



Re: Request review or approval of Draft Army Approved Minutes (UNCLASSIFIED)

Monday, September 13, 2010 2:52 PM

From: "Roach.Bill@epamail.epa.gov" <Roach.Bill@epamail.epa.gov>

To: "Gabel, Ted Mr CIV USA IMCOM" <ted.gabel@us.army.mil>

Cc: "Greg Zalaskus" <Greg.Zalaskus@dep.state.nj.us>, "Jim Kealy" <Jim.Kealy@dep.state.nj.us>, "Joe Marchesani" <Joe.Marchesani@dep.state.nj.us>, michaelglaab@worldnet.att.net, "Tracy Grabiak" <Tracy.Grabiak@dep.state.nj.us>

Ted, I have reviewed the meeting minutes and have the following comments

- 1) PICA 013 (Site 78), Vapor Intrusion at Building 91, fourth bullet - Revise the second sub-bullet as follows: "In conclusion, Mr. Nace stated that based on the secondary criteria, the site could be screened out but he was also concerned with public comment and lack of sub-slab data."
- 2) PICA 001/011/057 - Discussion on ARAR language, second bullet - The premise of the first sentence is incorrect as the May 12, 2010 letter from Walter Mugdan to Irene Kropp (NJDEP) did not state that LUCs address ARARs.
- 3) PICA 001/011/057 - Discussion on ARAR language, second bullet - The first sub-bullet should be rewritten to state: "EPA stated that in a recent telephone conversation between upper management, that NJDEP maintained that once risk was exceeded (greater than 10-4) at one single operable unit at Picatinny, then ARARs would need to be addressed facility wide. Furthermore, EPA HQs has stated that LUCs (other than some type of installed cover) do not address chemical-specific ARARs.
- 4) PICA 001/011/057 - Discussion on ARAR language, second bullet - The third sentence in the second sub-bullet refers to the May 12, 2010 EPA letter in stating that it would not lead to remedy changes. The May 12, 2010 letter does not address that issue.
- 5) PICA 001/011/057 - Discussion on ARAR language, second bullet - Revise the fourth sub-bullet to state: "USEPA has been told by NJDEP management that NJDEP may not be concurring on these remedies which may prevent construction completion at Picatinny since the state would presumably not concur." [cross reference comment 3 above]
- 6) 5-Year Review - A brief site-specific protectiveness statement should be made for each site discussed in the 5-year review in addition to the longer facility-wide protectiveness statement provided in the conclusion of the document.

From: "Gabel, Ted Mr CIV USA IMCOM" <ted.gabel@us.army.mil>

To: Bill Roach/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Greg Zalaskus" <Greg.Zalaskus@dep.state.nj.us>, "Jim Kealy" <Jim.Kealy@dep.state.nj.us>, "Joe Marchesani" <Joe.Marchesani@dep.state.nj.us>, "Tracy Grabiak" <Tracy.Grabiak@dep.state.nj.us>

Cc: <michaelglaab@worldnet.att.net>

Date: 09/13/2010 01:12 PM

Subject: Request review or approval of Draft Army Approved Minutes (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Bill/Greg, Jim, Joe and Tracy:

Minutes from the meeting of 2 September Please review so it will be part of the record. Let us know if we forgot or edits are required.

Bill: Please get this to your risk assessor if required.

Thanks.

Ted Gabe1

Re: Request review or approval of Draft Army Approved Minutes (UNCLASSIFIED) - 'att.net Mail'

Project Manager  
for Environmental Restoration  
US Army Garrison, Picatinny Arsenal  
INCOM-NERO-PIC-PWE  
B319  
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000  
Commercial: (973) 724-6748  
Fax: (973)-724-5398  
DSN: (312) 880-6748  
"We are the Army's Home in Northern New Jersey"

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE[attachment "Draft Meeting Minutes for September 2010 as approved by the Army.docx" deleted by Bill Roach/R2/USEPA/US]

---