

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
PARKWOOD INN
JUNE 8, 2011
MEETING NOTES**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Paul Burgio	U.S. Navy BRAC PMO/RAB Co-Chair
Todd Bober	U.S. Navy RPM
Suzanne Johnson	Brunswick Representative to RAB/RAB Co-Chair
Lisa Joy	U. S. Navy
Steve Dakin	NASB Caretaker Site Office
Claudia Sait	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Ed Vigneault	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Mike Daly	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Victoria Boundy	MRRA
Doug Heely	Environmental Strategies & Mgt.
David Chipman	Town of Harpswell, Maine RAB Member
Catherine Ferdinand	Bowdoin College
Chuck Race	TtNUS
Jeff Orient	TtNUS
Carolyn Lepage	Lepage Environmental Services
Carol Warren	BACSE
Ed Benedikt	BACSE
Anna Breinick	Town of Brunswick
Tom Foote	Bowdoinham Resident

1. Introductions

Suzanne Johnson (Town of Brunswick representative to Restoration Advisory Board [RAB] and RAB Co-Chair) and Paul Burgio (U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Project Management Office and RAB co-chair) opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. Everyone in the room introduced themselves. Steve Dakin is new to the RAB meetings; he is one of two civilians that will staff the newly formed Caretaker Site Office (CSO).

- o Old Business

No old business items were raised.

- o New Business

Paul said that there was a ceremony last week marking the official closure of the base. He confirmed that nothing from an environmental standpoint will change now that the base is officially closed.

2. FOSTs/FOSLs Status Update (Paul Burgio, U. S. Navy)

Paul Burgio presented a number of slides (attached) to update the group on the Finding of Suitability to Transfer/Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOST/FOSL) program.

Suzanne Johnson asked about a recent press release that discussed a proposed 75,000 square foot building that will replace Building 294. She asked if there are, or will be, any environmental restrictions during construction. Victoria Boundy said that MRRA is planning on constructing the building and leasing it to a private firm. The project has been reviewed on a number of fronts and has all of the required permits to move forward. MRRA is still working out financing issues, so the timeline for actual construction is not determined yet. Building 294 went through the RCRA process and has been cleared to be torn down. This area is in the north/central part of the base, across the street from the chapel. Mike Daly said he does not believe there are any contamination issues on this parcel. The Navy completed a groundwater investigation in the general vicinity and no issues were identified. There will be an overall groundwater restriction for the base, but no specific restrictions for this parcel. Claudia Sait said there is a materials management plan for the base that could be expanded to manage contaminated soil/groundwater at this parcel, if contaminants are found during construction. MRRA does not have custody of this land yet. This parcel is part of the “Pink” FOST area, which has several different conveyances. When ready, the Navy will convey this area directly to MRRA. The groundbreaking ceremony described in the press release is symbolic, since the conveyance to MRRA is not done yet.

Paul reiterated the various processes that are conducted by the Navy before land is transferred, which gives the Navy and stakeholders confidence that adequate due diligence has been conducted:

- RCRA – Paul said that this process is at times onerous but has turned out to be valuable because it has identified potential problems ahead of time, and has helped to facilitate reuse of the buildings.
- CERCLA – Community involvement in the CERCLA process has helped to identify new sites so they can be dealt with now. Paul said the CERCLA sites have been kept out of the FOST process, which has allowed the Navy to focus on transferring as much land as possible.
- FOST/FOSL – The FOST/FOSL process includes another layer of due diligence that has helped to identify data gaps from the RCRA and CERCLA processes.

Paul also said that several of the FOSTs started with as much land as possible, but the acreage was reduced during the due diligence process to remove parcels that were questionable or that needed more work. For example, the airport parcel started at 790 acres, and was cut to 715 acres to address certain issues. This has allowed the majority of the land to transfer without delay.

Paul provided an update of the various FOSTs that are in progress. The Pink parcel is currently at 463 acres, split mostly between Bowdoin, the Town of Brunswick, and SMCC. The actual transfer

mechanism for the base, Economic Development Conveyance (EDC), has not been approved yet. The conveyances are for land and “improvements,” which includes buildings and utilities.

Ed Benedikt asked if the deadline for comments on the draft Pink FOST could be extended from June 9 to June 18. Paul said that was fine, he would like to have comments within 2 to 3 weeks from now. Once the FOST is approved by Paul’s director, the deeds will be prepared.

The Orange FOST includes very little land and conveys utilities. This FOST is out for the 30 day review and comment cycle, and includes above ground systems such as pumps and pump stations (for the water system). The actual subsurface utility lines go with each parcel.

The Yellow, Green and Blue FOSTs are on-going and these parcels are still scheduled for transfer this year.

Paul said there is no new information on the radiological study, but he is still hoping to have the radiological experts come to a future RAB meeting. He said the buildings that have been transferred or are included in the currently ongoing FOSTs do not have any radiological issues.

Paul said that the shooting range (building 102), will need to go through the RCRA process. The Town of Brunswick was going to take it for continued use as a shooting range, which would have negated the need for RCRA closure. Since they no longer want it, the Navy needs to perform RCRA closure on the building.

3. Environmental Update (Todd Bober and Paul Burgio, U. S. Navy)

Building 27 – Todd Bober

This building was formerly part of the NEX site. During the soil removal project, a slurry wall was built in front of the building to prevent future vapor intrusion. In January, the Navy completed a vapor intrusion study that included collection of indoor air, sub-slab soil gas, and outdoor air samples in Summa canisters. The samples were analyzed in a laboratory for gasoline-related constituents, and compared to screening levels. The results showed benzene in indoor and outdoor air, but no significant levels in the soil gas samples collected beneath the floor. The group discussed the possible source of this benzene, which does not appear to be related to the gasoline release from the NEX station. Winter is typically the best time to perform these studies because the buildings are closed and heating systems are running.

Suzanne Johnson asked if the benzene results would be subject to notification on the deed when the building is transferred. Todd said that the conveyance would reference this study. He also said that the screening levels are very conservative and are greater than what would actually cause risk. He said that the building is suitable for reuse. The Navy installed a passive venting system in this building back when the NEX gas station operated, and EA Engineering performed a study of the indoor air before the removal. Now that the removal action is complete, the groundwater conditions will continue to improve over time due to natural attenuation processes.

Buildings 35, 87, Hangars 1/2/3 – Paul Burgio

The Navy elected to complete limited site assessments around Buildings 35 and 87, and around Hangars 1, 2, and 3 to see if past operations may have impacted groundwater. The field work was completed this spring and draft reports have been submitted for review.

At Building 35, there was potential past use of solvents by the Air Force, as well as an old septic system. Three soil borings were completed and groundwater samples were collected. No volatile compounds were detected in soil or groundwater around this building.

At Building 87, there was also potential past use of solvents by the Air Force. The assessment of this building included installation of shallow and deep monitoring wells and groundwater sampling. The results of this sampling event are pending.

At the three former airplane hangars, soil and groundwater samples have been collected, but results are not yet available.

Areas of Potential Interest (AOPIs) – Paul Burgio

There are four AOPIs that the Navy is currently investigating. These areas were brought to the Navy's attention based on reports from former Navy personnel. All four areas have been investigated and draft reports were submitted in April 2011.

At the Helipad site, metals and PCBs were detected. Except for arsenic, concentrations of metals and PCBs were less than EPA and Maine DEP residential standards. Arsenic was detected at concentrations that could be consistent with background.

At the Mercury Disposal area, soil and groundwater samples were collected for mercury analysis. All results were well below the most stringent screening criteria.

At the West Fire Training area, five soil borings and one temporary well were completed. Samples were collected for a variety of constituents, including chemicals used in fire fighting foam. Low levels of constituents were found in soil, but no exceedances of groundwater standards were noted.

At Former Buildings 7 and 10, an extensive soil and groundwater sampling program was conducted, based on the historical uses of these buildings. The results indicated limited exceedances of soil and groundwater screening levels. The Navy is still reviewing how to best move forward in this area.

Ed Benedikt asked about the old sewage treatment plant, located near the Androscoggin River behind Merrimeeting Plaza. Paul was not familiar with this issue. The plant was never owned by the Navy and is not part of this RAB process.

Site 17 – Todd Bober

Todd said that the revised Remedial Investigation (RI) was submitted in May. The RI prepared by the Navy includes a risk assessment that concludes there are acceptable risks at this site. The RI is still under review by other stakeholders. The future schedule includes preparation of a Remedial Action Plan in July and a Record of Decision in September.

4. Upcoming Field Work Update (U. S. Navy)

Upcoming field work for this summer includes the munitions sites (former munitions bunker west (FMBW), the Quarry, Site 12, and the Topsham Skeet Range), as well as the Old Navy Fuel Farm.

Carolyn Lepage asked about security at Site 12 and the Quarry. She recalled that at the last meeting, the Navy committed to installing fencing to limit trespassing. Todd said that Site 12 currently has fencing, and most of the surface hazards have been removed. A second surface removal action is planned for this summer. A similar surface removal action plan has been approved for the Quarry site. The Navy needs to go through rigorous safety procedures before any of this work can be initiated, including fence installation. A contract is in place to install fencing around the Quarry, and this work will commence as soon as NOSSA approves the safety measures and allows the work to proceed. The Quarry site will be fenced this summer, and this parcel will be excluded from the Pink FOST area.

Ed Benedikt asked whether ordinance was detonated at the Quarry site. Lisa Joy said that Site 12 is the only confirmed detonation area. There are no confirmed EOD pits at the Quarry site.

At the FMBW, additional soil sampling for metals was conducted relative to some ordnance magazines that were found. This is not a munitions site since the only issue is a limited area where metals were found in soil.

At the Topsham Skeet Range, the Navy is hoping to do a fast-track soil removal action to address metals in surface soil. The Navy currently has a contract in place to complete this work.

The Old Navy Fuel Farm was formerly a large above ground tank farm that was dismantled many years ago. A voluntary removal action was completed by the Navy in 1999 to remove almost 15,000 tons of petroleum-impacted soil. The Navy has developed a plan to assess residual contamination at this site. The plan is currently with USEPA and the Maine DEP for review, and TetraTech is contracted to do this work.

Land Use Control Investigations are planned to address issues identified in the five year review. At Sites 1 and 3, work will be done to delineate contamination at the southern end, near the former weapons area. At Site 2, assessment work will be done to delineate the western edge of this site. At Site 4, a former acid pit at Building 584 will be investigated. At Site 7, work will further define the source of cadmium in groundwater and the downgradient extent of the plume. Work plans for all of these issues are being developed, and field work is planned for this field season.

The Navy will also be assessing the monitoring program for the Eastern Plume to evaluate improvements to the Long Term Monitoring program.

Ed Benedikt asked whether the current fuel farm was going to be assessed. Paul Burgio said that due diligence for this parcel will be conducted as part of that FOST. No issues have been identified as of yet, because all of the reported spills have been cleaned up. This fuel farm has only been in operation since the mid-1990s. The fuel farm will be dismantled since fueling operations of that size will not be needed for any of the proposed future uses.

Carol Warren asked about the status of the Site 9 report. Todd Bober said that the sampling was completed, and the summary report and risk assessment are still in progress.

The group discussed the Groundwater Extraction and Treatment Pilot Study report, which recommends that the air stripper be deactivated (but left in place). David Chipman said that the sampling results from the liquid carbon units indicate that the carbon systems are not working properly. The carbon units were changed before the test was initiated, yet break through apparently occurred in the first carbon unit. He suggested that the Navy and EPA further review the report to explain this breakthrough before the air stripper is deactivated.

Ed Benedikt asked about the letter that BACSE wrote (concerning the HiPOx unit and possible deactivation of the air stripper), and when they would receive a response. Todd said that some of the questions in the letter have been answered, but that the Navy is still working on a decision tree that will clarify under what circumstances the air stripper would be reactivated.

5. Questions and Future RAB Agenda Topics

Suzanne Johnson requested that a map with building numbers be made available. Mike Daly gave her a map that shows the buildings, and Claudia Sait gave Suzanne a list of the building numbers and their names.

The next RAB meeting will be on September 14, 2011. Also on the calendar is the Site 17 Record of Decision public hearing (currently scheduled for August), and a technical meeting in July to discuss the Eastern Plume monitoring program.

Vicky Boundy said that MRRA will host a community forum on Wednesday, June 22, to discuss what's next now that the Navy has formally closed the base.

Paul Burgio asked for anyone having questions to contact him rather than Lisa Joy, since she is full time with Portsmouth now and is no longer part of NASB.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45