**Former Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant (TCAAP)**

**Restoration Advisory Board Meeting**

**Conducted Virtually using Microsoft Teams**

**February 16, 2021**

**Time/Place**: 7:00 pm, February 16, 2021 – Microsoft Teams

**Attendees:** Approximately 28 people attended the meeting including 9 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Community Members and 10 Non-Community Members. Names of attendees are included in the attachment.

**Agenda:** Review/Approve Minutes from Last Meeting, Select New Community Co-Chair, Member Bios, Review Mission Statement, Discuss/Approve Edits to Operating Procedures, Schedule of Meetings for 2021, Next Meeting Agenda, and Public Comments.

**Introduction:** Ms. Cathy Kropp took attendance and Ms. Linda Albrecht provided plans for the evening.

**Presentations:**

Review/Approve Minutes of Last Meeting

* Minutes were sent out to RAB members on 27 January with a request for input by 11 February. No suggested changes were received during that time.
* One member at the meeting recommended minutes be edited to include when the RAB was first established. The Army agreed to verify date and add to minutes.
* The minutes will be finalized, published on the website, and added to the administrative record.

Select New Community Co-Chair

* Originally three members volunteered to serve as Community Co-Chair. Two of those volunteers (Marie Culhane and Roscoe Curry) had to decline due to other commitments.
* Forrest Kelley confirmed that he is still willing to serve as a Community Co-Chair for the TCAAP RAB.
* The RAB was asked if any Community Members had interest in serving as Community Co-Chair. No additional volunteers came forward.
* Without objection, Forrest Kelley was accepted as the new Community Co-Chair.

Get to Know Each Other Through Member Bios

* At the last meeting it was requested that Community Members share information about themselves. Three forms were received with biography information, so the Army had not forwarded those in anticipation of receiving more (Paul Bloom, Lyle Salmela and Niall Johnson)
* One member recommended putting out another call for member biographies.
* It was recommended that member biographies be read at the next meeting. There were no objections.

Mission Statement Review

* Ms. Albrecht clarified the scope of the RAB and noted that the RAB is funded by Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP). During RAB meetings, only RAB topics can be discussed. At TCAAP, that includes the cleanup requirements for OU1, OU2, OU3 and Round Lake.
* The mission statement for the TCAAP RAB was finalized in 1996 and the Army feels it is still accurate. The 1996 mission statement was read out loud for review by the RAB.
* One RAB member noted that the mission statement does not specify surface waters. The Army agreed that surface waters should be included in the mission statement. No objections were raised.
* Regarding the RAB promoting and influencing policy decisions, the U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC) does not make policy decisions but can provide feedback from the community to the policy makers at Headquarters Department of the Army.
* One member recommended that Rice Creek Watershed District be included as a stakeholder. The Army concurred. No objections were raised.
* The Army will make the agreed upon edits to the mission statement and it will be sent out to the RAB members for review. If everyone agrees, the final mission statement will be voted on at the next meeting and it will be published on the web.
* A community member commented that a lot of RAB members are new, and it would be nice to have a map that shows land areas in OU1, OU2, and OU3 that will be discussed by the RAB. When the scope is done for next meeting, it should include landowners and what ground and surface water will be covered.
* The Army noted that several maps are available on the TCAAP website. Any time the RAB discusses cleanup there will be multiple maps available as well.
* One member commented that since some of the land has been transferred already and cleaned up, it makes sense to look at the map as it exists now.
* The Army does not maintain a map that says who owns which property. The Army maintains a map that deals with what and where the contamination is located. The land is owned by several different parties.
* The RAB looked at all the sites within the TCAAP boundary. If there are no decisions that need to be made related to a particular site, then there will be no need to get input from the RAB but for any sites where the Army has active remediation ongoing, the RAB will be given presentations on plans so the Army can receive feedback.
* The Army can provide an overview of the entire site at the beginning of the next meeting before presenting cleanup information.

Discuss/Approve Edits to Operating Procedures

* The Army received recommendations at the last meeting to include four additional Non-Community members. These include the City of Mounds View, Rice Creek Watershed District, Bethel University and Mounds View School District. The Army agrees with the additions of the City of Mounds View and Rice Creek Watershed District. Both have been invited to participate in the RAB and are present at the meeting.
* RAB meetings are open to the public and Bethel University and Mounds View School District are welcome to attend the RAB meeting, however, neither organization truly fits that of a typical government or community role in the RAB. The Army believes their interests are already represented on the RAB and does not recommend appointing them as RAB members. The RAB was asked to provide comment.
* One member commented that a professor at Bethel University has interest in participating in the RAB.
* Another member noted that for many years there was a professor that joined the RAB as a Community Member but not as a Non-Community Member.
* The Army’s position is that they do not consider Bethel University a Non-Community Member.
* If a professor wants to be a Community Member it is voluntary, and they cannot be compensated for their time by their organization.
* One member commented that because of the location of the plumes, and because of the large area Mounds View School District covers, if they are interested in being a Non-Community Member, it should be encouraged.
* The Army explained that the School District does not fit the description of a government member. The City of Mounds View as a government member can however represent the School District’s interests.
* The Army contacted the Mounds View School District to determine interest in participating in the RAB meetings, but they did not reply. If they are interested, their membership can be reconsidered in the future and the Operating Procedures can be updated as needed if RAB members support the inclusion.
* The Army requested feedback on the additional Non-Community Members that were proposed by the Army and noted that Ramsey County was invited but chose not to have a member on the RAB. The Community did not provide comment on the Army’s proposed Non-Community Members.
* Adding new members will bring the total of Non-Community Members to 14, including the Army Co-chair, and the total Community Members to 14, including the Community Co-Chair. The Army proposed changing the maximum number of Community members from 19 to 14.
* The community is now also represented by the appointed members of St. Anthony, Mounds View, Shoreview, Arden Hills and New Brighton. Therefore, there are 20 RAB members representing the community if the maximum number is changed to 14.
* The Army proposed changing “Policy” to “Procedures” since USAEC does not make policy decisions. No objections were raised.
* The Army proposed revising the preamble to include both the Army and Community Co-Chairs as having responsibility to assure compliance with the operating procedures. No objections were raised.
* The Army requested feedback on adding the additional Non-Community Members that were proposed by the Army to the operating procedures. No objections were raised.
* The Army recommend changing “selected” members to “not appointed” members and noted that RAB Community Members are truly community volunteers.
* One RAB member commented that the Non-Community Members are in essence selected (non-community members) so to say Non community Members sounds like they are not connected to the community.
* The Army proposed changing “Non-Community Members” to “Government Members” and instead of adding “not appointed” under the RAB Community Members section, it will say “Community Members” of the full RAB. No objections were raised.
* The Army proposed changing “specified membership” to “members in attendance” under the Simple Majority section.
* The RAB will be approving new changes to the entire document in 2021 so the “October 10, 2000” date currently in the Quorum section will be removed and the new date will be added at the top of the document. No objections raised.
* Since the RAB agreed to have the Community Co-Chair and Army-Co Chair jointly facilitate RAB meetings, the Army proposed changing the Call to Order section to read “RAB meetings shall be called to order and facilitated by the Army Co-Chair in the absence of the Community Co-Chair.” No objections were raised.
* In the Timely Action section, the Army proposed changing “rehabilitation” to “restoration” because it is an error. The Army does not do rehabilitation of formerly owned lands. No objections were raised.
* As discussed, the Army proposed changing the maximum number of Community Members from 19 to 14. This change will be edited in the Community Representation section. Historically there were 19 Community Members and three Government Members. The Government Members included the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and the Army.
* One member commented that it might be beneficial to keep the 19-maximum number as an option.
* The Army’s rationale for keeping the maximum at 14 is that a 19 maximum would make a 33 member RAB and it is recommended that RAB membership not exceed 30.
* Three RAB members expressed that the 14-member maximum is adequate.
* One RAB member noted that the equal representation of 14 Community Members and 14 Government Members is a good concept.
* No objections to the 14-member maximum were raised.
* Operating procedure amendments require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the full RAB. Currently there are 28 members in the RAB. Changing Non-Community Members to Government Members throughout the document was proposed at the February 16 meeting and will require a vote at the next meeting. A new draft document with mission statement will be sent to the RAB members for review and comment.
* The Army proposed that the RAB consider changing the operating procedure for amendments to require affirmative vote of two-thirds of member’s present rather than two-thirds of the full RAB.
* One member expressed agreement with the proposed change.
* The Army noted that if there are additional proposed changes, they can be voted on at the next RAB meeting if they are sent to the Army before the next meeting.

Schedule of meetings for 2021

* At the January meeting it was recommended that the RAB meet on the third Tuesday of each month at 7pm. The Operating Procedures call for a schedule for the year to be published. The Army recommends the next meeting be held on the third Tuesdays including April 20, July 20 and October 19. The agenda for most of the meetings will include reviewing/approving last minutes, old business, cleanup status updates, new business, the next meeting agenda and public comments.
* There were no objections to the proposed meeting dates.

Comments and Concerns

* One member recommended that the schedule should be open to the possibility of special meetings if issues arise.
* The Army agreed that in addition to a schedule for the year, special meetings can be called.
* **Q:** What issues are expected to come up within the year?

**A:** The proposed plan for Round Lake will likely be the next technical meeting (Linda Albrecht, USAEC).

* One member noted that a subcommittee for Round Lake may be needed to look at it more closely.
* The Army hopes to have the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) approved and available to the public and up on the website for detailed review. When it is available, the Army will notify the RAB. There will be a presentation about the information in the RI/FS and the proposed plan will summarize what is in the RI/FS and provide the Army’s preferred alternative (Cathy Kropp, USAEC).
* **Q:** Is it an Army only document or does it include other agencies?

**A:** All documents for TCAAP are approved by EPA and MPCA. At Round Lake because USFW is the trustee, their comments as well as Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) are also considered (Linda Albrecht, USAEC).

* **Q:** Who will prepare the final RI/FS document?

**A:** The Army (Cathy Kropp, USAEC).

* **Q:** Will a subcontractor assist in drafting the RI/FS? If so, who?

**A:** Yes, a Pika-Arcadis joint venture is the Army’s current contractor (Linda Albrecht, USAEC).

* **Q:** Where is the contractor located?

**A:** Arcadis has a Minneapolis office (Linda Albrecht, USAEC).

* **Q:** Rice Creek Watershed is not sure yet who will be appointed to serve on the RAB. Can Rice Creek Watershed invite anyone to represent our interest (a board member, staff member, appointed official for the agency)?

**A:** It is up to the agency who they want to appoint but the Army recommends a primary and an alternate so there is representation at the meeting even when there are conflicts (Cathy Kropp, USEAC).

* **Q:** Is the Community Co-Chair in contact with the Army and other group leaders on a regular basis? If the Co-Chair thinks a meeting should be initiated with all the members outside the set schedule, is this possible?

**A:** Yes. The Community Co-Chair is the primary point of contact for the RAB to communicate with the Army. RAB members are welcome to contact the Army directly. However, part of the Community Co-Chair’s job is to let the Army know when there are concerns from the community.

* **Q:** On the TCAAP website, when visiting the resources page and looking for maps, it directs you to the Operable Units but there seems to be a broken link?

**A:** The Army will look into that and fix it. (Cathy Kropp, USAEC).

**A2:** Maps can also be found in the Annual Performance Reports (Linda Albrecht, USARC).

**A3:** At the last meeting, the Army was asked to publish an APR on the website, but it is not yet published. The Army will make sure that some of the best maps are included as links on the website. Also, whenever a presentation is given on cleanup, maps are typically included in the presentation.

* **Q:** Forrest Kelley is not on the name of attendees from the last meeting. Can Forrest spell his name completely.

**A:** Forrest was not at the last meeting because he had a conflict. The RAB Member list will be sent out and it will include names and contact information for all the RAB members.

* **Q:** How can we access the biographies of the members that have submitted them?
* **A:** After responses are received from the next call for biographies, the Army will send them out to members.
* **Q:** One member recommended that there be a link on the website that says something like “more maps are available in the APR. Click here” otherwise it is only insiders that know there are easily accessible maps offline. If the public is looking for maps, they should have access to all of them. There should be an obvious link for people to access additional maps.
* **A:** The Army agreed and will look into making more maps accessible from the website.
* **Q:** Will an email list be published so that RAB members can email or call the Community Co-Chair as needed?
* **A:** A member email list will go out to the members. If desired, the Community Co-Chair can also publish a phone number.
* **Q:** When is the Army anticipating the biographies will be sent out, and will the biographies be sent out at the same time as the email list?
* **A:** The member’s email list will go out first. It is possible that the second request for biographies will be sent with the member’s email list. The biographies are completely voluntary.
* Since the next RAB meeting will be in April, members will likely be given until mid-March to submit biographies. Edits to mission statement and operating procedures will be sent out before the next meeting.Two emails will be sent out, one email will provide documents for review, contact info for members and request biography submissions. The second email will include the biographies that have been submitted.
* Meeting was adjourned by Co-Chair at 8:19 pm.

**ATTENDEES**

**Non-Community RAB Members Present**

1. Linda Albrecht (Acting Army Co-chair)
2. Brigitte Hay (MPCA)
3. David Brown (Northrop Grumman)
4. Melissa Collins (DNR)
5. Nicole Menard (USFWS)
6. Mary Lee (MN ARNG Arden Hills Army Training)
7. Nyle Zikmund (City of Mounds View)
8. David Yang (City of Shoreview)
9. Bernard Walker (City of St. Anthony Village)

**Community RAB Members Present**

1. Forrest Kelley (Community Co-Chair)
2. Paul Bloom
3. Tim Donakowski
4. Sara Frantz
5. Bobby Goldman
6. Niall Johnson
7. Katherine Haas
8. Keith Maile
9. Kristine Poelzer
10. Lyle Salmela

**Army and Army Contractors Present**

1. Cathy Kropp (USAEC)
2. Robert Reine (USAEC)
3. Susan Elrod (USAEC)
4. Thomas A Lineer (HQDA DCS G9)
5. Kay Toye (ERG)
6. Hoa Voscott (Arcadis)

**Visitors**

1. Sarena Selbo (USFWS alternate)
2. Richard Straumann
3. Kyle Axtell (Rice Creek Watershed District)