

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
PARKWOOD INN
DECEMBER 7, 2011
MEETING NOTES**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Todd Bober	U.S. Navy, RPM
Paul Burgio	U.S. Navy, BRAC PMO/RAB Co-Chair
Suzanne Johnson	Brunswick Representative to RAB/RAB Co-Chair
Lisa Joy	U. S. Navy
Steve Dakin	NASB Caretaker
Claudia Sait	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Ted Wolfe	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Mike Daly	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Tom Brubaker	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
Bob Phinney	Watermark
Celeste Hunt	Watermark
Evan Barman	Watermark
Chuck Race	TtNUS
Jeff Orient	TtNUS
Brian Geringer	TtNUS
Amy Stanford	TtNUS
Carolyn Lepage	Lepage Environmental Services
Carol Warren	BACSE
Ed Benedikt	BACSE
Antoinette Mercadante	BACSE
Denise Clavette	Town of Brunswick
John Maguire	Coastal Journal

1. Introductions

Paul Burgio, U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Coordinator for NAS Brunswick and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Co-Chair, opened the meeting with Todd Bober, U.S. Navy Remedial Project Manager, at 7:12 p.m. Everyone in the room introduced themselves. Tom Brubaker from Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority (MRRA) is replacing Vicky Boundy. Paul nominated him to the RAB, and the group approved his nomination.

- Old Business

Ed Benedikt mentioned the recent memo issued by Brunswick Area Citizens for a Safe Environment (BACSE) regarding communication, and expressed concern that they were not notified of some of the recent field work. Paul said that because of the mild weather thus far, the field season was extended and the Navy was able to perform additional work that was not on the schedule. Ed also asked for an update of the radiological assessment work. Paul said that the Navy will complete its review by December 16, and he believes the report will be available for external review and comment in early 2012. There will be an entire RAB meeting devoted to this with a full explanation of the findings. The process has been slowed by internal Navy review, but the report will be subject to public comment similar to all of the other reports.

- New Business

Paul reminded the audience that the BRAC group has transitioned to Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) and that the Brunswick website has changed to the BRAC PMO website. The old website will not redirect users to the new website after January 2012. The handouts contain the new website addresses.

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

Paul provided a summary of the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) activities for 2011. Almost 50 percent of the base has been found suitable to transfer. There is always a time lag between when the FOST is signed and the actual transfer of the property to the new owner. The last FOST for this year is 2011-4, which includes 216 acres for MRRA as part of the Airport Public Benefit Conveyance. This last FOST will mostly complete the MRRA airport parcels. Paul reviewed the parcels that were removed from the 2011 FOST process. The Navy's goal has been to transfer as much land as quickly as possible, so if certain areas have any environmental issues or suspected issues, they are held back to avoid delaying the release of the FOST. The Navy can then go back to review the issues on these smaller parcels to determine what additional work is needed.

David Chipman asked if some of the parcels being transferred are impacted by radiological material. Paul said that even though the Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) report has not been issued, the Navy has already identified potentially impacted areas. The HRA will include a map and tables showing potentially impacted areas. These areas are not necessarily contaminated but will be the subject of further review and study. The determination that an area could have issues is based on historical use and not radiological sampling or testing. These buildings and land areas were removed from the 2011-4 FOST, along with certain other buildings such as the groundwater extraction and treatment system (GWETS) building and the small arms range. As for the small arms range (Building 102), no Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) cleanup was conducted because the initial plan was to have MRRA acquire it on behalf of the Town of Brunswick and continue using it as a shooting range. The town no longer wants it, so the Navy needs to rethink what it wants to do with the building.

Land use controls (LUCs) are developed for each FOST. Typical LUCs for the base include no groundwater use anywhere and soil removal restrictions in select areas. Any changes to these restrictions require approval from the Navy, MEDEP, and EPA. Ed Benedikt asked how disagreements between these three entities are handled. Paul said it is a matter of providing notification to all three so that there are no environmental impacts when work is conducted. Carol Warren said there are no standards for approval and expressed concern that the public is not involved in this process. Paul said that no Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) sites have been conveyed - only clean properties have been transferred. If someone wants to excavate soil, they need to contact the Navy, MEDEP, and EPA to ensure there will be no issues associated with that work. The FOST is an attachment to the deed, so the restrictions are recorded along with the deed.

Claudia Sait provided a recent example where polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) compounds were found in soil that was slated for excavation. The soil could not be reused on site, so it was to be taken off site. MEDEP asked for soil sampling, and the results were sent to them for approval. Each site will be different depending on contaminants of concern, location, etc. The Navy will wait for MEDEP and EPA to review first and will be the last to concur. Because these are not CERCLA sites, there will not be public review in this process. There was much discussion regarding this process and whether the public should be involved when requests are made for LUC modifications. Mike Daly said that he is involved with many similar situations, and the military has always remained involved to address these issues when they arise.

The group asked that the slides showing LUCs (Figures 6, 7, and 8) be sent out in electronic format so that the detailed descriptions can be expanded and read more easily.

Ed asked where the soils management plans are because they are not part of the FOST documents. Paul confirmed that they are not in the FOSTs but that the land owner (e.g., MRRA) is obligated to prepare them before soil is excavated.

Paul reviewed the projected FOSTs for 2012, including almost 900 acres to the south (“Blue” parcel). The “Purple” parcel of about 31 acres may be combined with the “Olive” parcel of 254 acres. The FOST process will be mostly completed by the end of 2012. The small white area within the Blue parcel is a bunker, so it is not included in this FOST.

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

Topsham Test Pitting Program

An electromagnetic (EM) survey was completed last August that revealed anomalies in the Skeet Range Debris Area and Topsham Annex Debris Area. During subsequent test pitting, soil samples were collected for headspace screening and laboratory analysis. All test pits were filled in to avoid leaving an unsafe condition.

Jeff Orient explained the difference between the magnetic survey and EM survey. Both are capable of identifying subsurface metallic objects, and the two are used together to identify anomalies that need to be examined more closely via test pits.

Tables are presented in the handouts that show what was found. No drums were uncovered, but there was lots of construction debris. The results of soil samples collected for laboratory analysis are not available yet. A draft summary report will be available in January 2012.

Path Forward for GWETS

Todd said that there have been some operational issues in the last few months involving the HiPOx unit. The Navy deactivated the system (with MEDEP and EPA approval) for about 2 weeks to complete the repairs. The liquid-phase carbon was changed on November 22. The polish unit was moved up to be the primary unit, and the new polish unit now has fresh carbon. The Navy is working to optimize the system, and they are evaluating the possibility of shutting down extraction well EW-4. The Navy will update the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plan and operational flow chart, which will also specify how and where the system samples will be collected. The air stripper will remain on until regulatory approval is granted to shut it off. It will be kept operational so that it can be turned on whenever necessary. The revised O&M plan will be issued in February so that optimization work can be completed this spring. The plant will continue to operate during this optimization period.

David Chipman asked if the pilot test will be rerun now that the carbon units have been changed. Todd said that the pilot program is complete and will not be rerun. He also said that Watermark is leading the GWETS optimization program.

Munitions Sites (Quarry, Site 12)

The Navy has been conducting a number of activities at the Quarry and Site 12 munitions areas. At the Quarry site, fencing was installed to limit access under a Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA). A tank grenade was found near the fence line on the surface. There was discussion among the group as to whether additional surface objects may be present. The Navy believes the fence is in the right location because there are no landfill areas outside the fence. In the spring of 2012, additional surface clearance will be conducted about 200 feet beyond the fence. Because this is outside the landfill area, any additional objects will be on the surface. The handout includes a table (slide 36) showing what was found in the Quarry area. The debris is categorized in one of three ways – munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) items requiring detonation, material determined as safe (MDAS), and non-munitions miscellaneous debris.

The group discussed the efforts in place to prevent trespassing and to protect the public. The entire area is fenced, and this area is within the overall base fence. There are several locked gates inside and outside the base to access this area. There are also No Trespassing signs along the fence.

Paul said that this area was the subject of much discussion during the technical meeting yesterday. The public needs to be informed of the potential issues in the Quarry area, but it is also important to not over alarm and/or pique the curiosity of people who would otherwise not visit the area. The goal is to remind people that this was a former military base and to make sure that people remain vigilant. Much of the land outside this area will go to Bowdoin College. This FOST will be amended once the munitions have been addressed so that the entire area (north and south of the Quarry) can be transferred together.

At Site 12, no additional munitions items were found during the November 2011 TCRA. The only area that has not been cleared is the pond, and the Navy is reviewing options to complete that work. The Navy is working towards a Remedial Investigation (RI)-type investigation for Site 12. Work plans are being drafted now, and field work is planned for next spring.

Suzanne Johnson asked how the boundaries for Site 12 were developed. Todd said that Site 12 was documented on maps and in the files as an area where munitions were detonated. A considerable amount of construction debris was also buried there. The delineation work started in the center where munitions were exploded and worked outward. The land around Site 12 will be the subject of a FOST next spring, although Site 12 will not be included in that transfer.

4. Upcoming Work (Jeff Orient, TtNUS)

Data Gap Investigations

TetraTech NUS is leading the data gap investigation project. These data gaps were primarily identified from the most recent five-year review. The goal is to support long-term LUC strategies at Sites 1/3, 2, 4 and 7 and to better define site boundaries to determine if additional remedial activities are needed.

At Sites 1/3, the weapons compound was formerly off limits and not accessible. Carolyn reminded the group that review of this area after the base closed was mandated in the Record of Decision (ROD). Test pits are currently being excavated to determine the extent of buried wastes within the former weapons compound. The Sites 1/3 landfill has a slurry wall and a multi-layer cap that cannot be disturbed. The groundwater in this area is monitored four times per year. Information from this investigation will be evaluated this winter to see if the cap and/or slurry wall needs to be extended.

Test pits were also recently completed at Site 2 to ensure that the boundary of the landfill does not extent further to the west. A monitoring well will be installed along the eastern side.

Site 4 includes an alleged acid pit within Building 584. This building was a public works shop but is currently vacant. Although it is not slated for immediate transfer, the Navy wishes to determine whether the acid pit exists or not. A recent geophysical survey identified one anomaly at a location that seems to match the available historical records of where the acid pit should be. Future work will include completion of soil borings and installation of one or more temporary monitoring wells.

At Site 7, an investigation is being conducted to determine the source of manganese and cadmium in groundwater. The investigation work includes screen point groundwater sampling, installation of monitoring wells, and completion of soil borings to determine soil conditions. This area is included in the Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) program. If source material is found, soil excavation is a possible remedy. TtNUS just completed collection of the screen point groundwater samples, so the group will need to decide on soil boring and monitoring well locations next. The field program was accelerated to get additional work done this season.

Ed Benedikt asked about the recent report of odors at Sites 1/3. Todd said that a few weeks ago, Brunswick police offices reported noxious odors during a night patrol. The police called MRRA, and the Navy subsequently followed up with the police and notified MEDEP and EPA. Emergency Response personnel from MEDEP conducted air monitoring with a four-gas meter (hydrogen sulfide, methane, oxygen, and carbon monoxide) and a photoionization detector. There does not appear to be an ongoing release, but TtNUS is continuing to monitor the air during their fieldwork at Sites 1 and 3. The Navy will make sure that the gates remain locked, and jersey barriers were placed at the access road into Sites 1/3 to limit access. David Chipman asked if the odors could be related to tear gas or other noxious chemicals that were landfilled. Claudia Sait said that there has been significant sampling at this site, and this is the first time that odors of this nature have been reported.

Ed Benedikt said that he was approached by a citizen about dumping in the Topsham Annex. This person was unable or unwilling to provide additional detail. Paul Burgio said that this person needs to speak with MEDEP or the Navy to provide more detail for this information to be considered credible. Claudia confirmed this and said that many investigations have been completed, none of which have revealed additional sources. She said that everything that should have been done has been done, and more information is needed to justify further investigations.

Base Skeet Range RI Update

A surface soil removal action is planned in 2012, which will be based on a 2009 site inspection. The work plan is still in progress, although the Navy is hoping to collect surface samples before Christmas.

Upcoming Activities

Many of the upcoming activities that are planned are site assessments of buildings/areas that were removed from some of the previous FOSTs. The list of these areas increases with each new FOST. Most of this work is planned for spring 2012. The additional surface clearing work at the Quarry site will also be completed in the spring and summer of 2012. The handouts include a complete list of upcoming activities and the anticipated schedule.

5. Questions and Future RAB Agenda Topics

The next RAB meeting will be in March; the actual date will be determined once the availability of the town's camera crew is known.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30