

1 COPY

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

-----  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
FOR  
NAS JRB/ARS WILLOW GROVE

-----  
Willow Grove, PA, March 15, 2000  
-----

Meeting held at the Naval  
Air Station Joint Reserve Base at 6:05 p.m.  
on the above date before Kimberly A.  
Overwise, a Registered Professional  
Reporter and Notary Public of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

-----  
FOSTER  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC.  
1800 Architects Building - 117 S. 17th St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 567-2670

## 1       SPEAKERS :

2               JIM EDMOND

3               JIM COLTER

4               CHARANJIT GILL

5               LARRY BISHOP

6

7

8

## 9       PRESENT :

10              JIM VETRINI                    CDR. GILBERG VIERA

11              ERIC LINDHULT                   APRIL FLIPSE

12              THOMAS HIBBS                   PAMELA REIGH

13              GREG VAN HOOK                   MJR. MARGE McGLINN

14              RICH PEFFALL                   COL. DANA MARSH

15              DAN McCAFFREY                   DAN GOODE

16              JACK DUNLEAVY                   HAL DUSEN

17              ELAINE HUGHES                   CARL REITENBACH

18              JOHN C. MARTIN                   RUSS TURNER

19              KAYE MAXWELL-MARTIN            SHERRI R. JONES

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   MR. EDMOND: As you see from  
2 the agenda, there's a couple items  
3 tonight. The Air Force will talk about the  
4 contaminated sediment removal action at Air  
5 Force Site 3. We'll go over it. We did  
6 some well surveys and we're doing some  
7 stuff right now we'll tell you about. And  
8 we'll discuss the RAB questionnaire that we  
9 talked about last time. There was a lot of  
10 people not here.

11                   Before we start, I'd like to  
12 thank everybody for coming again. It's not  
13 spring yet but it feels like it and I know  
14 we're all thankful for that. I'd like to  
15 give you a little brief on things we're  
16 doing at the Air Station. Late summer,  
17 beginning of fall we're building a new  
18 building, hazardous flammable store house.  
19 It's being built for the issue and storage  
20 of hazardous and flammable material so  
21 everything from cleaning supplies straight  
22 through to petroleum products for oils,  
23 lubricants for aircraft and everything in  
24 between, anything with MSDS we stored there  
25 in segregated compartments,

1 state-of-the-art 7,200 square feet  
2 building. It is replacing -- right now we  
3 use Hangar 80. We have some space in  
4 Hangar 80 that we use. It can be used for  
5 something else but that's the only space we  
6 had at the time. Congress has funded this  
7 building for us. It's in the planning  
8 stages. We went with a nice big building  
9 and money Congress gave us scaled it down.  
10 We're in the scaled-down process now. We  
11 should be able to start construction  
12 August-September time frame.

13 For you folks that are in  
14 the industry, the Air Station's about to  
15 implement a two-year program, ISO 14,001.  
16 What that is is the tracking of hazardous  
17 materials throughout cradle to grave. In  
18 the private industry if you want to do  
19 business overseas, you have to be ISO  
20 certified. DOD is just starting to get in  
21 on this. They have picked us as the trial  
22 works and we are going to be the first to  
23 have it so it should be something  
24 interesting.

25 June 2 through 4 we're going

1 to be having Keystone State Dog Trials  
2 again, sheepdogs. If anybody's interested,  
3 it will be in the paper and advertised all  
4 over. So feel free to stop in and see the  
5 dogs chase the sheep across the back  
6 court.

7 The air show will be the  
8 16th through the 18th of June, Friday,  
9 Saturday and Sunday. As usual, I'll try to  
10 get tickets for our RAB members.

11 I have the web sites if you  
12 want to write this down. NASJRB web site  
13 is NASJRBWillowGrove.Navy.Mil, M-I-L. They  
14 list coming events for things happening at  
15 the Air Station, shows you all the people  
16 in the departments at the Air Station, and  
17 a little bit of history and all that. It  
18 might be interesting for you to look at.

19 And, finally, Ms. Hughes is  
20 on the RAB. You might know her. She is  
21 also a member of the Horsham Environmental  
22 Board. She's the cochairperson. They came  
23 to the Navy not too long ago and asked if  
24 we could help them if they got a grant to  
25 restore the stream banks down along Horsham

1 Road. It's the 10th through the 13th and  
2 14th of April. They'll be putting in  
3 grasses, shrubs, trying to restore the  
4 stream bank, the biodiversity of the area.  
5 If anyone's interested, please talk to Ms.  
6 Hughes after the meeting and you can get  
7 involved.

8 If there's no questions,  
9 we'll go right into the Air Force  
10 presentation. Gill?

11 MR. GILL: Today the only  
12 site we're going to discuss is the  
13 retention basin and I'm going to give you a  
14 brief background and then I'm going to turn  
15 it over to Larry Bishop from Montgomery  
16 Watson and he's going to go into detail of  
17 what we are going to do next on this site.

18 As you can see, this storm  
19 water retention basin was created back in  
20 1957 and it consists of 2-1/2 acres. And  
21 it gets storm water from almost 95% of the  
22 Air Force Reserve base and about 5% of the  
23 Naval Air Station. And I think presently  
24 it has almost 1 to 1-1/2 feet of sediment  
25 inside the basin and that's what we're

1 going to be doing, removing the sediment  
2 from the basin.

3 Now, in 1988 we actually had  
4 a no further response action plan decision  
5 document that was issued back in 1988 and  
6 we never got approval from EPA or the  
7 State. And then back in 1995 we were put  
8 on national priority list, which is NPL, so  
9 EPA came back and they told us to do  
10 further site investigation, which we did,  
11 and that was done back in '98 and '99. We  
12 did site investigation and also we did the  
13 ecological risk assessment.

14 The next step for us to do  
15 is modification. We're going to be  
16 modifying the basin. We do have a problem  
17 and we are trying to eliminate the geese  
18 from coming into the basin. So we're going  
19 to modify the basin to make it a dry  
20 basin. That means it won't have standing  
21 water in it. And another thing we are  
22 planning on doing is removal action, which  
23 is we're going to be removing the sediment  
24 from the basin. And I guess part of that  
25 removal action was that we're supposed to

1 have a legal notice published in three  
2 local newspapers and actually 30 days  
3 before today actually, so that was  
4 published almost a month ago. And we also  
5 did action memorandum EE/CA, E-E/C-A. What  
6 I'm going to do is ask Larry to go into the  
7 detail of what we're going to do.

8 MR. BISHOP: Good evening.  
9 My name is Larry Bishop. I'm with  
10 Montgomery Watson. We're an Air Force  
11 contractor and we've been working on this  
12 project for several months now. Basically,  
13 as Gill indicated, this is a storm water  
14 retention basin that receives much of the  
15 water off of the base. As far as the  
16 project overview, we basically have handled  
17 these phases. We went in, did an  
18 investigation and characterization of the  
19 existing storm water basin and also  
20 downstream to see what kind of impacts  
21 existed. There were some studies that were  
22 done before then but we've been working on  
23 it since about '96. A BASH evaluation,  
24 bird aircraft strike hazard evaluation, we  
25 in '97 did an evaluation of that and

1 basically these two issues, the sediment  
2 and the BASH issue, were really the reasons  
3 why we undertook this project.

4 I'll go a little bit into  
5 the improvements plan, including the  
6 engineering work we've been doing. As  
7 Charanjit indicated, our regulatory process  
8 is winding down and we will be going into  
9 the field in the very near future for  
10 implementation.

11 This is not great but here's  
12 the site location. We're sitting up in  
13 here. Basically the site is on kind of the  
14 northwest angle of the base here. It  
15 receives a vast majority of this runoff and  
16 it discharges through a culvert system  
17 eventually going down into Little Neshaminy  
18 Creek. One of the issues, of course, here  
19 is making sure we didn't impact any further  
20 the downstream neighbors and, of course,  
21 the improvements that we're trying to make,  
22 as we'll indicate, we wanted to make sure  
23 there were no negative impacts.

24 Here's kind of a washed-out  
25 thing but here's the pond right here in a

1 little bit more detail. We cross under  
2 Andrews Road with a couple 60-inch  
3 culverts. We then enter a ditch that runs  
4 through an agricultural area, some corn  
5 fields, into the Graham Historical Park,  
6 there's a couple dams there, and into  
7 Little Neshaminy. These points you see  
8 were sampling points we did during one of  
9 our investigation phases.

10 Here are some of the work  
11 that's been done. There was a sediment  
12 characterization study done in 1995. We  
13 undertook the multiple sites investigation  
14 in '98, which included the nine locations  
15 that you saw and characterization of those  
16 samples. As you see, five were in the base  
17 and four were downstream. Our  
18 investigation indicated that we had the  
19 presence of -- these are volatile organic  
20 metals and petroleum hydrocarbons. Even  
21 though those were present, only petroleum  
22 hydrocarbons exceeded a regulatory standard  
23 which classified it as a residual waste.  
24 Therefore, this is not a hazardous waste.

25 Here's a photo looking north

1 across the basin. You have an inflow  
2 coming this way into the frame here. You  
3 have some culverts coming off the runways.  
4 The runways are over on this side here and  
5 some culverts coming in this way, but you  
6 can see there is some sediment buildup and,  
7 as Charanjit indicated earlier, there's  
8 probably a foot to a foot and a half across  
9 the base depending on where you're at.

10 The BASH evaluation, this is  
11 serious business here. As I say, we did a  
12 BASH evaluation back in '96. Overall BASH  
13 accounts for more than a billion dollars in  
14 damage annually and fighter planes account  
15 for 32% of those strikes that are  
16 recorded. And that basically occurs  
17 primarily within the aerodrome environment  
18 or right here basically in the runways,  
19 takeoff zones and landing zones.

20 MR. EDMOND: Can I footnote  
21 that? That billion dollars is not for  
22 Willow Grove. That's DOD.

23 MR. BISHOP: Right. And, of  
24 course, this pond being directly adjacent  
25 to the tarmac and runways makes it a fairly

1 sensitive issue.

2                   The assessment we did looks  
3 at the fauna, the environmental setting,  
4 and the record itself here on Willow  
5 Grove. And as we all know in the area  
6 here, we have a lot of Canadian geese that  
7 make their way through. We did notice  
8 swallows, red-tailed hawks and turkey  
9 vultures. The environmental setting that  
10 we have, which is good for these type of  
11 fauna, agricultural land directly adjacent  
12 to the facility here, of course, we're kind  
13 of in a rural setting with a lot of wooded  
14 areas and nearby golf courses. And then  
15 finally you can see the record that we  
16 found here, two vulture hits, two deer,  
17 which obviously was on the runway, and one  
18 red-tailed hawk and one mallard.

19                   RAB MEMBER: Over what time  
20 frame is that?

21                   MR. BISHOP: I believe this  
22 is over the time they've been recording  
23 this.

24                   Is that correct?

25                   MR. GILL: I think it is,

1 yes. I think this is obviously in the last  
2 few years, I guess, going back a couple  
3 years.

4 MR. BISHOP: The planning of  
5 the improvements that we've undergone, we  
6 did a feasibility study to address both the  
7 sediment issues and the BASH issues. That  
8 feasibility study resulted in us evaluating  
9 five different alternatives with different  
10 criteria such as we did not want to affect  
11 the local drainage. We didn't want to have  
12 any negative impact on that. We did want  
13 to try and improve the hydraulics, though,  
14 along the base and in the local area. Of  
15 course, we wanted to get the sediment out  
16 and we wanted to incorporate BMP's. The  
17 basin is directly adjacent to a POL with  
18 some fuel tank areas and also the operation  
19 and maintenance. It's kind of a difficulty  
20 for the guys to have to run out there  
21 during rainstorms and open up the large  
22 sluice gate and make sure they're not  
23 flooding any areas. We wanted to try and  
24 improve that efficiency.

25 Here's a closeup of the

1 outfall structure. It's about a 5 foot  
2 wide sluice gate. It's motorized. They  
3 have to go out there and turn it on and  
4 open it and close it. They try to keep it  
5 closed during most of the year just in case  
6 they do get a spill so it is readily  
7 contained and they can deal with it.  
8 otherwise, once the water level reaches a  
9 certain elevation, they will release the  
10 water.

11                   Again, some of the selected  
12 alternatives, after we went through the  
13 feasibility study we looked at everything  
14 from no action to different types of  
15 capital improvements, including additional  
16 basins. What we came up with was a  
17 compromise, which was basically the upgrade  
18 of the outlet structure. We wanted to give  
19 them something that was more operable. We  
20 wanted to rehabilitate the shoreline  
21 because they have some gentle sloping  
22 shorelines which these birds and geese like  
23 to really hang out on. We wanted to get  
24 rid of the sediment and we wanted to go and  
25 remove the basin as a wet basin and turn it

1 into a dry basin. That way again the  
2 interest from the fauna would be reduced.

3 The engineering analysis  
4 that we did to undertake this, we did a  
5 complete hydraulic analysis using a soft  
6 weir model. We looked at all the drainage  
7 basins contributing to this particular  
8 storm water retention basin, modeled all  
9 the downstream conditions, including  
10 pipings, ponds all the way to Little  
11 Neshaminy, and we used that as the basis to  
12 implement our improvements to make sure we  
13 weren't negatively impacting on-site or  
14 off-site basins.

15 We also looked at the  
16 groundwater situation. When you have a dry  
17 pond and you put water into it, what  
18 happens is mounting effects. It causes the  
19 groundwater to actually raise and you end  
20 up with a wet pond anyway. So we modeled  
21 those effects to make sure when we  
22 implemented a dry pond, it would end up  
23 being a dry pond.

24 What we ended up with in the  
25 design, which I have a couple of sheets

1 here I'll show you, we ended up with a  
2 program that's going to include the removal  
3 of the sediment. That sediment will go  
4 off-site to a Subtitle D landfill for  
5 disposal. It's about 5,000 cubic yards of  
6 sediment we figure. A new weir structure  
7 would be retrofitted into the existing  
8 one. We will regrade the pond into a dry  
9 pond. We're going to be putting lined  
10 drainage channels in there to put some of  
11 that low flow directly out of the pond so  
12 it doesn't sit there. Sediment sumps,  
13 those are going to be localized sumps where  
14 the inflow comes in to probably pull out  
15 some of that sediment in there, give the  
16 guys a little bit easier place to go in and  
17 remove sediment without having to worry  
18 about the whole basin, and it will backfill  
19 to dry conditions. If I didn't mention,  
20 the basin is about 3 acres in size.

21 Here's one of the existing  
22 conditions. There's a large concrete flume  
23 that comes in here, again a culvert here.  
24 This was our sediment removal plan. What  
25 we're going to do is confirmatory sampling

1 locations so once we pull out that foot to  
2 foot and a half, we can make sure we're  
3 getting all the contaminated sediment.  
4 These boxes you see here are going to be  
5 areas we're going to stockpile the  
6 sediment, allow it to be dewatered, get it  
7 down to a fairly dry state so we can  
8 transport it to the disposal facility.  
9 That reduces volume and then cost for the  
10 base.

11 This is our final basin.  
12 These concrete flumes here basically are  
13 the channels to get the incoming flow  
14 through and out the outfall structure.  
15 It's hard to see but these areas here are  
16 all of the influent locations. They're  
17 going to be depressed sediment sumps, as I  
18 explained, to take out the sediment and  
19 we're going to be improving the outfall  
20 structure.

21 Here's kind of a detailed  
22 sheet. This is the existing structure  
23 here. We will be going in and knocking out  
24 a piece of the wall, putting a smaller weir  
25 control structure in that will go into the

1 wall where they can come in with a sluice  
2 gate and cut it off if they need too, much  
3 smaller capacity to flow through this. And  
4 we're going to put a baffle around the  
5 whole thing. What that will do is if  
6 there's any floatables, large solid objects  
7 or light phase materials like a petroleum  
8 product, that will get caught behind this  
9 barrier and will not go out into the  
10 downstream adjacent neighbors.

11 As I said, in implementation  
12 we expect to maybe get out there this month  
13 or next month. We just went through an  
14 EE/CA process where we looked at a few  
15 different options for them and we've had no  
16 problems there. And it looks like today  
17 was our last day I guess as far as the time  
18 frame so we'll confirm that we are ready to  
19 move down the road. And Montgomery Watson,  
20 we're contracted to go and implement these  
21 improvements.

22 Again, the sediment will be  
23 transported and disposed of in a certified  
24 Subtitle D landfill. What we want to do is  
25 makes sure we execute this with minimal

1     disruptions to the base and the adjacent  
2     landowners. This is a facility that will  
3     remain on line. We want to make sure we  
4     don't cause any problems either up or  
5     downstream. We think this is all going to  
6     be done from implementation in May and  
7     we're going to come back in September and  
8     do a followup inspection. With earth work  
9     projects like this, sometimes you need to  
10    do some minor fixes and we'll do that at  
11    that point.

12                     Okay. That's the program.

13                     RAB MEMBER: How do you  
14    figure getting away with this? I mean the  
15    EPA on one hand insists that everybody dig  
16    these retention basins; right?

17                     MR. BISHOP: Yes, sir.

18                     RAB MEMBER: And you're  
19    making this thing like you might as well  
20    fill the whole thing up and put some catch  
21    basins in there and run the whole stuff  
22    out. You're running it from one end to the  
23    other out. You're not doing what the EPA  
24    wants you to do, which is let the stuff  
25    percolate into the soil.

1                               MR. BISHOP:  Actually what  
2     we're doing is even though we're making  
3     this a dry basin, there is still more  
4     available volume for storage of the water  
5     coming in.  The flumes that I talked about  
6     are really to just push the very low flows  
7     through there so they don't stay in the  
8     pond.  When you get a big storm, it is  
9     going to attenuate in the pond, build up  
10    and percolate out like the EPA wants us to  
11    do.

12                             RAB MEMBER:  But the way the  
13    soil is around here, it takes a heck of a  
14    long time to percolate so you have to store  
15    water in the pond in order for it to  
16    percolate.  If you have a dry pond like  
17    you're advocating here, you don't have  
18    that.  So how are you going to percolate  
19    anything through the soil?

20                             MR. BISHOP:  It's a  
21    combination of two things.  It's  
22    percolation.  And, yes, you're right.  
23    There is a saprolite type soil.  It's not  
24    very conducive to percolation.  But we're  
25    going to put a certain soil in that does

1 help us. Plus, you'll have the outfall  
2 structure. There is going to be a  
3 controlled outfall that's going to help  
4 over time move the water out. So the  
5 combination between the slow percolation  
6 that we have and the open discharge that's  
7 going to be controlled, you're going to be  
8 able to move the water out of the pond.

9 RAB MEMBER: I can't see  
10 it. I mean otherwise why are they making  
11 these people dig all these ponds? If they  
12 want dry ponds, let it all run out the  
13 other end.

14 RAB MEMBER: They are dry  
15 ponds. They accumulate water and slowly  
16 will percolate.

17 RAB MEMBER: The way this  
18 stuff percolates, it's going to be a pond  
19 with water in it all the time. You're not  
20 going to percolate it five days after a  
21 storm. How are you going to have a dry  
22 pond? I mean it's a contradiction in terms  
23 here.

24 MR. EDMOND: Well, it's not  
25 a pond. It's a retention basin.

1                   RAB MEMBER:   Then if you put  
2 it in one end and out the other --

3                   MR. EDMOND:   John, I guess  
4 the definition, a rough definition by EPA  
5 of detention basin is something to control  
6 the discharge of water.  They're allowed to  
7 let the discharged water go to the stream  
8 and EPA and PADEP likes that because you're  
9 recharging that stream with water.  But  
10 they don't want a waterfall just like a  
11 fire hose shooting it through.  They'd  
12 rather use a garden hose and minimize the  
13 flow.  That's what this will do in a more  
14 controlled way than the Air Force has in  
15 the past.  Plus, you're getting rid of  
16 contaminated soil that's basically not  
17 good.  You're getting rid of it and putting  
18 down clean soil.  You're right, it's not  
19 going to percolate fast but it will help  
20 control it.  And a retention basin is not  
21 supposed to pond the water because, as they  
22 said, when you pond the water, you have the  
23 birds.

24                   RAB MEMBER:   Now we're  
25 talking about two different things.

1 MR. EDMOND: The Navy has a  
2 pond. See, the Navy has a recreation pond  
3 detention basin. It's a combination of  
4 both. It has fish. We got a beaver in  
5 there that's building -- you might think  
6 he's Trump with all he's doing.

7 RAB MEMBER: You guys are  
8 plugging up his home.

9 MR. EDMOND: Theirs is  
10 strictly a detention basin. It's a  
11 nomenclature difference. They look the  
12 same. They act the same. But because it's  
13 a strictly a storm water detention basin,  
14 they're allowed to let the water flow out.  
15 We do the same thing. We let the water  
16 flow out of the recreational pond to the  
17 golf course in a controlled manner. We  
18 keep the level of our pond up high enough  
19 to support the aquatic life but still give  
20 them water.

21 RAB MEMBER: But if you're  
22 doing like he says, putting these runways  
23 for water to go through without stopping --

24 MR. EDMOND: But that's for  
25 like a light rain. When there's like a

1 monsoon season and we get a 24-hour deluge  
2 of rain, that pond will fill up. There's  
3 no way they can release the water. The  
4 State nor EPA will let them release all  
5 that water in one shot. They'll have a  
6 gradual release of the water. I mean the  
7 basis behind what they're doing and what  
8 they've got is basically the same. It's  
9 just best management practices. They're  
10 collecting the sediments so they don't have  
11 to go back and spend you taxpayers' money  
12 15 years down the road again and collect  
13 the sediment and get rid of it again, if  
14 that's correct.

15 MR. BISHOP: I couldn't have  
16 said it any better myself.

17 RAB MEMBER: Well, I'll tell  
18 you, you guys are actually working on two  
19 different things. Up around Doylestown,  
20 you have all these environmentalists  
21 chomping at the bit and want all this stuff  
22 released back into the ground. They don't  
23 want anything piled up, I mean run out from  
24 one side of this thing to the other. And  
25 there's a lot of developers that did that

1 up around Doylestown that put these  
2 concrete things from one end of the pond to  
3 the other, entrance, exit, water never  
4 stops. It goes right through. So you have  
5 this great big pond but there's no water in  
6 it.

7 MR. EDMOND: Maybe it would  
8 have been better if we could have done a  
9 tour of the pond. They could have seen the  
10 sluice gate and creek on the other side.  
11 It would have given everybody a picture of  
12 what they're trying to do.

13 RAB MEMBER: I understand  
14 what they're trying to do.

15 MR. EDMOND: But a picture  
16 is worth a thousand words.

17 RAB MEMBER: I've looked at  
18 a lot of ponds.

19 MR. EDMOND: This isn't a  
20 pond. That's the problem.

21 RAB MEMBER: He's calling it  
22 a pond. What are you talking about here?

23 RAB MEMBER: It's for peak  
24 flow only. When there's a light rain, it  
25 can handle it.

1                   RAB MEMBER: You know what  
2 the heck the whole thing's about, don't  
3 you? Geese. Eliminate the geese. Get  
4 yourself some dogs and chase them out.

5                   MR. EDMOND: We have dogs,  
6 Jackie the wonder dog, a border collie for  
7 the last three years. She does a wonderful  
8 job. But nesting season they come down and  
9 build their nests.

10                  RAB MEMBER: You ought to  
11 get your pilots and go out there with  
12 12-gauge shotguns.

13                  MR. EDMOND: That's  
14 illegal. Canadian geese are protected  
15 because they're migratory water fowl.

16                  RAB MEMBER: They're not in  
17 certain hunting seasons.

18                  MR. EDMOND: That may be  
19 true, but on NASJRB they are protected.

20                  RAB MEMBER: Not in  
21 nonmigratory times.

22                  MR. EDMOND: You can't hunt  
23 on the base for geese. That's a no-no.

24                  RAB MEMBER: Well, you  
25 shouldn't yell if one hits your planes.

1                   CDR. VIERA: We have other  
2 methods of trying to control them. We  
3 bought some noisemakers we're experimenting  
4 with to see if that will help.

5                   RAB MEMBER: You have  
6 noisemakers every time one of those jets  
7 take off. If they can stand that,  
8 noisemakers aren't going to do it. You  
9 have your biggest noisemakers.

10                  RAB MEMBER: With all due  
11 respect for what you've done, because I  
12 know you've studied this in detail, I  
13 would really suggest that someone from the  
14 Navy --

15                  MR. EDMOND: Air Force.

16                  RAB MEMBER: From the Air  
17 Force. I'm sorry. -- come down and take a  
18 look or talk to the consultants from the  
19 Heritage Conservancy when we start to do  
20 our restoration because the emphasis now is  
21 not on using a lot of cement and  
22 rechanneling things, it's on naturalized  
23 storm water basins using plants that are  
24 indigenous to the area so that these plants  
25 can be used as living filters to do a lot

1 of the things that you're trying to achieve  
2 through engineering, through cement and  
3 rechanneling and so forth. So I would  
4 really suggest that someone come out and  
5 take look at this and see what  
6 bioengineering techniques are being  
7 advocated by the DEP in these kinds of  
8 instances. I don't know if it has any  
9 applicability here but I would certainly  
10 strongly suggest that you take a look at  
11 this.

12 MR. BISHOP: Sure, sure.  
13 There are a lot of good management  
14 practices that you can use in  
15 bioengineering. We've done a lot for  
16 stream bank restoration, for more natural  
17 pond control systems. And that's something  
18 that, you know, we would have done here.  
19 This is something more that we're trying  
20 to -- we're working with a limited space  
21 and we really don't have the option to go  
22 with bioengineering processes for the  
23 pond. Now, if we go downstream and we were  
24 to do improvements, that would certainly be  
25 the place we would like to do it. What

1 we're trying to do is trying to cut down  
2 velocities and trying to control flows and  
3 we're trying to do it in a pond that's  
4 dry. If we had a wet pond, we could  
5 probably do a lot more of those  
6 bioengineering things, but we'll look into  
7 that.

8 RAB MEMBER: We'll have  
9 technical advisors on the site there and  
10 also the Montgomery County Planning  
11 Commission is heavily involved on these  
12 things. They've done a whole section on  
13 repairing storm water basins. I think it  
14 might behove you to look into it. It might  
15 offer some other alternatives, approaches  
16 that might be helpful to you too.

17 RAB MEMBER: I agree with  
18 this lady. Something like a biological  
19 filter would certainly help the absorption  
20 process along the lines of what this  
21 gentleman is talking about.

22 What I wanted to mention is  
23 I think the whole BASH thing does  
24 complicate this issue because it seems like  
25 either way, you know -- during the fall you

1 have all the migratory hawks, birds,  
2 geese. Maybe a study should be done to see  
3 whether or not this small retention basin  
4 has any direct impact on the number of  
5 wildlife that are around or are struck by  
6 the planes, but I think adding that into  
7 this is just complicating the main issue  
8 that we're dealing with here and that's the  
9 sediment and the flow. I mean the deer are  
10 going to be up there by the runways.  
11 They're not going to be -- I don't know.  
12 Maybe they should see. They're being  
13 struck on the runway. The geese are flying  
14 around. Who knows? But to me it's just  
15 kind of another issue.

16 MR. EDMOND: If I could, the  
17 Navy's retention basin ponds are in a  
18 wooded area away from the runway, away from  
19 the aprons, taxiways, et cetera. This one  
20 that the Air Force has is right on top of  
21 the apron. I mean literally it's no more  
22 than 20 feet between this pump basin and  
23 concrete, the tarmac. So the proximity is  
24 real great. I run this base three times a  
25 week and ever since I started here nine,

1 ten years ago the geese use that to nest.  
2 And the problem with nesting geese is  
3 they're not migratory. They become  
4 locals. These guys could pay taxes here.  
5 You can't get rid of them. They don't want  
6 to go. The dog chases them. They come  
7 back. The dog chases them. They come  
8 back. It's a problem. And the  
9 presentation said a billion dollars across  
10 DOD is spent on BASH, but bigger than that  
11 is the human life value. I mean I've seen  
12 what a Canadian geese does to an aircraft.  
13 It can take it out of the sky. An aircraft  
14 with five or six people, it drops to the  
15 ground, you lose five or six people. You  
16 have to weigh the environmental with the  
17 safety of life here. It's a fine line we  
18 have to walk down but that's the mix of the  
19 Air Station.

20 In a perfect world, I am the  
21 most conservative person when it comes to  
22 using concrete versus dirt, plants. I'm a  
23 very strong ecologist. But here you have  
24 to balance between the two, between life,  
25 property, safety and this pond. And it's

1     been studied and studied. I mean the Air  
2     Force has put big scary balls with faces on  
3     them, wired the pond to try and stop the  
4     geese from landing. They still come. The  
5     dog doesn't stop them. We have A-10's  
6     running up their engines a hundred yards  
7     away. That doesn't scare them away.  
8     Something has to be done. The Navy's ponds  
9     are different. They're natural. But we're  
10    in a natural setting. They're in a wooded  
11    area. They're by a recreation area.  
12    They're away from the runway and air  
13    traffic. I mean, yes, in this area you're  
14    going to have birds. You can't help it.  
15    Commonwealth Golf Course is our neighbor.  
16    They have water, a lot of green flat land  
17    for these birds. But where the Air Force  
18    is talking about is an industrial area.  
19    It's buildings. It's oil tanks, fuel tanks  
20    and aircraft hangars. It's a fine line  
21    they're trying to walk down. Like I said,  
22    if we could have had a tour and you could  
23    have seen where it was, it would be  
24    different. You guys know where our pond is  
25    because we've driven by it before. Right

1 along their side also is the corn fields.  
2 We have water. We have food. This is  
3 great. They ain't going nowhere.

4 So we really do have to try  
5 and control the situation the best we can.  
6 I give the Air Force credit. They've taken  
7 the bull by the horns. But I'm sure  
8 they'll look into your questions.

9 RAB MEMBER: I stand  
10 corrected then. I certainly don't want to  
11 undermine human life or anything like  
12 that. But a tour would have helped. I  
13 agree with that.

14 RAB MEMBER: Can I just say  
15 the idea of maybe changing the vegetation,  
16 maybe doing a combination --

17 MR. EDMOND: Well, we'd like  
18 to get rid of the vegetation because the  
19 vegetation is where the birds nest.

20 RAB MEMBER: Well, as I  
21 understand it, certain vegetation does  
22 discourage some birds. They like open  
23 areas. I'm just wondering in order to get  
24 the benefits of the plants and obviously we  
25 want to keep people safe and so forth,

1 maybe a combination of things can be done  
2 here.

3 MR. EDMOND: I'm sure now  
4 that they've heard your concerns they'll  
5 look into it and try and do the best they  
6 can.

7 Any more questions?

8 MR. BISHOP: Thanks.

9 MR. EDMOND: Well, I'd like  
10 to turn it over to Jim Colter. He's going  
11 to update you on some water well surveys  
12 we're doing and future work we have planned  
13 here on the Navy side.

14 MR. COLTER: Okay. At the  
15 last meeting, I mentioned briefly that the  
16 Navy was about ready to prepare a  
17 feasibility study for the groundwater  
18 contamination at Site 5. We had thought we  
19 had our investigation complete enough to  
20 start a feasibility study. The EPA came in  
21 with a couple concerns and they were  
22 legitimate concerns where potentially we  
23 could have chosen an alternative and  
24 pursued a remedy and possibly have it not  
25 work as well because we didn't know all the

1 answers, especially about the effects of an  
2 off-site pumping well nearby, that being  
3 the Horsham Well No. 26. So we agreed to  
4 do a shutdown test on that well and see  
5 what information we could get. In  
6 addition, there was kind of a data gap as  
7 far as location of a well to help  
8 facilitate what is the true direction of  
9 groundwater flow and the EPA thought the  
10 installation of another well cluster would  
11 help us define that direction. So what we  
12 did over the wintertime was basically get  
13 all our contracts in place, get our scopes  
14 of work in place, work with our contractor  
15 on a plan of action, and that's where we're  
16 at today.

17 Over the winter, we worked  
18 with Tetra Tech NUS and we basically asked  
19 them to do several things. One was, first  
20 of all, the Well 26 shutdown test with  
21 USGS. What we did -- I'm not sure exactly  
22 the time frames, Dan. We shut that well  
23 down when?

24 MR. GOODE: The exact date?

25 MR. COLTER: Rough date.

1 January?

2 MR. GOODE: I'd say the  
3 third week of January, possibly a little  
4 later than that.

5 MR. COLTER: It took a  
6 little while to get Horsham Township to  
7 give us a date where we could shut the well  
8 down for about three weeks at a time of low  
9 water demand. That didn't happen until  
10 January. We did a little analysis before  
11 we shut the well down for a week. We shut  
12 the well down for a week but monitored  
13 wells on the Navy's property, restarted the  
14 well for a week and monitored again the  
15 wells, the same wells on the property.  
16 That just got done not too long ago and  
17 USGS is still evaluating that data. So by  
18 the next RAB meeting, we'll have a  
19 presentation on the results of that.

20 Also, again over the winter  
21 we really couldn't do much field work to  
22 install some of the wells that the EPA  
23 recommended. One of those wells is going  
24 to be -- if you recall a presentation a  
25 couple RAB's ago, we had a detection of

1 VOC's up along Taxiway J, which is not in  
2 the direction of groundwater flow but is in  
3 the direction of strike on the bedrock and  
4 there's a hole in there to determine if  
5 that detection of VOC's is because of  
6 solvents traveling along the strike in the  
7 bedrock or maybe it's coming from another  
8 source area. So we agreed to install a  
9 well in between our hot spot at Site 5 and  
10 Taxiway J. Actually probably by I think  
11 May we'll be out there doing the field  
12 work.

13 With the Well 26 shutdown  
14 information and the two clusters of wells  
15 we're putting in, that should satisfy all  
16 the data gaps that the EPA had regarding  
17 our investigation. We still think we have  
18 a pretty good handle on what our remedy is  
19 going to be and we want to start writing  
20 the feasibility study. Because we don't  
21 want to design something without the most  
22 current information, the last thing we're  
23 going to do this summer is do another  
24 snapshot round of sampling at Site 5,  
25 determine where the contamination is today,

1 and then we have the feasibility study  
2 basically written. We're just waiting for  
3 a little additional information. So we'll  
4 take that snapshot round of sampling.  
5 We'll know where the groundwater  
6 contamination is and we'll be able to offer  
7 pretty good remedies and alternatives and  
8 get cost estimates to make a  
9 recommendation.

10 The other thing we did over  
11 the winter again in response to EPA's  
12 concern over our original Phase 2  
13 investigation was at the Privet Road  
14 compound here. We basically determined  
15 that Privet Road itself was not the source  
16 of the groundwater contamination in the  
17 Navy's production wells. They still wanted  
18 to know where that was coming from. One of  
19 their suggestions was to log and take a  
20 look, pull the pumps out of the production  
21 wells, take a look at where the water  
22 bearing zones are and see if we can get any  
23 other information. In lieu of that, they  
24 wanted us to install wells around the  
25 production wells in a more east/west

1 direction.

2                   So it became apparent it  
3 would be cheaper for the Navy to pull the  
4 pumps than to install wells at about a  
5 depth of 350, 400 feet. So again over the  
6 winter we talked with the Air Station about  
7 when we could, you know, shut those wells  
8 down bearing in mind they have certain  
9 water emergency demands that have to be  
10 met. We came up with a plan to shut down  
11 each well alternating and actually that  
12 just got kicked off last week.

13                   MR. TURNER: Monday.

14                   MR. COLTER: Monday. And  
15 there's a group out there right now doing  
16 an eight-hour pump test on the well. We're  
17 doing a pump test and monitoring wells  
18 around the area to see what the reaction  
19 is. In a couple days USGS will go in and  
20 log those wells, find out where the water  
21 bearing zones are. That will take a couple  
22 days. And then next week they'll be out  
23 there sampling the wells trying to find  
24 zones of contamination. We have quick  
25 turnaround on the lab analysis so we'll

1 have good results in about two days and  
2 we'll be able to determine if we have  
3 enough information, if we have to do  
4 another round of sampling. So at the end  
5 of next week, we should be in a position to  
6 reinstall new pumps and get that well  
7 turned back on and move on to the second  
8 well. So by mid-May we plan on having both  
9 wells completely done and retrofitted.

10 So that's basically about it  
11 as far as the immediate work that the Navy  
12 has planned. Probably next RAB meeting  
13 we'll have some special or more  
14 presentations on the Well 26 shutdown.  
15 We'll have information on what we found in  
16 the production wells. And we'll be able to  
17 give you an updated plan of action for the  
18 feasibility study at Site 5.

19 And I know one of the RAB  
20 questionnaires was an actual time line.  
21 Right now we're into our budget submission  
22 for the upcoming year so I'm updating the  
23 schedule for all the cleanup programs for  
24 all the sites. One thing I will do in  
25 response to the RAB questionnaire will be

1 to generate an overall schedule of how the  
2 Navy sees its program in the out years.  
3 And we should have that ready by the next  
4 RAB meeting. So right now because of the  
5 wintertime and the lack of field work  
6 capability, it's a good time just to write  
7 reports and make plans of action. So we  
8 just basically started implementing the  
9 plans I announced at the last couple RAB  
10 meetings so it's a little light in the  
11 information this meeting but we'll have  
12 plenty at the next meeting to share with  
13 you.

14                   The only other item of  
15 interest is we continue to run the oil  
16 recovery system at the Navy's field farm.  
17 That's been operational for a couple years  
18 now. Every year we have our consultant  
19 write a summary report of what they have  
20 found and that's this report here. I'm  
21 going to give one copy to Liz to hold. If  
22 anyone -- basically it's all just  
23 information, data. There's nothing to  
24 review. I'll give a copy to Liz. If  
25 anyone has an interest in looking at it or

1 reviewing it, she can handle it. We're  
2 getting to a point where the consultant  
3 feels that we only need another year or two  
4 of operation to get the oil down to a level  
5 where we can close the site out. So we  
6 have to talk to him about that because  
7 right now we're spending a lot of money and  
8 I think that report says we only recovered  
9 about 46 gallons of oil the entire year of  
10 '99. Another thing about running it this  
11 year, hopefully it will be a little drier  
12 and the dryness obviously has a big effect  
13 on the capability of this system to recover  
14 oil. So we'll be making some cost type  
15 decisions here in the near future regarding  
16 this system. We may switch to another  
17 system similar to maybe what the Air Force  
18 is experimenting with with the  
19 oxygen-releasing compounds or something  
20 maybe a little bit better than pumping  
21 trees is what we're doing.

22 RAB MEMBER: Just turn it  
23 off during the dry periods.

24 MR. COLTER: That was one  
25 way originally thought off and it was

1 thought by artificially depressing the  
2 table, constantly making it low oil would  
3 be constantly running into the wells.  
4 Either we're removing most of it or the  
5 system's not working as it should be, but  
6 that's one of our next items with the fuel  
7 farm.

8                   So that's about it as far as  
9 the status of the cleanup program. I know  
10 there's been some concern about comment  
11 responses on the original draft RI report.  
12 If you remember, we decided because it was  
13 so voluminous to take each site one at a  
14 time. We started with Site 5 and we should  
15 have been done with 5 but we had some  
16 additional concerns by the regulators and  
17 we've been basically taking the last six  
18 months to get a plan in action, which we  
19 are going to pursue this spring. Once we  
20 get to the -- once we determine that the RI  
21 is complete for each site, those comments  
22 that you submitted, if they were  
23 site-specific, will be included and  
24 summarized and responded to as we finalize  
25 each site's RI and move into the

1 feasibility study for each site.

2 So that's about it. Any  
3 questions?

4 RAB MEMBER: I just have a  
5 couple questions. One is on the pooling of  
6 the pumps. You say the wells are 320 feet  
7 deep?

8 MR. COLTER: Something like  
9 that, 350.

10 RAB MEMBER: Are you doing  
11 packer zone evaluation?

12 MR. COLTER: I think we  
13 are. We're doing vertical gradients.

14 RAB MEMBER: The EPA  
15 requests to fill in the data for the  
16 contamination found off on the strike,  
17 runway flow is determined by fractures and  
18 you have to hit one of those fractures.  
19 What is the likelihood of hitting those  
20 fractures or how confident do you feel  
21 you'll get any data you can use? I don't  
22 know the frequency of the fracture  
23 structure in there.

24 MR. COLTER: I'm not sure.  
25 We're going to present something in a work

1 plan that hopefully addresses the concern  
2 of the EPA and how we plan on responding to  
3 that.

4 RAB MEMBER: Like a 40-foot  
5 open case section?

6 MR. COLTER: I'm not sure  
7 but that's a good comment. I don't know.

8 Russ, do you have anything  
9 off the top of your head?

10 MR. TURNER: Kevin, our  
11 hydrogeologist, has addressed it and we  
12 have a draft discussion of the issue that  
13 EPA has looked at. I don't think we're  
14 talking about a long well screen there. I  
15 think we were going to take a shot at  
16 getting to the geophysics and put the  
17 screen near the top of the bedrock to fill  
18 this area of data gap rather than what  
19 you're asking for is how to pinpoint the  
20 fracture, but we were assuming probably  
21 there is flow, not just in the fracture, it  
22 would have to be enough volume. We're  
23 trying to hit that volume.

24 RAB MEMBER: Is there  
25 somebody from the EPA here today?

1 MR. COLTER: No.

2 RAB MEMBER: Is there any  
3 reason they have all these concerns but  
4 don't come to the meetings?

5 RAB MEMBER: The EPA's been  
6 at the last couple meetings. She had a  
7 conflict of schedule at the last minute.  
8 Right now we've responded to most of their  
9 concerns, which were there was a lot of  
10 action items generated at a technical  
11 meeting last April. We've addressed all of  
12 them except those that deal with field  
13 work. And by the time we got a plan in  
14 place and we got our consultants under  
15 contract, it was the wintertime and all we  
16 did was get work plans, get them approved  
17 and get ready for the upcoming construction  
18 season. So we should see some significant  
19 progress on Site 5 over the next six to  
20 nine months as far as moving into the  
21 feasibility study and maybe even pursuing  
22 an interim remedial action for what we feel  
23 we already know what the answer is. So we  
24 should be seeing some progress there as far  
25 as a remedy in place within the next, you

1 know, 12 to 18 months I'm hoping.

2 RAB MEMBER: Great.

3 MR. EDMOND: Any other  
4 questions? Before we take a nice break  
5 here, I think it's due a couple things.  
6 There was a lot of talk about the Navy  
7 ponds and Air Force ponds. Well, the Navy  
8 has a nature trail. It goes by our ponds.  
9 If anybody has school groups, scout groups,  
10 community groups, if anyone wants to,  
11 please contact the public affairs officer,  
12 Ms. Sherri Jones, 443-1779, and set up a  
13 tour. We've done a lot of work. You can  
14 walk across the ponds. There's a duck  
15 stand. There's going to be signs showing  
16 where all the fauna is out there. It's  
17 pretty nice.

18 Everybody who hasn't signed  
19 in, please sign in so I can use it for the  
20 official record of the meeting.

21 Also, if anybody wants any  
22 material on past RAB meetings, I have some  
23 old newsletters which for people who  
24 haven't been here before might be  
25 interesting. There's been a lot of talk

1 about the water systems in the area. I  
2 have our consumer confidence reports on the  
3 water system. If anybody would like to  
4 take one home, review it, I have some  
5 here.

6 With that said, please take  
7 a 10, 15-minute break.

8 (Short recess.)

9 MR. EDMOND: For the final  
10 point of interest this evening, I'd like to  
11 go over the RAB questionnaire. A few  
12 months ago I sent everybody a questionnaire  
13 and I took all the responses as it says on  
14 your handout. I sent out 20 questionnaires  
15 and got 12 back. These are a summary of  
16 the comments I received. We'll go over  
17 them and we can discuss them.

18 Some of the suggestions RAB  
19 members came up with was giving an overall  
20 restoration strategy and time line for  
21 cleanup update annually. As Jim said, we  
22 took that to heart and we will start giving  
23 you a good time line. Every time something  
24 changes, we'll update it and keep you all  
25 abreast of what's happening.

1                   Increase community  
2 involvement at the RAB. Now, I would love  
3 to increase community involvement at the  
4 RAB but I don't know where to go. I  
5 knocked on doors. John Dunleavy when he  
6 worked for the Navy before he became a  
7 community member, him and I and Jim Colter,  
8 staff from both the Air Station and  
9 Northern Division knocked on doors and put  
10 handouts in mailboxes asking for people to  
11 attend the meeting.

12                   RAB MEMBER: Jim, I think I  
13 made this comment. What I was trying to  
14 say was instead of it being a presentation  
15 of about what's happening or going to  
16 happen, maybe the RAB members can be more a  
17 part of how something happens, once in a  
18 while having a more technical RAB meeting.  
19 I don't know. It's just an idea. I know  
20 it was done at some other naval bases.  
21 They would have a technical subcommittee  
22 meeting that was actually more involved  
23 with the decision-making progress.

24                   MR. EDMOND: The  
25 double-edged sword to that was another

1 comment, are we using too many technical  
2 words and jargon.

3 RAB MEMBER: I like the idea  
4 of a technical submeeting. I can miss  
5 that.

6 RAB MEMBER: I'll just make  
7 a suggestion that it might be helpful to  
8 you to call in Leo Shane.

9 MR. EDMOND: I did. He was  
10 supposed to be here tonight.

11 MS. JONES: I talked with  
12 them.

13 MR. EDMOND: They have free  
14 access to me all the time. They know my  
15 number. They've come before and did  
16 interviews. They're on the mailing list.

17 RAB MEMBER: We have a cable  
18 channel too.

19 CDR. VIERA: I think he's  
20 mentioning you made that comment.

21 RAB MEMBER: It was so long  
22 ago.

23 CDR. VIERA: But it wasn't  
24 necessarily get more people here?

25 RAB MEMBER: Right. It was

1 the RAB members would have more -- I hear a  
2 lot about the negotiations between the Navy  
3 and EPA and the State. RAB members seem to  
4 never be involved in those negotiations or  
5 even hear them. That's I think what I was  
6 saying.

7 MR. EDMOND: That's true.  
8 You know what, I think we can arrange  
9 that. I'm sure after the first one you'll  
10 all not want to come.

11 RAB MEMBER: Actually, I'd  
12 rather go to meetings like that.

13 MR. EDMOND: I know you  
14 would, Jack and Eric. Maybe Kaye would  
15 like to go.

16 RAB MEMBER: You have to  
17 have someone that can understand what's  
18 going on. Guys like me or Rich here would  
19 sit there and say okay, what's going on?  
20 It's good to have the presence there,  
21 that's correct. But if you really want  
22 some activity, it's going to be you folks  
23 that have that background and education  
24 that can understand what's going on. My  
25 input would be hello, goodnight.

1 MR. EDMOND: That's what  
2 we'll do. The next time we have a  
3 technical review meeting, it will be a  
4 short fuse notice. These things are -- we  
5 give you a couple weeks but that's probably  
6 about it because these things are pretty  
7 flexible according to EPA or PADEP's  
8 schedule.

9 RAB MEMBER: And they're  
10 probably during the week.

11 MR. EDMOND: Maybe we can  
12 schedule one for at night to give everybody  
13 a taste of what these things are.

14 MR. COLTER: You know I'm on  
15 call 24 hours a day but the regulators  
16 aren't.

17 MR. EDMOND: The regulators  
18 say they are.

19 CDR. VIERA: Is it possible  
20 to do something like that here?

21 MR. EDMOND: Yes, sir.  
22 We'll do it at the conference room. It  
23 won't be a RAB meeting. It will be a  
24 submeeting in between with the technical  
25 people only and RAB members, the

1 community.

2 CDR. VIERA: We couldn't  
3 hold one in place of what we're doing right  
4 now?

5 MR. EDMOND: No, sir.  
6 That's over and above.

7 RAB MEMBER: Jim, I'd just  
8 say if I was to participate, I wouldn't  
9 object to doing something on an afternoon.  
10 It doesn't have to be at night.

11 MR. EDMOND: I will try and  
12 make it 5:00, 6 o'clock in the conference  
13 room here and I'll invite everybody. And  
14 it will be -- nothing will be held against  
15 you if you don't want to come.

16 MR. COLTER: What we try to  
17 do is hold some type of meeting with the  
18 regulators prior to each RAB meeting, make  
19 decisions, make progress and come to the  
20 RAB and basically announce what the  
21 decisions are.

22 RAB MEMBER: Right, right.

23 MR. COLTER: We didn't do it  
24 this time because, like I said, we had a  
25 technical meeting back in October where we

1 talked about Site 1, we talked about the  
2 groundwater with the Air Force and I handed  
3 them our packet of information how we're  
4 going to answer their Site 5 problems. So  
5 there was really nothing to discuss. It  
6 was at the October meeting it got discussed  
7 and we've been for the last six months  
8 basically implementing those decisions.  
9 The next couple months we'll be doing field  
10 work. So I'm not sure when the next  
11 meeting we're going to have with the  
12 regulators to actually make a decision  
13 until we get to the feasibility study of,  
14 say, Site 5 where the Navy presents what  
15 its preferred alternative is. That's going  
16 to be after the field work, after the  
17 results, after the regulators look at the  
18 data. So it may not happen even before the  
19 next meeting.

20 MR. EDMOND: Unless, you  
21 know, the Air Force has a meeting and we  
22 can use that. It doesn't have to be the  
23 Navy. It can be the Air Force also.

24 Moving along here, make  
25 presentations less formal, keep unrequired

1 facilities people away. I'll volunteer not  
2 to come. Less military DOD civilian  
3 participation. As you can see, we've  
4 dropped it down. We only have the  
5 cochairperson, the XO, the Colonel and  
6 Major from the Air Force. I don't think we  
7 can get less military participation than  
8 this. DOD civilian participation is  
9 myself, Hal and Gill and our contractors.  
10 Again, our contractors have to be here  
11 because they're doing the majority of the  
12 work. They can answer most of the good  
13 technical questions.

14 Encourage press coverage.  
15 Both The Intelligencer and Record are on  
16 the mailing list. They get mailed  
17 everything that the people from the RAB  
18 get. They're encouraged to come. Our PAO  
19 is here also to encourage them to come.

20 Keep information in as  
21 simplest terms as possible. As hard as  
22 that may be, we're really trying to do  
23 that. There's just some terms you can't  
24 get around. Volatile organic compound is a  
25 volatile organic compound.

1 RAB MEMBER: Solvent.

2 MR. EDMOND: That's a good  
3 one.

4 Need better commitment from  
5 community members. Now, this was your --  
6 these are not my responses. This is the  
7 community's responses. I didn't know how  
8 to react to that. I think the community  
9 has made a good commitment. I see the same  
10 faces all the time. I mean I'm getting  
11 paid for this. Our contractors are getting  
12 paid for this. You people are giving up  
13 your own time. We're very appreciative of  
14 that.

15 RAB MEMBER: Where are the  
16 doughnuts?

17 MR. EDMOND: I was going to  
18 ask Rich to bring them. I'm sorry, Rich.

19 RAB MEMBER: That's okay.  
20 We do bagels.

21 MR. EDMOND: Less meetings  
22 and put them in a more informal location,  
23 i.e., school, library, municipal building.

24 When we started the RAB  
25 three and a half years ago, we attempted

1 this. This is what the Navy would have  
2 liked us to do. We looked for a facility  
3 that had, you know, audiovisual equipment,  
4 it was easy access, it was nice for  
5 everybody. We couldn't come up with  
6 anything. It was like we hit the schools,  
7 libraries, there wasn't anything convenient  
8 to everyone. This being right in the front  
9 gate, if somebody can come up with some  
10 suggestions, we'll be more than happy to  
11 see what the RAB members think. It doesn't  
12 have to be here. We started out in the Air  
13 Force conference room and when we got this  
14 one redone, we moved in here. If anyone  
15 can come up with a good solution, do some  
16 leg work, we'll be glad to move it to  
17 somewhere more advantageous to the  
18 community.

19 RAB MEMBER: I prefer to sit  
20 on plastic molded seats myself. That's all  
21 right. This is fine.

22 RAB MEMBER: I think this is  
23 fine, especially since we have the ability  
24 to do the tours.

25 MR. EDMOND: And now that

1 the time is going to change on Monday,  
2 daylight savings time, I'll be bus driving  
3 again. I'm going to teach the XO how to  
4 bus drive so we have a backup. Next  
5 Monday. I thought it was this Monday.

6 Keep members off mailing  
7 lists when it comes to technical reports  
8 which they do not want nor have time to  
9 review large technical documents to save  
10 taxpayers money. We're trying that. As  
11 you know, we came up with a Readers' Digest  
12 version of things. We'll keep moving in  
13 that direction. If the web, Internet  
14 starts moving up, we'll try and go in that  
15 direction.

16 MR. COLTER: Kind of what we  
17 did today, one to the RAB cochair. If  
18 anyone has a real interest, you can hand it  
19 out.

20 RAB MEMBER: I thank you.  
21 My mailman thanks you.

22 MR. EDMOND: The next one is  
23 have a social type meeting so members get  
24 to know each other a little better other  
25 than in the environmental type setting.

1 We're thinking of doing something like that  
2 in the summer months, maybe a picnic, a  
3 late afternoon picnic, barbecue type  
4 thing.

5 MS. JONES: Walk the nature  
6 trail.

7 MR. EDMOND: Walk the nature  
8 trail, see our pond, cook some hot dogs or  
9 hamburgers, pizza.

10 The next one was the most  
11 important function of the RAB. Some of the  
12 input was to provide input to the military  
13 environmental staff and as a liaison  
14 between the community and Air Station.  
15 That's exactly what it is. I can give you  
16 what we as the Air Station are doing good.  
17 You hear enough bad stuff in the paper and  
18 press or whatever. I can say, hey, we're  
19 doing a nature trail. Come and visit it.  
20 We're having an air show. I get a good  
21 report back from you guys and it's great.  
22 It gives North Div and our contractors, the  
23 Air Force and their contractors an idea of  
24 what the community thinks what is good  
25 technology, what's not good technology.

1 It's better spent if we all come up with  
2 the idea of this is what we're going to  
3 do. This is what the RAB is for. Public  
4 relations, we're always looking for good  
5 public relations so this is good public  
6 relations for us.

7 To involve the community in  
8 the decision-making process, again, that's  
9 what I hope you're all here for.

10 Provide information and  
11 communication to the community in  
12 partnering from the Air Station. The  
13 military these days are moving into  
14 partnering. We're trying to do a lot of  
15 stuff with schools, scouts. We do a lot of  
16 volunteer work throughout the community.  
17 We're trying to partner with the  
18 community.

19 Monitor and assist in the  
20 redemption process and hopefully speed it  
21 up. Redemption process, I think to redeem  
22 on some of the contaminated lands, clean  
23 them up and put them to good, good use.

24 Provide effort on the  
25 military's part to involve the community in

1 restoration decisions. For agenda items or  
2 topics for future, more of an outreach to  
3 community, participate in the Horsham  
4 Environmental Advisory Board, which we  
5 would love, myself and public works  
6 officer, somebody from my staff would love  
7 it. If you guys invite us, we're sure to  
8 come.

9 Continue updates, strategy  
10 goals, cleanups and effects of cleanup  
11 efforts. We're attempting to give you a  
12 better idea of that on a meeting to meeting  
13 basis.

14 More groundwater status  
15 reports. Next meeting you'll probably have  
16 more groundwater you need or want to know  
17 about.

18 Give an historical  
19 presentation on all previous and present RI  
20 efforts. I think we've done that in the  
21 past but it's something we can do in the  
22 future, get everybody who may have  
23 forgotten back up to speed.

24 Finally, an overview how the  
25 Air Station compares to other military

1 installations in the United States and our  
2 problems compared to theirs. Just to touch  
3 on that, a lot of the military  
4 installations would love to have our  
5 problems because they have a lot worse than  
6 we do. Ours is on station. It's well  
7 defined. We know our problems. We're  
8 addressing our problems. As Jim Colter can  
9 tell you, he has Calverton, New York, and  
10 it's a bird of a different color. He  
11 wishes they were all like Willow Grove but  
12 they're not.

13 That's the responses to the  
14 RAB. I just wanted to go over them with  
15 you. Any comments? Any other responses  
16 from the community members?

17 RAB MEMBER: Just one. No.  
18 3, I don't know how you have less military  
19 people and DOD people on a military  
20 installation. Somebody's intimidated.

21 RAB MEMBER: Early on at the  
22 RAB's there was an overload, I think.

23 MR. EDMOND: There's been  
24 times because it was a community meeting  
25 everybody wanted to come out and make sure

1 they were showing their best face. As  
2 things progressed, they realized that we  
3 don't need that much. It's under control.  
4 And the minimal is best. That's what we've  
5 been trying to keep it at.

6 RAB MEMBER: The more people  
7 involved, certainly military people, they  
8 work here, a few people live here, they  
9 have a right to be here.

10 RAB MEMBER: How many active  
11 RAB members do you have?

12 MR. EDMOND: Well, this is  
13 really the nucleus right here. These are  
14 the people that come day in and day out.  
15 Tom Hibbs, there's some other people, but  
16 I'd say it's about 10 to 15 people that are  
17 solid always here or have an excuse why  
18 they can't come, give me feedback on the  
19 documents that are sent out, give comments,  
20 10 to 15.

21 RAB MEMBER: How do we  
22 compare to other RAB committees on other  
23 bases?

24 MR. EDMOND: It's probably  
25 about the average I'd say for size. Some

1 are huge. At community meetings, they're  
2 forums.

3 RAB MEMBER: At least when I  
4 worked in the Navy, there was a large  
5 variance. This is big compared to some of  
6 the ones I worked on. Some of them were  
7 just a group of six people where the RAB's  
8 members had enough technical people  
9 technically qualified. They trusted them  
10 enough to say go to the meetings, make sure  
11 everything is going the way we want it to  
12 go.

13 MR. EDMOND: There were some  
14 people when we started that more or less  
15 thought it was going to be a forum for them  
16 to address their problems or difficulties  
17 with the military or the groundwater at  
18 Warminster. Some of them thought this was  
19 Warminster. I can remember the first  
20 meeting we had somebody come in and start  
21 slamming us about the water's bad. We  
22 said, "You're at the wrong base." But as  
23 April said --

24 MS. FLIPSE: There's maybe  
25 two or three people showing up at the RAB

1 meetings at Warminster now but they're  
2 daytime meetings and the people who are  
3 showing up are the township officials. The  
4 mayor of Ivyland is there all the time.

5 RAB MEMBER: That's one  
6 thing. There isn't anybody from the  
7 township here?

8 MR. EDMOND: They're  
9 invited. Elaine Hughes is from the Horsham  
10 Environmental Advisory Board so that's an  
11 ipso facto part of the community.

12 Any other questions?  
13 Comments? Well, in that case June is  
14 another three months so I selected June 7,  
15 which is the first Wednesday in June. If  
16 no one has any heartburn with that, we'll  
17 etch that in stone. It's not Ash Wednesday  
18 as last time. My wife chastised me for  
19 that. Don't you know your religious  
20 holidays?

21 If nothing else, I'd like to  
22 call the meeting to a close. We'll see you  
23 in the summer. Have a good spring. Thank  
24 you all for coming.

25

-----

1 REPORTED BY: Kimberly A.

2 Otherwise, RPR.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25