't have a presentation on this today because I knew we had a full agenda so the next meeting we will have a complete presentation that will probably take up most of that meeting. But we will have a presentation on it. What you're gonna find on this disk, after the ECP was completed, we found additional maps that showed where old barracks were, where some buildings were, and we had someone do a review of what we call

"white cards."

These are cards that were in our real property office that explained -- that described if the building had oil heat, if there -- well, the heating source for the building, and then that triggered, Well, was there a tank at that building? We had to cross-reference to see if there was a tank there, if it was removed. If there was a tank removed, was it fiberglass or was it steel? If it was just fiberglass and we didn't have anything that showed a steel tank was removed, then it was considered a potential that there may be an unregulated heating oil tank or "UHOT" is what we call them, at that site. So that's what you're gonna find in this report. At the next meeting there will be a complete briefing for you so I ask that you take this home.

Now, we've had problems before where we would ask the RAB members to review the documents. We are asking you to review the documents, and Frank volunteered. Send your comments to Frank and we will be prepared to answer everything. You can get answers even before the next meeting once you review the document. I've offered assistance and I'm continuing to do so for the Board members. You can

call me any time, you can email me. If you need to come over to my office, we could sit down, I could go over things with you. And I ask that you do that before you go to your representatives -- I mean, the townships that you're representing, before you go to any other meeting, before you go to the media so that you are sure to understand what it is that you are reviewing.

This is gonna be fairly new to some folks and I want to make sure that you understand before you publically give your comments or give your summary of something. I just want to make sure that you understand what it is that you are reviewing.

MR. DLUGOSZ: You mean on this disk?

MS. GREEN: Yes. And it has a map on there so if you are not able to print out maps that large, I can -- we can sit down, as I said, in my office and we can go over the maps and you can see things a little easier.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Your office is right here in this building?

MS. GREEN: Building 286. It's Garrison for now. It's gonna change in a couple of months.

So that's all I have.

MR. ALLEN: You are now finished?

MS. GREEN: I am now finished, sir.
MR. ALLEN: Thank you.
No. 6, we talked about the round table discussion. Are there items to be brought up?
Frank, do you have something, sir?
MR. BARRICELLI: Yes, I do. I have a presentation.
MR. ALLEN: Oh.
MR. DLUGOSZ: This is unexpected.
MR. BARRICELLI: I'm going to have to go fast because there's a lot of information here.
Okay. This is a site that required a closer look since Wampum Brook runs alongside of it and is upstream of Fort Monmouth. The RAB toured Fort Monmouth on May 2012, during which a stop was made at Metallurgical Industries; however, some members left the tour before the site. Next slide.
The Location. Metallurgical Industries was located at 1 Cold Stream Way in Tinton Falls. Cold Stream Way was the company driveway leading in from Pinebrook Road. The area on the other side of Pinebrook Road is shown on this map as Park Fort Monmouth. After this map was published, the tract itself at the railroad line was given to Tinton Falls and is now called Pinebrook Park. The eastern edge

of the Metallurgical Industries site borders on Wampum Brook. Metallurgical Industries no longer exists as a company and the building has been demolished. While it was operating, Metallurgical Industries leased and did not own the land it was on. Next slide.

As the first bullet indicates, the site was suspected of being a source of contamination, but we didn't have detailed information. The next two bullets are addressed on the slides that follow. Next slide.

Mr. Dlugosz provided a briefing to the RAB on 7/12/2012, and this is the page from Mr. Dlugosz's briefing dealing with Metallurgical Industries. The site was taken from the EPA Website -- the information was taken from the EPA Website. It concluded Metallurgical Industries was not responsible for contaminating Wampum Lake. Unfortunately, this Website only had data entered for one year of the site's discharges and does not provide the information needed to adequately assess this site's impact on Wampum Brook and lake. This Website indicates some more information was available from NJDEP. Next slide.

Okay. This was a detailed study from --

a detailed study performed by an agency from the Property Moving Ground. RAB members may remember that this was a study that was critical of the critics of the Fort Monmouth Sewage Treatment Plant. The study gave high marks to the Fort Monmouth Sewage Plant operations. The Charles Wood sewage plant actually had better capability to process sediments than the northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewer Plant that the Army eventually connected to. The observations of Wampum Brook clearly showed that something was not right upstream of Fort Monmouth. Next slide.

One of the observations done by they study was that there was an oil spill downstream of Fort Monmouth on Wampum Brook that was being cleaned up by the County. This was a picture showing that site. It's not that important for the rest of these. Keep going. Next slide.

This is a satellite view, a current satellite view available on Google Earth. The cleared area is where the building and parking lots were located. Next slide, please.

Metallurgical Industries was up here. The brook runs right here, crosses into what was Fort Monmouth, it is now Monmouth Park. If you view the

site today from ground level, there is a raised plateau of fill about one or two feet high where the locals said a building was planned but never started. That's where that area was.

Okay. This is the oldest photo of the site available on Google Earth and shows buildings, parking lots, and the area to the rear where much of the discharges occurred. Notice that the area to the southwest of the wooded parcel shows clearings, open clearings. Those are locations where various types of trash were dumped that may not be related to Metallurgical Industries. That's the building, and this is the area right behind it where problems occurred. Next slide.

I did an Internet search about Metallurgical Industries, not much information on the company. This 1993 press release indicates the company was bankrupt, not paying its rent, and disposing of assets. A search of the Internet about the gaining companies didn't get any results so the people who got their assets, I can't locate them. Next.

I did make an Open Public Records Act request about Metallurgical Industries and visited the NJDEP file center, they were very accommodating.

More than four large boxes of reports, memos, and letters were available. Next.

Metallurgical Industries opened in 1967. Metal recovery means the recycling of metals contained in previously manufactured items. One recovery technique was a patented process called "cold streaming" whereby fragments of materials smashed into each other until metals were reduced to powder. Other techniques were used depending upon the nature of items being recycled. The operations at Metallurgical Industries was equipment which smashed, shredded, and chemically dissolved items containing the metals which were to be recovered. Those operations used toxic materials in the recovery process and generated various toxic wastes. The plant also processed an unspecified amount of raw water. Next slide.

Problems soon resulted from Metallurgical Industries operations. Both the sanitary sewer system and the industrial waste treatment discharge in Wampum Brook. The description of the waste handling process used when the plant first opened was rudimentary and prone to failure due to both inadequate design and human error. Reoccurring fish kills, odor, and color of the stream

were proof that the system was not working. Next slide.

Because of the problem, the redesign of the industrial waste processing facility was initiated. The redesign included a lagoon for acid waste containing metals. Next slide.

Numerous problems were detected during inspections. The slides only include sample representatives of the problems detected. The redesigned industrial waste treatment system that was built did not resolve all the problems, so modifications were again made. I suspect that raising the discharge pipe to increase capacity without increasing the thickness of the lagoon walls may have led to the wall failing. Metallurgical Industries did not repair the failed lagoon and continued to pump industrial waste effluent into the swampy area of the rear of the plant. What this says is in '76 when the wall failed, they ran a pipe off the back of the plant beyond the lagoon and discharged to the surface running into the ground. Next slide.

There was considerable dumping and burying of industrial trash at the site. The discharge liquid waste was a few inches deep in the

swamp and that area was swept by rainwater flowing to Wampum Brook. I found a piece of the slag that was supposedly cleaned up and this is some of the slag typical of what was being dumped into the swamp. The swamp contained acid wastes that was not completely neutralized. Next slide.

This is the first of several administrative and legal actions taken by NJDEP dealing with Metallurgical Industries. Next slide.

This one's self-explanatory. You can read it yourself. Next slide.

Notice in the second bullet that Metallurgical Industries was discharging industrial waste into the Regional Sanitary Sewer Treatment System. Next slide.

This one's self-explanatory. Next slide.

Okay. A summary of what this slide is is that since the company was not effectively cleaning the site, the state was gonna step in and take over and initiate the cleanup and bill the owner. Next slide.

The first bullet voices NJDEP concerns about the timeliness of Metallurgical Industries performing work that was agreed to. It was not clear

in the documents reviewed how much of the work was actually performed even after agreements were made. It was not clear how much of the site remediation was done by the property owner Sudler Companies before the property was sold. Again, second bullet, the company goes in Chapter 11, boom. The property owner is now responsible for cleanup. Next slide.

The next slide is self-explanatory. Next slide.

In going through the files, it was evident considerable efforts were put in by the Tinton Falls health officer, Monmouth County health officials, and the NJDEP into investigating Metallurgical Industries site and operations, and files show that the company did not adequately respond to the remediation actions that were directed. So the site is no longer being monitored by NJDEP, they were told to hire a licensed professional to oversee their work, and that's being done. Next slide.

I walked the site on May 18th, entering the site in the middle of the raised area. I continued to the lagoon and swamp. I then went due south to the location where the main and feeder branches of Wampum Brook join. I continued westward

observing dirt trails and trash of various types. Heavy growth of poison ivy restricted the areas I could inspect. After walking the site and driving around the perimeter of the wooded area, it seems likely that the heavy rainwater runoff to the south of the plant was made worse by the facility being built in a location that blocked the downhill flow from the northwest corner of the wooded tract. There was no culvert draining runoff from the corner directly to the stream. Water from that area flowed around the southern end of the building right into the -- right through the lagoon and swamp area.

What I'm trying to point out is if you go to the site, right along this area is a steep drop-off here. Before the plant was ever built, water would have flowed right here directly downhill to the low point, which is Wampum Brook, heading towards the lake. When they put in the plant and the roadway and the parking lots, this area gets elevated. Water now goes this way, this way, this way to the stream, so it just accelerated, put more water behind the building than would have flowed had the building not been there. It's just -- it was a bad siting of the building without putting a culvert to go directly there and relieve some of that water

flow. Next slide.

This is where the back of the plant was located. The lagoon right here was just to the south of the plant building, and this area here is the swamp also called the "dead zone." Next slide.

Okay. This is the end of the lagoon that collapsed. The lagoon discharge pipe is inside the fenced enclosure. The masonry spillway was built sometime after the collapse. It was not clear if or when the lagoon was repaired or used after the collapse.

Next page is a picture of the discharge pipe. You can see where it's still -- concrete is exposed. This entire bank collapsed and I believe -- well, that was the flow that went into the brook, in addition to the stuff that was being pumped from the pipe. Next slide.

This is the swamp. You could see the -- Wampum Brook is down here. There's evidence of heavy water flow going from west to east down to that brook. The effects are just very visible. This is sediment. It's not any kind of liquid or anything. The site was dry the day I was there except the streams were moving very, very fast. Next slide.

This is some of the debris dumped in the

wooded area. There are several locations where old boilers and other metal debris are visible. Next slide.

This is where the main branch and the feeder branch of Wampum Brook merge, and this is Wampum Brook heading towards Eatontown. Next slide.

Okay. This is an I-chart. This photo with the added information was prepared by Monmouth County Health Department shortly after the May 2012 RAB tour of the Fort. It used two-foot GIS data overlaid on an aerial photo to generate a view of the watershed area for Wampum Lake. Wampum Lake is visible in the upper right.

Okay. The Charles Wood area is shown by the straight line areas to the left of the lake. There was a small error depicting the Fort's perimeter, Mitchell Drive got left out. So right here, there should be a little bump out for Mitchell Drive, okay?

The Metallurgical Industries site is visible from Pinebrook Road. It's that white little patch right there. The source -- the mainstream of Wampum Brook drains -- the retention pond is located to the south of Highway 35. This is 36. I'm sorry. To makes some sense out of this, this is Highway 36,

Parkway, Route 18 ramps. These retention ponds weren't there before the 1990s, they're fairly new. And this area, this ragged line here, this is the watershed area for Wampum Brook. So all the roadways and parking lots within this area drain towards Wampum Brook.

On the plus side, after the 1990s, the state highway department started putting in lots of retention ponds. That's a big plus. If there was a lot of roadway contamination in the past, in the '60s, '70s, because the Parkway opened in the 1953 time frame, '54, a lot of that has been kind of taken care of by putting in retention ponds. It's a place for the water to discharge into the ground and a place for the sediment to stay and not flow into the stream. So that is a big plus having the state put in lots of retention ponds. They're redoing the intersection again as we speak. That's a big plus to keeping down the amount of roadway runoff because this area is so small and there's so many parking lots and roadways in this area. Next.

Okay. This is my briefing to the RAB in April 2012, it was greeted with lots of shots. Concluded that automotive-related runoff was the primary cause of heavy metals contamination of Wampum

Lake. I have to say, I went back -- I did go back. I've been watching the Internet and I was very interested that the states of California, Oregon, and Washington now are basically outlawing the use of Copper in brake pads.

Before the 1990s, break pads were asbestos, after the 1990s, they went to metallic brake pads and they put lots of Copper in them, okay? It's not only a hazard to the water supply, asbestos to copper, but the guys who work on brakes, if you've ever gone to an automotive shop and watched people pull the wheels off, the first thing they do is hit each wheel with an air hose. It puts a big cloud of dust from the brakes in their face. So those states have moved to outlaw the use of metals in brakes because that is estimated like 15 percent of the metals that get into the western water bodies they believed was due -- 50 percent was due to automobile brake runoff. Very big problem.

Again, I spoke very quickly because we're running out of time. I did go to that cite because it always bothered me that we never really talked about it. I wish I had done this in 2007, because that site was not good in the way it was pumping its effluent directly into the brook for many

years, not doing anything about it, and basically stymieing any effort by the people who were trying to do the right thing on getting them to do their job.

Anybody have any questions? I do have the number if you want to go visit NJDEP and look up stuff.

MR. ALLEN: Could you put the lights on, please?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay. Just to be fair, in my briefing that you referred to, I tried to get -- I put in an OPRA request and did not get any response to get this information at that time. It was only three months after your presentation. And how, you know --

MR. BARRICELLI: Okay.

MR. DLUGOSZ: I just wanted to let you know that what I had was what was available at the time.

MR. BARRICELLI: Right.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Also, there was the -- the first one was the ETA that you showed at the beginning of the presentation, and then there was a letter from DEP representatives that I included in that briefing. That was as much information as I could get from the NJDEP at that time, which, in

fact, said that, you know, Metallurgical Industries, at least as far as what she knew and her case manager knew was not a major cause. So without that OPRA request filled --

MR. BARRICELLI: Yeah, you were left with nothing. I mean -- yeah.

MS. GREEN: But no, I can't let that go. On several occasions -- because we have been beating this and beating this at every meeting. On several occasions we asked you, Have you done the study? Because you kept telling everyone in this RAB that Metallurgic (sic) had no contamination issues, that they only had a little bit of chromium and everything came from Fort Monmouth. You said that on more than one occasion. I asked you, Have you done any type of studies? Have you seen any reports from Metallurgic? You told me that you had at meetings. Frank has asked you and I have asked you to please bring it to the meeting so that it won't be just a hearsay thing and we could actually see it.

Now, I don't -- I don't know why the state wouldn't allow you to come because it is a public record that you can go and look at all these reports from Metallurgic and see all of the contamination that they have there. So to say that,

you know, you weren't allowed, we've been asking for it.

MR. DLUGOSZ: And as I said, the briefing was three months after yours and in the time frame, okay, I did not get a response. In fact, they -- they mentioned that they didn't have any materials.

Now, whether that was true, I didn't pursue it past that time, okay? So I gave you an honest rendition of the information that I had available.

MR. BARRICELLI: Okay. Well, I got some more information, then, that you can look at.

MR. DLUGOSZ: I just wanted to say that.

MR. ALLEN: Richard, sir.

MR. GRUSKOS: Okay. I just had a question. Like, so with, you know, this Metallurgical Industries, I realize it's off the site of the property, but when did you say it actually ceased operation and who has responsibility for the site now?

MR. BARRICELLI: Well, from what I can gather --

MR. ALLEN: Never on the Fort. Sorry, Frank.

MR. BARRICELLI: Never on the Fort. It's across the street.

MR. GRUSKOS: Information and purpose as far as I'm concerned.

MR. BARRICELLI: Right. It opened in '67. By 1993, you know, it's gone into bankruptcy and shut down. I think probably the worst time from what I can gather just going through the documents very, very fast was that it was from opening through the '70s into the early '80s when you had just stuff being poured in. Because as time went on, I think the company was just not able to financially keep going because of the expense of what was happening so that's why by '93, things went up.

MR. GRUSKOS: So at this time, who has -- to the best of your knowledge, who has responsibility of the site?

MR. BARRICELLI: The current owners is Metallurgical -- not Metallurgical, it's Mid-Monmouth Realty Corporation owns that property. They are on the hook. They are paying a company to come monitor the wells. And, again, there's still stuff flying around, and I know there's still stuff in the groundwater 'cause the well cages are there. But there's no remediation that you could see actively

ongoing, it's just wells in the ground. And they still have to do more ground cleaning from what I could see and looking at reports.

MR. ALLEN: Does anyone else have questions for Frank and his report?

Frank --

MR. BARRICELLI: I hope it helps.

MR. ALLEN: -- you did quite a bid of work on this. I would compliment you on behalf of the Board.

MR. BARRICELLI: Well, again --

MR. ALLEN: It's interesting to me because I had no realization that this thing was contaminated.

MR. BARRICELLI: I wish I had done it seven years ago.

MR. ALLEN: Well, we've been talking about Wampum Brook and contamination to it -- can I finish, please. We've been talking about contamination of Wampum Brook and I think I've been on this committee for about seven years and I think we've been talking about it for at least the last five. So to find out there were other sources of contamination to the Wampum Brook which past through the Fort property is very interesting to me. Sorry

to interrupt you, sir.

MR. DLUGOSZ: I also, as part of my briefing, mentioned the 2005 report that sort of was aimed at the -- at the new owner. That was -- that was part of it also. But one thing that is not clear by that, Wampum Brook, as it comes on the south side of the railroad track for the most part enters downstream the -- as I heard it called "Shrewsbury" or "Parker Creek" that went through -- it was not affected by the -- by the Metallurgical Industries and there were instances of chromium, hexavalent chromium and other heavy metals that were produced that were in that -- that stream, okay? That were also -- whether it was background, there was new materials created. New contaminants created as a result of Fort Monmouth even though there was background information.

MR. BARRICELLI: I don't remember that in anything I've read.

MR. ALLEN: Neither do I.

MS. RANGE: Neither do I.

MS. GREEN: And you both have said this and this is where I come again to when you make statements like that, that you should have your information to be able to show what you're talking

about because we don't know what you're talking about. And I'm not talking about your report, I'm talking about a report that you're saying that we created and it had these exceedances of these various contaminants. That's what we need to see because we don't know what you're talking about.

MR. DLUGOSZ: There were sections within the -- what is it called? ECP-1 and ECP-2 where I got some of that information and B also had the levels that were --

MS. GREEN: Exceedances?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Exceedances that were at the exit from the Fort.

MS. GREEN: Well, that chart there should show what you're talking about. That one is the chart that shows the B and the results from it.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay. I will --

MS. GREEN: We'll take a look at that after the meeting. That has the results, and then you can show me what you're talking about, because I haven't seen it.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, Richard.

MR. GRUSKOS: Yeah, I just want to recap one aspect of it. The 2010 sediment data you were talking about in the first presentation mentions that

they were investigating Wampum Brook for Cadmium, Chromium and Nickel where it enters the Fort property, right? So by 2010, which would be after the date that Metallurgical Industries ceased operation as near as I can tell, these levels weren't found to be exceptional for the first report, for the ecological evaluation. So it sounds like the stream sediment data that was taken at that point was within reasonable numbers, right? That was Page 20 of the first presentation. Because I was sort of interested in that at just the before and after. We've done similar things trying to look at other properties, you know, where water enters and where water leaves just to get an idea. These are contributions from it. So it appears from this -- what I had understood from the first presentation is that it's not horrific, you know, by the screening criteria. They were lower levels than human exposure. So I'm sort of interested in that.

MR. DLUGOSZ: I can read a section out of the B that says what I -- what I said. In my presentation of July of 2012, I excerpted from the B, a statement about the Charles Wood area downgrading contaminants. "Sediment samples were collected from two test locations downgrading the map of the CWA

activities. One, CWA SD-1 was collected from the north branch" as you just specified as the Shrewsbury or Parker Creek and collected -- okay. The two sample sites were added. The other one was at the south branch of the Wampum which is where it traveled along the railroad, and then exited the property. Fort property.

It says, "Metals. A total of 21 metals were detected in the sediment from the CWA downgrading samples: Aluminium, Tantalum, Arsenic, Beryllium, Cadmium, Chromium, Cobalt, Copper, Iron, Lead, Magnesium, Manganese, Mercury, et cetera. Seven of these metals were applicable freshwater or saltwater sediment criteria and were found at concentrations at one or more sediment sampling exceeding the criteria: Cadmium, Chromium, and Selenium were in both samples. Arsenic, Mercury, Lead in the north branch, and Nickel in the south branch exceeded the criteria." This is from the B.

And then it goes on to talk about VOCs, SVOCs, and PCBs and many of the things that Frank talked about and many of the things that the other person talked about were non-metal, heavy metal items. So here I was concentrating in the whole briefing on the heavy metals and this excerpt from

the B, verbatim, said that there were exceedances there at the exits from the properties.

MS. GREEN: And then we will take a look and you will see exactly what the numbers are and an exceedance can be .01. It would be still considered an exceedance. So we will take a look at that map there and we'll see where this -- the hexachromium (sic)?

MR. DLUGOSZ: Hexavalent, right.

MS. GREEN: Hexavalent.

MR. DLUGOSZ: But that was only one.

MR. CHARNICK: Yeah, he explained that.

MR. DLUGOSZ: It's just an isotope of the chromium.

MR. CHARNICK: He explained it's a low level.

MS. GREEN: Oh, we don't need an explanation of what the metal is, but we can go over that.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Okay.

MS. GREEN: We will go over it because you can't just take one little excerpt out and not look at the rest of the report. And that's --

MR. DLUGOSZ: Well, I did look at the rest of the report and the values are put on here

which that...

MS. RANGE: But just real quick, as Allan indicated, yes, some of the numbers exiting the site were above the screening criteria, but they were not above background which entered the site. We can't require the Fort to cleanup greater than background.

MR. DLUGOSZ: I'm not requiring the Fort -- as I said, I was looking for, you know, sources of it. Now we're finding that there may be more from Metallurgical than I expected from the research, but --

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MR. DLUGOSZ: -- we'll look at that afterwards.

MR. BARRICELLI: If I may. That report, the 1975 report that said, Hey, there's problems upstream also indicated that there were other pipes entering from the other side from other plants. Right now a plumbing company is taking over a lot of buildings over there. I don't know historically back in the 1960-1970 time frame what industries were in the buildings on the other side of Wampum Brook from Metallurgical Industries and if they had pipes in there. I don't have any information on that either.

So you know, it's a long time ago and we can't -- it's hard to find the information, so there's other sources.

MR. DLUGOSZ: My main concern of this whole thing is, is the contamination in Wampum Lake dangerous to the health of the people if there are no fishing, you know, signs up around there.

MS. RANGE: Two more things. Keep in mind it's screening criteria, not cleanup criteria. And secondly, we're here for Fort Monmouth and what Fort Monmouth has generated.

MR. DLUGOSZ: Right. That's understood.

MR. ALLEN: Good. Okay. Any other discussion with regard to the round table?

MR. CHARNICK: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, sir.

MR. CHARNICK: I just have a simple question on sort of a new topic.

MR. ALLEN: Oh.

MR. CHARNICK: Just a simple -- it's not a layperson's briefing or anything. As part of the formal Installation Restoration Program and the marina site, okay, was there any soil removed from the -- from the marina site in preparation for the leasing of the marina or anything like that?

MS. GREEN: Was there soil removed for -- just for the leasing?

MR. CHARNICK: Well, was there any soil removed at all from the marina site?

MS. GREEN: You are speaking about site M-16, which is the former --

MR. CHARNICK: The Fort Monmouth marina that's been in the papers recently.

MS. GREEN: It was a former pesticide site and we have had two meetings ago -- we did discuss this. You may remember Rob gave a complete presentation on it. There is a rapper that is being -- soon to be given to the state for a final review. We've had sampling performed. Everything is within compliance. There was soil removed years ago from that site when it was identified as a contaminated site. But if your question is, is it considered a contaminated site --

MR. CHARNICK: No.

MS. GREEN: -- we did not remove soil just for transferring of the --

MR. CHARNICK: No. My question was that a source, a reliable source told me, okay --

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MR. CHARNICK: -- that soil was removed

from the marina area and put on the Eatontown golf course.

Now, I'm asking --

MS. GREEN: I don't know who your reliable source is, but --

MR. CHARNICK: I'm asking as a matter of record, did that happen or not happen?

MS. GREEN: No.

MR. CHARNICK: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Can we now move on to Item 7, unless there's some other questions. Item 7 is discuss the meeting schedule, and I see one is scheduled for Thursday, October the 2nd, 2014. Does everybody have that? Good.

The next item is with regard to the Picatinny Army Web page is where you get your information about meetings and other vital information.

Now, No. 8 on our agenda, the public comment section. As we have changed the speaking time from three minutes to five minutes about two meetings ago, I will first call upon Sara Breslow. Would you please come up and tell us where you're from and what you'd like to discuss, ma'am?

MS. BRESLOW: Sara Breslow, 11 Lake

Drive, Eatontown.

I guess as a housekeeping thing, your site's impossible to find. You can't search for "RAB" and find it, so could you please ask your IT people to make sure that if someone searches for the "Restoration Advisory Board," the site will come up? One of our councilmen couldn't find it, I don't believe the reporters could find it, the agenda was not available to the public, Phamera has discontinued its link to RAB. I'd like to know what specific media the notices have appeared in or whether you just send out press releases and hope that it's printed.

As for -- first off, since Ms. Green jumped on Mr. Dlugosz's report as hearsay, you were quite willing to accept Mr. Barricelli's former report which was totally unscientific regarding pollution from chain link fences and tires -- excuse me, but we did talk about respect, didn't we -- because it suits your purpose. Metallurgic (sic) Industries may have poured contaminants into one branch of the Wampum from 20 to 25 years, but the Fort, a much larger industry, poured tons and tons of contaminants down the drain for 30 years with three paths to the lake.

This whole meeting is dedicated to convincing us that the Fort has no responsibility, but it's only served to show us the likelihood that the Fort still has the lion's share of responsibility. If heavy metals settled downstream and it's from 50 years ago and you repeatedly said the lake isn't part of Mr. Motter's report, there's absolutely no science that was presented today to eliminate the Fort as a source of contamination in Wampum Lake.

When Mr. Motter said, no human exposure, how is that possible? The fish there are contaminated. The fish aren't marked for whether that contamination came from upstream Fort Monmouth or from Metallurgic Industries. I think this is still something that requires testing in the lake one way or another. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Now, I'm sorry, Miss, what did you want? You wanted an email address? I'm sorry.

MS. BRESLOW: No. I'm saying if you go online and search for "RAB" --

MR. ALLEN: But the one in the minutes here, this one here doesn't work? I haven't been on it in a while, so...

MS. BRESLOW: It does work, but it doesn't work if you go online and search for "RAB."

MR. ALLEN: Oh, you can't scroll down and get "RAB."

MS. BRESLOW: You can't put in "RAB" and search and find a site come up that will get you to that site.

MR. ALLEN: He may have an answer for you.

MR. RIDER: If you put in "Fort Monmouth RAB," you will find the site. It's the first one that's listed in BING.

MS. BRESLOW: I've put in "Restoration Advisory Board, Fort Monmouth." So I'm saying as an IT, you should put in multiple ways because everybody's having trouble finding it. And what comes up are "RAB Minutes," but they -- but if you're coming to a meeting and you haven't gotten the minutes and you can't find the agenda online, you don't know where to look.

MS. GREEN: I will answer that. Fort Monmouth is closed. We do not have an IT department. Picatinny has graciously agreed to continue the Website and to continue to upload documents whenever they are available or it's needed. I cannot direct

Picatinny how to do their Website.

This is Tim Rider who is from our public affairs office. When I send something to him, he puts it on the Website and what he's saying is that what he just did a search for, we don't have the old dual that we used to have here that would have created all of that just for this installation. We don't have that luxury anymore. We do have a Website, it's on every agenda for anyone who's been here before. That's why we have so many representatives from the local towns so that they, who should know what the Website is because every meeting they're given the agenda, every meeting --

MS. BRESLOW: They probably do --

MS. GREEN: -- they're given the minutes.

MS. BRESLOW: -- but that doesn't mean the public can find it.

MS. GREEN: Please don't speak over me when I'm speaking.

MS. BRESLOW: Well, stop saying ridiculous things.

MS. GREEN: Okay. You're done.

MS. BRESLOW: I'm not done. I'm just saying, where do you advertise?

MS. GREEN: Thank you.
MS. BRESLOW: Where do you advertise? Where has this meeting actually been printed?
MS. GREEN: Thank you.
Who's the next person on the --
MS. BRESLOW: Yeah, it's a one way street.
MR. ALLEN: First initial is W, last name is K-a-l, I think it's, o-o-s-s. Kaloosss?
I don't see him. Okay.
So the Web page is here. I've gotten on it, but not in the last three or four months, so I don't know what the problem is.
MR. RIDER: There's somethings I can clarify about the Web page.
MR. ALLEN: Okay. Please. Would you announce who you are and what you do?
MR. RIDER: My name is Timothy Rider, I am chief of public affairs for Picatinny Arsenal at the Fort Monmouth RAB. I was formally a Garrison public affairs officer for Fort Monmouth.
When I was Garrison public affairs officer for Fort Monmouth, I would do updates for the Fort Monmouth Web page when it was on the Fort Monmouth Web address, www -- I can't remember it.

Sorry. But it was a subset of the Fort Monmouth Website where all the rest of the Fort Monmouth information was, its organizations, including Garrison and the Website.

I was, like many people, transferred to other Army installations. I transferred to Picatinny. When that happened, there was a discussion between the Army personnel about how some of the missions that were at Fort Monmouth were gonna be handled and the Website was brought up. We looked at how we might be able to transfer the data from the Fort Monmouth Website because it had already been created. As a matter of fact, I was involved very heavily in its creation for the Fort Monmouth site. So I arranged to have a CD of all of the Restoration Advisory Board Website sent to Picatinny, and then recreated on the Picatinny site. There was no deviation from what was on the Fort Monmouth site to the Picatinny site, all of that data was transferred from the Fort Monmouth site. In other words, there were servers on Fort Monmouth that held that data. That data was copied onto that disk, it was sent to me by mail, I received it, gave it to the Picatinny IT people, they loaded all that data onto their servers so that it still resides there.

Additionally, as Wanda mentioned, she sends me requests to make updates and when she gets approved minutes, I load those minutes up onto the site, as she's done within the last month, I believe. The most recent set of approved minutes that were sent to me, I loaded up. And I also support the Fort Monmouth RAB by sending out the news releases to the greater media newspapers, the HUB, the Atlanticville, the Asbury Park Press, Two River Times, and an environmental site that I can't remember the name of. I could find out for you, though. I think it's Clean Water Action.

So that's what happened. And we are still maintaining the site, we're still updating it and we might be able to get more information, you know, when we get these loaded up. We have some difficulty with the IT ability to load some of these files from CD because they're in PDF format and they don't always transfer very well to hyperlinks and to websites, but we can always put the full data on there. It's not always easily searchable.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I think we'll move on.

I'd like to thank the people from Fort Monmouth Ecological Environmental for sticking around

a little later tonight. I didn't know what the public might have wanted. So you folks --

MS. GREEN: From the DEP.

MR. ALLEN: From the New Jersey DEP, thank you. And the other landfill design construction, you folks did a great job in your presentations. Thank you for sticking around.

All right. At this point in time, I'll entered a motion to adjourn this meeting. Frank has made a motion. Is there a second?

MR. OWENS: Second.

MR. ALLEN: Frank again.

Is there discussion with regard to the motion?

Hearing no discussion, all those in favor of adjourning the meeting at this time signify by saying "I."

(All members respond in the affirmative.)

MR. ALLEN: Opposed?

So ordered. Thank you, folks.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, LYDIA F. McDONNELL, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
License No. 30XI00155900
My Commission expires June 30, 2016
Dated: July 17, 2014