

NOMAN1101

NOMANS LAND ISLAND
CHILMARK, MA

AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT PHASE II
COMPREHENSIVE SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

PUBLIC MEETING
10 JANUARY 2001

Summary of Minutes:

Meeting started at 7:06 p.m. Attendance list attached.

Harry Manasewich: I'd like to welcome everyone tonight. I'm from the Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution. We're a state agency that specializes in mediation negotiation training. We have no regulatory control and we were asked to come here tonight.

Two reasons for tonight. First, is to present and further explain the Draft Phase II site assessment report for Nomans.

The other part is to answer your questions and get your comments. There's a stenographer that's recording everything tonight. If you prefer, you can say your comments or you can submit them in writing, if that's more comfortable for you as well.

We are scheduled to go to about 9 o'clock, but we can extend that if people would like that. You also noticed there are some materials in the back of the room, fact sheets, and other

NOMAN1101

materials.

I wanted to go over the agenda for tonight. We will be presenting the report itself. And one of the things I wa

nt to

draw your attention to is the last item in the presentati

on.

That will be what happens after tonight with your comment

s, the

study and with everything else. At that point we will th

en turn

it over to questions and answers and comments and so fort

h for

the remainder of the evening.

You may have also noticed in the materials that you recei

ved was

a copy of all the slides that will be coming tonight. Wh

en we

do the presentations, hold your questions to the end. On

e of

the reasons to have the slides is to mark them and turn b

ack to

that slide if you need to as well. Any questions so far?

With that then I'll introduce the person who will be doin

g the

presentation. When it's over, I'll be doing other

introductions, who they are, and why they are here as wel

l, and

every person that will answer your question. I'd like to

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

2

introduce the project director, Larry Kahrs.

Larry Kahrs: As Harry said, I'm Larry Kahrs with Foster

NOMAN1101

Wheeler. I'm going to try to speak up to allow everybody to hear me. As Foster Wheeler, we're the contractor for the Navy that's responsible for the cleanup activities at Nomans L and Island.

Just a little overview of what I'm going to talk about is the time line associated with the investigation activities at the site. I'd like to talk a little bit about the removal actions and investigations that have been underway since 1997, '98 time frame. I'd like to talk a little bit about the Phase II Site Draft report. I'd like to talk about how that report works. How we use what we call a conceptual look at the site in terms of what's there, what's happening, and what kinds of risk it has associated with contamination on the island. I'd like to give a summary of the findings for Phase I and Phase II Investigation, and then take that a step further. What does that mean for tomorrow's risk? What we need to do with this data is make some conclusions about risk. As Harry said, I'm going to finish up with next steps like where do we go from here.

Larry Kahrs gave a presentation on the Draft Phase II Comprehensive Site Assessment for Nomans Land Island, Chilmark, Massachusetts.

Harry Manasewich: Going into comments. Just a few little notes for you. Before we get going I wanted to introduce some of the people that are likely to respond to your questions and hear

NOMAN1101

tify
r

your comments. Besides Larry, I'd like you folks to identify yourself. Some are from the Navy and some are from Foster Wheeler.

Introductions were made.

Questions:

n is,
ur
an
her

Freddy Rundlet: I have two questions. The first question is, from your experience, define such a breakdown of those four areas where there are no significant risks. And is that an exceptional event or usual event from your experience rather than having all four the same?

can go

Larry Kahrs: I don't know how to answer that. I guess I'll go through each one and speak to each one.

Freddy Rundlet: Is what you're finding unusual?

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

3

pects
d have

Larry Kahrs: I don't think so. I don't think anybody expects to go into a site as complex as this one and come away and have everything come out great or everything come out negative.

e is

I think the data that we've collected indicates that there is contamination on the island. I think that the limitation

s on
uman
n
e

the access in particular enabled us to reach no risk to human health simply because it's not Martha's Vineyard. It's a uninhabited island, and we are able to limit access to the island. People are in contact a limited amount of time.

u build
g the
the

Every day we drink water out of the tap, and over time you build up a high risk potential. In this case, no one's drinking groundwater, and we have limited access to the soil. In the case of environmental, we have a wide variety of species.

It's
ants
man
ptors

a special place in terms of ecology. Those same contaminants where we could limit access and make conclusions about human health, it's a high potential for risk to ecological receptors and leads us to conclusions that we do need to do more.

t's
came
n

Freddy Rundlet: Second question, if under the environmental section and under safety section, either one of those you came out with significant risk, could that in turn affect human health welfare?

Larry Kahrs: We're asked to address them separately.

out to
mpact

Freddy Rundlet: To answer my question, if that did come out with significant risk in those two areas, could that have an impact on public welfare and human health?

Larry Kahrs: We didn't establish --

ou did
ver

Freddy Rundlet: I understand that. Hypothetically, if you had further studies come up with significant risk, whatever

NOMAN1101

negative that risk was, environment or safety, could that have a n
affect on health and/or public welfare?

oking Larry Kahrs: No. When we look at human health, we're lo
cals in at chemical exposure. We're looking at exposure to chemi
king at the soil. When we do an environment of safety, we're loo
someone getting blown up out there. Those two are very
separate.

g. If Freddy Rundlet: I find your answer, no, to be interestin
plant there were no potential risk to the environment to either
have or wildlife, you're assuming that human contact would not
ldn't an interplay with that. And so, therefore, that risk wou
d be passed on realizing that we have significant fish, bir
action.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

4

hese Larry Kahrs: You're wondering about the interaction of t
things and does that impact ultimately?

y, no Freddy Rundlet: I find it interesting that, unequivocall
more, Nomans health risk. No public health risk. And, further
ct on you seem to be implying that if there were significant
environment issues, that they still wouldn't have an affe

NOMAN1101

human health and public welfare.

things
we
bit
nts on
ors and
d on
t and

Larry Kahrs: This investigation is ongoing. One of the that I brought out in the findings is, I don't think that have a good handle on what's happening. I spoke a little about migration on the island. We know we have contaminants on the island. At this time with the human receptors, we've identified fish and wildlife, personnel authorized, visitors and trespassers. We've established a finding of no risk based on that use of the island. If we extend our investigation outwards, we may find adverse effects into the environment making their way into the food chain. Yes, you're right.

may be

Freddy Rundlet: The possible adverse effects that there human health affects to public welfare?

Larry Kahrs: Yes.

t
sonable
ou've
ere.
anal.
at bad
d that
e
lth

Cal Burden: My question is, back to that slide, the first health issue where you said no significant risk given reasonable and on and on, if we don't find anything. But you know you got to go back and you have to know there's a risk out there. That's almost like the same tale they used for the Love Canal. They said, there's no risk that we found. Is the risk that with the weapons and the bombs, especially, uranium tipped they had to be practicing with for over fifty years on the island? Winds come across. Do we have a significant health risk up here?

Let me put it another way. A gentleman said, you know Ca

NOMAN1101

l, back
f
ave
ame
so
or

then the old people died of old age. Now we have a lot of people dying of cancer. And that's a thought because I have cancer. I didn't have it when I came here, not that it came from here. I've been coming here since I was five. And you're answering things knowing you're going to go back for more; are you not?

nance
lly and
t we

Larry Kahrs: I think we're using the data and making conclusions. I'm going to ask Ron. When we did that ord removal in 1998, all that was clean for uranium specifically we didn't find any, given the wide range of materials that we removed from the island.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

5

ole
And
ge,
at the
s, and
e out.

Ron Marnicio: The finding of no significant risk, the whole Phase II report either human health or ecological risk assessment has to be based on results for future years. And going on the current designation of Nomans' wildlife refuge, that lead us to define hypothetical receptors. We looked at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife workers, their expected activities, and what they may embark on that would bring additional people out. A trespasser coming in contact with the beach or the soil

and
uess

the surface water or the sediments of the ponds. So, I guess what I was trying to get to, there's a scope of the whole investigation. At this time it is the island.

inding
given
ry of

The earlier comment, could there be a carryover between ecological and human health. That may come earlier. But the scope of the assessment, it is pretty much the boundary of the island.

ium.
l the
t.
ium out

Rod Warner: I'd like to clarify one thing, depleted uranium. Before we even did the scoping out there, we looked at all the Navy. We were confident that the screening validated that. There's no reason to think that there's any depleted uranium out there.

lse

Beverly Wright: Larry had said that the island was very complex. Would you put that in comparison to something else that you've worked on. Why is Nomans complex?

signed
at
u go

And the other thing, the map shows that the island was designed up into grids and you took samples so many feet down. What determined how many feet you went down, and why didn't you go down further?

about

Harry Manasewich: One has to do with what's behind the designation of complex and the other is more information about the sampling, why at certain depths.

It's
in

Larry Kahrs: The site is complex because it's enormous. 800 acres -- 600 acres. As consultants, we get involved in sites, let's say a plating shop. We look at operations a

NOMAN1101

nd do
s site,
o
that
It's
tals;
fter
surface
go

some borings and wells. Here we're looking at an enormous
and we have to choose where we begin to sample. It's also
complex as stakeholders. I look at the different agents
are involved. That adds to the complexity of the site.
complex in the contaminants in terms of explosives and metals
and it's complex in terms of media. We don't always go after
all four. Sometimes we just focus on groundwater or soil
contamination. Here we're looking at soil, groundwater,
water, sediment. There's not too much other media we can
after.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

6

irst
that
eler.

Beverly Wright: My other thing, Nomans is probably the first
large mass area that you have worked on. So, I would say
Nomans is the first time out of the stall with Foster Wheeler.

at

Larry Kahrs: I wouldn't say that at all. We're involved
other DOD locations that are just as large.

Beverly Wright: The depth of the grade.

Larry Kahrs: The grids were established for removal of
ordnance. Each one is about a builder's acre. Our employees

yees
her it
and

actually walked across each grid, flagged each item, whether it was scrap metal or live ordnance, flagged it, removed it, and put it on the data sheet.

oil
the
We have
s go
we
ow a

When we went back, we looked at those areas for area contamination. We went off that in terms of collecting samples. How we come to that decision is, we go back to the same location -- relocated the original sampling point. We have a system from 0 to 6 inches. Let's go down deeper. Let's go further out. Let's try to understand how extensive when we expanded that out until we got the contaminant levels below a criteria.

d by
a
nd many
return
sume
nother

Jim Fuller: Mine is a comment and underlined and enhance your description of the levels of risk in the context of a reasonably foreseeable use. My comment basically is, I and many others are incredulous that the Navy would see fit not to return the island in the condition that it was in, but rather assume twenty years from now or ten years from now or whenever another use might exist.

ntify
ppens.
or the
refuge

Larry Kahrs: I'll speak to that. In order for us to quantify risk or make conclusions, we've got to understand what happens. You're right. We have to choose. Someone has to tell us or the government tell us that the island is going to be used as a refuge so we can understand who the receptors are. You're right. These conclusions that we make now are only as good as the

e

NOMAN1101

current foreseeable use of the island.

what
the
Harry Manasewich: I think part of what you're saying is, you see is appropriate to see the island return to before Navy had it.

r any
level
ply to
fact
cy. We
Rod Warner: Under the base realignment and closure act o disposal process, we do an environmental clean up to the that's necessary for the designated reuse. That would ap any industrial site that's contaminated in any way. The that it happens to be an island, it's still the same poli

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

7

e
. I
dustry
t would
ntended
clean it up to the reuse. To do what you suggest, we'd b cleaning up everything in the Navy to pristine conditions would say that's not a practical thing for the Navy or in and regulations respect that, but even just the investmen be impractical. It's cleaned up to the level that it's i to be used.

it not
Jim Fuller: In as far as the Department of Interior, was sort of a feeble excuse to simply transfer it to another department, to the Department of Interior?

Rod Warner: The whole disposal process for land goes thr

ough a
for
series
t, it

structured process that ends up determining where it goes
reuse, and the first step is other defense agencies and a
of other steps in there. In the first level of keeping i
was decided to go to the Department of Interior.

rch for
e

Kristina Williams: But my question is, this is due in Ma
us that are going through this and our children. Like th
symptoms for what they have, you're saying, oh, it's not.

And
I'm
tration
of us.

there are some cases that haven't been counted for. What
saying is, who is going to fund this once the new adminis
is in? I think this is a severe problem. It affects all

or our
ike

Who is going to fund us for us to get the medical needs f
children as well as ourselves for when we have symptoms l
this -- high levels?

Harry Manasewich: Is your question on effects?

read or
cal
d I
o pick
see a
issue.
we get
s.

Kristina Williams: Funding for treatment. I haven't had
diagnosis for treatment. I haven't heard from anywhere,
seen on TV. I know there's not a solution for every medi
reason, but there has to be someone who we can go to. An
believe with all these new medicines, we should be able t
what we're comfortable with and our children. With me I
lot of kids hurting up here, and no one's addressing this
Who is going to be held accountable for it and make sure
it? I just can't see any of our children suffer like thi

NOMAN1101

rned of
ll who

Harry Manasewich: If I have you right, you're very conce
your health, the impacts of these things, and health of a
are going to be provided for that.

Kristina Williams: For me I can't afford some of these
remedies.

since
e that
health
ar to

Suzanne Simon: We've been in consultation with the tribe
the last year and are working very closely with the peopl
are representing you in your tribal nation regarding the
issues and environmental issues. It's been made very cle

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

8

undlet

us at ATSDR. We were asked to assist in the consultation
process with the tribe to work with Jeff Day and Freddy R
to look at these health concerns. And we've been talking
basically with the indian health service representatives.

They
ncerns

were here last month along with discussions with Freddy
Rundlet's office and others within the tribe about the co
of cancer and illness and where the tribal members live,
where they play, where they go to school, what they eat.

And
mans,
tha's

we've been in discussions and are considering not just No
but in terms of lives of tribal members and people in Mar

Vineyard.

In talking about that, we have to break it out. It's a big project. We can't look at it all at once. We have some folks looking at the issues of concerns of cancers and illnesses and are working closely with Freddy Rundlet's office -- the health department's office to look into that. Our health assessors along with Lenny Young are looking at data, and in regards to the concerns that members of the Martha's Vineyard's community at large as well as the tribe indicated to us concerns about consuming shellfish, consuming birds, etc., coming in contact with potential contaminants that may or may not come from Nomans. We're taking all that in and trying to identify data gaps and data gaps that we recommended be pursued and looked at to determine what needs to be done -- more sampling, more data. Maybe there's information that the Navy has to try to understand how people may be or may be not coming in contact with contaminants that may have come from Nomans Island and other things that will be going on at Martha's Vineyard or tribal lands.

Kristina Williams: I understand everything you said, but to me, there's a lot of people that don't want to come up. This is a private issue. As a department director, you should be dealing with the people who are affected now. We've had certain people -- we've had a hard time getting our medicines. Just for the

NOMAN1101

ndle it
You
the
in

doctors, what's coming down the pike here. They can't ha
in the hospital. Wherever you go this is a time issue.
have to be airlifted out of here, and if something is in
woods, we should be told so our kids don't go in and play
there.

e here
and
as,
be
sitting
d
and

Suzanne Simon: You hit on one other point. I didn't com
to speak. One of the things you talked about is privacy,
that's a big issue. Information your health department h
medical information, I'm not going to see. It's going to
handled by specific people, and it's going to be done by
down on a consultation basis with the tribal officials an
d
determine how to proceed in evaluating cases of specific
diseases and cancer so that your privacy as an individual

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

9

n and
an't go
at you
he

community is protected. Nobody wants an agency to come i
take control whether it's the tribal nation's data on
individuals or for the Martha's Vineyard community. We c
into a hospital and say open your records. Let me see wh
got there. That's not how it works. There are laws at t
local level and state. Your doctor can't give me any
information on you.

NOMAN1101

o be
issue

Kristina Williams: They just changed them. It's going to be for people who broken that. But like I said, it's a time for all of us.

Harry Manasewich: Thank you.

e been
s Air

JoAnn Eccher: My question is around the assessment. I've been reading in the Cape Cod Times there was an article in the beginning of December about new technology to go over Otis

new
ng now,
things.
up?

Force Base to look at change of color to see where some contamination is. I was wondering if you used any of the technologies? Just because on Nomans there's no one living

ou have

there used to be, so we might designate it for different things. Are we really cleaning it up as well as it can be cleaned up? When you went out there, I was trying to visualize, did you have protected clothes on or were you just walking around?

e?

My two questions are, how did you approach going out there? And, also, are you really cleaning it up to the point the

new
t might
nd
nt to

technologies are out there allows it to be cleaned up? I think it might be expensive, but we're talking about seven generations and a stewardship to land. That's what people who live here want to see.

able.

Rod Warner: We're looking at technologies that are available. There is a lot of stuff in research and development. You have to look at four firms. We're looking at that stuff now.

've got

There's no commitment one way or the other.

NOMAN1101

Larry Kahrs: Before Brian talks to you in terms of making decisions about the technology, I'd say that's about two steps away right now. We have to complete investigations and understand what's there. What do we need to clean up? The next step is Phase III which is what's called a feasibility study. We look at what kinds of technology to apply to these areas. So, we're not there yet, but I think that they will be addressed further down the road.

Brian Corbett: I've been on many UXO sites and on the site it was surface cleared in '98 by Foster Wheeler. It was surface cleared to the extent whenever you dig a hole or brush some sediment, you'd have to clear that type of item prior. Somebody

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

10

who's an experienced ordnance professional would have to do that.

JoAnn Eccher: Were they worried when they went over? They weren't worried about breathing it? When the fires would start and the air would come over and you see the smoke, they weren't concerned?

Brian Corbett: None of that was occurring. This stuff h

ad been

sitting there for a long time.

Larry Kahrs: They didn't need any protective gear.

hen

Brian Corbett: Right. They can identify it, the team, when they came up upon it. They flag it safe or not.

being a

Pam Goff: I want to say briefly, a previous use that my generation was familiar with Nomans was the aspect of it being a wildlife sanctuary. The appreciation of migratory birds.

It
eased
to

It wasn't disturbed by human beings. Some of us are very pleased to have the island designated for wildlife refuge and not to have human occupancy on it.

it were

By the same token, as a tax payer, it would be lovely if it were perfect. I feel it should be reasonably cleaned up.

and was

And the third point, that it was, obviously, all of our land once Wampanoag land including my yard. And that's all.

and and

Harry Manasewich: You're recognizing the rights to the land and also saying --

that

Pam Goff: I don't think the tribe has any more rights to land than to my own backyard.

of

Tim Scanlon: The choice of restricted class lowers the requirements for clean up according to the interpretation

keep

statutes. And I have similar thinking that we ought to keep

way in

open a wider range. But one of my questions concerns the

rea

which assumptions about use in particular in the safety area

ged to

seems to be very restricted. The current level is not judged to

be a safety threshold, but remedy was to keep more people

NOMAN1101

from
long
e to go
to
ing to
accept.

going there. We're not talking about making it safe for term habitation. Maybe wildlife refuge might allow people hiking. Maybe it's desirable. But to say that we ought to spend money for the coast guard to prevent people from going to the island rather than cleaning it up, is hard for me to

beyond
other

Harry Manasewich: Summing up your point is, it should go the point of uninhabited sanctuary. It should allow some

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

11

uses as well.

e that
sh and
. It's
re
n terms
and's
t

Larry Kahrs: We had this discussion a lot. The clearance was done was to enable the island to be transferred to Fish and Wildlife. You have to understand the position of the government, particularly, the position in terms of ranges also going to be a range. There's also a possibility there could be an ordnance there. There's always a risk. So in terms of risk, we know the water's restricted. We know the island's restricted. We want to tighten that framework to prevent people from coming into harms way.

Rod Warner: It is a liability to say, go out there. It'

s a
There's
would
o more
at's

situation that probably won't exist in the near future.
different ways to make it safe. The situation right now
be, prevent additional access. Another way would be to d
work out there short of cleaning up the whole island. Th
part of where we're going from here.

f the
not
up of

Anne Malewicz: Point of clarification. When you speak o
government, you're speaking of the Department of Defense,
the State of Massachusetts. We do differ upon what clean
a range would be.

Island
u found
there?
es in
nds

Virginia Poole: I'd like a few more details about Nomans
as we call it. I'd like to know what kinds of animals yo
when you were making the inventory. Were there mice out
Were there coyotes? We know they have them in other plac
Massachusetts. What is the exchange between the three po
that I've seen on the island? What's the exchange?

Tisbury
here's

Larry Kahrs: Can you clarify exchange?

Virginia Poole: We've learned here on Martha's Vineyard
Great Pond at the point where there's a barrier's beach t
an exchange of fluid.

mitting
Mass
o date,
skrats

John Schaffer: I performed the site recognizance for sub
ecological inventories that have been done previously by
DEP and Fish and Wildlife. In answering your question, t
to my knowledge, one of the more prevalent mammals are mu
on the island right now. Their burrows are in the ponds

NOMAN1101

in the
have
never
birds
ut the

the
s

small wetland areas. There's not very many mammals that
been listed. There's been speculation of a fox. That's
been confirmed. The dominant group without question are
who utilize the island either as residents or migrants, b
mammalian fauna is limited.

Larry Kahrs: If everybody wants to look at the figure on
back. The pond is more in the center of the island. It'

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

12

north
ckish

the
cliffs.
t
s down
kish
pect

called Ben's Pond. That had an outlet. It exits to the
and exits down on the beach. That's fresh water. No bra
water exchanged between pond and outlet. The other pond,
Rainbow Pond, that's at a high elevation. If you look on
eastern part of the island, it's very steep. You'll see
And those are there present also to a lesser extent. Wha
Rainbow Pond does, it discharges and flows down the cliff
into the ocean. Rainbow Pond has no exchange of the brac
water. The pond at the northern tip to the island we sus
that that pond receives fresh water, but it also may be
undergoing a brackish exchange.

NOMAN1101

Mark Nelson: I'm a principal with Newton. I'm a license professional in Massachusetts. Paul Nixon and I would like to make a couple comments. I want to talk a second about the groundwater investigation for a minute as well as potential exposure pathways and human interaction at the island.

For starters, a little more work needs to be done for potential groundwater contamination to understand the groundwater system on the island. In reading the Phase II draft report, there's some inconsistencies as to how these ponds -- as we've just been talking about them -- are perched above the groundwater system on the island. From our ongoing work to date, the groundwater wells have been installed in perched water. It's quite high compared to sea water. There's been not a lot of discussion on how that perched water reacts. The potential to be getting into groundwater separate from the perched water, I think, needs to be looked at further. And we'll be providing written comments on that.

There's some concerns about the marine sediments and shellfish and lobsters. I don't think we can say that no one's using that shellfish because of access and people needs being out there. I think that's a pathway and route that needs to be investigated.

You say you have a pond 43 feet up, but you need to look at the source areas where the source areas have been done and get a

NOMAN1101

ure
,
water
n right
much
ntioned
going
o one's
the
ulation
that

better picture of groundwater overall. In terms of exposure pathways and system of the assumptions in risk assessment there's been an assumption GW 3. It's not used as spring and is not an aquifer. After review, I'm not sure you can't say that's not GW 1 category with very different and lower with risk assessment requirements to it. You've mentioned that it is an aquifer. There's no one to say it's never to be used as a drinking source. Common sense says, if not out there, I'm not sure we can reasonably foresee use in the future. And it's very different in the Massachusetts regulation to downgrade the aquifer to nonaquifer standing. I think

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

13

needs to be looked at.

ther
as
t on
nable
still
sland

The leap to category three needs further thinking and further documentation behind it. In terms of the risk assessment well and the potential exposure for folks that may get out the island, I think we can't see right now what's a reasonable foreseeable use. One of the main reasons is the tribe is in negotiations with what activity they can take on the island

NOMAN1101

think
when
d fully
er

and how that's going to affect the fish and wildlife. I
the risk assessment has to come back and look at it again
those negotiations are complete and the tribe is describe
on what they are going to be able to do on the island und
current conditions.

ete act
ully
and
nate
at
ers as
o plan
d

Following that, though, I'm not sure that there's a compl
under Mass contingency plan that people are going to be f
restricted from the island. It's based on language back
forth from Navy and Fish and Wildlife. Proposed to elimi
people from being at the island, I think at a minimum, th
there had been trespassers and wildlife personnel and oth
well could have a greater level on the island, but need t
for because the risk is this and needs to be addressed an
managed.

never
that a
that
across
or
art of
soil

One thing very quickly. An assumption that children will
be present on the island. I paint very quickly a picture
boat comes into an area to stop to fish. Nothing to say
there are kids on the boat that they aren't going to run
the beach. I think that exposure needs to be described f
certain why it's not going to happen or be addressed as p
the risk assessment. If any, it would have an affect on
and clean up standards for soils.

a

Paul Nixon: I want to address the scope of the Phase II
assessment. As Larry said, he's done a great job. It's
complex site, 628 acres. The assessment that was done is

NOMAN1101

good,
is a
We've
ampled.
of
There
. It's
panded
now.

is
eing
ams had
n

however, it needs to be a bit bigger. Starting with this map that we used. The base map from the Phase II report. We've changed the colors to show you the acres that have been sampled. The black denotes acres that have had at least one sample of surface water or groundwater. I noticed we missed one. There are approximately 60 blocked out. It's about ten percent . It's not very much. It's our assumption that that could be expanded and more problems could be found. Take care of soil for now. Offshore has not been assessed.

Offshore impacts. The groundwater from center of island is going out underneath and coming through ocean floor and being diluted with ocean water. The impact of the lobsters, clams had not been assessed. In fact, the offshore area had not been

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

14

out
been
tentia

assessed at all. There's been no evidence to try to find where the ordnance is. No assessment of groundwater have been done. Those ordnances could have an impact and also a potential impact there -- matter of scope.

Going a little further, Phase I samples were collected at

hot
needs

's
nt of
think
ments.

ails it
into
he long

wells
water.
,
evel in
felt
ng the
tact
ink we

s
ment

reason

spots. Phase II were collected at below hot spots. What to be done is increase sampling. Looked at 210 pieces of ordnances, but no sampling found underneath ponds, and it stated clearly in Phase II report. There was no assessme the ordnance underneath the ponds. Needs to be done. I I'll leave it with that. We'll be submitting written com

Rod Warner: Generally demonstrates once you get into det is complex and a lot of professional judgments that goes it. Those comments will be taken into consideration in t run. I don't know how specific you want to reply.

Larry Kahrs: It's readily apparent that the groundwater were installed, whether that was perked water or aquifer I do want to say wherever we did install monitoring wells whether they were sandy, we encountered that same water l the wells. I think regardless of the soil conditions, we that we were in the groundwater table. In terms of purgi well and pumping it out and ensuring that well was in con with -- the scope of the investigations is limited. I th even said that in conclusions and recommendations. These findings are based on the data we collected. Our scope i limited to the island itself. I think we're all in agree we're going to expand on that scope as well. There's two reservoirs that clearly outlay the target areas. And the

NOMAN1101

al,
ose are
nished
actual

for that, there was a Navy EOD, Explosive Ordnance Disposal team went on the island, and the summer before we were contracted to do so. They started removing ordnance. There are two areas of stockpiled ordnance. When we came on, we finished that process. Those are gridded and recorded along with actual impacted areas as well.

those
of
n terms

The sampling is a biased approach. I think we focused on areas that had the greatest likelihood of contamination. Particularly, in the case of metals, we do not see a lot of difference between impacted areas and nonimpacted areas in terms of metals. In terms of missing something, it's assumed.

At a
rying
d make
y is a
with
and say
hange,
is

At a site this size you can always do more work. What we're trying to do is get at those areas that exhibit contamination and make some conclusions. The groundwater classification probably is a potentially productive aquifer. When we come out of this with recommendations, as I said before, we need to look ahead and say what is going to be the use of the site. The use might change, and we've heard a lot of comments on this tonight. This is

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

15

et Ron placed on the use as it stands right now. I'm going to

jump in.

number
always
e used
of the
ies
ith an
other
was
that
most
to try

Ron Marnicio: As you said, there's ten percent, roughly, of grids. One of the reasons, what's enough sampling is an important question to answer. One of the tools that we used to try to get at to determine what's enough was this idea of the conceptual site model. Looking at where the past activities were documented or evidence that they occurred and then with an understanding of whether erosion or wind blowing or some other natural process. Where might the material move to if it was going to move from those historic locations? If you take that into consideration, it does put constraints on where the most likely areas of impact might be, and we use that approach to try to limit where we went.

t
se II
. I
at was
te
heir
ampling

The Phase I was a biased approach which went to the target areas. And Phase II went back to confirm it, and the Phase II did have a number of additional samples in outlying areas. I just want to make the comment that there was a process that was used both with the bias. We looked at that conceptual site model to try to rule out areas that had a likelihood of there being any contaminants there, and not to put money into sampling there and put money in some place else.

he
at it
next

John Schaffer: With regards to marine sediments around the island, one recommendation was that we again take a look at it as a scoping issue. Look at those sediments in terms of

NOMAN1101

scope of work.

Harry Manasewich: Thank you very much for your comments.

ee with
n that

Beverly Wright: Anne indicated that Mass DEP did not agree with the clean up of the Navy, and I wanted you to elaborate on that and what are the areas that you disagree?

to say
the

Anne Malewicz: I've heard this site being called complex it lightly. We have concerns about the remaining UXO on site, unexploded ordnance that's subsurface. There was a surface clean up that was done for UXO at the time about 70 percent of the island because of the growth on the island

70

o be as

That's one area. Our general approach to every site is to be as comprehensive as possible with investigation as well as remediation and to target the future reuse. So those are

the

things that we are going to be working with the Navy and stakeholders on how to achieve that and how to get a comprehensive site assessment of the site so we know we've

e done

the best job we can do with unexploded ordnance that are currently on the island.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

16

o bring

For example, these different technologies, we're trying to bring on some staff that has expertise on unexploded ordnance a

nd have
job on
ke sure
g done

been researching other sites that have done an excellent providing additional funding, like Hawaii. We want to make that we, in Massachusetts, do equivalent work that's being done across the country.

shove,
what

Beverly Wright: This is a yes or no. When push comes to shove, is it Massachusetts or the Navy who has the final say on what the maximum or benchmark is for clean up?

hout
t the
mes.

Anne Malewicz: I've seen some extensive clean ups throughout the country. It's really the people who say it. It's not the commonwealth or county. It's really the community that's impacted. I go offshore. The Navy goes back to their homes. It's you people who really should have the most impact to what the final clean up is. We have to be very rational based on technologies. What technologies are available now that we can use with a review in five years. There's different ways on approaching that site where we should all have a say for protecting future reuse of people that go on it.

that
gy.
the
ed. It
with
us

Deborah Medders: Request is to hear about the next steps that the Navy will be taking from the engineering and technology. And, I think, ultimately, we will all have confidence in the Department of Defense on the funds that have been obligated. It is the best of the best when it comes to the engineering with feasibility studies, remedial, and such. Ultimately, for us here on the island, and I think it is an adversarial

NOMAN1101

ust
o place
ds for
ly have
ts of
ss
more
and
e
ng
action
nity
vy to
nd what

relationship we have, and there is a strong element of trust versus mistrust. So my request of the Navy is to put into a more formal documented process for community public involvement similar to what the Department of Defense funds for superfund. We know them as RABs. Where you would actually have formulated for the Vineyard, whether it's for the residents of Chilmark, Aquinnah, the island as a whole, a formal process where these stakeholders take on more identity. Take on advisory roles with recommendations to where the minutes and summaries of those formal meetings will become part of the information repository. To where there would be an ongoing documented history in retrospect of this entire process paralleling engineering technology, paralleling remedial action that will be taken by the Navy on Nomans but by the community and public involvement piece. I really would like the Navy to address that request. I begin requesting that tonight and what you are able to commit to.

shing a
ght
to look

Rod Warner: We've already put out feelers out on establishing a technical review committee advisory board. Now is the right time. We have the report and will give people something

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

oing
at. Now is the right time to consider this, and we are d
that.

minated
Jeff Day: I'd like to clarify some points. The tribe no
this site as a public involvement site. They asked
Massachusetts to bring that on behalf of all residents of
Martha's Vineyard. They took the first steps and that's
why
you're here tonight. I think these are important to the
Navy to
recognize. The tribe also approached the Navy to establi
sh a
technical board. It would take too much time, but we wan
ted the
technical advisory board to be created with representativ
es from
each community and Nomans and state what's going on so th
at the
tribe is not only approaching the Navy as far as access f
uture
use of the island, but also for general information shari
ng.

You
I'd like to make some comments as far as soil sampling.
circled
mentioned you did a 138 soil samples and came from three
s.
areas. 75 percent of soil samples came from circled area
soil
Then I understand there was trouble finding a background
eve
sample on the island. Contractors went around and I beli
lish a
took between 7 and 12 samples that you attempted to estab
is need
background on the island. That just tells me that there
for more clarification and characterization of extent of
contamination because even contractors couldn't find a cl
ean
spot.

We also have concerns about the depth of the samples. It

NOMAN1101

's my
m 0 to
ow that
l as
down
uents

k the
the
is on
t go
lands
y
tion --
ough

matter
the
pacted
nce
n the

understanding that most of the samples were collected from 0 to 1 foot depth range, and we believe there's evidence to show that there's much more UXO underneath that soil horizon as well as the associated contamination from those that have leached down through the soil system. My understanding of the constituents many of them are broken down by ultraviolet acid rain and washing away by wind, rain, and erosion. Yes, these contaminants do migrate, but can be tracked down. I think the boundaries of this site, and this gets into the scope of the original project, the Navy clearly stated that the scope is on the island itself. That's why the risk assessment doesn't go back to human receptors because they concentrated on the lands of Nomans. We feel the extent of the site should be fully extended as waters too. How visitors and people who vacation -- how that may be migrating here to the Vineyard itself through coastal processes and through atmospheric deposition and exchange of wildlife and fish resources.

Larry Kahrs: In terms of background samples, it wasn't a matter of not finding samples, but trying to get data all across the island. At some sites you have an area that's clearly impacted and not impacted. At this site we didn't see any difference between the impacted area on the island and other areas on

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

18

nology
ted and
beneath

island that have been historically. It's more of a termi
issue as far as us when that's why we used the term targe
nontargeted in terms of ordnance remaining on the island
grade.

nd was
do is
ls. We
r wells
l site
work if
e, and a
not
sland.

Going back to Ron's comment, if that material was there a
leaching into the groundwater system, what we've tried to
put a groundwater network that would detect those materia
have not detected any explosives on any of the groundwate
never during all these events. So, I think the conceptua
model that we're using in terms of having groundwater net
explosives are migrating. Say we have a piece of ordnanc
casing is corroding and leaching into groundwater, we're
seeing what happened here. The scope is limited to the i
I think we're all in agreement we need to expand that. I
there's other receptors we could find in the future. We
move in steps here, and the next step is to understand wh
happening in that pathway. I think we're in agreement th
work needs to be done.

think
need to
at's
at more

the
n.

Rebecca Gilbert: I understand that the ocean was beyond
scope of what you studied, and you can't address this
scientifically. I'd like to ask you your personal opinio

NOMAN1101

ottom
This is not hypothetical. Would you feed your families b
fish caught off that island on a regular basis?

g
know is
etals.
hey
Larry Kahrs: I don't think we know about what's happenin
offshore to be able to answer that question. What we do
that the scenario of why we are expanding is because of m
Maybe John can talk about the metals of concern and how t
might affect a crustacean.

ined in
any
mpacts,
island
John Schaffer: The movement offshore should be fully def
terms of the metals themselves, organisms when exposed to
contaminant. The investigation needs to consider those i
those sediments in the vicinity of the island and how the
interacts with them.

e time
le that
d a lot
d every
--
are
Rebecca Gilbert: My other comment is that this is not th
of year when a lot of our people are here. A lot of peop
use our beaches are not going to be hearing about this an
of them are not concerned to come to this meeting and rea
long document and they are going to look at that and look
human health, no significant risk. And that's what they
going to see when they come here this summer.

o me
have,
can
My question is, if that's what I have seen that implies t
that our accelerated cancer rates here, which we know we
do not have any relationship to the Navy's use of Nomans;
you say that?

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

19

to
e

Larry Kahrs: I don't think so at this time. As we begin to understand what's happening offshore, we might change our opinions as far as human health. I don't think we're her standing in front of you saying we're done with our investigation.

g there
stand

Rebecca Gilbert: I think it would be irresponsible saying there is no risk to human health. People aren't going to understand what that means.

nse
o boil
t the

Larry Kahrs: That's a good point. Maybe trying to condense information and put it on a poster board is not the way to boil down a complex issue into a one line term. If you look at the report, there's quite a lot of --

saying
lost.
isk

Harry Manasewich: I think the other part of what you're saying is, in the effort to make it concise, some information is lost. Maybe a better way of saying it is, that no significant risk exists under current activities. Point well taken.

to make
ome are
oing to

Freddy Rundlet: While we're all gathered here, I wanted to make a couple of comments. There are many tribal concerns. Some are natural resources. Some are economic impacts. I'm not going to comment on those. I speak from one perspective on health

. I
ch are
y and
res, be
e that
tise,
nter
ess
on, all
number

want to be very clear and express the health concerns which are really twofold that we have. The first is to identify all potential risk to land, water, air, all living creatures, be they animals, vegetarian, people, and to that is to remove that risk. The tribe has resources in terms of dollars, expertise, effort. We have resources available to us through the Center for Disease Control, Indian Health Service, environmental health, etc. These resources are being committed to address that first concern on behalf of the Wampanoag Tribal Nation, all citizens, and visitors to this land base. That's concern number one.

new
l with
as
e's a
mpanoag
rds to
the
the
ress
issue
and I
lth

Concern number two, environmental health is relatively a new field on the cognizant clock. We've seen issues that deal with our own government in areas such as the military as well as private sector, be it oil or other toxic situation. There's a tremendous issue with all due respect to trust. We in Wampanoag Nation and as a watch dog activity and overseer with regards to issues of trust, and I just want to assure you again that the efforts that the tribe is taking and we're taking only in the area of health is for the common good of all of us to address the first question and if you will allude yourself to the issue of trust because it is there. It's a very serious issue, and I just want you to know that this is the concern of the health committee that's endorsed by the tribal counsel.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

20

health
d?

Allan Hughes: Is there a shed of evidence to date of any impact on anybody in the town of Aquinnah or elsewhere on Martha's Vineyard of reported contamination in Nomans land?

your

Freddy Rundlet: We don't have the information to answer question. My answer is not no. We don't know.

Allan Hughes: To date there is no evidence?

n.

Freddy Rundlet: I'm not qualified to answer that question.

Harry Manasewich: You're saying you don't have enough information. There's nothing out there.

d last
inted
urvey
the
they
took
ly job
maller

Russell Walton: I was privileged to go out to the island last July. In reference to the unexploded ordnance, it was pointed out to us that the people doing the unexploded ordnance survey and removal had been very careful to do a thorough job on the road or on certain particular roads which meant basically they had gone down four feet to that whole section of road and took it up entirely and put it back together. They did a lovely job of that in a couple of places. In one place one of the smaller

NOMAN1101

ut.
ace or
t rocks
t was
e's not

ponds was beginning to go over the edge. It was pumped out.
What was removed? What was at the surface or on the surface showing at the surface? And it's been my observation that rocks have a tendency to pop up out of the ground. I think that was commented on. Do we have any good reason to believe there's not more UXO out there?

enance
as are
and
at
island
pen.
t on is
go out

Larry Kahrs: We're actually preparing an operation maintenance plan to be used by Fish and Wildlife in terms of what are safe to walk on and what kinds of procedures -- say Fish and Wildlife want to put a sign up. But more importantly, that report lays out a schedule of regular inspections of the island and look for ordnances. You're right. We've seen it happen. Things tend to pop up over time. What we're trying to get a regular scheduled program, whether it be once a year to go out there. When we do find material, we go out there with an explosive detonation team and remove those materials.

ify
sty's
rface
t you
rts
he
t's

Unknown Person: What efforts have the Navy done to identify explosives on the island? My understanding along with Russ is, you picked up anything you saw sticking out of the surface as you walked across the island without the use of any subsurface technology or anything to identify the UXO that you could not see as you walked across the island. What efforts have been taken to identify the risks beforehand before that stuff migrates through or identify part of the island that's more prevalent? What efforts have you done to protect that

ose

NOMANS LAND ISLAND

21

people?

le who

Rod Warner: It's supposed to be a restricted area. People who are authorized to go out there are authorized.

How

Unknown Person: What if it's four feet beneath its feet? How do they know it's safe?

Rod Warner: Brian, do you want to discuss the process?

a

Brian Corbett: They would be assigned an EOD. They use a handheld magnetometer. A handheld magnetometer was used. More so if you came across a bush, use this handheld magnetometer. ter that can see adequately probably up to three, four feet. They are very large, like, 500 pound bombs out there.

is the

not

earing,

it,

years

Derrill Bazy: It seems to me the critical issue tonight is the level of clean up. Even if you study, you've said, we're not there yet. You're assuming no human contact. What I'm hearing, it, some people are saying in the audience, and I agree with it, it's wrong for us to limit ourselves in the next hundred years when we're talking about ourselves, our children, and our children's children to say no one should go out on that i

sland.

In a sense this is our one chance to clean up the island. There's a clean up going on and questions on how far to go. I think it's really important for us to change the goals we have. I think we'll need to do a clean up based on assuming human contact there and as time goes on we decide. But to never be able to choose for no one to go out, we limit ourselves from just enjoying the refuge, from having the tribe enjoy, or the island go eco, touring of the island. The island may choose to do that. Right now we're limiting ourselves from ever doing anything there. We won't have a second chance to go out and clean it up.

o. I have.

an

r be

rom

have

choose

doing

and

. They

Rod Warner: Fish and Wildlife owns that island right now can choose to do whatever they choose. It's not the last chance. The clean up would be commensurate.

and ask

level of

Derrill Bazy: So, we need to talk to Fish and Wildlife them to change the parameters and that would change the level of study and clean up that's done on the island?

he

d

nsurate

Larry Kahrs: I understand the conclusions are based on the reuse. It would not be unusual for someone to go back and change reuse. That drives cleanup. The cleanup is commensurate with the site. So, yes, you're right.

g out

oval of

Mark Cargan: There's a couple of points I wanted to bring this evening. During the presentation earlier on the removal

22

ved.
re that
sting
s were
re the

the UST has showed that there was 25.5 yards of soil removed. Usually that's areas where they dropped the tank. I'm sure you probably also had some sampling taken of soils for testing and that was said to be done. Also, the monitoring wells were put in places that weren't previously disturbed. These are the questions I raise and I will be expecting answers.

h
find
er else
O
ally
ble to
ning no
he

Russell Walton: I do not personally use shellfish or fish because of allergies. I think it would be a good idea to find out what's happening in the flow out of metals and whatever else on the island. Also, the other is if the only way the UXO people could be sure of having a safe road was to essentially turn an area down four feet deep, is it going to be possible to return the island to a clean, quote, clean condition, meaning no danger, UXO for that matter, without totally destroying the wetlands and other ecological systems?

o thank
s to
l to

Harry Manasewich: Thank you for your comments. I want to thank everybody that's come tonight. The direction of the plan to get done depends on your participation. We invite you all to stay, if there are other questions you have that you would

NOMAN1101

d like

to ask.

Meeting concluded at 9:15 p.m.

NOMANS LAND ISLAND