

Meeting Minutes
Restoration Advisory Board
Former Schenectady Army Depot – Voorheesville Area
July 21, 2005
Lynnwood Reformed Church
Schenectady, New York

Restoration Advisory Board Members and Project Staff Attendees:

Ted Ausfeld, Alternate Acting Community Co-Chairman
Heather Bishop, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Gregory J. Goepfert, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Army Co-Chair
Joan Kappel
George Moreau, Parsons
Charles Rielly, Acting Community Co-Chair
Deb Volkmer, Weston

Other Attendees

Andrew Graham, Blasland, Bouck & Lee, Inc.
Suresh R. Kikkeri, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
Melissa Hale-Spencer, Altamont “Enterprise” newspaper

Introductions

G. Goepfert called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and asked everyone to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance. After the pledge G. Goepfert welcomed everyone for coming to the meeting. Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members, project staff, and other attendees introduced themselves. G. Goepfert provided a handout that is duplicated at the end of the minutes.

Proposed Remediation, Area of Concern #2

G. Goepfert referred to the handout and said the selected remedial alternative was removal and off-site disposal. The Corps estimated the cleanup cost to be \$650,000. G. Goepfert said the 30-day comment period will end on 29 July 2005. He said he has already received comments from T. Ausfeld, C. Rielly, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and Joan Burns. He added that a Responsiveness Summary will be prepared and attached to the Action Memorandum.

G. Goepfert addressed the questions he received earlier from C. Rielly:

Question #1: What responsibility does the Army have of past, present, and future health of those exposed? G. Goepfert response: The Army is responsible as long as it can be shown that the site contamination was caused by the Department of Defense. This question was brought up before – if someone has concerns they can petition the New York State Department of Health to conduct a health study.

T. Ausfeld said he passed the information around the neighborhood to see if there was any interest and nothing happened.

Question #2: What would be the Army responsibility if an off-site drinking water supply was polluted?

G. Goepfert said the Army is responsible as long as the contamination is linked to the Department of Defense's use of the site and that he would meet separately with C. Rielly to discuss this further.

T. Ausfeld said the well areas in Albany County were tested but he did not see any results.

G. Goepfert said Metweld was a private well and the information was confidential. He added that Ron Groves had informed him that there were some metals detected, similar to conditions found in other wells in the area. Mr. T. Ausfeld said it was in Area of Concern (AOC) #1; a very bad site. He asked the Corps to look at Route 158 when working on Area of Concern #8.

G. Goepfert said he would not wait too long to sit down and discuss the areas.

C. Rielly said the key was that groundwater is a drinking water source and it sounds like the drinking water is polluted.

G. Goepfert said there is a potential for groundwater impact.

T. Ausfeld said the test wells on the Burns' property informed the people it was not wise to use the well water for drinking.

G. Goepfert said first, let's remove the source material. He added that the State is requiring post excavation confirmatory sampling of the source area. He said follow-up groundwater sampling will be added to the work plan for AOC #2.

C. Rielly asked how many people were using private wells.

T. Ausfeld said residents could use wells for barn uses or irrigation, but not drink it and be on public water.

G. Goepfert said he would need a list of private wells.

C. Rielly asked if people can not be on public water and use well water.

T. Ausfeld responded yes, it is possible.

C. Rielly said then people could be drinking well water that is contaminated and they wouldn't know it.

T. Ausfeld said sampling needs to be done.

G. Goepfert said if there is a problem with the groundwater then a deed restriction may be considered, upon discussion with the regulatory agencies and the property owner.

T. Ausfeld said everyone said if there was a problem with the groundwater; we have to do something after the fact.

G. Goepfert said we can request private well information from the State.

H. Bishop said this should be looked at; the State should have the information.

T. Ausfeld said that it needs to be looked at and it can be done simply.

G. Goepfert asked the RAB members to give the Corps time to do the research. T. Ausfeld offered a map of the regional municipal water system for the Corps to do the research.

C. Rielly said tell the people they should not drink the water.

H. Bishop said first need to look at the data.

G. Goepfert asked what can the State do.

H. Bishop responded that Dan Geraghty, New York State Department of Health, would be the primary contact. She added that she would work with D. Geraghty on this.

G. Goepfert said he would contact D. Geraghty.

C. Rielly asked G. Goepfert to ask D. Geraghty to e-mail the plan and information to C. Rielly.

G. Goepfert said the Corps would conduct follow-up sampling of the downstream well at Area of Concern #2 after remediation. He added that he wants to keep the well out there for future sampling efforts.

Question #3: The content of the pill bottles met RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) criteria so why were the bottles not removed.

G. Goepfert responded that the pill bottles are not hazardous as defined by RCRA; however, if the removal of the pill bottles is incidental to the removal of other items, the Corps will remove the bottles.

Question 4: Only though RAB participation were the new sources of contamination found.

G. Goepfert said the RAB program is working and he will acknowledge the RAB members' involvement in the final Remedial Investigation report. He asked if there were any other questions.

C. Rielly asked a question about Section 3 in the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for AOC #2, and discussion followed.

J. Kappel asked if analysis results are compared to site background or to regulatory criteria.

G. Moreau said both are used, and generally it the higher of the two numbers that helps to identify impacts that require further evaluation.

C. Rielly said drums near TP-25 [TP=test pit] containing solvent bottles were not shown in the EE/CA for AOC #2.

G. Moreau said they were rusted drum fragments and showed no concentrations over criteria. He added that once the work crews are digging during the remediation and find a drum that they will deal with it at that time.

T. Ausfeld asked about the letter that Mrs. Burns sent to the Corps.

G. Goepfert said he would add Mrs. Burns' letter to the list of comments as part of the Responsiveness Summary section of the Action Memorandum. He said one of Mrs. Burns' questions was would the Army be responsible if Department of Defense materials were found in the future. He added that the answer is yes, the liability does not go away and that this was provided under CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act). He said that Section 6.2.3.3 in the EE/CA for AOC #2 refers to the capping alternative, which included operation and maintenance for 30 years with periodic inspections and maintenance in the cost estimate for that alternative.

G. Moreau said the 30 years is standard to develop operation and maintenance cost estimates.

T. Ausfeld said there should be a note on the property deed for future property owners that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cleaned up the site.

G. Goepfert said a final report will be provided to the property owner.

J. Kappel said there are real estate disclosures.

G. Goepfert said if future owners find something they may not know what to do. He added that he would ask the Corps attorneys, review Army standard operating procedures, and document this in the Responsiveness Summary attached to the Action Memorandum for AOC #2.

C. Rielly said he did not want what happened to Mrs. Burns to happen to future property owners.

G. Goepfert said there may be a deed notice prepared for the property. He said that Mrs. Burns' letter also asked for details of post excavation sampling. He said that the Corps will conduct soil, sediment and groundwater confirmatory sampling. He added that confirmatory sampling will include collecting and analyzing samples from inside the excavated hole and the excavated soil. If the results show contamination, the excavation will continue and the

confirmatory sampling process will be repeated. He said in his experience items buried in the ground are typically found above the water table.

J. Kappel said in that area of town the water table has risen due to farming practices. She added that the water table may not be where the Corps thinks it is. She said the high level of beaver activity may also have something to do with the water table level.

C. Rielly said there is the potential that contamination is reaching Black Creek and the Watervliet Reservoir.

G. Goepfert said the Corps has no justification to sample any further downstream in Black Creek. He suggested that discussion of Area of Concern #2 finish and move on to Area of Concern #8.

C. Rielly asked if the Corps discovered any pollution-indicating activities at FSADVA that residents were not aware of.

G. Moreau said he did not think so.

G. Goepfert said no, he did not know. He added that depot operations are typically storage and transport.

J. Kappel said that BEHP (bis[2-ethylhexyl] phthalate) was unexpected.

G. Goepfert said BEHP was found upstream from the site and was not strictly tied to the depot.

C. Rielly said the Remedial Investigation report needs to update its census figures and correct the "junior" high school to senior high school.

G. Goepfert said the Corps will develop a Site Safety and Health Plan; meet with Mrs. Burns before remediation begins; inform area neighbors of the remediation; and when the Action Memorandum is signed, place an ad in the newspaper. He said if the Corps finds anything new during remediation he will share the discovery with the RAB and address the situation.

J. Kappel asked G. Moreau regarding cost estimates for Parsons to sample the [Black Creek] delta.

G. Moreau said sampling costs could range from \$10,000 to \$100,000 depending on the number of samples, the chemical analyses used, sampling depth, and size of the sampling area. He said sampling would be done in a staged approach. He added it is expensive to do a thorough job.

J. Kappel asked what if another entity found something linked to FSADVA.

G. Goepfert said there could be other sources for the contamination and operations between the depot and the delta.

C. Rielly said it was possible to find some contamination that the Northeast Industrial Park did or did not do.

T. Ausfeld said the Northeast Industrial Park (NEIP) drew up a general Environmental Impact Statement to address construction planned for Areas of Concern #1 and #7. He said there is a 30-day public comment period and construction will affect those sites. He added that people do not know about this and residents should be notified by the local planning board of these actions.

J. Kappel said if the town board does not act within the 30-day public comment period the plan would be accepted. She said the public comment period ends September 6, 2005.

C. Rielly said with implementation of the plan traffic volume would increase; there would be more office/research space and more industrial space. He added this would impact the FSADVA Areas of Concern.

G. Goepfert said the NEIP owner knows where the Areas of Concern are located. He said he would check with Corps counsel; but he believes the Corps has no authority over the industrial park's action. He thanked the RAB members for bringing it to his attention.

C. Rielly said the Corps could let the town know it may be concerned; otherwise the town may approve the Environmental Impact Statement.

J. Kappel said attendance at the town meetings is low and this item was not at the top of the meeting agenda; if there are no comments or concerns raised within 30 days the document is accepted.

C. Rielly repeated that the Corps needs to let the town know of their concerns and that the industrial park expansion is done after the cleanup of the FSADVA site.

G. Goepfert said he needed to know when the comment period ends.

C. Rielly said he would provide the information to G. Goepfert.

G. Goepfert announced that Andrew Graham who has been working on the FSADVA project now works for Blasland, Bouck & Lee, Inc. He added that Mr. Graham will continue working on the FSADVA team as a subcontractor.

C. Rielly said he was pleased that work on Area of Concern #2 was progressing for Mrs. Burns' sake.

Status, Remedial Investigation Report

G. Goepfert referred to the handout entitled *Remedial Investigation, Status* and said the Corps now needs to finish the Remedial Investigation report; the Corps, in collaboration with Parsons, will be formatting data, incorporating a Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment, incorporating all previous public and regulatory comment, and will issue a final document. He added that he would arrange for a meeting just to go over the Remedial Investigation report

before it is finally issued. He will send the report to the RAB members for another review, and then issue a final document. He said the Remedial Investigation report should be wrapped up by the end of 2005.

Program Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) – 2006

G. Goepfert referred to the handout entitled *Summary of Future Work – FY 2006* and said the Area of Concern #7 would be brought into Area of Concern #1 (Southern Landfill). He said that public involvement would continue during this work.

T. Ausfeld asked if the Corps would get the City of Watervliet and the City of Albany involved or given copies of reports to those two entities to provide input. T. Ausfeld also asked about the Voorheesville depot.

G. Goepfert said those responsible for the Voorheesville depot are not at the meeting and he could not address RAB member questions on that depot. He said he would ask Dennis Wesolowski of the Defense Logistics Agency and F. Kevin Reilly, DLA/DNSC, to attend the next RAB meeting. G. Goepfert said the next RAB meeting will be an informal small meeting and then a full RAB meeting with an Area of Concern #2 progress report in October or November 2005.

J. Kappel said RAB members fear that the Northeast Industrial Park does something before the Corps is up to that step or Area of Concern.

H. Bishop said the industrial park cannot transfer property without deed notification of letting the Department of Defense know of their intentions.

T. Ausfeld said the industrial park's construction will affect everything; Black Creek, and the Burns property.

G. Goepfert referred to the handout that expressed the Corps' thankfulness of the RAB members, specifically Messrs. Charles Rielly and Ted Ausfeld, for their dedication and collaboration with the Corps' work on the FSADVA. He added that he looks forward to their and the RAB's continued involvement.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Handouts



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Former Schenectady Army Depot – Voorheesville Area

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

July 21, 2005

Schenectady, New York



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Agenda

- Introductions
- Proposed Remediation, Area of Concern #2
- Status, Remedial Investigation Report
- Program Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) – 2006
- Adjournment



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Area of Concern #2

- Alternatives considered in Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA): No action, soil containment or removal & off-site disposal
- Proposed Plan: removal & off-site disposal
- Cost Estimate: \$650,000
- Public comments on EE/CA due 29 Jul 2005
- Schedule: Begin work on or about Sept/Oct 2005, subject to funding availability, Action Memo signing and work plan approval



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Remedial Investigation, Status

- Incorporate data gap results
- Incorporate a Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment
- Incorporate all previous public and regulatory comment
- Issue final document, as soon as possible



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Summary of Future Work – FY 2006*

- Perform Feasibility Study, Area of Concern 1 (Southern Landfill)
 - Consider all data during investigation to address AOC 1
 - Develop and evaluate alternatives to address AOC 1
- Perform Feasibility Study, Area of Concern 8 (Black Creek)
 - Consider all data during investigation phase.
 - Develop and evaluate alternatives to address AOC 8



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Discussion



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New York District

Words of thanks are in order for all citizen members of the Restoration Advisory Board, and for the notable efforts of Messrs. Charles Rielly and Ted Ausfeld; for their dedication to their community, and their value-added collaboration with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the investigation and clean up efforts at the Former Schenectady Army Depot – Voorheesville Area.