

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
PARKWOOD INN
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011
MEETING NOTES**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Todd Bober	U.S. Navy RPM
Suzanne Johnson	Brunswick Representative to RAB/RAB Co-Chair
Lisa Joy	U. S. Navy
Greg Preston	U.S. Navy, BRAC PMO Northeast
Steve Dakin	NASB Caretaker
Mike Braun	U. S. Navy
Claudia Sait	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Ed Vigneault	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Ted Wolfe	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
David Wright	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Victoria Boundy	MRRA
Doug Heely	Environmental Strategies & Mgt.
David Chipman	Town of Harpswell, Maine RAB Member
Scott Libby	Town of Topsham, Maine RAB Member
Catherine Ferdinand	Bowdoin College
Chuck Race	TtNUS
Jeff Orient	TtNUS
Carolyn Lepage	Lepage Environmental Services
Carol Warren	BACSE
Ed Benedikt	BACSE
Denise Clavette	Town of Brunswick

1. Introductions

Suzanne Johnson, Town of Brunswick representative to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) and RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting with Todd Bober (U.S. Navy Remedial Project Manager) at 7:10 p.m.

o Old Business

Todd Bober asked if there were any comments on the last meeting minutes, and they appear to be fine. Ed Benedikt said that BACSE wants more consistent notification regarding when documents are available for review. He also cited some specific comments on recent reports. He said some of the reports do not include all of the laboratory data. For example, lab results that are below regulatory limits are not included. BACSE also wants clarification on what information will be added to the Administrative Record in the future. Todd said that reports are added to the repository electronically when they are finalized, but that the Administrative Record is only updated either at key milestones or twice per year. The last update to the Administrative Record

was in August 2011 in association with the Site 17 ROD. Ed asked that all correspondence be posted, including emails and letters. Todd said that an action item for the next meeting will be to determine how to address this issue. Ed produced a memo on behalf of BACSE titled “Issues of Concern Regarding Report Availability and Content” (copy attached).

- o New Business

Todd said that the Navy is closing the NASB website and that information on Brunswick activities will be on the Navy’s BRAC PMO website:

www.bracpmo.navy.mil

This website still needs additional updating but should be operational in October. All of the Navy’s BRAC sites are listed, which allows readers to review activities at other sites. There is a pull-down menu to access Brunswick BRAC activities.

2. FOSTs/FOSLs Status Update (Greg Preston, U. S. Navy BRAC PMO)

Greg Preston provided an update of the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) activities for 2011. The “Pink” parcel FOST was completed in July and included 456 acres. These parcels have not actually been transferred yet; however, the Public Benefit Conveyances have been assigned. The “Orange” parcel FOST was completed in August. This parcel is ½ acre in area and includes only utilities such as pump stations and waste water systems. It does not include natural gas utilities because these are not owned by the Navy. The actual utility lines will go with each individual parcel.

Suzanne Johnson asked about the status of the radiological assessment. Todd said that the Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) Report has not been issued yet; however, the Navy knows where the potential issues are, and none of these areas will be transferred until they have been investigated further. A contractor is already lined up to initiate investigations but will not start until the HRA Report is released. The report will contain a preliminary list of issues, which may or may not need further investigation. The radiological review started several years ago to ensure that the majority of the land could be transferred on time.

The FOSTs for the Yellow, Green and Blue parcels will be completed this year. All together, about 75 percent of the base will be approved for transfer by the end of this year. Greg said that MRRA was instrumental in making these transfers happen so quickly. The remaining 25 percent of the base will take some time to transfer, so that cleanup activities can be completed.

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

Old Navy Fuel Farm (ONFF)

The ONFF was a former tank farm and is now used for ball fields. Recent assessment work was conducted to determine current site conditions approximately 10 years after a large removal action was completed. Monitoring during the 2000s indicated that petroleum concentrations were attenuating; however, Maine DEP recently adopted new standards (volatile petroleum

hydrocarbons [VPH] and extractable petroleum hydrocarbons [EPH]), which prompted the Navy to re-assess site conditions. Chuck Race from Tetra Tech accomplished the field work, which included completion of 45 soil borings and collection of soil samples, installation of 18 monitoring wells and collection of 17 groundwater samples, and completion of three rounds of groundwater gauging. Chuck said that the impact to groundwater is limited and that there has been no significant off-site migration of petroleum. Tetra Tech is in the process of preparing a report on these activities.

Eastern Plume Activities

Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System (GWETS) Modifications

A pilot study was conducted to assess whether operation of the GWETS air stripper was necessary to support groundwater remediation, and a technical memo was produced. The Navy is working on responding to the second round of comments. Todd said that a new contractor has been hired (Watermark) to operate the system. They will replace the carbon in October and will then deactivate the air stripper. The Navy developed a flow chart to help determine under what conditions the air stripper should be reactivated. The flow chart specifies that EPA and DEP will be notified of any exceedances in the effluent. The Navy may elect to re-activate the air stripper system if the exceedance is significant. BACSE and DEP provided comments on the flow chart, and the Navy still needs to respond to those comments. David Chipman thought that monitoring should be conducted between the carbon units rather than only at the effluent so that breakthrough in the first carbon unit could be documented.

Merriconeag Stream Sampling Update

The purpose of the Merriconeag Stream sampling program is to update the Conceptual Site Model with regards to upwelling of groundwater into the stream. This most recent program included collection of groundwater, pore water, surface sediment, and surface water samples for analysis of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and 1,4-dioxane. The work also included collection of vertical groundwater flow and gradient information. A draft report will be submitted in December. Claudia Sait said that she visited the field crew today, and most of the work is already done.

LTM Optimization

The long-term monitoring (LTM) program was evaluated to see what data are no longer needed and what data should be collected in the future. The Merriconeag Stream sampling results will be valuable in determining LTM program needs. The revised recommendations, which have not been release yet, will include:

- Continuation of biannual monitoring of extraction wells and GWETS influent/effluent concentrations.
- Reduction in monitoring frequently to annual for monitoring wells with decreasing concentration trends.
- Reduction monitoring to every 5 years for monitoring wells near the plume's margin.

Chuck Race reviewed data trend graphs for several wells to explain why the monitoring frequency can be reduced. Trend graphs are important to show how concentrations change over time, because sampling results may fluctuate from one period to the next. Select piezometers will also be included in the LTM program. Future pore water and surface water sampling needs will be determined after the current stream sampling data are evaluated. Two bedrock wells and the off-site residential well are also included in the LTM program.

Munitions Sites

Todd Bober reviewed the recent work completed at Site 12 and the Quarry site. At the Quarry site, a Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) is now underway to clear the remaining areas of the site for explosive hazards and to install a perimeter fence. The work plan for these activities was extensively reviewed by the Navy to ensure that the work is done safely. Additional investigations are planned to determine long-term cleanup needs. For now, fencing will be installed around the entire area to restrict access.

At Site 12, field work is planned for October in the wetland area north of the site boundary where debris was found during the 2010 TCRA. Todd was not sure if the field work will be completed this season. Site 12 is about 10 acres in size, and extensive excavations to natural undisturbed soil would be needed to make the area safe for unrestricted future use. So far, no significant hazards have been found. This area will remain under the control of the Navy until a remediation strategy is determined and implemented through the CERCLA process. The Navy has contractors in place to install fencing at other locations, if needed. There are no plans for additional fencing around Site 12; however, the existing fence will remain.

Topsham Annex

At the Topsham Skeet Range, a plan of soil testing with simultaneous cleanup will likely be implemented to address lead in soil. Todd said that he is not sure if this work will be completed this field season.

At Buildings 338, 378, 1099, and 1114, additional investigations are planned using VPH/EPH testing methods to assess residual concentrations of petroleum.

Also at the Skeet Range and at the Topsham Annex Debris Area, electromagnetic (EM) surveys and test pits will be completed to determine the extent and type of debris in the subsurface. CH2M Hill is under contract to do this work and will continue the work started by the prior contractor. The EM survey and test pits are scheduled for September 2011.

The housing area was investigated during summer 2011. The precise boundaries of property suitable for transfer will be determined after these investigations are complete. Groundwater use will likely be restricted, although vapor intrusion does not appear to be an issue and will not prevent future residential use.

Ed Benedikt said that people have approached BACSE to say that material was buried at the Topsham Annex. These people are apparently not willing to elaborate on what was buried or exactly where debris was buried.

Site 17

The Navy has determined that a level of no significant risk for soils exists at this site. The stakeholders have provided comments on this. Caroline Lepage said that she believes there is ecological risk in soil from residual pesticides. BACSE provided comments on the last report, saying they think a covenant should be placed on the deed to require future owners of the property to notify EPA and DEP of soil movement. The Navy has considered the comments carefully, and their experts have determined that ecological risk was adequately addressed. There may ultimately be a difference of opinion on this issue between the Navy and DEP/BACSE. The Navy signed the Record of Decision, which also needs to be signed by the regulators. Todd said there is still approximately 1 more year of monitoring planned to determine if there are any groundwater concerns that will impact potential property transfer. When this property is eventually transferred, the FOST would be an exhibit to the deed and could specify soil management requirements if necessary.

4. Upcoming Field Work Update (Jeff Orient, Tetra Tech)

Jeff Orient said that the Five-Year Review identified a few issues that will require additional site investigations. The work is referred to as the Land Use Control (LUC) Data Gap Investigation because it is designed to better define the boundaries of several sites so that LUC boundaries can be more precise.

- Sites 1 and 3 will require additional assessment near the southern boundary where the Weapons Area was formerly located.
- At Site 2, the western edge of the landfill is not defined. The investigation will include downgradient well installation and sampling.
- At Site 4, an investigation will be conducted to determine if an acid pit is present beneath the floor of Building 584. Although the ROD did not specify that any action was required, this acid pit would need to be addressed if the building is demolished in the future. Therefore, the Navy is considering addressing this issue now to determine if future LUCs are necessary and if there have been any environmental impacts adjacent to the former acid pit.
- Soil removal actions were accomplished at Site 7 to remove cadmium in soil. Additional soil and groundwater sampling will be conducted to determine if a cadmium source is still present and if that source is responsible for elevated levels of cadmium in the groundwater.

Ed Benedikt said there are two issues near the Androscoggin River that BACSE wants investigated. The first is a release of petroleum that occurred in 1993, and the second is the former sewage treatment plant that serviced the base before municipal sewer service was available. The land is currently owned by the state, and it is not clear if the Navy ever owned it. Todd said that the petroleum release was previously investigated and that as far as the Navy is concerned, no further action is required. With regard to the former sewage treatment plant, the Navy is unclear as to what action is required because they are not aware of any environmental issues associated with this plant and are not aware that the Navy ever operated it. Ed was not sure when the base switched over to the municipal sewer system.

5. Questions and Future RAB Agenda Topics

Ed Benedikt requested that future meetings be televised on the local cable channel. Carol Warren concurred and said that some of the people who cannot attend the meetings have expressed interest in seeing the meetings on television. The Town of Brunswick would be able to perform this service.

The next RAB meeting will be in December; the actual date will be determined after the availability of the camera crew is known.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20

September 21, 2011

Issues of Concern Regarding Report Accessibility and Content

Need to Improve Availability of Documents

BACSE and public members of the RAB need timely and consistent notification that documents have been released and are available for review &/or consultation.

Documents should be made available on a website that is easy for RAB members and all interested persons to access. A good example is the TTNUS site, but this should also be the policy for all Navy document sources.

Files must be a manageable size. This may require a document to be broken into several files. No file should be larger than 10 MB.

Need for Improved Accuracy & Availability of References Cited in Reports

Documents must contain appropriate & accurate reference citations for supporting information that is to be found in a different report so the reader knows where to look when following up.

Reference lists must be complete and accurate so the reader can find the correct report.

The references cited must be readily available for readers to check, either on an easily-accessible website or at the information repository.

Example 1:

1. One report doesn't give the actual contamination numbers, but instead makes bland statements like one or more wipe tests exceeded levels. Or PCBs were detected but below regulatory levels. These levels are subject to change (and it's not clear what the regulatory level they used is (since they also do not give the levels allowable concentration.)

We would like to see the scientific test result information in the report

Example 2:

The latest ONFF report is setting an arbitrary "Limit of Quantitation" at 1/3 of the current regulatory limit. The reports should list the value of any detected compound above the detection limit. One cannot get important information about dilution and plume location by not having all data above the detection limit reported. This is important historical data (and paid for by taxpayers) even when the result is less than 1/3rd of the current compliance level.

The actual regulatory criteria should also be presented. ~~Do not correct,~~ Regulatory levels can change. Any future reader of the report should be able to understand what was found, and what the decision criteria were at the time the report was written

Clarification of Administrative Record content

Please clarify what information (documents, data, correspondence) is currently being added to the Administrative Record, and what information will be added in the future

Sincerely,

Ed Benedikt, BACSE President and member of the RAB

