TECHNICAL MEETINGS
NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
12-14 JUNE 2007
PARKWOOD INN
BRUNSWICK, MAINE

MEETING ATTENDEES

Al Easterday, Senior Project Manager	ECC
Gina Calderone, Project Manager	ECC
Lonnie Monaco, Remedial Project Manager	US Navy, NAVFAC Mid Atlantic
Dawn Kincaid, Environmental Coordinator	US Navy BRAC, PMO NE
Dale Mosher, IR Coordinator	NAS Brunswick
Carolyn Lepage, BACSE TAG Consultant	Lepage Environmental Services
Claudia Sait, Remedial Project Manager	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Chris Evans, Project Geologist	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Fred Lavellee (13 June Only)	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Christine Williams, Remedial Project Manager	US Environmental Protection Agency
Dave Peterson (13 June Only)	US Environmental Protection Agency
Dave McTigue (13 June Only)	Gannett Fleming
Carol Warren	Brunswick Local Redevelopment Authority
Lisa Joy, Environmental Director	NAS Brunswick
John James, Public Affairs (12&14 Only)	NAS Brunswick
Dan Waddill	US Navy, NAVFAC Atlantic
Arnold Ostrofsky	TTNUS
David Chipman (12&13 June Only)	Town of Harpswell
Ed Benedikt (13&14 June Only)	BACSE
Linda Klink	TTNUS
Lawson Anderson	TTNUS
Doug Heely	H&S Environmental

12 JUNE 2007

Meeting start time – 1100 hours.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Navy discussed the 6 June 2007 letters from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received by Navy 8 June 2007, regarding missed sampling data and stipulated penalties. The second letter from EPA (same date) addressed the treatment of 1, 4 dioxane. The Navy has concerns with contractual, policy and legal issues, and internal discussions are ongoing. The Navy will respond within EPA's deadlines - either 15 days (for dispute) or 30 days (mitigation, not dispute).

The Navy asked for clarification on what supplemental projects are. EPA referenced the 1998 Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP) policy, dated 10 April 1998 (available on the internet). Discussion was had about whether projects related to pollution prevention could be considered. The policy has caveats as to what projects can be considered. The projects must be not required by law, not part of current on going work, and need to be fully outside of required remediation work.

2. SITE 7 WELL INSTALLATION

This work will start after the Mere Brook wells are complete (on going this week). Three additional monitoring wells (MW-772, 771 and 770) are proposed. Wells are currently being monitored for metals and alkalinity. New wells will help to delineate the extent of metals and groundwater (GW) flow direction. This additional work comes out of the 2002 Record of Decision (ROD). ECC previously notified the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and EPA of this upcoming work.

Clay in this area is 15-20 feet below ground surface (bgs), and the work proposes 10 feet of screen. Previous work may suggest a shorter well will be necessary. These wells will not be completed within the clay but above it. The depth to clay does vary, which may not allow for a full 10 feet of screen. The work plan does say that clay is estimated at 15-20 bgs, but the screen will be set based on where the clay actually is. Dave and Chris (DEP) will be notified if screen length is shortened. ECC will attempt to contact DEP and EPA on this field decision, and include Claudia and Christine on email notification. ECC will document any change in screen via email. This work should commence during the week of 18 June 2007, and will require 1 to 2 days to complete.

3. SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SMP)

ECC is now working on the SMP, and will issue it by the end of June. It will have all attachments with it, including a schedule.

4. SITES 15 AND 16 – EPA COMMENT # 22

Much discussion was had regarding the observations of debris and metal drums. The Navy is investigating whether this is a housekeeping issue or not. Site 16 is located next to a maintenance building for the golf course. The Navy will also review consensus statements for these sites and RODs for other sites. Debris observations regarding Site 15 were discussed. Drum remnants were found near the impoundment and at the survival training area. A magnetometer survey was done to show that no other buried objects were present. However, the surface drum was previously not noticed. The Navy wants to make sure there are no lurking issues prior to transfer. Other locations where debris was found during the CERFA (Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act) walk-over were the northwestern corner of the base boundary near the cemetery and the former dog training area. The Activity reported soil piles behind the Commander's house. Discussion was had regarding how the soil

pile/debris sampling will be conducted (i.e., surficial or deeper into the piles). Both shallow and deep sampling will be performed. Locations of drums at both Site 15 and Site 16 will be documented by GPS (global positioning system). The debris/mounds next to Site 7 will be sampled this summer. Navy will add all three areas discussed to the tracking system. The work plan for sampling has yet to be developed.

Discussion was had about whether debris was originally part of Sites 15 or 16 or not. Site 16 was associated with metals, and it is not clear if debris was part of this site. DEP and EPA asked if housekeeping work will be done before further investigation. The Navy said yes, but only to pick up trash and household debris. If issues other than housekeeping are found, they will be flagged for BRAC (Base Realignment and Closure) PMO (Program Management Office) to address. If any drums are found, they will be left in place until a removal plan is discussed with stakeholders.

5. DELIVERABLES STATUS

ECC distributed a deliverable tracking form and a Federal Facilities Act (FFA) schedule table. It was asked that the group notify ECC if anything is missing to help cooperatively meet all deadlines. This tracking form should be a tool for everyone's benefit. The Navy wants to be responsive to all deadlines. EPA mentioned a December 17, 2007 deadline noted in another schedule. Navy will check to see which schedule is correct. The third five-year review needs to be added to the schedule.

ECC is doing a good job of getting deliverables out and getting caught up. Since the beginning of this year, ECC produced 20 final and 11 draft documents. ECC plans on being caught up by July. This will allow more timely ability to react to new data. Since there is a lot going on now, ECC is trying to accelerate work to get caught up.

December 2009 is the due date for the third five year review. The group discussed producing a good draft by August 2009. TTNUS will be doing this, not ECC. TTNUS has done 20 of these for EPA Region 1. *[Note: While December 31, 2009 is the due date for the third Five Year Review noted in the EPA latter approving the second five year review, EPA headquarters has since changed the due date to September 29, 2010. Therefore, a draft would not be due until early 2010.]*

The draft Supplemental RI (Remedial Investigation) Work Plan for Site 17 is due 18 June 2007 and needs to be delivered by Monday. TTNUS needs to incorporate comments and issue by Monday. The Navy will ask for an extension if it is not ready.

ECC will forward an email regarding the April 2007 Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) reports for Sites 7 and 17 to project stakeholders. ECC expects to meet the FFA 45 day deadline.

6. ORDNANCE INVESTIGATION UPDATE

Presentation by Linda Klink of TTNUS (see Attachment A). The ordnance investigation contract was awarded to TTNUS, however the field work has not started yet.

The presentation discussed the difference between MC (munitions constituents) and MEC (munitions and explosives of concern). MEC are munitions and un-exploded ordnance, such as mortar rounds. MC are chemicals that originate from ordinance (i.e., lead). MC conditions do not pose an immediate safety risk. MEC can include chemicals when concentrations are an explosive hazard.

All six sites will have MC work plan and field work, because all sites have the potential for soil and groundwater (GW) contamination. Only the first three sites have the potential for MEC.

Site 12/General
Site 12 is a suspected MEC area. The ESS (Explosives Safety Submissions) will define procedures to work with MEC safely. The former munitions bunker and Quarry sites are the other two MEC areas. The machine gun range, skeet range and Topsham skeet areas are MC sites only.

There was a discussion whether analytical procedures will include just MC-related contaminants or other contamination. TTNUS stated that the lab work will include lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and MC-related contaminants. The analytical program will include propellants also, as necessary.

Only Site 12 has an ESS planning document, which describes how to handle MECs when found in the field. The ESS specifies how explosives will be set off, among other things. The other two MEC sites are not expected to have the same level of ordnance, and therefore, do not have their own ESS. At the Quarry site, if MECs are found, this would necessitate an ESS at that time. For now, Navy is working off an “ESS waiver”. The ESS requires a high level of Navy involvement.

There was discussion about stakeholder input for these sites. The SI (site investigation) MC work plan done by Malcolm Pirnie includes stakeholder review. Site visits will be conducted to include stakeholders. The MC work plan states that the 3 sites that do not include MEC can commence. The results will allow for further review of the MEC work plans.

This work is in the SI phase, and Navy hopes that more expansive sampling effort will result in no further action (NFA). If not, the sites will proceed to the RI phase. These sites will be prioritized in a more streamlined process to minimize steps, as Navy does not want to slow down the transfer process. The funding for this work is from BRAC and is separate from work at the active base. If BRAC money is stagnant, the group will need to prioritize internally. The SI process for these sites will not have a prioritization scheme under the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP). It will either be NFA or completed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). EPA would like clarification on this to determine the protocol for prioritization and to help

determine the need for RI. As an action item, the Navy will explain how prioritization works within BRAC.

This work is currently in the planning stage. Malcolm Pirnie prepared the MC work plan and is working on finalization. The MEC documents are behind while waiting finalization of Malcolm Pirnie Preliminary Assessment (PA). The Navy and the consultant site visits were in May, and the ESS and MEC work plans are on-going. The ESS is expected to be final in late fall. The stakeholders will have the opportunity for a site visit before the work commences.

Munitions Bunker West Area
There was a discussion related to potential areas where chemicals could have leaked in the munitions bunker west area. The investigation will be conducted in the former training area, which encompasses the bunkers. The work will include a sweep first because it is an MEC site.

Quarry Site
The Quarry is a 4 acre site, and is a possible MEC site but not confirmed. This site will be investigated for MEC initially. It has the potential for being a dumping area of other debris and materials. There will be an addendum to address this issue.

Machine Gun Range
At the machine gun range, there are only MC issues and the focus will be on the berm. Question about the recent site visit and whether the location of the berm was noticeable. The area of disturbance was noticeable, and concrete chunks were found in the woods nearby. The SI will focus on the area near the berm where contamination is most likely. This could expand beyond that area but only if necessary. There are no plans to go beyond the boundary of the base. The work will focus around the berm and temporary wells will be installed to sample groundwater (GW). Machine gun practice dictated shooting low initially, working up to the target to minimize shooting over the target.

Skeet Range/Topsham Skeet Range
At most skeet ranges, there is typically a semi-circle pattern of shooting. At this skeet range site (at Site 9), the shooting patterns changed over time so that the area of investigation is a larger circle. The Topsham range does have a more conventional semi-circle pattern. This site is located off-base, which requires right of entry access agreements. There is evidence of possible sampling in the area by others. The Navy has not done any testing there yet. In the Topsham work plan, Malcolm Pirnie suggested surface water/sediment testing. TTNUS does not recommend sampling because this is a runoff impoundment pond (near Site 9) that is likely impacted by other sources.

7. VAPOR INTRUSTION

Presentation of Navy Vapor Intrusion Guidance update by Dan Waddill (see Attachment B).

There was a discussion on policy versus guidance, and when/how to implement this guidance. The group discussed how this guidance would apply to the proposed joint forces reserve center north of Site 12, and what measures would need to be taken since the Eastern Plume is near by. There was further discussion regarding the Mere Brook investigation and whether the plume is traversing towards the Mere Brook investigation area. Recent work has included piezometers showing volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in shallow zone. Bedrock is noted along the eastern side and there are no signs that the Eastern Plume extends east of Merriconeag Stream. Eastern Plume components have not been detected in bedrock wells east of Merriconeag Stream.

Action item – Navy will distribute the Group the Federal Real Estate transfer form for any real estate transfer.

8. ACTION ITEMS FROM MAY CONFERENCE CALL

Action items were reviewed from the 15 May 2007 conference call. See below for updated status. The following are changes/updates to the list:
5) – data that supports Form 1 was not provided to EPA. The Navy will get this information from Oak.
8) – ECC is working on the CAD drawing, and will deliver near the end of June
9) – ECC is looking for TtEC (former Foster Wheeler) design specs
10) – there was a discussion regarding the letter dated 5 June 2007 that Navy sent regarding policy on treatment of 1, 4 dioxane. EPA and DEP stated that this letter does not address action item #10.

Much discussion followed. Navy asked what is the trigger for discharging 1, 4 dioxane to the ground. 1, 4 dioxane is viewed by the Navy as an emerging contaminant. DEP/EPA stated that contaminated groundwater should not be put back into the ground, and that dilution is not the solution. 1, 4 dioxane is still a pollutant even though concentrations are below action levels. EPA and DEP feel that the treatment system has the ability to treat 1, 4 dioxane and should be used. The Navy wants to discuss this internally prior to setting up discussions with the regulators. There is a legal question whether discharge levels ARAR (Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements) in ROD are being met. The Navy had previously agreed to use Maine Maximum Exposure Guideline (MEG) to treat 1, 4 dioxane. The EPA and DEP position is that the aquifer needs to be restored with no exceedances of ARARs per the ROD. The Navy may need to reconsider the extraction program because some water is extracted with levels below federal Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL), which dilutes other more contaminated water. The group may need to consider extracting water only from the southern end of Eastern Plume. The ROD calls for containment and treatment, and includes restoring the aquifer. The southern area is where the 32 ug/L (micrograms per liter) MEG is exceeded. The Navy wants to do a risk assessment for 1 ,4 dioxane, however, risk assessments are cumulative and would include all compounds. This would result in a risk-based number lower than 32 ug/L. The Navy will discuss this more internally.

Below is an update of action items generated from the May 15 call:
1) – complete
2) – need FFA amendment, to be signed by all FFA parties. The EPA will resend the email to Navy for Navy follow up action.
3) – complete
4) – complete
5) – complete
7) – complete
8) – the week of July 9 is scheduled for the new extraction well
9) – NA
10) – the background study work plan is in progress. TTNUS and ECC are working together to complete.

See Attachment C for complete list of action items reviewed during the June 2007 Technical Meetings.

9. MERE BROOK INVESTIGATION UPDATE

A slide showing the location of the Mere Brook investigation area was shown. The work has been conducted in two phases. The first was nested piezometers in the C and A transects, which was done in February/March of this year (2007). The work included sampling the groundwater (GW) to the top of clay in multiple zones, for a total of 3 to 5 GW samples per location. ECC communicated information real time to DEP/EPA. On site GW testing for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and off-site testing for 1, 4 dioxane was completed. The results showed the presence of contaminants of concern (COCs) from the Eastern Plume in GW.

The second phase includes soil borings that were started the week of 4-8 June 2007 (TB-3, 5 and 6 north of the confluence). This work includes drilling to the top of clay at about 55-62 feet bgs (below ground surface). There is a thick transition sequence near the top of the clay, which includes fine sand lenses or silty sand just above the clay. Deep, intermediate and shallow wells are being installed, with the screen intervals communicated to DEP and EPA. The deep screen is set to the top of the clay, and field decisions are made for the intermediate and shallow screens. This week, (11-15 June 2007) three additional borings (TB 4, 2 and 1) will be installed. Clay was found at 40 feet in TB-4, with the deep screen interval set to the top of the clay. Intermediate screen sections were also installed. Well installations will likely be complete this week, with development and sampling (including nested wells) in mid July.

DEP stated they would like to take split samples. EPA will check on analytical testing for 1, 4 dioxane.

Boring TB-3 showed some PID (photo ionization detector) hits in the upper sand, and so the screen was set shallow in this boring. A letter report is scheduled for the end of September 2007. The project has gone well.

10. MERE BROOK FISH TISSUE STUDY UPDATE

EPA provided an update of this project. The group reviewed the slides that were prepared for the RAB presentation. The work is scheduled for the week of 9 July 2007. The study includes collection of greater than 6 inch adult fish, and less than 3 inch juvenile fish. Testing will be done for metals, pesticides and percent lipids. Fish scales will be used to determine the age of the fish, and these scales will be archived. EPA will write the report and compare the results to the Fish and Wildlife study of 1995. The report will likely be published next year.

EPA will need to coordinate access with base personnel for work in the weapons area. Samples will need to be taken in and out of this secure area. The work will be weather dependent.

[Note: the Navy distributed a CD/DVD of the June 2007 CERFA updates to BLRA, BACSE and ECC (for the administrative record).]

11. APRIL 2007 LONG-TERM MONITORING (LTM) UPDATE

Slide presentation by ECC (see Attachment D).

Prior to the last monitoring event, a sample summary table was circulated by ECC for comment. This list included wells to be sampled and testing parameters.

The group discussed the need to re-number the wells, because there is more than one set of "series 1300" wells. Action item - ECC will search the database and submit a letter to change well numbers as needed.

There was also a question as to whether the Dyers Gate well will be added to the LTM program. This is an agenda item for the next technical meeting.

Action item – Sites 1 and 3 LTM plan needs to be updated to include 1300 series wells, and Site 7 LTMP needs to be updated to include the 3 new wells.

ECC distributed a draft of the most recent 1, 4 dioxane figure. The most recent data on this map (April 2007) has not been validated yet.

The new wells north of MW-313 and piezometers will provide additional 1, 4 dioxane data. Extraction wells were also included in this April sampling event. All extraction wells (EWs) pump water through piping to the treatment plant and discharge to an infiltration gallery. Discussion was had about whether the extraction system can address 1, 4 dioxane. ECC's program at US Army Soldier Systems Center, Natick treats water for 1, 4 dioxane with ultra-violet oxidation (UVOx) prior to going to the main treatment plant. Here in Brunswick, influent water to the system is typically below the MEG of 32 ug/L. The Mere Brook

investigation is working towards identifying areas of highest impact so that extraction wells can be reconfiguration. The groundwater (GW) extraction treatment system (GWETS) reports show that the influent/effluent levels are very close. A new EW near P-106 is possible, plus one other to the south. The Mere Brook investigation and the GW model will help decide where to place these new wells. EPA is amenable to amending the remedial programs to include more wells and/or other techniques. The ROD needs to be complied with to target containment and to remove hot spots with extraction wells.

Action item - ECC is to forward information on Natick treatment system to the group.

This is the first time that individual EWs have been sampled. Previous sampling of the EWs has been influent to the GWETS, which is all EWs combined. It was discussed that the sample results from each EW appear to be similar to the influent results.

12. FIELD WORK SCHEDULE

The following information was presented on a slide.

- Mere Brook – June 2007
- Site 7 monitoring well (MW) installation – June 2007
- Site 9 direct push – July 2007
- EW installation – July 2007
- Area north of Site 2 landfill – Fall 2007
- Site 17 – Fall 2007
- Fish tissue – July 2007
- Munitions sites
    - MC field work fall 2007
    - MEC planning documents in October/November; field work likely in spring 2008
- Site 9 removal – In progress

There was a discussion about a proposed monitoring well in the southwest (SW) corner of Site 9. This proposal has been in progress since 2004, and the new well was to be a sentinel well. The initial request was based on soil boring results provided by EA Engineering, Science and Technology (EA). The group discussed this previously, so that this well would be installed during Site 7 drilling. The Navy agreed to provide EPA/DEP with a letter to commence installation of this well. The letter will state that ECC will install a well in the SW corner of Site 9, in accordance with the QAPP (Quality Assurance Project Plan). The letter will include a site map and boring logs for the up-gradient area. The letter will include a statement that EPA and DEP hydrogeologists and Navy (including ECC) will decide on the screen interval.

Meeting adjourn time – 1715 hours.

13 JUNE 2007

Meeting start time – 900 hours.

1. SITES 1 & 3 & EASTERN PLUME

Additional Sampling Points/Pore Water
Additional comments were discussed from EPA/DEP regarding sampling points along the Mere Brook. The group discussed pore water versus surface water sampling techniques to determine if groundwater (GW) is discharging to the brook above applicable standards. DEP would like pore water samples as part of the LTMP (Long-Term Monitoring Plan). Co-location of these samples with surface water samples could be used to evaluate dilution to the brook. The Navy believes pore water samples are good qualitative information, and this information prompted the Mere Brook investigation. DEP believes that pore water samples will better show where discharge may be occurring. Pore water samples may be variable, similar to GW sampling. Variability may be with the method of collection, so fixed points such as shallow piezometers for pore water should be considered. Shallow piezometers are, however, subject to frost problems and erosion. DEP believes this data would be valuable in the LTM program relative to plume migration. Establish locations and depth, and collect samples from same places consistently. These results could help evaluate the effectiveness of a new extraction well in the Mere Brook area. Fixed locations now exist for surface water and sediment. DEP proposed to add pore water points to those same locations. Navy wants to look at the data and consider the objective of preventing plume migration to surface water. DEP wanted to open this idea to stakeholders for consideration. Navy believes it would make sense to have new data first to hone in on where pore water locations would be most valuable. DEP wants to consider this proposal and other ideas to help meet the goals of the LTMP and ROD. It was recommended that this be discussed in detail in the December technical meeting (12/11 to 12/13). The GW model and new data will be available then. Navy will apply its DQO (Data Quality Objectives) process to determine the best approach to meet the goals of the ROD (Record of Decision). There was discussion of having a draft pore water proposal prior to the December meeting (prior to the Thanksgiving holiday in November). The Navy will attempt to have this ready, but it will be dependant on when the model is complete. The location of the new EW will be based on all available data and models. There was a discussion on whether or not pore water data would help to refine the citing of the new EW.

The Navy will continue with steps that are currently underway and will finish its evaluation. The Navy will consider pore water sampling as well as other things that will best fulfill the LTMP objectives. DEP believes that some data now would be useful. Navy would prefer to look at LTMP as a whole using DQO process. The goal is to fulfill the LTMP objectives under the ROD.

There was a considerable amount of discussion regarding when to implement pore water sampling. DEP/EPA advocated for implementing pore water sampling now to establish a database. The Navy wishes to evaluate all data and refine the LTMP first.

The new extraction well is currently planned for the 2008 field season. This well has been funded, and the group is waiting for all the data and an agreement on where to locate it.

New monitoring wells are going in this week and will be developed and sampled by mid to late July. That data will be available in mid-August.

DEP wants to consider pore water as a tool under the LTMP. There was discussion on whether or not pore water can be a joint effort with the State (i.e., a pilot study). The joint efforts from the past, and the Mere Brook study, show that COCs (contaminants of concern) are discharging to the Brook. Therefore, this work is no longer considered to be a pilot study.

The group decided to revisit this issue during the next conference call. Everyone should refresh what the LTMP and ROD say, and whether pore water sampling should be added. Everyone should also consider locations for sampling points, and how the data will be used. DEP wishes to move ahead sooner rather than later, to hopefully include this sampling in the fall sampling event. EPA and DEP would like to see pore water locations at PW-81 and PW-51, along with surface water locations.

Action item – Navy and ECC will discuss this topic prior to the July conference call.

Effectiveness of GWETS

DEP has reviewed monthly reports, and has concluded that at least one well is not pumping effectively. They want to ensure that the system is operating efficiently. DEP prepared/reviewed graphics on mass removal, pumping rates, etc. They asked whether scale removal treatment was effective. The data suggests there was an increase in the EW-1 flow rate, but then a decline. The system as a whole shows low concentrations in the influent. It is not clear whether the infiltration gallery can handle the increased flow from the proposed new wells.

DEP wants to look at efficiency to determine if the declines in flow rates are attributed to maintenance. Each location needs to be looked at to determine its effectiveness. Each well needs to either contain the plume or be an asset to hot spot removal. Well EW-1 has 50 feet of screen, and most of the clean water comes from the upper sands. This well may potentially be replaced to pump only from the lower zones. This well was treated recently for clogging.

A review of pump rates indicated EW-5A dropped from 6 to 2 gpm (gallons per minute), and EW-1 went from 4 gpm, then up to 10 gpm after clean out, returning now to below 9 gpm. The total pumping from all wells appears to be steady. Historically, each well pumps at 10-15 gpm, for a total of 35-40 gpm. It is unclear what the system capacity is for treatment.

The need for shorter screens at some wells is recognized. There is also the need to look at each well and see what the mass removal is. Well EW-5A initially had good removal, but then it declined.

Agenda item for December meeting – further discussion on efficiency of system and how to optimize performance.

Target Deeper Intervals with New Wells
This topic was covered in the above discussion.

[Note: The RI (Remedial Investigation) indicates that the Site 3 boundaries are not accurate on the maps. Figures need updating to better show the orientation of trenches and the location of Site 3 boundaries. This is for clarification only, and does not change the remedy.]

2. SITE 2 – REVIEW OF MONITORING EVENT 12 & 13

TTNUS is working on the QAPP, which is due within a month after the ECC work plan is submitted. The work is currently on the schedule, expecting to do the field work in the fall. There was much discussion regarding the email from EPA concerning new screening procedures for dioxin. TTNUS is aware of these new procedures. EPA suggests evaluating screening methods to refine the number of soil samples for expensive lab testing.

Action item – EPA is to send this email to ECC.

The screening method is part of SW-846. EPA is not sure how commercially available the method is. The Navy will review the method internally. There was a question of whether the work plan would need to be amended, or just described in QAPP. Screening procedures have been used at other sites (Natick and Davisville) to refine the number of lab samples for VOCs (volatile organic compounds). Screening provides qualitative results, and allows for more samples to be taken. EPA is not sure what the detection level is, since this is a new technique that was offered to Navy to consider.

The work plan currently includes 3 sample locations around the former incinerator, and 3 other locations. The citizens previously commented that 6 samples are not enough to characterize this site. No other dioxin sampling has been done in this area. The RI work plan said that the landfill at Site 2 includes ash. This area was not previously fully characterized because it was within the weapons area. Old air photos showed possible erosion (water and air). It was suggested that erosion could have allowed dioxin to migrate to the brook. The assumption is that dioxins are associated with ash. The Navy will implement the DQO process to evaluate if 6 samples are enough to meet the objectives. It was suggested that this work may be a phased approach, since little is known about the extent of ash and possible migration. Prevailing wind is from southwest towards the brook.

Monitoring Event 12
Two items were discussed on recent VOC data. For Event 12, leachate locations 201 and 203, many VOC results were noted as J values and R (rejected). Many other J results were reported for compounds not previously seen. These data were validated (Tier 2 validation). The text of the report needs to better explain data quality issues.

The second issue concerns acetone in the total VOC trend plots for sediment. For Sites 2 and 3, acetone is a by product of a sample preservative used. This issue was discussed in past meetings. The group has previously discussed different preservation methods. The preservation method that all agreed on does produce acetone as by product. A previous side by side study did determine that acetone was not in the sediment but is a by product of preservation. Acetone is found in groundwater in some areas, but is not a COC in sediment in Sites 2 and 3.

At Sites 2 and 3, acetone should not be included in the sediment trend graphs, but should be included at Site 9 (to be discussed later). The text of this Monitoring Event report should say that acetone is a by product of preservation. Acetone is not used on the base, and there is no information as to the source of acetone.

Aerial Photo

The group reviewed a recent air photo on the screen. During the last meeting, the group discussed historical photos for TTNUS to review and incorporate into the work plan. The historical photos have been obtained, as per the work plan. The work plan was recently finalized and approved, and review of photos will be performed as part of the work. CERFA documents have additional detail. It was stated that aerial photos were supposed to guide sample locations, prior to finalizing the work plan. The air photos will fine tune locations and also guide the electromagnetic (EM) survey. The agenda may have been misleading – the air photos have not been reviewed yet, but will be. Stakeholders want to be able to review photos and agree on sample locations. It was agreed that stakeholders may participate in a site walk to determine sample locations. This issue will be further discussed on the August 14 conference call, or earlier if possible. TTNUS is to have a review done by then.

[Side discussion not on agenda: ECC is contracted to continue with GWETS (groundwater extraction treatment system) plant through July 2008. This can be extended for one year, depending on funding and contract issues. ECC's contract (ordering period) expires in September of 2007. There are no plans yet for other O&M (operation and maintenance) contractors. The Navy is looking for other contract mechanisms beyond the ECC contract, such as 8A. ECC has two years to execute work that is awarded before September of 2007. This may extend ECC's O&M work though July 2009.]

The plan now is to finalize contractual issues with TTNUS, then do the air photo review. The field work, including the EM survey, should be done this fall.

3. SITE 17 LONG-TERM MONITORING (LTM) OPTIMIZATION

The group discussed the Site 17/Building 95 area and GW sampling frequency. ECC presented slides on the topic (see Attachment E). There have been monitoring wells in this area since 1995. Currently, 3 wells are in the monitoring program, plus 3 other wells. Wells MW-97 and 98 were installed in March 2000 at the request of DEP. GW flow direction is towards the

southeast, and varies slightly with the seasons. Many gauging events have been done in Site 17 and Site 7 areas. EA formerly did a combined gauging event for these sites and the Old Navy Fuel Farm (ONFF) site. The LTM frequency has changed over time, and 25 events have been completed total.

[Note: The term bi-annual has been replaced with the term semi-annual to mean twice per year.]

ECC reviewed the analytical list. In 2001 the analyte list changed to remove avitol and add 3 other pesticides. April 2002, VOCs, SVOCs (semi-volatile organic compounds) and TAL (target analyte list) metals were removed. ECC is currently only testing for pesticides by EPA method 8081 list. The April results show only very low detections for DDD (dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane) and DDE (dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene) which was found in wells 67 and 97, and levels were below MEGs (Maximum Exposure Guidelines). ECC showed trend graphs, indicating relatively flat and stable levels since about 1997. A removal action was done in 1994, and monitoring started in 1995. DEP stated that two compounds have been detected above MEGs and concentrations have increased with drought conditions. ECC stated that water table levels during the drought did not appear to decline.

If DEP decides to go forward with optimization of the LTMP, the best time to sample needs to be agreed upon. DEP would want to select sample times when concentrations would be expected to be highest (i.e., during low water table). There was much discussion about possible additional removal actions in this area.

A summary of the last 4 events shows levels for DDD and DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane) below MEGs in groundwater. DEP believes there is still an issue with soil. During the previous removal action, soil testing results may have had elevated detection limits. The current reporting levels appear to be acceptable to DEP.

In summary, the last four rounds show that DDD and DDT levels are below MEGs. These were the compounds driving the monitoring at this site. Additional sampling will be conducted during the RI performed by TTNUS. ECC is recommending that GW monitoring be eliminated from Site 17. Even though soil still has pesticides, there appears to be an incomplete pathway to groundwater. Pesticides prefer to adsorb to soil and do not dissolve readily in water. There was a discussion of whether or not a liner was installed after the removal action. The liner was installed as a marker of the excavation limits, rather than to prevent migration to groundwater. Under the RI program, human and environmental risk will be considered.

The Navy recommended to stop long-term groundwater monitoring at Site 17. EPA states that there needs to be a discussion of cessation of monitoring versus sampling annually in the fall.

There was a slide presentation of TTNUS's Site 17 RI Work Plan (see Attachment F). Excavations in 2004 removed 1300 cy (cubic yards) of soil, and there were subsequent well

installations. This area is close to the dog training area. Currently, there is more vegetation than shown on the air photos. The work plan includes 20 soil borings around Site 17 area (based on a 50 foot grid). Three borings will be converted into wells. The work plan will be submitted on Monday, and the schedule is to complete the field work this fall.

[Note: No comments from EPA on recent ECC reports.]

EPA and DEP agreed to prioritize review of work plans over monitoring reports, to facilitate the summer/fall field schedule.

4. SITE 9

Status Update
Contractor performed sampling of CDD (construction demolition debris) piles, the results are back. The contractor consulted with the landfill operators and the CDD material has been accepted. The schedule for segregating ash from CDD and actual removal is not proposed yet.

The facility for hazardous waste is in Canada. Details are still being worked out on the trans-boundary paper work. EPA will get confirmation from Canadian Environmental Ministry to confirm their acceptance. The Navy is working with Canadian agencies to make sure all paper work is complete. It may take 3 to 4 additional weeks for EPA headquarter's approval. Lisa will let Christine know who in EPA is involved with this; Christine will help to coordinate within EPA.

This field season, the plan is to remove existing piles and complete other work that was proposed. Excavation is to be done this fall, backfilling and site restoration may not be finished until spring. The plan is to remove existing piles by late summer. Also to complete sampling and remaining excavation this fall. This includes ash and CDD. There is more excavation to be done towards the northwest. No more excavation (horizontally) to the south, but additional excavation to depth is needed. The roadway between upper and middle ponds still contains ash.

ECC put a map on the screen to show limits of current excavation, based on information from Oak.

Excavation work will start on the northern end first, then backfill that area. This will minimize expensive dewatering. Then complete excavation in the southern end.

Meanwhile, ECC will be completing the boring program on either side of Neptune drive. There was a question if Oak will continue to the south if borings show more ash. The plan is for Oak to install a liner to mark the southern extent when they are done. If more work is needed south of Neptune, this would be a separate remedial action with its own RI, ROD, etc.

The south end excavation will be deep – greater than 22 feet. There is concern over utilities around Neptune Drive. There was discussion about the need to accurately place liner and mark with GPS (global positioning system).

There was discussion about where the ash may have come from. Navy will go back through records to piece together where ash was uncovered. EPA believes this information is important to have before confirmatory sampling is conducted. Original confirmatory sampling program was developed before material was known to be hazardous. Piles were to be flagged, but were moved, and confirmatory sample locations need to be GPS'ed.
[Note: The Initial Assessment Study (1983) states that the waste is all the way to Building 201 and that 2 PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) transformers were located on the site. EPA has requested PCB analysis for both confirmation and backfill (if using site backfill).]

Sampling Frequency and Additional Monitoring Points
The group discussed the new well to be installed in the southwest. The location was based on direct push work done a few years ago. DEP has also requested that MW-76 be replaced with deeper well screen (MW-76 is screened 12 feet above clay). This well will not be installed until Site 9 excavation is complete. DEP believes the boundaries of Site 9 plume are not delineated and when the property is transferred, the plume extent will need to be known. COCs include TCE (trichloroethylene) on one side and vinyl chloride on other side. DEP considers Site 9 primarily vinyl chloride, but parent compounds are also present. Also there is an area of DRO (diesel range organics) in Site 9. Discussion was had on whether or not the NEX (Naval Exchange) site is the source of DRO impact to Site 9, which is more than 1000 feet away. The NEX discussion is on the agenda for later. Monitoring may need to be expanded for DRO in Site 9 depending on the outcome of the direct push work. DEP will want to revisit sampling frequency after well 76 is replaced.

There was a question if NEX sentinel wells had been sampled by TTNUS for DRO. Currently samples are collected for GRO (gasoline range organics)/BTEX (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes), not DRO. DEP had wanted down-gradient wells sampled in conjunction with the injection program. It is not clear if sentinel wells south of Avenue F were sampled for DRO when first installed. It does not appear they have been sampled recently. EPA believes that additional data points are needed to the west for the benefit of the NEX site as well as Site 9.

Need to add these topics to future conference call - defining plume in Site 9, data gaps to the west (for VOCs), and defining analytes.

USGS Study on Diffusion Sampling and Low Flow Sampling Discussion
Discussion was had regarding the USGS (United States Geological Survey) study and low flow sampling versus diffusion sampling. The USGS report includes data from MMR (Massachusetts Military Reservation) and compares the two sampling techniques. There were poor results for PCE (tetrachloroethylene) and TCE (trichloroethylene), but other reports indicate diffusion sampling is good for PCE, TCE and vinyl chloride. Problems at MMR may

be related to other site-specific factors. DEP suggests it may be good practice to collect additional low flow samples from wells that are to be dropped from LTMP. At MW-76, vinyl chloride was seen frequently before diffusion sampling started. After diffusion sampling, vinyl chloride was not detected. There may be insufficient data to determine if it is really gone or if sampling techniques are responsible.

DEP stated that there is a need to confirm diffusion data with additional low flow samples, and use EPA Method 8260 SIM Analysis (selected-ion monitoring to achieve higher sensitivity) for vinyl chloride analysis to get lower detection limits. DEP and EPA believe 4 rounds of low flow/SIM sampling are needed for well closure (SIM is needed for vinyl chloride to achieve detection limits). Passive diffusion data is not acceptable for well closure, but may be alright for routine monitoring. Navy will need to use low flow with acceptable detection limits for 4 rounds to close a well.

If EPA method 8260 indicates ND (non detect), Navy would still need to switch to SIM (for vinyl chloride) to prove that concentrations are below MEGs. Navy believed that when they switched to diffusion sampling that there was good correlation with low flow. EPA and DEP do not believe that diffusion results are acceptable for regulatory decisions, but can be useful for trends.

The LTM Plan needs to be updated before wells are dropped. This will include identifying which wells will be switched to low flow in preparation for dropping from the plan. The well(s) to be switched will be presented in a monitoring event report to keep the proposed change with the data. Then a page change to the LTMP will be made once consensus is reached.

DRO (Diesel Range Organic) Results
The group reviewed a summary table of Site 9 DRO results. They discussed Comment 5 from EPA on monitoring event #27 - which asks to add DRO sampling for all wells in Site 9 for minimum of one event. This must include wells MW-74, 75 and 76 where DRO was previously detected. Discussion was had on whether to wait for the DRO direct push report from ECC first. EPA is fine with this for now. Further discussion on DRO sampling in Site 9 can be had after this report is issued. DEP will also ask to add sampling of wells south of NEX (under NEX program).

5. NAVAL EXCHANGE (NEX) SERVICE STATION

Site Progress
The discussion was led by Fred Lavallee of DEP. He was skeptical that the bio technique could work here given large source and stratigraphy, but DEP did not have other suggestions. In-situ oxidation had previously not worked. SVE (soil vapor extraction)/AS (air sparging) did clean up the vadose zone (unsaturated zone in the subsurface) but did not sufficiently address saturated zone. Geo-vation did have success at other sites with similar impact. There program uses indigenous microbes, but since oxygen is usually the limiting factor, this program uses

anaerobic processes. Diagnostic work indicated microbes are present, and that the objective was to provide the right conditions for them. This process is typically slow, and by-products are CO_2 (carbon dioxide) and water (if the process goes to full completion). Nitrogen eventually goes off as nitrogen gas. In-situ oxidation did not work at this site because most of the source is in soil and is not available to this treatment.

Maps were projected on screen showing groundwater concentration isopleths of GRO (gasoline organic compounds) for 3 groundwater sampling events. The outer isopleth is 1 mg/L, and the MEG for reference is 50 ug/L. Additional maps show isopleths for soil (5000 to 500 mg/kg range of contours). Soil maps are not conclusive as to the effectiveness of this treatment – the area of red (highest concentrations) does not appear to be smaller after treatment.

Even at 500 mg/kg goal, vapor intrusion still needs to be considered. Odors were detected in the Family Services Building #27 previously, but recently were checked by Geo-vation and found to be not an issue. A passive system was installed several years ago along the foot print of the building, but its performance is not well documented. Indoor air sampling was done at DEP's request before the treatment started. Sub-slab monitoring points are still present, although it does not appear they have been recently sampled.

In summary, DEP wanted to see this process succeed so that it could be used elsewhere. The data does not support that this treatment process has worked well, although subsurface conditions appear to be amenable to this process. Geo-vation report #3 offers several theories on why it has likely not worked, including continued impact from an upgradient source.

DEP explained that the GRO goal of 500 mg/kg in soil was negotiated and is not based on risk. There is very limited information on risk-based standards for GRO.

TTNUS slides were shown to review the status of the pilot study (see Attachment G). It was initially decided to go full scale after the second round and then the third round of data was collected. One possible explanation for limited progress includes continued migration from upgradient source (the pilot study was conducted downgradient of the UST (underground storage tank) source). There was discussion on whether control of the source was considered before conducting the pilot test. The documentation of the old extraction wells is somewhat incomplete. This system included culvert extraction wells installed with backhoe, and a pump and treat system. EA performed a mini-feasibility study that discussed the mass removed during SVE operation. Records from the tank removal indicate that not much soil was removed. Initial direct push work done by EA showed adsorbed phase extending upgradient to source area. DEP believes that the upgradient source area was not significant and that most of the source was within the pilot test area.

The recommendation was to (1) perform GC-MS (gas chromatography-mass spectrometry) on samples, (2) identify the tentatively identified compounds (TICs) in the laboratory analysis reports, and (3) sample downgradient of the building. This work is not currently scheduled. DEP would like to see completion of the 4th round of monitoring since additional End Blend®

has already been added. DEP sees limited value in the bio mass sampling. The current levels of GRO are not close enough to the closure goals.

Discussion was had regarding the original decisions in the NEX area and how they were made before the base was slated for closure. Since the NEX was to be relocated, this remedial program was initially thought to be an interim solution. Now that base is closing, this site may need a new direction. *[Note: A brief overview of the Site 9 status was provided to EPA legal council.]*

Action items include completing sample round #4, and include downgradient sentinel wells. DEP and EPA will respond to TTNUS regarding which downgradient wells should be included.

6. REVIEW OF RESORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING AGENDA

The agenda was handed out to the group.

Introductions will be handled by Navy representative, Lonnie. The newsletter, Site Management Plan and Community Relations Plan updates will be conducted by ECC's representative, Al. A status of the NASB website development will be led by Linda of TTNUS. Al of ECC will lead the Mere Brook topic. Christine, EPA representative, will talk to slides about the fish tissue study. Lonnie will give an update on the north area of Site 9 while Al will follow with an update on the activities in the south area. Mention in meeting that Time Critical Action memo and Decision will be available for public comment. This process will start late summer/fall. The status update on Site 17/Bld 95 will be given by Al.
The discussion of Sites 1 and 3 and Eastern Plume will be lead by Al and Lonnie. There was discussion on the need to address past unauthorized changes to LTMP, and MEDEP/EPA's letters regarding this issue with the long-term monitoring program at NAS Brunswick. Navy should state that the number of wells sampled this spring complies with the plan. Mention that Navy has re-negotiated the plan with the regulators, including the split of documents, better turnaround time and better communication prior to sampling events. Need to discuss the timeline for responding to EPA stipulated penalties and what the outcome may be. The field work schedule will be discussed by Al and Lonnie. This will be followed by a question and answer period. Afterwards, suggestions will be taken from the RAB attendees for future RAB agenda items (next RAB meeting will be on 17 October 2007)

Meeting adjourn time - 1700 hours.

14 JUNE 2007

Meeting start time – 900 hours.

1. OPENING ISSUES

Navy opened with a discussion of the DQO (data quality objectives) process for Site 2. Since 6 dioxin samples will not meet everyone's objectives, Navy wants to review the work plan. There was a question about whether the currently approved work plan will be implemented. Navy wants to pull back the work plan and reconsider using the DQO process. There was a suggestion to meet two half days on 14 August 2007 and 15 August 2007 in DEP's Portland office. The Navy will bring a DQO facilitator to help walk everyone through the process. This will establish the objectives of what the work will accomplish. This will involve the determination of what COCs (contaminants of concern) are present, including dioxin. All agree that this will be a useful process and that Site 2 is a good work area to apply this to. This is a method to put the work plan together, and the end result will be a work plan that all parties can buy in to. The Navy would like to do some better planning so that the end product meets the objectives. EPA wants a chemist and risk assessment people to be involved in this August meeting.

2. RAB MEETING REVIEW AND FOLLOW UP

This was the shortest RAB meeting yet, about 40 minutes long. Hopefully this speaks well to preparation and clarity of presentation.

Ed Benedikt had follow up questions on the comment made last night by Suzanne Johnson. Ed was questioning if the DQO process would involve dispute resolution. The Navy reiterated that the FAA (Federal Facilities Act) is designed to detail the process for dispute resolution. This process is very different from the DQO process discussed above. Almost all work plan issues are resolved within the technical group.

3. NEWSLETTER, WEBSITE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN (CRP)

Newsletter

The next newsletter issue could highlight the new extraction well and discuss the basics of the Eastern Plume (i.e., geology). Also, a letter could be included from Tom Fusco speaking from the citizens' perspective. The next issue after that could include an article or letter from the BLRA (Brunswick Local Redevelopment Authority).

The last issue was dated spring 2007, and the plan is to shoot for 3 issues per year. This is not just news, but is also a community relations tool. The group will try for early August for the next draft issue, to be published final in September. ECC will need Tom's letter in July, and Ed will notify Tom to help coordinate. Since it is a Navy newsletter, it requires multiple levels of review within Navy.

Last fall it was discussed to have a separate petroleum newsletter, and could include a discussion about USTs (underground storage tanks) at Topsham. There are a large number of tanks that still need to be looked at. This is not an agenda item for today.

The next newsletter could include more discussion on the Eastern Plume, including specifics about the GWETS (groundwater extraction treatment system) and mass removal.

Website
The current schedule calls for internal review in July/August timeframe, with stakeholder review in the fall. The Issue Tracking System (ITS) discussed last night could be a link from the website. The spreadsheet of all sites and base map that were in the newsletter could also be included.

The notes from last fall indicate that the SMP (Site Management Plan) was to be ready and linked to the website. The group discussed how the website should tell readers how to obtain a copy of the SMP.

Ed had a question about PDF documents and why they are used. He has had problems in the past downloading some documents on his computer. PDFs are typically smaller in size and easier to download.

Community Relations Plan
There is now a third party interviewer on board (Planning Solutions from Portland, Maine) recommended by Carol. The draft CRP will be issued in late September. Interviews will be held in July/August, the Navy will review questions first. Town officials (Brunswick and surrounding towns), military personnel, citizens group, and abutting property owners will be interviewed. The contractor (Kevin Scribner of Planning Solutions) did suggest which town officials to interview. Communities impacted by BRAC action (economically) may be more outlying than just abutting towns, possibly include these towns. Carol will send a list of towns to be considered for interviews. Face to face interviews are preferred, but phone is acceptable. The guidance does provide questions and calls for a minimum of 40-45 interviews. EPA sent to Navy two forms from other CRPs; one from South Weymouth, and one from a private entity. These will be forwarded to ECC.

4. INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL (IC) INSPECTION CHECKLIST

A checklist for Sites 1 and 3 Landfill was displayed for the group. The suggestion was made to change ‘bi-annual’ certification to ‘semi-annual’. The form is split in two sections. First is IC inspections for Sites 1 and 3 Landfill. Similar to Davisville, there will be signoff by the Navy. The second part includes review of physical features; observations on liner, intrusive activities, monitoring well status, etc. This form provides a statement of compliance, and will be included in Sites 1 and 3 O&M (operation and maintenance) manual.

Correct mistyped word in Item 1 to read “disturbed”. On the second page, there are two #2’s which needs to be corrected. On the second page, #4 it was suggested to change ‘distributed’ to ‘disturbed’. It was suggested that as-built plan of base plan be included. Item 1 includes all structures, including detention basin. Clarify why there are two sets of yes/no boxes. Make

first part of question a full sentence. Change 'borrows' to 'burrows'. Rephrase question on second #2 to be "assure that there has been no…" or, "has there been…"

There was discussion on what should constitutes soil disturbance and how the Navy tracks these activities. Dig permits are required and include anything that disturbs the ground surface. There was discussion on what to do if "trigger elevations" are met (i.e., if groundwater elevations rise above a certain level in the landfill wells). If groundwater elevations rise, this is to be discussed with stakeholders. This may necessitate re-activation of extraction wells in this area. Address this issue in RTCs (response to comments) to describe what action will be taken if trigger elevations are met. Make sure to include observations and/or attach field notes. If something is found, describe what action is to be taken (for example, notification).

These forms should be sent to public works and copied to environmental. In the past, when a drainage basin problem was noted, it was relayed to Tony Williams, Environmental Manager NASB. Dale Mosher, NASB IR (Installation Restoration) Coordinator would be the contact person now. Environmental office would be responsible for relaying information to all required parties. Form should include phone number and contact person. Field people will get direction from project manager as to who to contact. Certification will be Navy person, likely NASB environmental person.

Further discussion was had on what constitutes soil disturbance. DEP defines disturbance as fill, excavation, bulldozing, evidence of vehicles, etc. Need to be consistent on describing disturbance and what is "out of the ordinary". Also define what "timely" notification is. The Navy suggested that 24 hours was timely.

Action item - ECC is to revise this form and redistribute via email. Similar forms will eventually be developed for other sites.

5. UPDATE ON FIRE FROM YESTERDAY – HANGER 1

Water from firefighting ran off into impoundment pond, black residual material noted in water. Booms are retaining this. NASB did notify DEP, including spill response people. DEP does not see the need to visit now, but may stop by in the future. Greg Wood was DEP representative notified. Clean Harbors Inc. (CHI) was contracted to pump black residual from pond. Oil/water separators were cut off from water flow (previously done in preparation for demolition). CHI will also replace boom, although it is still in place and functioning. Impoundment pond is doing what it is suppose to do. No one was injured from this event. The Navy is currently cleaning up so that the runways can be opened by 1300 hours.

6. COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE FACILITATION ACT (CERFA) REVIEW PROCESS AND TRACKING SYSTEM

There is lots of work to do yet on CERFA review process, including comments to be addressed. Hand outs from Lawson Anderson (TTNUS) of a proposed environmental issue

tracking (ITS) system. The idea is to track issues from the beginning to end result, to document for the record. An example was made of the area where boots and mattresses were allegedly dumped. The form will record where the anecdotal report came from, what the issue is, and who was told about it. The system will include follow up interviews, and this interview form will be attached. Also discussion was had about documenting the location and whether to use quadrant, GIS (geographical information system) or parcel identification system. When parcels are being divested, one could query the parcel and find what issues are associated with it. The ITS form will include list of actions to be taken, such as gathering air photos, etc. There could also be site visits, with documentation of observations. Tracking system would also document discussions with stakeholders and what decisions were made (i.e., will the issue create a new site that goes into the IR program, will there be a removal action, or will there be no further action). The end result will be PDF's of all documents and forms, and will be made part of the administrative record.

The group discussed including regulatory comments either on the form or part of the ITS database, to document their input. This could eventually become a large database that can be queried.

Christine mentioned an example in South Weymouth where 3-4 issues were identified, and these eventually followed into the RI (Remedial Investigation)/FS(Feasibility Study) process. The Davisville site had one issue that went further. This tracking system is a good tool, and regulatory involvement will facilitate transfer of parcels. Regulatory signoff is needed and EPA suggested adding space for that.

The group discussed how to make this accessible to the team. One idea is to put the ITS on the website with password access. There would be a need to limit who could edit the database. Public access may help to make it accurate and/or add new information. Ed Benedikt commented that he had trouble printing the ITS forms. Eventually, it will be designed to be more user-friendly. The database will be a technical tool. A readable report that could be printed off the internet would be something different.

Discussion was had about quadrants and whether they are already developed for the base. Now, there are parcels developed for the transfer purposes. A consistent system to identify areas will be needed; either parcel ID or GIS grid. Since parcels can change, a grid system may be more consistent. This concept is still to being considered.

Discussion was had about what kind of issues are going to be included. The UST/AST area (aboveground storage tanks) in Topsham is an example, and further documentation of tank removals is underway. The Navy is preparing a summary spreadsheet to include reference to any spills, clean up, site assessment, etc. This is a large undertaking, as there were hundreds of tanks. Potential sources of PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) from transformers will also be included on spreadsheet.

[Note: There was discussion about how the disposition of some of the transformers will be hard to track. Ed Benedikt believes that some transformers were taken to a local junk yard, and have since been taken elsewhere. This issue tracking system is specific to whether the properties are suitable for transfer or not. Tracking where old transformers are now is a separate issue, and can be addressed at technical meetings. There is a paper trail of these issues through reports, comments, and response to comments. Ultimately these issues (transformers) are documented in the administrative record. EPA uses a contractor to assure that comments are addressed and are contained in the record.]

The group discussed ITS form numbering and whether the tracking numbers start at 19 or 20. This is still to be determined. This is a system to track any new issue. If it becomes a formal IR site, it will be assigned a new site number. This form assigns a tracking number, which then may become a CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act), MMRP (Military Munitions Response Program) or petroleum site later. There is a need to make sure ITS numbers do not get confused with other site numbers. There was much discussion about how to assign tracking numbers. The Navy will suggest a numbering system. All sites ultimately need to be tracked through to closure and associated with a parcel or GIS coordinate to facilitate transfer.

7. AGENDIA FOR JULY 2007 CONFERENCE CALL

Discuss adding Dyers gate well to LTMP (Lonnie)
Pore water in Mere Brook – select locations, and review ROD/LTMP (Claudia).
Discuss DQO process (Navy).
Site 9 status update on ash removal (NASB)
CERFA ITS system (Dawn)
Navy response to EPA letters, stipulated penalties and possible follow up meeting (Lonnie and Christine)
Tentative GWETS/1, 4 dioxane treatment discussion (Lonnie)
New extraction well update – currently scheduled for second week in July (ECC)
Field work update (Navy contractors and EPA)
    Fish tissue – Christine
    New monitoring wells and Mere Brook (ECC)
Confirm DQO meeting date in August (All)
Set up detailed site visit for 6 MRP (Munitions Response Program) sites (Linda)

Base Operating Instruction update (Lisa). There are outstanding comments on Base Operating Instruction from DEP and others, and Navy is still reviewing. The intent of the BOI is for Navy personnel to have guidance on many issues, but this is not an enforceable document.

8. ACTION ITEMS

1. Christine of EPA to send email to group regarding dioxin screening method

2. Carol of BLRA to pass on to group list of communities impacted by BRAC for use in CRP

3. Navy to clarify how they prioritize MMRP sites

4. ECC to email well screen information to DEP/EPA for Site 7 and Site 9

5. Base will look into debris area at Sites 15 and 16, and will GPS drum locations

6. Claudia and Christine will notify Lisa and Dale for Quarry site visit. Coordinate with August meeting.

7. Dawn to forward to ECC and Lawson the EPA interview forms

8. Gina to obtain available information on 1, 4 dioxane pilot study at Natick

9. ECC to coordinate with DEP and EPA on split samples for Mere Brook

10. Claudia to follow up on drinking water standards/guidelines for 1, 4 dioxane

11. Navy (ECC) to provide letter on additional Site 9 monitoring well

12. Claudia to resend interview form to group

13. Christine to check QA/QC link from EPA's website

14. Navy to check status of work plan implementation for Site 2 (aerial photo review)

15. Navy to prepare action memo for Site 9 north removal

16. EPA and DEP to suggest wells to be included in NEX pilot study monitoring

17. Future discussion of Site 9 and NEX data gaps and western control – waiting for ECC direct push results

18. Claudia to send DEP's definition of soil disturbance to ECC and Navy

19. Future discussion on GWETS efficiency (October meeting)

20. ECC will add Monitoring Event numbers next to agenda items and assign names to lead future discussions.

21. Carol will consult with property manager regarding consistent approach to GIS/parcel identification

22. Sites 1&3 LTMP update - need to re-number series 1300 wells

23. Site 2 LTMP revision - discussion must include a discussion of adding Dyer's Gate well

24. Install well at Site 9 in SW corner – LWP due June 25, 2007

25. Navy to provided fed-fed transfer forms when transfer occurs

Meeting adjourn time – 1200 hours.

Sign In Sheet
Naval Air Station Brunswick (NASB) Technical Meeting
Parkwood Inn
Brunswick, Maine
Tuesday, 12 June 2007
11:00 AM – 5:00 PM

NAME	ORG	
Gina Calderone	ECC	gcalderone@ecc.net
AL EASTERDAY	ECC	AEASTERDAY@ECC.NET
John W. James	NASB Public Affairs	john.james@navy.mil
Dawn C. Kincaid	BRAC PMO NE	dawn.kincaid@navy.mil
LONNIE MONACO	NAVY RPM	orlando.monaco@navy.mil
Doug Heely	H+S Env.	dheel@hseav.com
Arnold Ostrofsky	T+NUS	Arnold.Ostrofsky@ttnus.com
Carolyn Lepage	BACSE Tech Advisor	calepage@adelphia.com
Christine Williams	EPA	williams.christine@epa.gov
Claudia Sait	MEDEP	claudia.b.sait@maine.gov
David W. Chipman	Town of Harpswell	dwchipman@suscom-maine.net
Dan Waddill	NAVFAC Atlantic	dan.waddill@navy.mil
LINDA KLINK	T+NUS	linda.klink@ttnus.com
CAROL WARREN	Brunswick LRA	carol@warren.com
Dale C. Mosher	NASB ENV	dale.mosher@navy.mil
LISA JOY	NASB ENV	lisa.joy@navy.mil

Sign In Sheet
Naval Air Station Brunswick (NASB) Technical Meeting
Parkwood Inn
Brunswick, Maine
Wednesday, 13 June 2007
9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

NAME		ORG
AL EASTERDAY		ECC
Gina Calderone		ECC
Dan Waddill		NAVFAC Atlantic
LISA JOY		NASB ENV
Dawn C. Kincaid		BRAC PHONE
LONNIE MONACO		NAVY – NAVFAC MIDLANT
Doug Heely		H+S Env.
CAROL WARREN		Brunswick LRA
Carolyn Lepage		BACSE Tech. Advisor
Dave McTigue		Gannett Fleming (for EPA)
Christine Williams	williams.christine@epa.gov	EPA
Claudia Sait	claudia.b.sait@maine.gov	MEDEP
Chris Evans	gordon.c.evans@maine.gov	MEDEP
David W. Chipman		Town of Harpswell
LAWSON ANDERSON	lawson.anderson@ttnus.com	TETRA TECH
LINDA KLINK	linda.klink@ttnus.com	T+NUS
Arnold Ostrofsky	Arnold.Ostrofsky@ttnus	T+NUS
FRED LAVALLEE	FRED.C.LAVALLEE@LMAIL.GOV	(202) 287-7677
Ed Benedict	BACSE <rbenedik@gwi.net>	
David Peterson		EPA

Sign In Sheet
Naval Air Station Brunswick (NASB) Technical Meeting
Parkwood Inn
Brunswick, Maine
Thursday, 14 June 2007
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

NAME	ORG
AL EASTERDAY	ECC
Dan Waddill	NAVFAC
Arnold Ostrofsky	TtNUS
Lawson Anderson	TETRA TECH
LINDA KLINK	TtNUS
LONNIE MONACO	NAVFAC - NAVY
Dawn Kincaid	BRAC PMO - NE
Doug Heely	HTS
Gina Calderone	ECC
Claudia Sait	MEDEP
Cristine Williams	USEPA New England
Carolyn Lepage	BACSE Tech Advisor
Ed Benedikt	BACSE
CAROL WARREN	BRUNSWICK LRA
Dale C Mosher	ENV NASB
John James	NASB PWD