



**Naval Air Station  
South Weymouth, MA  
Restoration Advisory Board  
Summary of RAB Meeting – June 9, 2005**



NAS South Weymouth Website: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>

***1. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES***

Ms. Susan Jeghelian, MA Office of Dispute Resolution, and RAB meeting facilitator, opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. She requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, introduce themselves. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A to this meeting summary. S. Jeghelian asked if everyone had time to read the meeting notes from the prior RAB meeting and asked for comments on them. There were no comments on the April 2005 RAB meeting notes; the notes will stand as issued. In addition, S. Jeghelian encouraged those with ideas for future RAB meeting topics to bring them to the attention of the RAB co-chairs.

S. Jeghelian reviewed the guidelines for the meeting. She reminded the participants when asking questions to wait to speak until they are acknowledged, to state their names and affiliations, and to speak into the microphone when they have questions.

The Agenda for the meeting and the Action Item Tracking List are provided as Attachment B to this meeting summary. S. Jeghelian then noted that in accordance with the agenda, the presentation (the Update on the Tile Leach Field and AOC 8) would be followed by the Updates and Action Items portion of the meeting.

***2. PRESENTATIONS***

S. Jeghelian asked M. Leipert, Navy, to present an update on the Tile Leach Field (TLF) groundwater sampling in late April and the AOC 8 (Former Radio Receiver Building 70) removal action, which is ongoing. Questions were encouraged during the presentation. The following paragraphs summarize his presentation and include references to selected presentation slides in Attachment C.

M. Leipert started with a brief history of the Tile Leach Field (TLF). The TLF is located south of the former Hangar 2, adjacent to French Stream and north of the TACAN outfall. The TLF received sanitary wastewater from the former Hangar 2 until the hangar was demolished in 1953. The TLF and surrounding area are shown on Slide 2. The site was initially studied in a 1991 Site Investigation (SI), during which three wells were installed. In 1996, the Navy returned and conducted a Remedial Investigation (RI). Work conducted under the RI included digging test pits and installing piezometers (monitoring points used to

collect groundwater level data but not analytical samples) and one monitoring well. All previously existing wells in addition to the new well were sampled. For the Phase II RI, conducted in 1999-2000, two additional overburden and one bedrock well were installed. The supplemental groundwater investigation conducted in 2005 involved sampling the previously existing wells and installing an additional, temporary well (Slide 4).

As mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, the TLF received sanitary waste water from the former Hangar 2. In late 2004, the Navy conducted a maintenance action at the former Hangar 2 involving a video survey of the floor drain system, which became storm drains after the building was demolished, and the sanitary waste lines. The work mapped the entire drainage system for the former Hangar 2, including catch basins, and confirmed the connection from the hangar to a lift station and then to the TLF (Slide 5). The report documenting the work at the former Hangar 2 (RIA 111) has been added to the information repositories for anyone who is interested.

Both the Phase I and Phase II RIs for the TLF sampled groundwater and other media. Groundwater was analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and metals, in addition to MTBE (a gasoline additive) and 1, 4-dioxane (stabilizers for solvents, which were used as degreasers). The risk assessment for the Phase II RI indicated no significant risk from exposure to the groundwater. The analytical results were validated to determine whether the data collected were useable. After completion of the data validation, the 1,4-dioxane results were rejected for all of the monitoring wells, with the exception of TLF-MW-15, where 1,4-dioxane was detected below regulatory levels. After discussions with the regulators, the rejected data was identified as a data gap. The Navy agreed to complete a supplemental investigation.

The Navy returned to the TLF in late April 2005 and performed the supplemental investigation field effort which focused on 1,4-dioxane and VOC concentrations in groundwater (Slide 7). Work started immediately after the Navy received state and EPA approval for the sampling plan. Nine existing wells from previous investigations were re-developed. One new temporary well was installed approximately 100 feet upgradient of TLF-MW-15, which was the well with the previous detection of 1,4-dioxane, and was also developed. All 10 wells were sampled for 1,4-dioxane. The temporary well and TLF-MW-15 were also sampled for VOCs. Groundwater levels were also collected to confirm the groundwater flow direction. A photograph of the groundwater sampling effort at TLF-MW-15 is shown on Slide 8. Equipment used for low-flow groundwater sampling, such as a water level indicator and flow-through cell with probes to measure water quality parameters, were pointed out on the photograph.

The results from the supplemental investigation confirmed the groundwater flow direction, which appears to flow to the south and southwest (toward the TACAN outfall and French Stream) (Slide 9). The field effort confirmed the general groundwater flow direction to the south and southwest. VOCs and 1,4-dioxane were not detected in any of the groundwater samples from the April field effort (Slide 10).

K. Hayes asked whether the floor drains at the former Hangar 2 drained to the TLF. M. Leipert replied that the floor drains were connected to the storm system, which directed flow to French Stream. Only sanitary wastes drained to the TLF.

The TLF field investigation conclusions are summarized on Slide 11. There were no exceedances of established regulatory levels for VOCs or 1,4-dioxane at any of the monitoring wells at the TLF; the risk assessment from the Phase II RI indicated no risk. The Navy is planning to proceed with a No Action Proposed Plan (PRAP) and then a No Action Record of Decision (ROD). The regulators have not seen the field report for the April supplemental investigation yet. The field report for the supplemental investigation will be available to regulators, RAB members, and repositories later in June. The report will also be available on the website.

The Navy presentation continued with a discussion of AOC 8, the former Radio Receiver Building (Building 70), which is located on the east side of the base (Slide 12). Building 70 was used during the 1940s and 1950s and contained electrical equipment to support antenna field activities. The building was burned intact as a fire training exercise, with equipment (including a transformer) still inside. After the fire was extinguished, the structure and equipment were buried on-site. The Navy's sampling experience indicates that contamination was spread over a large area. A drain located under the transformer discharged to the ground surface; the area of discharge had the highest concentrations of PCBs on the site.

The various EBS sampling efforts at AOC 8 were summarized (Slide 13). In August/September 2001, sediment, surface soil, and subsurface soil samples were collected. PCBs were found at levels up to 21 ppm in the soil samples. The area is known for its good turtle habitat, especially for eastern box turtles; a number of turtles with transmitters have been found there. The Navy clears the area for turtles before beginning any removal action.

When the removal action at AOC 8 was initiated, the Navy originally intended to do a "hot spot" removal of contamination along with the solid waste removal. Sampling results from the four removal rounds indicated PCB concentrations ranging from 2 ppm to 430 ppm (Slides 14 & 15). At this point in the project, six rounds (160-180 samples) of exploratory and confirmation samples have been collected. K. Hayes asked if the Navy had to de-water the excavation this spring and whether there is a pond at the site now. M. Leipert responded that no removals have been conducted this spring; only soil sampling has been conducted so far. His understanding is that the area is wet but does not have standing water.

The last sampling round, in April 2005, was along the perimeter of the most recent excavation, in the wetland area. The wetland boundary runs roughly northwest-southeast through the site. Slide 16

summarizes the sampling results from the April sampling round. Three of the April confirmation samples exceeded the 1 ppm cleanup goal, with exceedances of 27 ppm, 5.2 ppm, and 1.1 ppm to the south and west of the present excavation (Slide 16). PCBs were not detected in EBS samples just outside of the sampled areas, so the Navy is almost to the edge of the area to be removed. K. Hayes asked if the samples were collected in the wetland areas. M. Leipert responded that the southern samples are in the upland area, but the northern exceedance (SS03 at 27 ppm) is in the wetland area (Slide 16).

The quantities disposed of off-site to date include approximately: 1,170 tons of PCB-impacted (TSCA) soil and sediment; 170 tons of non-TSCA material; and 18,000 gallons of water removed from the excavation (Slide 17). Future work at AOC 8 (Slide 18) includes a survey for turtles prior to initiating work, due to the presence of box turtle nesting areas. The Navy also has to clear the vegetation to find the turtles and move them. The area is checked for turtles the day before and the morning of any work at AOC 8; in addition, a final sweep is conducted immediately prior to the work. A question was asked how the Navy knows whether or not turtle nesting grounds are damaged. Does the Navy track any of the hatchlings? M. Leipert responded that ENSR's turtle expert is John Bleiler, but that they have found empty nests and empty turtle egg shells. The Navy has never found turtle hatchlings on the base.

The Navy plans to collect additional exploratory and confirmatory samples. Details on future work at AOC 8 are presented in Slide 18. The Navy believes that approximately 100 tons of soil and sediment will be removed. The material to be removed is generally at a depth of less than 1 foot. Once the contaminated material is removed and confirmation samples are clean, wetland restoration will begin.

A number of photographs of site activities were shown (color photographs are included in the full presentation on the NAS South Weymouth website). Confirmation sample locations are indicated with stakes with the orange flagging seen in Slides 19 and 20. Plastic is laid down before backfilling to separate the clean backfill going into the excavation from the possibly contaminated surface soil still in place. K. Hayes asked where the backfill came from. M. Leipert said he didn't know where exactly it came from; however, the backfill has been certified clean. Slide 21 shows the excavation, silt fence and turtle barrier, and turtle tracking activities. The site will be restored once excavation is complete. Slide 22 is a photograph of roll-off containers full of the excavated soil waiting to be transported off the base.

S. Jeghelian asked if there were any questions on the presentation.

L. Corin-Ash asked about human health risk assessments, which were also described in the PRAP for the Buoy Depot. She expressed concern about the 1 ppm cleanup level for PCBs. She commented that the 1 ppm PCB level is probably safe for adult exposure; however, until recently little to no research was conducted on PCB effects on children, infants, and developing fetuses. She mentioned newer research that indicates adverse effects on children and fetuses at dosages lower than 1 ppm and suggests that no

exposure can be considered safe for these sensitive populations. B. Olson, EPA responded that he is not aware of these newer studies. The 1 ppm PCB standard used for AOC 8 is the EPA standard, which is more conservative than the 2 ppm standard Massachusetts uses. The EPA believes 1 ppm is protective of all human receptors based on the EPA's continued review of newer studies. If newer data show that the 1 ppm level is not protective, the EPA could re-open the issue for further site work. In addition, safety factors are built into the standards. L. Corin-Ash offered to provide the studies. D. Chaffin added that the 1 ppm level is conservative for this site, as it is for residential exposure and the presumed future use is recreational, given that the wetland in the area would not allow residential development. Therefore, the most sensitive exposure scenario is not applicable to AOC 8. L. Corin-Ash said that she was concerned about exposures to more sensitive populations, such as pregnant women and adults with chemical sensitivities.

K. Hayes asked whether the lift station area overflow area was tested; D. Barney responded that the lift station was a part of RIA 112 and was sampled for waste characterization only.

S. Jekhlian asked if there were other questions. There were none. The meeting then moved on to the Updates and Action Items portion of the agenda.

### **3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS**

Ms. Jekhlian then reviewed the four action items listed on the Action Item Tracking List (see Attachment B) for this RAB meeting as follows.

#### Action Items

1. Provide RDA construction cost, cap design life, address swale safety issues – D. Barney, Navy, said that the construction cost for the cap was \$3.334 million and \$900,000 for the design, for a total cost of \$4.234 million. The cap has a minimum 30-year design life, but because it has more gentle slopes and lower erosion rates, the cap could last much longer. The Navy will manage the landfill as long as there is a potential for contamination to migrate. Costs for the long-term management of the cap have not been worked out yet.

M. Bromberg asked about the swale safety issues from the last meeting. The concern with the swale was the exposed rip-rap. Would it be possible to add smaller stones to level out the swale? D. Barney responded that he had contacted the design engineer, who had said that the swale is designed to collect sheet flow runoff from the cap. A French drain is an alternative; however, that is significantly more expensive than the current design. M. Bromberg stated that he still would like to make it safer for children to play, as the Navy had stated earlier that the RDA was designed as open space. He would like to

see at least a fence in front of the swale. D. Barney responded that the Navy doesn't share that concern – the swale is not designed as an area for a child to play. K. Hayes clarified that the larger sized-stone in the swale is necessary to allow for drainage and to limit sediment and plant build-up, which would reduce the effectiveness of the swale. M. Bromberg said that he would hope Navy would still consider the issue. D. Barney said that his objections to the swale would be noted.

2. Provide copies of DoD directive regarding environmental issues – D. Barney offered copies of the directive to anyone who wanted them. B. Olson said that the EPA had concerns about the directive, and high-level EPA management brought up the issue with the DoD. High-level DoD management assured the EPA that the directive is not intended to reflect a reduction in environmental program support by the military. D. Barney added that the Navy also believes that the directive would not affect NAS South Weymouth or the progress of environmental programs in place.
3. Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update – D. Barney said that the first update was sent to RAB members in May. He offered to provide another update if the RAB decides to skip a meeting and added that the update's format could be changed. In addition, the meeting minutes and updates will be available on the NAS South Weymouth website. The URL for the new website will be included in the meeting minutes. (URL is <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>)
4. Provide DEP Small Landfill letter to M. Parsons and S. Ivas – D. Chaffin has mailed out the letter to both individuals.

S. Jeghelian then asked each of the Leads to provide updates to the list of eight Update Items.

1. Administrative Actions – D. Barney said that the EFANE office (the organization supervising the environmental work at the base, which M. Leipert is part of) is on the BRAC list to be realigned. However, nothing will change for at least a year and a half. Regardless of what happens to EFANE, the Navy will have the same commitment to NAS South Weymouth.
2. MADEP Update – D. Chaffin, MADEP, stated that the DEP has received the RAM plan for FFTA and is reviewing it now. Also, the MADEP has received a scope of work from the Navy to conduct a Corrective Action Alternatives Analysis (CAAA), which is similar to a feasibility study (FS), with cleanup alternatives for the Small Landfill. MADEP has

approved the scope and the CAAA is due by the end of August. M. Bromberg asked what alternatives will be evaluated. D. Chaffin explained that the alternatives explored include no action, removal of the entire landfill, and various capping scenarios, with cost estimates and other comparisons for each alternative. It will be similar to the evaluation process for the RDA; however, the work will be done under the Massachusetts solid waste program and not CERCLA.

M. Bromberg asked if the FS will go out for public comment. D. Chaffin responded that there will be additional updates on the Small Landfill at the RAB meetings as part of the MCP update. M. Bromberg asked if there was a formal public involvement process for this work. D. Chaffin said that a formal process is not in place under the MCP; however, he can send out documentation as requested. There is also no formal process for sites like the Small Landfill, which fall outside the MCP and under the DEP's solid waste program. The documentation should be available in the public repositories. He will include the Small Landfill work in the DEP update at future RAB meetings. D. Barney said he will make a note of public interest in participating in review of the Small Landfill CAAA.

3. Coast Guard Buoy Facility Update – D. Barney stated he has not received an update from the Coast Guard; however, there was a public hearing a few weeks ago for the proposed plan (PRAP). The PRAP is available for review (copies were available at the back of the room) and the comment period is open until June 15.
4. IR Program Sites Update – D. Barney said that the Tile Leach Field report will be out for review later in June. If the report is reviewed favorably, the Navy intends to proceed with a no further action proposed plan. The Navy is currently reviewing the conceptual site models for Building 81 and Building 82, which will be used in revising the draft final work plans. For RDA, the Navy is having internal discussions regarding the removal of residual PCBs. Once the LTMP is finalized (it's presently being revised), a plan for the removal of the PCBs will be sent to the regulators.

M. Bromberg asked about the present condition of the RDA. D. Barney responded that the grass cover is sparser than the Navy had anticipated, so they will discuss the possibility of an additional grass seed application with the contractor.

M. Bromberg asked whether the new contractor working on the Buildings 81 and 82 conceptual site models and work plans are proposing less work or more work. D. Barney responded that they were proposing additional work. M. Bromberg noted in addition that Building 81 may be the location of a school. How would a plume at Building 81 affect the

school? D. Barney responded that a risk assessment conducted as part of the RI would consider indoor air and other potential sources. M. Bromberg asked what sort of work would be conducted at Building 81 and Building 82. D. Barney replied that the work plans for the investigations at Building 81 and Building 82 are intended to help determine nature and extent of contamination (with additional soil borings and monitoring wells), as well as provide a baseline risk assessments.

M. Leipert said that the Navy has met with regulators and discussed a conceptual site model for the SRA (former AOC 108/IR Site 11); preparation of a draft work plan is underway. The Navy is hoping for field work to begin in late August or September.

5. MCP Release Areas Update – M. Leipert said that a RAM status report and RAO completion report for RIA 21 (Building 15) have been filed in the past week. As announced in the last meeting, the Jet Fuel Pipeline (JFP) Phase IV completion statement/remedy operation status report was submitted for review. In addition, a tank removal was completed today at the south side of the Hangar 1 south lean-to. There were some residuals in the tank, but none in the soil collected in the vicinity of the tank; the soil was shipped off-site. The Weymouth Fire Department oversaw the removal process.
6. EBS Review Item Areas/Various Removal Action Update – M. Leipert said that the removal action at AOC 8 (Wyoming Street Area) is ongoing, as mentioned in the presentation earlier. Sampling is almost complete for AOC 53 (Former Radio Transmitter Building Area); the Navy will proceed with a no further action PRAP if the sampling results are clean. AOC 3 (Suspected TACAN Disposal Area), AOC 13 (Supply Warehouse), AOC 15 (Water Tower) and AOC 100 (East Street Gate Area) will be addressed in a combined PRAP, with a public hearing in mid-August, possibly combined with a public hearing for the TLF.
7. FOST/FOSL/CDR Update – D. Barney said there were no changes from the last meeting.
8. SSTITDC Update – No SSTITDC representatives were available at the meeting; there are no updates tonight.

#### Additional Discussions – Possible Issues to Discuss at the Next RAB Meeting

S. Jekhlian asked if anybody had an opinion about skipping one of the summer RAB meetings (July or August). J. Cunningham suggested that if D. Barney would provide a July update, he would recommend

waiting until August for the next RAB meeting. No one objected; the next RAB meeting was set for August. D. Barney will provide a July update, which will be posted to the website and mailed out to the distribution list.

A question was asked where the public notices for RAB meetings are posted. D. Barney responded that the notice should be in the Patriot Ledger, but he would check into it. In addition, the meeting times are posted on Route 18 and are distributed with the meeting minutes.

J. Cunningham wanted to know how wildlife and the turtle survey are doing. D. Barney said that he could include an update on the turtle survey work in the July update. Also, the SSTTDC has received a permit for their consultant to do an evaluation of grassland bird species. J. Cunningham also wanted to know about the vernal pools on the base. A question was asked whether a list of wildlife on the base and any supporting documentation were available. An individual responded that the SSTTDC should have that information; however, that information has not been published to anyone's knowledge. D. Chaffin responded that wildlife surveys would be part of the redevelopment and NEPA/MEPA process. D. Barney added that the Navy initially performed a wildlife evaluation in 1982, which has been made available in the past. However, the report is now over 20 years old. The Navy has evaluated potential impacts to wildlife and the environment for each environmental site on the base. Each RI has a section documenting habitat and species observed in each area. A complete wildlife survey for the entire base has not been conducted; however, the Navy is conducting a basewide ecological risk assessment. The risk assessment will evaluate the risk to higher trophic-level species which are present or can be assumed to be present on the base. D. Chaffin added that SSTTDC would likely have to create a consolidated list of wildlife on the site as part of the MEPA process.

K. Hayes wanted to know what type of public involvement would be part of the MEPA process. D. Chaffin responded that the MEPA process would not be part of the RAB; however, the developer will have to submit an environmental impact statement and report (DEIR) to the state. Those documents and applicable permits will be available for public review and comments. D. Madden, Mass. Highway Dept, said that a public hearing is not conducted for the DEIR. On the federal level, public hearings are required for roadway work. An individual asked if the people involved in the MEPA process could give a presentation for the RAB meeting. D. Madden responded that a presentation could be requested, but they are not usually given. A comment was made that generally opponents to development hire their own environmental consultants to put the data together and make presentations and that concerned citizens shouldn't assume that another organization will do a full search for endangered or rare species on the property in question. An additional comment noted that the eastern box turtle is about to be added to the endangered species list in certain parts of the state, so the Navy should avoid digging where the turtle is known to exist.

S. Jeghelian asked if there were any other topics to discuss for the next RAB meeting in August. Did anyone have ideas for presentations?

D. Barney suggested providing an update on FOST IV and possibly the status of the Building 81 and Building 82 work plans. However, there may already be enough to talk about with the other topics.

D. Barney said that the draft FFTA RAM is out for comment; after the response to comments, the RAM and/or modified work plan will be presented to ConCom with a notice of intent. The comment period is 30 days. He believes it is May 29 to June 29. The Navy will either request a determination of applicability or file a notice of intent to get on ConCom's calendar. It is up to ConCom to decide whether or not the Navy should give a presentation at the meeting; however, the public will have a chance to comment at that point.

L. Corin-Ash would like to hear the results of Jan Sullivan's epidemiological study in South Weymouth/Rockland at the next meeting. B. Olson said J. Sullivan should be ready to give an update for MPH probably in September or October. Someone asked L. Corin-Ash how she had heard of the RAB meetings. L. Corin-Ash responded that her contacts in public health and some of the families she works with in the area who have a member with ALS prompted her interest in the base.

M. Bromberg asked for an update about the testing at French Stream. B. Olson responded that the data has just been received by EPA, but has not been reviewed. EPA will incorporate the data, and possibly additional data collected later this summer, into a presentation for the RAB meeting in August. EPA will try to get the something out by next week.

#### Conclusion/Next Meeting

The meeting concluded at approximately 8:45 pm. The next monthly RAB meeting was set for Thursday, August 11, 2005.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

SIGN IN SHEET  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC MEETING

6/9/2005

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
DAVE BARNEY	NAS S. WEYMOUTH	617-753-4638
LESLIE BRID. ASH.	ARLINGTON	781-648-9283
Mary Joyce	Norwood	781-648-9283
PF Schmieg	Medford	
Michael Smart	Weymouth Town Council	
Bryan Olson	US EPA	617-988-1365
Proebe Call	TANDUS	978-658-7899
Auran Jighelean	MODR	617-287-4047
Pam Harting-Barcat	USEPA	617-918-1318
Steve Whores	RAB	781-331-5523
Patty Manajh-Whittemore	USEPA	617/918-1382
Dwadden	MHD	617-973-7477
JAMES CUNNINGHAM	RAB/WEY	781-331-0545
Dave Craffin	DEP	617 348-4005
Dan McCormack	Weymouth RAB	781-340-5000



**ATTACHMENT B**

**AGENDA & ACTION ITEM TRACKING LIST**



**Naval Air Station  
South Weymouth  
Restoration Advisory Board  
RAB Meeting Agenda  
South Weymouth, MA**



9 June 2005

Conference Center on Shea Memorial Drive

7:00 PM

<i>Agenda Items</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Projected Time</i>
<b>1. Introduction, Review of Meeting Notes</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	7:00 - 7:15
<b>2. AOC 8/Tile Leach Field Updates</b>	<b>Navy</b>	7:15 - 7:45
<b>3. Updates and Action Items</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	7:45 - 8:15
<b>4. Questions, Agenda Items, Next Meeting</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	8:15 - 8:30

**Facilitator:** Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution: Susan Jeghelian

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members:**

**Abington:** James Lavin, (Alternate: Steve Ivas); Phil Sortin (Alternate: Beth Sortin)

**Hingham:** no current representation

**Rockland:** no current representation

**Weymouth:** James Cunningham (Community Co-Chair); Ken Hayes; Verna Hayes  
Dan McCormack; Steve White

**Navy:** Dave Barney (Navy Co-Chair); (Alternate: Mark Leipert)

**EPA:** Patty Marajh-Whittemore (Alternate: Pamela Harting-Barrat)

**MA DEP:** David Chaffin (Alternate: Ann Malewicz)

**BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Points of Contact:**

**Navy:** Dave Barney, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)/EFA Northeast Remedial Project Manager (617) 753-4656  
Email: barneyda@efane.navfac.navy.mil

Mark Leipert, EFA Northeast EBS Project Manager (610) 595-0557, ext. 146  
Email: mark.leipert@navy.mil

**MA DEP:** David Chaffin, Environmental Engineer Federal Facilities (617) 348-4005  
Email: david.chaffin@state.ma.us

**EPA:** Patty Marajh-Whittemore, Remedial Project Manager, Federal Facilities Section (617) 918-1382 Email: whittemore.patty@epamail.epa.gov



**Naval Air Station  
South Weymouth  
Restoration Advisory Board  
Action Item Tracking List**



**9 June 2005 – Next RAB Meeting**

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		
Provide RDA construction cost, cap design life; address swale safety issues	D. Barney	Next RAB
Provide copies of DoD directive regarding environmental issues	D. Barney	Next RAB
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update	D. Barney	May
Provide DEP Small Landfill letter to M. Parsons and S. Ivas	D. Chaffin	Next RAB
<b>UPDATES</b>		
RAB Administrative Actions	D. Barney	Each RAB
MA DEP Update	D. Chaffin	Each RAB
Coast Guard Buoy Facility Update	R. Marino/J. Connet	Each RAB
IR Program Sites Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
MCP Release Areas Update	M. Leipert	Each RAB
EBS Review Item Areas/ Various Removal Action Update	M. Leipert	Each RAB
FOST/FOSL/CDR Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
SSTTDC Update	J. Lavin/ S. Ivas	Each RAB
<b>COMPLETED ITEMS</b>		
Provide Vortech system O&M handout to Navy (3/05)		
Provide a paper copy of SMP schedule to J. Cunningham (3/05)		
Provide completion date of draft base-wide assessment report (3/05)		
Post summarized version of DDA on SSTTDC Website (12/04)		
Check on seating capacity for Conference Center (12/04)		
Update RAB on BRAC conference (12/04)		
Check on analytical data from RIA 112 storm drain maintenance actions (12/04)		
Provide list of sites for L. Larrabee (12/04)		
Navy and consultant evaluate alternatives for reporting data on several metals for D. Wilmot (12/04)		
Provide sample ESCA from another Navy site to Mary Parsons/B. Sortin (12/04)		
Provide copy of EPA's June 14 Letter to Navy to M. Parsons		
Provide copy of Navy's June 24 Letter to SSTTDC to M. Parsons		
Provide data on RIA 4B surface water and sediment		
Provide analytical results for several metals to Dave Wilmot		
Check on whether any more barrels have been found at RDA		
Check on preliminary data from the Jet Fuel Pipeline Site		
Provide USGS with leads on sources of data for the Old Swamp River Study		
Compile and review available French Stream data – to be done as part of Basewide watershed study		

**ATTACHMENT C**

**SLIDES FROM TLF and AOC 8 PRESENTATION**