

October 31, 1995

Commanding Officer  
Southern Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Attn: David Cabiness; Code 1869  
P.O. Box 190010  
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

Re: Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant  
Fridley, Minnesota

Dear David:

Enclosed, for your use, are two copies of the notes from Restoration Advisory Board meeting #3, held at the Fridley Municipal Center on October 12, 1995. These final notes address review comments on draft notes provided to RMT by the Navy. Other copies of these notes have been distributed according to the attached Distribution List.

Persons receiving copies of these meeting notes are requested to note that the next Restoration Advisory Board meeting will be held at the **Fridley Municipal Center, 6431 University Avenue N.E.**, on **January 11, 1996, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,



Eric Gredell, P.E.  
Project Manager

Enclosure



RMT, INC. — MADISON, WI  
744 HEARTLAND TRAIL = 53717-1934  
P.O. Box 8923 = 53708-8923  
608/831-4444 = 608/831-3334 FAX

**DISTRIBUTION LIST  
MEETING NOTES  
RAB MEETING #3  
October 12, 1995**

	<u>Number of Copies</u>
City of Fridley Department of Public Works Fridley Municipal Center Attn: Mark Winson <i>John Winson</i> 6431 University Avenue, NE Fridley, MN 55432	1
Kerry Morrow NAVSEA Technical Representative Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant 5001 East River Road Minneapolis, MN 55421-1406	1
Naval Sea Systems Command Attn: Steven Hoffman C-SEA 654-C Washington, SC 20362-5101	1
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Site Response Section Ground Water and Solid Waste Division Attn: David Douglas 520 Lafayette Road St. Paul, MN 55155	1
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region V Remedial & Enforcement Response Branch OH/MN Section, Unit 1 (HSRM-6J) Attn: Tom Bloom 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604-3590	1
United Defense LP Armament Systems Division Attn: Doug Hildre 4800 East River Road Minneapolis, MN 55421	1

**DISTRIBUTION LIST  
MEETING NOTES  
RAB MEETING #3  
October 12, 1995**

Number of Copies

Metropolitan Council Environmental Services  
Attn: Leo H. Hermes, P.E./Michael Flaherty  
Mears Park Centre  
230 East 5th Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

1

Environmental Services  
Anoka County Courthouse  
Attn: Robert Hutchison, Director  
325 East Main Street  
Anoka, MN 55303

1

Minneapolis Water Works  
Attn: Mr. Adam Kramer  
4300 Marshall Street, NE  
Minneapolis, MN 55421

1

Defense Contract Management Office - Minneapolis  
Attn: LTC Jan Frye  
4800 East River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55421-5094

1

Commanding Officer  
Southern Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Attn: David Cabiness; Code 1869  
P.O. Box 190010  
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

2

**Minutes of Meeting  
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting #3  
October 12, 1995**

**Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant  
Fridley, Minnesota**

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting #3 was held at the Fridley Municipal Center in Fridley, Minnesota, on October 12, 1995. A copy of the agenda distributed at the meeting and an attendance list are attached.

**A. Introductions**

1. Kerry Morrow opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. All meeting participants introduced themselves.
2. Co-chairmen for the RAB are:  
  
David Cabiness - Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southern Division  
John Flora - Director of Public Works, City of Fridley  
Kerry Morrow - Technical Representative, Naval Sea Systems Command  
Pat Mosites - Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Engineering Field Activity-  
Midwest
3. There were no comments on the meeting notes for RAB meeting #2 held on July 13, 1995.

**B. Actions Since Last Meeting**

1. Caroline Voelkers reported that the NPDES permit has not yet been issued by the MPCA. A meeting was held on August 14, 1995, attended by representatives of the MPCA, the City of Minneapolis, the City of Fridley, the Navy, and other organizations. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss concerns regarding the draft NPDES permit issued by the MPCA. At the meeting, no technical concerns regarding the planned discharge of treated groundwater to the river were raised. However, the planned discharge was opposed by representatives of the cities of Minneapolis and Fridley on the basis of "public perceptions." It was noted at the August meeting that a letter will be sent to the Navy from the (Minneapolis) City Engineer's office stating that the City Engineer will not contest the final NPDES permit. However, the Minneapolis Mayor's office may formally protest issuing the final permit.

Caroline Voelkers said that if the MPCA receives written comments objecting to the MPCA issuing the final permit, a ruling on the permit will be made by the Minnesota Pollution Control Board (the Board) at their meeting on December 20, 1995. If the NIROP NPDES permit will be on the Board's December meeting agenda, the MPCA will distribute notices by mail in early December advising of the meeting. Gary Eddy said it may also be possible for the MPCA to issue the final permit without bringing the permit before the Board for a ruling.

Caroline Voelkers said the final NPDES permit will require design documents for the planned groundwater treatment facility (GWTF) to be submitted to the MPCA for review and approval. Gary Eddy said that in their review of the design documents, the MPCA will ensure that the concerns of the City of Minneapolis regarding the possibility that inadequately treated groundwater may be discharged to the river upstream of the Water Treatment Plant intake are adequately addressed. He said the MPCA considered including a special condition in the permit that would require the GWTF to automatically shut down the groundwater flow and the entire treatment facility if a malfunction of the treatment equipment occurred. However, the pending final permit does not include this condition. The final permit also will not include discharge limits for iron or manganese.

The final NPDES permit will include an optional discharge point location for the treated groundwater, downstream of the Water Treatment Plant intake. The optional "downstream" discharge location would include discharge concentration limits that are generally somewhat higher than the limits for the planned discharge location near the NIROP, which is greater than 5,000 feet upstream of the Water Treatment Plant intake. Dilution in the river was not considered by the MPCA in determining the concentration limits for either discharge location option.

David Cabiness said the Navy requested the City of Minneapolis to evaluate the feasibility of constructing a new sewer line from the location of the proposed GWTF at the NIROP to a suitable location downstream of the water plant intake where the treated NIROP groundwater could be discharged to the river. The city performed this evaluation, and sent a map to the Navy showing a possible route for a sewer line. The length of a new sewer line for this purpose would be approximately 9,800 feet. Several obstacles would be encountered in design and construction of a new sewer line. The existing storm sewers on the water plant property could not be used to provide a portion of the required sewer line distance; the water plant storm sewers do not have adequate capacity for the increased flow. Construction of a new sewer line on water plant property would also not be allowed. A major Amoco Oil Company pipeline is known to exist in the area of construction for a new sewer line. It is likely that the sewer would have to cross the oil pipeline at least at one location. John Flora said there are a number of other existing buried utility lines that would have to be crossed by a new sewer.

David Cabiness said that a rough cost estimate prepared by the Navy for a new sewer line indicated a construction cost of at least \$500,000, assuming there would be minimal interferences from existing utilities and the oil pipeline, and not including the cost of obtaining easements for the construction. The Navy offered to discuss the possibility of sharing the cost of constructing a new sewer line with the City of Minneapolis; however, the city said it could not fund such a project.

2. David Cabiness said that two new extraction wells were started up in June, bringing the total number of operating wells to six. An evaluation of the improved effectiveness of contaminated groundwater capture over the entire site resulting from the upgraded extraction well system was recently completed. A draft report presenting the results of this capture re-evaluation was delivered to the USEPA and MPCA representatives prior to this meeting. Eric Gredell presented a summary of the report findings for the meeting attendees.

3. Tim Ruda presented a summary of completed and upcoming operation, maintenance, and monitoring activities related to the groundwater extraction system (summary information attached).
4. The Navy recently received written comments from the MPCA on the draft Remedial Action Workplan-Revision 3 for the groundwater Operable Unit (O.U.#1). The workplan will be finalized by the Navy within approximately the next month. The final workplan will be distributed to the full RAB. One unbound copy will be sent to John Flora.
5. Michael Flaherty said that a renewal of the Industrial Discharge Permit was issued to the Navy by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) in July 1995. The permit includes 3 steps to be taken by the Navy in the event that the direct groundwater discharge to the sanitary sewer begins to exceed the permit limits. These steps include 1) re-sampling of the discharge within 24 hours after monitoring data are available that indicate a permit limit exceedance has occurred; 2) immediately reducing the flowrate from the wells with the higher VOC concentrations, to reduce the VOC concentrations in the combined discharge; and 3) if measures in step #2 are unsuccessful, re-starting the existing pretreatment system and using the system to treat the flow from the wells with the higher VOC concentrations. Since the discharge from all 6 extraction wells has remained below the MCES permit limits for the last several months, the existing pretreatment system will remain shut down. However, the equipment will remain on standby, to be returned to service if needed. Tim Ruda noted that some modifications to piping and possibly equipment would be required to allow the existing facilities to be used as anticipated by the MCES permit conditions.

Michael Flaherty said that MCES personnel made an unannounced visit to the NIROP in September to collect a sample of the groundwater discharge. Laboratory results from analysis of this sample are not yet available. Discharge limits in the renewed permit include 3.0 mg/L TCE, and 10 mg/L for total VOCs. The TCE concentration in the current discharge is approximately 1.0 mg/L; current total VOC concentrations are only slightly higher than the TCE concentration.

Gary Eddy asked if the volume of the current NIROP groundwater discharge is causing any capacity problems at the sewage treatment plant that receives the flow. Michael Flaherty said the NIROP discharge does not cause any capacity problems. He said the MCES considers the NIROP groundwater discharge to be only temporary, until the water is discharged to the river. Therefore, the MCES also does not anticipate any future problems with treatment plant hydraulic capacity due to the NIROP groundwater cleanup project.

Adam Kramer asked if the MCES has considered potential hazards that may be created in the sanitary sewers that receive the NIROP groundwater due to the VOCs that are present. Michael Flaherty said the MCES has considered this possibility, but does not believe there are any unacceptable hazards caused by the NIROP flow. The MCES is currently considering factors such as VOCs in sewer lines during development of a revised plan for establishing local discharge limits. This plan is scheduled to be issued in September 1996. The MCES currently regulates discharges from all groundwater cleanup sites that utilize the MCES sanitary wastewater system by means of Industrial Discharge Permits, and a substantial Add-on Service Charge (ASC) that is primarily based on flow volume rather than contaminant mass loading.

The ASC is intended to discourage reliance on the MCES sanitary system as a long-term disposal option for groundwater from remediation sites.

6. David Cabiness said a Navy contractor recently completed a geostatistical evaluation of the monitoring well network that is being used to monitor groundwater quality at the site. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether the wells included in the current monitoring network are the most effective group of wells that should be used to meet the groundwater monitoring objectives. The results of the evaluation, which were presented in a report that was sent to the MPCA, indicated that the 27 wells included in the currently approved network, with the addition of 7 other existing wells as recommended by RMT, would provide the most effective groundwater monitoring program for the site, based on a geostatistical evaluation of the distribution pattern of contaminated groundwater over the site. The MPCA has requested the addition of 17 wells to the monitoring network. The geostatistical evaluation indicated that only 7 of these 17 wells would be required to provide effective groundwater monitoring for the site.
7. Tom Bloom said the Feasibility Study (FS) Report for Operable Unit #2 is still under review by the USEPA. Review comments will be sent to the Navy in about one week. The USEPA and MPCA have decided to revise the strategy for remediation of soil outside the NIROP plant buildings (O.U.#2), based on results from preliminary soil investigations in the East Plating Shop area of the plant. These results indicate that the extent of soil contamination under the plant buildings may be significantly greater than the amount of soil contamination addressed under O.U.#2. Therefore, the agencies believe it would not be efficient to proceed with remediation of O.U.#2 soil until the extent of soil contamination under the buildings (O.U.#3) is known. A broader strategy will be developed for remediation of all contaminated soil at the site by combining the remedial action under O.U.#2 and O.U.#3. The Navy will prepare a final FS Report for O.U.#2 that addresses review comments on the draft report from the USEPA and MPCA. However, the agencies will defer further action on O.U.#2, and will address remediation of O.U.#2 soil in a combined remedial action for O.U.#2 and O.U.#3 that will provide a comprehensive plan for remediation of all soil at the site.
8. Scott Glass said the Navy has issued a contract to Brown & Root to investigate soil under the plant. A records search was completed at the plant in August. A draft site evaluation report has also been completed. A workplan for the full investigation is currently being prepared. The results from preliminary soil and groundwater sampling in the East Plating Shop area will be included in the workplan. Based on the records search, tours in the plant, and interviews with current and former employees, 59 areas of concern (AOCs) were identified in the plant as possible sources of a past release of contaminants to the soil beneath the plant. Storm sewers and sanitary sewers were also identified as possible sources of past releases. The 59 AOCs included locations of former sumps, dry wells, etc., and former TCE storage tank locations outside the plant. The past practice of transporting TCE from outside bulk storage tanks into the plant using smaller "tote tanks" on a flat-bed truck is believed to have resulted in tote tank spills where TCE was released into storm or sanitary sewers, and possibly into the soil via sewer leaks. The O.U.#3 investigation will address only soil beneath the buildings on the Navy property. It will not address soil beneath the building on United Defense property.

9. Tom Bloom said that as a settlement of the enforcement action initiated by the USEPA and MPCA, the Navy proposed, and the agencies accepted, four items: a "payment" of \$130,000; assignment of one additional full-time person (S. Glass) to assist David Cabiness on the project; a "supplemental" environmental project (start of O.U.#3); and preparation of a Site Management Plan.

**C. Actions for Next Quarter**

1. David Cabiness said the cost to continue groundwater discharge to the sanitary sewer is approximately \$500,000 per year. In the interest of reducing this cost to the public, the Navy wants to proceed with design and construction of the on-site GWTF, to discharge treated groundwater to the river as required under the Record of Decision (ROD) for groundwater cleanup. The Navy expects to renew their existing contract with RMT in November 1995 for design of the GWTF. The ROD requires the GWTF design to be completed within one year after the USEPA and MPCA approve the plume capture effectiveness created by the groundwater extraction system.
2. David Cabiness said that backhoe pits will be dug in the North 40 in the spring of 1996, in 9 areas identified from a geophysical survey done in the summer of this year. Any drums or other containers that may be uncovered during the excavations will be removed. A soil sample will be collected at the base of each excavation for laboratory analysis. Soil will be removed if the lab results indicate contaminant concentrations are above pre-determined acceptable levels.
3. The workplan for the O.U.#3 investigation will be issued by December 31, 1995.
4. The draft Site Management Plan will be issued by November 1, 1995.
5. The Navy will issue a contract soon to perform seismic imaging of the geology beneath the plant buildings and in areas outside the buildings. The results of this work will be reviewed before decisions are made regarding proposed locations of new monitoring wells to be constructed inside the plant.

**D. RCRA Status**

No topics were discussed.

**E. Community Relations**

1. Kerry Morrow distributed a draft Mission Statement for the RAB, and the Rules of Operation for the RAB as accepted (copies attached). It is desired to finalize the Mission Statement prior to the next RAB meeting. John Flora offered several comments on the wording of the Rules of Operation. Kerry Morrow will consider these comments in a revision of the rules.
2. In response to a request by John Flora, it was agreed that the Navy will distribute an agenda for each RAB meeting to the full RAB at least 10 days prior to the meeting.

3. Navy guidelines for RABs suggest that RAB membership be limited to a maximum of 20 people. However, this is only a guideline; there is no specific cap on the size of a RAB.
4. The Navy will send a notice with summary information by mail to various public groups, to attempt to generate public interest in the site and RAB participation. Kerry Morrow said the RAB will not be "formalized" until and unless public participation occurs. If there is no public interest or participation, despite the best efforts of the Navy, it may be necessary at some point to discontinue the RAB, and return to the format of the previous Technical Review Committee. Kerry Morrow requested the MPCA and USEPA to prepare a summary sheet handout for all future RAB meetings, presenting information on the site and key topics that the agencies believe should be communicated to the public.
5. The information repository is currently maintained at the NIROP. The information is open to public review. Requests for access should be directed to Pat Mosites or Kerry Morrow. David Douglas suggested that a copy of all current documents should be kept at the Fridley Municipal Center. It was suggested that any advertisements or public communications regarding the site include information on where the information repository is located and how to obtain access to it. The repository was previously located at the Anoka County Library. However, the library declined to renew rental space for the repository due to lack of public use of the information. John Flora said the repository could be located at the Fridley Municipal Center; however, the Navy would have to provide personnel to maintain the information. It was agreed to keep the repository at the NIROP. Tom Bloom explained the difference between an information repository and an official Administrative Record for a Superfund site.
6. The RAB is open to any Minneapolis resident or other "stakeholder," not just to Fridley residents.
7. A copy of all draft documents for the site is to be sent to John Flora. A review period of at least 30 days should be allowed for comments on all draft documents.
8. Kerry Morrow said the mission of the RAB does not necessarily address all public relations issues that NAVFAC faces.
9. Preparation of the Community Relations Plan-Revision 1 will proceed, based on the RAB information issued to date.

**F. General Topics**

1. Adam Kramer and John Flora expressed a concern regarding the possibility of exceedances of air quality standards due to a malfunction of equipment in the planned GWTF. David Cabiness said the facilities would include two gas-phase activated carbon units operated in series to remove VOCs from the air exhaust from air stripping units. The air quality would be monitored in the air duct between the first and second carbon unit to detect VOC breakthrough from the first unit. The operating procedures would then call for replacement of the carbon in the spent unit, and reversal of the lead/lag sequence of the units. This procedure is expected to ensure that proper air treatment for VOC removal is provided at all times. It was acknowledged that if VOCs were ever released to the atmosphere due to a major

equipment failure, the VOCs would tend to move with the prevailing wind direction as the concentrations diluted into the atmosphere and the VOCs were destroyed by naturally occurring processes. Tom Bloom said the USEPA and MPCA would ensure that adequate regulation of the air and water discharges was provided. Tim Ruda said he believes that too much emphasis has been placed on the concern for the risks posed by potential failure scenarios of the planned GWTF, compared to the risks posed by other potential and existing contaminant sources. Adam Kramer said that specific allowable discharge limits are set based on public concern and the need for protection of the public. Gary Eddy said that air modeling would be needed to verify whether a health risk would result from a specific treatment facility failure scenario.

2. David Cabiness discussed a letter sent to the Navy by Representative Bill Luther of Minnesota in which Mr. Luther requests the Navy to clarify certain details of cost estimates for groundwater remediation prepared by the Navy. The Navy sent a response to Mr. Luther explaining that the cost of liquid-phase carbon treatment would be in addition to the cost of facilities needed to produce treated groundwater that was suitable for discharge to the river. Air stripping alone is expected to meet the NPDES permit limits. In addition, removal of iron or manganese would not be required to meet the permit limits, and the cost of equipment to remove these metals from the groundwater would also be additional to the cost of facilities necessary to meet river discharge limits. He said the cost to operate a treatment facility that used only direct liquid-phase carbon treatment would be significantly higher than the cost of a facility using air stripping.

John Flora said the Navy added too many "bells and whistles" to the treatment process configuration used for preparing their cost estimates. He said the costs should have addressed only use of direct liquid-phase carbon treatment for comparison to the cost of air stripping equipment. He said the city decided that much of the treatment equipment the Navy recommended as necessary to produce potable-quality water for Fridley's use was unnecessary. He said the city has a different opinion than the Navy regarding the appropriate treatment process design needed to provide potable water quality. He said it should be recognized that VOC concentrations in the extracted groundwater will drop over time, which could change the comparative operating cost for carbon vs. air stripping. In addition, he said the cities of St. Anthony, New Brighton, and one other city in the metro area are currently using activated carbon treatment of contaminated groundwater to produce a supplemental drinking water supply.

David Cabiness agreed that a difference of opinion exists on this matter. He said other treatment unit operations in addition to carbon are needed to produce the water quality requested by the city and required under state and federal regulations.

3. Adam Kramer asked if use of air stripping would be a problem due to upcoming air quality regulations. Eric Gredell said that because carbon treatment of the air exhaust from the groundwater treatment equipment to remove VOCs to near zero-detect concentrations is planned for the GWTF, the future air regulations are not expected to present any problems.
4. Richard Harris asked whether measures will be taken to address proper abandonment of the 3 unused groundwater supply wells at the site. He said these wells should be considered due to the possibility that liquid wastes may have been dumped down the

wells years ago, and the possibility of future vandalism or waste disposal down the wells.

It was noted that purging of these wells would be needed to collect a representative sample, which would require pumping from the wells. This was considered to be inadvisable due to the possibility that contamination may be drawn down into the bedrock from the overlying sand aquifer.

Tim Ruda said it is important to consider the possible future re-use of the supply wells after the site groundwater is cleaned up, before decisions are made to permanently remove the wells.

John Betcher said the MPCA's comments on the O.U.#3 investigation workplan will require the Navy to evaluate possible impacts to or by the old production wells. He said the MPCA has also required that bedrock monitoring well 2-PC be added to the monitoring network to assess possible continuing impacts to bedrock groundwater quality. David Douglas said the upcoming seismic imaging will define bedrock contours, which will help in the evaluation of the production wells.

5. It was noted that the existing on-site elevated water storage tank is supplied from the Fridley water system, not the old on-site production wells.
6. Richard Harris expressed a concern regarding possible off-site contamination due to past transport or discharge of wastes to off-site locations. David Douglas said there are some data gaps in the records regarding the final disposition of all waste products generated at the plant, particularly in the time period from 1940 to about 1960. He said information is needed from persons who are familiar with the history of plant operating practices to help fill these data gaps. Adam Kramer said there is a possibility of mislabelled sewer lines on existing plant sewer maps, which could allow some process wastewater to inadvertently enter the storm sewers. He suggested there is a need to verify all plant sewer connections. Kerry Morrow said the Navy intends to distribute a survey questionnaire to FMC retirees requesting information on past plant operations that may assist the investigations.
7. David Douglas said the MPCA's goal for O.U.#3 is to deal with all sites of possible releases, and to deal with the remaining cleanup efforts for the site as a whole. Any remaining investigation data will be folded into the RI for O.U.#3.
8. David Douglas said an MPCA attorney is considering how the MPCA should proceed with investigation of soil and groundwater under the plant area owned by United Defense. John Betcher said that a large photographic lab operated by United Defense on their property is not currently addressed in the O.U.#3 investigation plan. Tim Ruda said that information on this photo lab was provided to the MPCA previously by United Defense.
9. John Flora said the Navy should identify the specific concentrations of VOCs, iron, and manganese that will be present in the treated groundwater discharge to the river. He said that iron and manganese in the discharge will also produce an undesirable color effect in the river. Tom Bloom said that iron and manganese are expected to be present at concentrations below the secondary drinking water standards. David Douglas said that iron and manganese are not a problem as a threat to river water

quality. However, he will ask Caroline Voelkers to again review the possible need for regulation of iron, manganese, or color in the NPDES permit.

10. David Cabiness said the Navy has estimated that it would cost about twice as much to treat the NIROP groundwater for use by Fridley as the city currently charges its customers for use of city water.
11. The next RAB meeting will be held on Thursday, January 11, 1996, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Fridley Municipal Center, 6431 University Avenue N.E., Fridley, Minnesota. (NOTE LOCATION AND TIME).

NIROP FRIDLEY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING #3  
@ FRIDLEY MUNICIPAL CENTER  
OCTOBER 12, 1995  
AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTION

2. Corrections to Minutes of RAB #2

3. RAB Formation

- Operating Procedures (Draft for RAB review/comment)
- Develop mission statement

4. Actions since last meeting

NAVY/RMT

Operable Unit #1 - Groundwater

- Status of Upgraded GWES Operation
- Status on design of new treatment facility
- RAWP Revision #3
- MCES PERMIT
  - 1) Permit renewal.
- Capture evaluation for upgraded GWES
- Geostatistical Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring
- GAC vs Air Stripping plant cost comparison

Operable Unit #2 - Soils outside plant

- Feasibility Study Approval
- Geophysical Work in North 40 Report
- Removal action at North 40 Workplan
- Removal action contractor mobilization.

Operable Unit #3 - Soils under NIROP Plant

- Additional Soil Sampling in Plating area
- Site Evaluation Report for OU#3

- Update on Draft Remedial Investigation(RI) Workplan
- Status of Seismic Imaging Survey of entire Navy Property at Nirop Fridley.

Miscellaneous

- Enforcement Action Status
- Community Relations Plan(CRP) update
- City of Minneapolis  
Downstream Discharge  
Water Quality issues for upstream discharge

CITY OF FRIDLEY

- Residual Iron/Manganese
- Residual TCE in discharge water

UNITED DEFENSE

- Maintenance and Monitoring Activities

MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

- NPDES Permit Status
- Downstream Discharge Option

5. Actions Scheduled/DUE for Next Six Months

- |       |  |               |
|-------|--|---------------|
| OU#1: | - Capture Evaluation Report                      | DUE:13 OCT 95 |
|       | - Capture Evaluation Report approval by agencies | DUE:13 NOV 95 |
|       | - Annual Monitoring Report                       | DUE:31 JAN 96 |
| OU#3: | - Remediation Investigation Workplan             | DUE:31 DEC 95 |

6. Other issues/Comments

~~Next RAD meeting proposed for 10:00 AM Thursday  
11 January 1996 at the Fridley Municipal Center~~

SEE MEETING NOTES FOR DATE, TIME, &  
LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING.

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING #3

OCTOBER 12, 1995

NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE ORDNANCE PLANT, FRIDLEY

LIST OF ATTENDEES

NAME	ORGANIZATION	
<del>MARGARET CASSERLY</del>	<del>BLACK AND VEATCH</del>	
TOM BLOOM	USEPA REGION 5	<i>Tom Bloom</i>
JOHN FLORA	CITY OF FRIDLEY	<i>J. Flora</i>
ROBERT HUTCHINSON	COUNTY OF ANOKA	
EVAN DRIVAS	DNR	
<del>RICHARD NINESTEEL</del>	<del>HALLIBERTEN NUS</del>	
<del>JAMES DELAMBERT</del>	<del>LIESCH ASSOCIATES</del>	
<del>BRUCE REHWALDT</del>	<del>LIESCH ASSOCIATES</del>	
JOHN BETCHER	MPCA	<i>John Betcher</i>
DAVE DOUGLAS	MPCA	<i>Dave Douglas</i>
GARY EDDY	MPCA	<i>Gary Eddy</i>
FRED JENNESS	MPCA	
MARK FERREY	MPCA	<i>Mark Ferrey</i>
<del>CAROLYN VOLKER</del>	MPCA	<i>Carolyn Volker</i>
MICHEAL FLAHERTY	<del>NEWS MCES</del>	<i>Michael V. Flaherty</i>
ADAM KRAMER	MINNEAPOLIS WATER WKS	<i>Adam Kramer</i>
ERIC GRIDELL	RMT INC.	<i>Eric Gridell</i>
<del>LINDA HICKEN</del>	<del>RMT INC.</del>	
<del>GALEN KENDYER</del>	<del>RMT INC.</del>	
PETER HESS	SOUTHNAUFAK.COM	<i>Peter Hess</i>

~~MARK BRIGGS~~

SCOTT GLASS  
DAVE CABINESS  
RICHARD HARRIS  
GEN PETERSEN

~~CORINNE HSEFT~~  
*Mark Herwig*

KERRY MORROW  
PAT MOSITES  
DOUGLAS HILDRE  
TIM RUDA  
LTC FREYE  
DANIEL FULLER

*Andrew Kendrick*  
MARK PERRY  
*R.W. (John) Aubert*  
Paul Estueta

RMT INC.  
SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM  
SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM  
FRIDLEY RESIDENT  
LEAGUE/WOMEN VOTERS  
DISTRICT REP CONGRESSMAN LUTHER

*S.A. Glass*  
*David Cabiness*  
*Richard Harris*

NAVSEA  
REICC MNPLS  
UNITED DEFENSE  
UNITED DEFENSE  
DPRO UNITED DEFENSE  
MORRISON KNUDSEN

*[Signature]*  
*[Signature]*

*Brown & Root Env.*  
BROWN + ROOT ENVIRONMENTAL  
*Teague*  
MPCA

*Tim Ruda*  
*Andy Kendrick*  
*Mark T. Perry*  
*R.W. Aubert*  
*Paul Estueta*

NAME

ORGANIZATION OR  
ADDRESS

Craig Gordon

Republican Party

P.O. Box 32622

Fridley, Mn. 55432