MINUTES TO 35% PROJECT REVIEW MEETING

PLACE: Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. BUF
DATE: April 17, 1991
TIME: 8:00 am
ATTENDEES: See attached attendee sign in sheet

I. Flood Retention Basin Design

A. Recap of 35 Percent Design Analysis for FRB (Section 2.1.5)
   - There will be no water level change in the FRB wetlands during non storage conditions.
   - Work to date indicates that the 10-year storm el. is 717. With emergency spillway set at el. 717, the 100-year storm stage is 718.7.

B. Design Concept
   - Malcolm Pirnie hydrologic calculations assume that storm water flows freely move through the Railroad culverts south of the site without constriction. This is not currently the case, as the railroad culverts are too small for storm flows and back up water south of the tracks.
   - Recommend that Malcolm Pirnie should address the railroad track restriction in the Design Analysis Report.
   - The Design Analysis Report should clearly identify what the upstream and downstream limitations/restrictions are.
   - USEPA to determine whether and when dialogue will take place with local authorities regarding details of design of FRB and improvements to Marshall's Run.
   - The east bank of Marshall's Run is the hydraulically limiting factor, and will need to be raised to protect either the 10-year or 100-year flood. USEPA must give direction on what storm event Marshall's Run should be designed to accommodate.
The ground water treatment building will be protected from flooding.

Recommend riprap of drainage channel of improved Marshall's Run to protect against erosion and to facilitate excavation of sediment during routine maintenance.

Abandon storm water pump station for area east of Marshall's Run in favor of drainage swales with flap gates through the new berms downstream of low head diversion structure. Drainage for this area may be slightly improved because the storm flows through Marshall's Run will have been attenuated through the FRB. Flap gates will also prevent potentially contaminated runoff from flooding onto property.

Keep Marshall's Run and improved berm on Millcreek site.

C. Detailed Discussion of Hydrologic (HEC-1) and Hydraulic (HEC-2) Modeling

- Request that Malcolm Pirnie continue informal correspondence with COE regarding design concept and HEC-1 and HEC-2 computer runs.
- Include site runoff calculations (i.e. contribution of flow from site to Marshall's Run and FRB) as well as ground water treatment system discharge with FRB design documentation.

II. Cap Design

A. Grading Plan Design Concept

i. Limits of Fill Survey

- Malcolm Pirnie limits of fill survey showed entire site (including wooded areas) contains foundry sand fill. Revised capping plan shows all of site capped, with the exception of the northeast peninsula where the ground water treatment plant will be constructed.
- The northeast peninsula also has fill. Recommend entire site be capped.
- Local landowners also appear to have fill on their property. Limited or no information exists regarding the nature of this
fill. Neither the RI/FS, ROD or Pre-design work addressed this issue. USEPA to determine course of action.

- All present agreed with Malcolm Pirnie recommendation to cap entire fill area.
- USEPA to determine extent of capping.
- Temporary access to the site from 12th Street may have expired. COE to coordinate real estate work with USEPA.
- There are a number of real estate issues. USEPA/COE to determine course of action. There may be a need to access adjacent property for roads or construction of berms for the FRB. Malcolm Pirnie to arrange for a property survey to define property boundaries if one has not already been completed. If property boundary survey is necessary, Malcolm Pirnie personnel should accompany surveyor to assess limits of fill relative to property lines.
- It was recommended that USEPA/Malcolm Pirnie contact Town of Millcreek/City of Erie regarding number of truck loads of fill (approx. 10,000) which will be required as well as weight limits of streets, alternate access points and other prohibitions.
- All agreed to design a permanent staging area just north of FRB to be used for drum staging, fill dumping and decontamination of personnel, materials and vehicles. Permanent staging area to be located so as not to interfere with operation of ground water collection Trench 4. Design permanent staging area with gravel base.
- WWTP staging area to be used for overflow parking.

ii. Wetlands Consideration

- Reviewed extent of wetlands and design concept to minimize disturbance of wetlands. Current estimate is that there will be a net loss of less than 2 acres of wetlands.
- John Japp to contact COE (Buffalo District) and USEPA regarding wetlands additions/deletions.
• Wetlands mitigation measures to be developed by Malcolm Pirnie and reviewed by USEPA wetlands people.

iii. Grid Concept

• 50-foot grid concept for grading acceptable.

iv. Other Considerations

• Details to be provided in design include drainage channel erosion protection (riprap), key in of 12-inch topsoil layer at boundary of fill, FRB structure(s).

III. Site Construction

A. Site Access Roads

• All agreed site access road to be gravel construction. Need note on drawing to describe function and intent of road...contractor may revise road location provided the road meets function and intent of specification (viz. access to wells, perimeter inspection of cap and FRB).

B. Timber Clearing/Disposal

• All agreed that felled trees currently stored on-site to be chipped and buried.

• Agreed all standing trees less than 3" dia. to be chipped and buried to specified maximum thickness.

• Agreed for standing trees greater than 3" dia: Contractor to have option of cutting to specified lengths and burying within maximum specified thickness; or hauling offsite for sale. For offsite option, specifications to state that no contaminated material may leave site.

C. Site Security

• Malcolm Pirnie recommends fencing the site perimeter, except possibly the southern boundary (wetlands area), to prevent unauthorized use of the area by off-road vehicles.
• At maximum capacity the FRB would be approximately 4 feet deep, raising questions regarding need for fencing around FRB.

• USEPA to determine fencing requirements.

IV. Material Handling

A. Disposal of Drums/Bulk Debris

• No wipe tests will be required as determined by A. Koller of USEPA.

• Small items may be buried but large items must be removed. Specifications must contain good definitions of large/small debris.

• Malcolm Pirnie to generate list of bulk debris to be removed from site. Add statement to plans to effect that list of debris is for information only and may not contain all bulk debris on-site; contractor is responsible for removal of all bulk debris as specified. Add definition of bulk debris to plan sheets.

• Specification to require that contractor catalog bulk debris.

• Omaha COE to send Malcolm Pirnie drum handling specification.

• Drum disposal specification to indicate that all USEPA-tested drums will be crushed and buried on site per USEPA.

• Any drums containing liquid will be staged and sampled.

• Unit price needed for drum staging and testing.

• Separate unit price needed for drum disposal (for bidding purposes, Malcolm Pirnie to estimate quantity of drums for off-site disposal).

V. Discussion of Specific 35 Percent Review Comments

• Marshall's Run will be relocated as part of FRB construction.
• Appropriate COE, USEPA and local agencies should be informed of relocation plans for Marshall's Run. COE and USEPA to determine course of action.

• Use 90% of Standard Proctor (not modified Proctor) for compaction specification.

VI. Miscellaneous

• Define "exclusion zone" to be area not covered by clean fill.

• Will need to revise Health and Safety plan weekly (as necessary) to acknowledge changing exclusion zone.

• USEPA to determine what party should apply for Generator ID number to be used on Manifest of drums removed from site.

• Question was raised regarding whether PRP's A-E should be added to distribution of design documents.

• Need to expand discussion in design analysis to document design rational for vegetation.

• The need for an additional boring directly in the location of the FRB control structure was discussed. COE and Malcolm Pirnie to determine need/course of action.

• Will a landscape plan be required now that the treed areas will be removed? It was suggested that planting quick growth trees along perimeter might be sufficient. USEPA to determine need for landscape plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent R. Hile</td>
<td>Malcolm Prime 716-828-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Werthman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Brovicka</td>
<td>USACE, Omaha (EPA Liaison) 215-597-3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Thornton</td>
<td>Corps of Engs - Omaha 814-838-9143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis L. Morgan</td>
<td>Corps of Engs - Omaha 717-782-3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ogden</td>
<td>Corps of Engs - Omaha Area Office 717-782-3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary J. Lang</td>
<td>Corps of Engs - Pittsburgh Port Off 412-269-8134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Earhart</td>
<td>COE, Baltimore District 301-902-2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Snyder</td>
<td>Pa DEP, Meadville Regional Office 814-335-3362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hap Chadburn</td>
<td>Malcolm Prime (914) 521-7135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Doan</td>
<td>COE, Omaha District 402-221-4583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Jaff</td>
<td>COE, &quot;        &quot; 402-221-7658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Miller</td>
<td>Malcolm Prime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>