



**Naval Air Station
South Weymouth, MA
Restoration Advisory Board
Summary of RAB Meeting – November 9, 2006**



NAS South Weymouth Website: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>

I. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Mary Skelton Roberts opened the meeting at approximately 7:05 PM. She requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, introduce themselves. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A to this meeting summary. M. Skelton Roberts checked to make sure that everyone had received a copy of the September mailing. M. Parsons and D. Galluzzo did not. [The RAB mailing list will be double-checked.] An October summary/update was also sent out with the September mailing in lieu of an October meeting. M. Skelton Roberts asked if everyone had time to read the meeting notes from the prior RAB meeting (September 2006) and the October 2006 memo cleanup update and asked for comments on them. There were no questions or comments on the September minutes.

Regarding the October update J. Cunningham asked about the distribution of Site Management Plan. D. Barney stated it was distributed to the libraries. J. Cunningham also asked if the original design of the Small Landfill was incorrect since it needed a Corrective Action Design. D. Barney stated that that is standard state regulation terminology. There was a question about the revision of the FOST. D. Barney said FOST 4 was being revised to fit the current situation. M. Bromberg asked when the basewide assessment was going to be issued. D. Barney stated that there would be four technical memoranda. The Geochemical and Hydrogeologic Tech Memos will be available around the December 15th timeframe and the Higher Trophic Level Risk Assessment and the Iron Floc Risk Assessment Tech Memos will be available in March 2007.

M. Skelton Roberts reviewed the guidelines for the meeting. She reminded the participants when asking questions to wait to speak until they are acknowledged, to state their names and affiliations, and to speak into the microphone when they have questions. She then set some ground rules. Please ask one question at a time and give everyone a chance to speak. It is okay to disagree but please be respectful. Please allow Mary to 'facilitate' the conversation.

She then reviewed the agenda and presentations scheduled for the meeting. The Agenda for the meeting and the Action Item Tracking List are provided as Attachment B to this meeting summary. In accordance with the agenda, the presentations would be followed by the Updates and Action Items portion of the meeting.

2. PRESENTATIONS

Sewage Treatment Plant Feasibility Study Presentation

D. Barney introduced Diane Baxter, TtNUS, who would be discussing the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) Feasibility Study (FS). D. Barney gave a brief summary of the STP and the FS. The bases' sanitary waste was treated at this facility until about 1978 when the sanitary waste was discharged through the Weymouth sanitary system. The FS comes after a series of investigations. The Preliminary Assessment occurred in 1988. A site investigation process followed, which included borings, well drilling, and surface water sampling. There was a Remedial Investigation Phase I (1998) and Phase II (1999-2000). The FS states that there is an unacceptable risk posed by the site contaminants and there needs to be an evaluation of how to address the contaminants. The following paragraphs summarize the STP FS presentation and include references to selected presentation slides in Attachment C. The complete presentation is available in color on the NAS South Weymouth web site: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>.

D. Baxter stated she would talk about the general FS process and then how that process is applied to the STP Site. The primary objective of the Feasibility Study is to identify and evaluate alternatives for either cleaning up a site or reducing exposure to site contaminants so they no longer pose an unacceptable risk. The FS is broken into four main components (Slide 3).

The first step is to identify the media and contaminants of concern (Slide 4). The nature, extent, and concentration of contaminants are determined from site investigation results (e.g. the remedial investigation). The human health and ecological risk assessment results are reviewed. These indicate which media and which contaminants pose a risk to human health or the environment. Finally pertinent regulatory requirements are considered. All of these factors are used to determine whether remediation is required. For the STP Site contaminants were identified in soil, sediment, groundwater, and surface water. Soil and sediment were the only media determined to be media of concern. The groundwater and surface water contaminant concentrations were low enough to conclude that there was no unacceptable human health or ecological risks (Slide 5).

The next step in the FS process is to develop Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) and cleanup criteria that are protective of human health and the environment and comply with regulatory requirements. The RAOs are the overall goals to reduce the risk posed by site contaminants. The cleanup criteria are the numerical values of contaminant concentrations that need to be achieved in order to protect people and

the environment. The RAOs developed for the STP Site are to eliminate human exposure to contaminants in soil and sediment exceeding cleanup criteria and to eliminate ecological exposure to contaminants in soil and sediments exceeding cleanup criteria (Slide 6). The contaminants of concern identified for soil and sediment were pesticides, petroleum compounds (PAH), and metals (primarily Arsenic). Cleanup criteria were established for each of the contaminants of concern.

The soil remediation areas comprise an area of about 0.5 acre to a depth of 1 ft. The sediment remediation areas are both in drainage ditches on the Site and comprise an area of about 0.15 acre, also to a depth of about 1 ft (Slide 7). These areas are approximate and will be refined during a pre-design investigation, or PDI, which will consist of a more focused sampling program.

The next step in the FS process is to identify and evaluate remedial technologies and alternatives. First a wide range of potential technologies is identified and screening is performed. Promising technologies are evaluated in much greater detail to determine whether they would be effective and able to be implemented at the Site. The viable technologies are then combined into alternatives that address the remedial objectives for the Site.

There are several general categories of remedial technologies that are considered in the screening process. Treatment technologies will remove or degrade contaminants from the soil or sediment. Containment/capping technologies will prevent exposure to contaminants by placing some form of a barrier between the contaminants and potential exposure routes. Removal/disposal (landfill) technologies involve removing the contaminated media and disposing them either offsite or at another location onsite. This could help contain the contaminants, prevent exposure, and prevent migration of the contaminants to other areas. Land use controls are an administrative type of control used to prevent exposure; for example, placing restrictions on use of groundwater beneath a site, if it is contaminated. Access restrictions are more physical types of restrictions, such as fences and warning signs. Different technologies from these various types can be combined together to form viable alternatives to address the site-wide problems.

Four remedial alternatives were developed for the STP Site (Slide 8). The first is No Action, which is required to be part of the process, so it can be used as a baseline for comparison. It means that no remedial action is taken but it does include a five-year review. There is minimal sampling and monitoring to support the five-year review process. The second alternative is in-situ bioremediation and phytoremediation. In-situ means the treatment is being conducted in place, so the sediment and soil are not excavated. Bioremediation enhances the natural bacteria and natural microorganisms in the soil so they will break down the contamination into harmless components. Phytoremediation uses plants to break down contamination by uptake of contamination through the root system. Depending on the plant

system and contaminant types, the contaminants can be metabolized and degraded in the plants or the contaminant can accumulate in the plant tissue and then the plants would be harvested and disposed of offsite. Due to the fact that this process can take more time (3 to 5 years), institutional controls, such as land use restrictions and access controls, would be implemented to prevent exposure to site contaminants while remediation is occurring. The third alternative is offsite disposal and/or recycling. The soil and sediment would be excavated and transported off site either to a licensed landfill or, if the media is chemically and physically suitable, it could be sent to an asphalt batching facility for recycling. The final alternative is onsite ex-situ (above ground) solvent extraction treatment. The soil and sediment would be excavated and transferred to an onsite treatment unit. Liquid solvents would be mixed with the media in the treatment unit. The solvents draw the contamination away from the media. The clean soil is then backfilled and the now-contaminated solvent is disposed of offsite.

The last step in the FS process is to evaluate the alternatives. The alternatives are evaluated against seven criteria and then are compared against each other to determine the differences between them. The first two evaluation criteria are the threshold evaluation criteria, which must be met in order for the alternative to be selected. The first criteria is overall protection of human health and the environment. Does the alternative effectively reduce risks to people and the environment to acceptable levels and is this reduction permanent? The second criteria is that the alternative must be in compliance with all the laws and regulations. The remaining criteria (e.g. 3 to 7) are termed balancing evaluation criteria and are used to differentiate the alternatives that pass the threshold criteria. Criteria number three is long-term effectiveness and permanence; number four is reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment (Is treatment employed to reduce risks?); and number five is short-term effectiveness. This looks into the possibility of any short term impacts, to people or the environment, due to remedial action itself and, if they do exist, can they be adequately controlled. Criteria number six is implementability (Are there technical or administrative obstacles to implementation?), and number seven is cost.

There are two additional criteria, modifying criteria, which are considered in the Record of Decision (ROD). The modifying criteria are state acceptance and community acceptance. After the FS is finalized, a proposed plan that recommends the Navy's preferred remedial alternative will be released for public comment along with the FS. After state and public comments are received and evaluated, the preferred alternative is modified, if necessary, in the ROD.

The STP remedial alternative evaluation is summarized in Slide 9. The \emptyset indicates that the criteria is not met, the **O** indicates that either the criteria is partially met or there is uncertainty whether or not the criteria can be met, and the **•** indicates that the criteria is met. The No Action alternative does not meet the threshold criteria. With the bio/phyto alternative there is an uncertainty that the required cleanup levels will be reached for every contaminant of concern. There are also some difficulties with implementing this

alternative. The off-site disposal alternative is readily implementable and protective. Its only drawback is that if the material is disposed in a landfill there is no treatment (only isolation and containment) to reduce risks to humans and the environment. If the material goes to an asphalt batching treatment instead, that is considered treatment that will reduce the toxicity, mobility, and volume. The ex-situ solvent extraction is also a protective option, but it would be the most difficult option to implement. This is due to the fact that there are several different types of chemicals that would have to be removed from the soil, which would require different solvents, and therefore multiple runs through the reactor to remove contaminants. The costs for the four alternatives range from \$600,000 to \$1.4 million, with off-site disposal/recycling the least expensive of the alternatives that could be chosen (e.g. that meet the threshold criteria).

The status of the STP CERCLA process was summarized on Slide 10. The Final FS was issued by the Navy in September 2006. The Navy needs to respond to comments; a public hearing for the Proposed Plan is anticipated in the spring of 2007.

M. Skelton Roberts asked if there were any questions.

H. Welch asked how can there be no problem with the groundwater when there is soil contamination. D. Baxter stated that depending on the type and concentration of contaminants, there are some contaminants that will attach to soil particles, and especially sediment particles, so a certain contaminant load in soil would not necessarily leach into groundwater. Numerous groundwater samples were taken, from different time periods, and significant groundwater contamination was not found.

M. Bromberg asked what the nature of the PAHs (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) found in jet fuel was. D. Baxter stated that the primary PAH was benzo(a)anthracene, which is not from jet fuel. The specific source of the PAH is unidentified. It could be a low concentration but a toxic PAH.

K. Hayes asked if with the removal of the soils more PAHs would be released into the groundwater. D. Baxter stated that the PAHs were only found in the top foot (thus above the water table), and since they do not leach and are not highly soluble, the excavation of the soils should be a relatively easy process. The PAHs were not identified in groundwater.

M. Parsons asked if PAHs were commonly found at sewage treatment plants. D. Baxter said that PAHs are not associated with sewage treatment plants but that the Site was uncontrolled for a while and PAHs are also found commonly in the environment.

J. McGrath asked if there was any reason that the contaminants in the groundwater would not move and effect some place else. D. Baxter said that there was very little contamination in the groundwater and

nothing in the groundwater that would pose an unacceptable risk. The groundwater was evaluated in terms of risk for drinking water and was considered not to be a concern even if it was to be consumed.

D. Galluzzo asked for clarification on the location of the STP on the Base. Where will the new WWT plant be located? D. Barney pointed out the approximate location on a map of the Base.

P. Scannell asked if it would be unusual to find PAHs where jet fuel was disposed of. D. Baxter stated that the PAHs are a semi-volatile compound, while jet fuel is a volatile compound, to allow it to burn more readily; there may be PAHs as minor constituents in jet fuel. [Note: jet fuels were not identified as a contaminant source at STP.]

A question was asked what the danger is of the surface water runoff bringing the contaminants to other areas. D. Baxter stated that surface water from the main drainage ditch was sampled and found to not contain contaminants of concern. Surface water and sediment samples are generally co-located.

M. Bromberg asked how far surface water and sediment will be sampled from the location. D. Baxter stated that there is some uncertainty whether the contamination extends beyond the areas shown on the figure. A pre-design investigation (PDI) will help delineate the extent of the required removal action. French Stream was not evaluated as part of the surface water program in the STP RI. The PDI would include more extensive sampling in the ditch and surrounding area.

M. Smart asked if there was a slide with the number of samples and depth of samples taken. D. Baxter stated that there was not but she guessed about 20 soil samples were taken. D. Barney stated that the information was all in the RI. The depth of the borings and soil samples was from the ground surface to a depth of about 14 feet, but the top foot of soil was the interval that was an issue.

H. Welch asked about PAH in jet fuel and what type were found at STP. D. Baxter stated that PAHs are a constituent in petroleum but there is a wide range of petroleum constituents. Benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, and benzo(b)fluoranthene, were the main PAHs detected at the STP Site. They are at the heavier end of the petroleum spectrum, and are semi-volatile and which means they are not easily dissipated into the air. D. Chaffin stated that pesticides are a bigger issue at the STP Site than the PAHs, and DEP does not consider this a fuel spill site based on the information from the samples analyzed.

A. Malewicz asked where they put the sludge from treatment plant and where the arsenic could have come from. The sludge was placed within the sludge drying beds. Four soil borings were taken from this area and found to contain contaminants of concern. The arsenic could be related to the pesticides as

well. D. Chaffin stated that the liquid from STP was discharged through the ditch so the contaminants could have come from anything on the Base that ultimately ended up at the treatment plant.

M. Bromberg asked for clarification on whether or not the investigation was going to include French Stream. D. Baxter stated that the exact limits of the PDI have not been established but French Stream was relatively far away from the Site. It was suggested that the culverts be checked. D. Chaffin stated that the PDI would probably check the culvert for contaminants of concern and determine whether or not French Stream needs to be investigated.

M. Bromberg asked about the nature and source of the pesticides and any other contaminants of concern. D. Baxter stated that dieldrin, 4,4' DDT, 4,4'DDD, and 4,4' DDE, were the pesticides found, and may have been used onsite. D. Chaffin suggested that since there was a shed on the Site, pesticides could have been stored there and used for pest control at the treatment plant.

D. Galluzzo asked if this was a liquid medium could there be more contamination that is not shown on the map. D. Baxter stated that is why a PDI will be done.

J. Rakers asked if beryllium was all over the Base why is it not being cleaned up. D. Baxter noted that at STP beryllium does not pose a risk. Beryllium is a naturally occurring substance and it was not found at elevated concentrations in the site investigations. D. Barney stated that virtually all the samples collected on the Base were analyzed for beryllium. The detections that were found were below risk based standards.

E. Kelly asked what the elevation of the Site was. D. Barney stated it was about 155 feet. The STP was located there because it was an optimal location for the discharge system.

P. Scannell asked if the risk assessment took into consideration the 500 families that would be living there in 2008. D. Baxter said that the risk assessment assumed a lifetime residential use.

P. Scannell explained his concerns about the developers disclosing information to the public. D. Barney said Navy has an obligation to disclose information to the subsequent landowner about the condition of the property. There was some concern expressed over underground pipes at the Site that might be a source of contamination leaking into the subsurface. It was stated that the liquid going through the pipes was treated wastewater and not a concentrated source of contaminants. D. Chaffin stated that there were an adequate number of samples taken from the area. H. Welch will be provided a blueprint of the old STP.

FOST Update Presentation

The following paragraphs summarize the FOST Update presentation by D. Barney and include references to selected presentation slides in Attachment D. The complete presentation is available in color on the NAS South Weymouth web site: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>.

FOST stands for Finding of Suitability to Transfer. The property conveyance process consists of three elements before any property can be transferred. The first element is completion of the NEPA process. The second element consists of the real estate process, or conveyance process. The third element is the FOST process. As part of the FOST process a number of assessments have to be performed, including CERCLA, MCP, EBS, regulator walkovers, and SSTDC Due Diligence. As of 2001 Navy had spent \$22 Million in assessment and remediation at the Base; as of 2006 the cost is closer to \$40 million. The end of the FOST process is the finding of no undue risk to human health and the environment.

The FOST area selection is determined by evaluating each site as a whole, looking at the results of the site investigations (PA/SI, RI, EBS, MCP, and visual site inspection) which lead to and support the decision document. A thorough evaluation of each property is performed. The FOST document itself is a 2-4 page memorandum that is signed by a delegated official of the Navy. Within the memo are a series of references. These refer to the documents that pertain to the investigations related to the sites that may be within or abutting the land that is proposed for transfer. The FS would be an example of a referenced document. There is also an Area Specific EBS portion of the FOST document that looks at the property to be transferred and adjacent property. There is a section covering environmental covenants, conditions, reservations and restrictions, some of which are required by CERCLA. One of the covenants is that if contamination is found in the future, and is found to be the responsibility of the Navy, the Navy is required to deal with it. There also may be environmental restrictions, such as activity and use limitations under the foundations of some structures because the contamination could not be removed without demolishing the building. Once the document goes out for public comment and comments are responded to, a Responsiveness Summary is then attached to the document before the FOST document is signed.

FOST 3 includes a small section of the Base, about 20 acres, with two parcels that were zoned as "senior residential" under the previous zoning plan. It was ready to be signed in 2003 but was not due to problems with the conveyance mechanism. FOST 4 includes about 330 acres and was issued for public comment in late 2004. Due to the changes in the reuse and zoning plans, Navy is now in the process of revising FOST 4 and will resubmit it for public comment. FOST 3 has recently been resubmitted for public comment; a legal notice was published in October and the comment period is open until November 17, 2006. A revised draft of FOST 4 will be issued later in November and will then be available for comment. Navy anticipates conveyance of the FOST 3 and 4 parcels in June 2007.

M. Skelton-Roberts asked if there were any questions.

M. Parsons asked if part of FOST 4 was the public benefit conveyance, which was never conveyed and if the Navy was going to charge for the land to be conveyed. D. Barney said the Navy may charge for it but he does not know yet.

M. Bromberg asked if the comments previously submitted for the original FOST 4 would be answered along with new comments. D. Barney stated that Navy wants to make them side by side documents. All the 2004 FOST 4 comments will be answered and provided for public review and comment along with the revised FOST 4.

A request was made for D. Barney to issue a Notice of Availability for FOST 4 to let people know of the public review period.

H. Welch asked if a few streets around the Base could be shown on the figures so that people have a better reference point.

P. Scannell stated he had asked for overlays from the development company to show where housing is going; they have not yet been provided. He also stated that the NAS South Weymouth website was under construction and he could not get to earlier versions of RAB minutes. P. Call stated that she wasn't aware of any website construction activities and indicated she would check into it.

J. Cowie asked for clarification on transferring property near West Gate Landfill (WGL) and asked for EPA's opinion on the matter. D. Barney stated that the FOST 4 document will have a section showing WGL as located within 200 ft of one of the parcels; the document will describe the type of contamination found there from the WGL RI. D. Chaffin stated that monitoring wells would surround the cap area and if there are unacceptable releases found through the monitoring program then further action may have to be taken. With respect to the FOST, the property will not be suitable for transfer if there are any restrictions on the groundwater, for example if it is found that there is a plume extending from WGL.

J. Rakers stated she was concerned that in the long run after WGL is capped Navy can then walk away. D. Chaffin stated that if the decision is to cap the landfill, there would be an active and aggressive monitoring program and the Navy retains responsibility for the monitoring. EPA requires an alteration in a remedy if it is not effectively protecting human health or the environment. The ROD is a legal binding document implemented by EPA that holds the responsible party accountable. B. Olson stated there was

a presumptive remedy for landfills, which is capping them, due to the fact that excavating a landfill just moves the soil/media to another landfill location.

M. Parsons asked if there was a written agreement for DEP and EPA to inspect areas that have been transferred. For example if something is found during development that had not been previously found, what happens? A. Malewicz stated that the ROD allows both the state and the EPA to go on the property and do what is necessary to monitor the property. There may also be institutional controls that are put in place on these remedies; therefore any development has to be approved. If a developer finds evidence of contamination they are required to report this. The Navy is still held responsible. B. Olson also commented that SSTTDC/LNR should be responsible for reporting any evidence of contamination. Once transferred, the property is treated the same as other private development – the owner/developer is required by law to report any spills or evidence of contamination. In this case LNR has a pollution liability insurance policy that will allow them to report and then deal with any unexpected contamination. The insurer can then recoup the cleanup costs from the Navy.

3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

M. Skelton Roberts asked each of the Leads to provide updates to the list of Update Items.

RAB Administrative Actions: S. Jeghelian stated that she was officially passing her position on to M. Skelton Roberts.

MADEP Update: D. Chaffin stated that D. Barney would give an update on the FFTTA and an update on the Small Landfill.

D. Galluzzo mentioned the injunction and read a statement about the injunction. He stated that he does not feel the SSTTDC is being truthful. Their frameworks do not address environmental cleanup. No blueprints, road layouts, etc have been presented.

Coast Guard Update: The Buoy Depot ROD was signed at the end of September. The O&M monitoring program is moving forward in development and implementation.

IR Program Site Update: Two brief updates that could not be presented at the September RAB meeting were presented by D. Barney. The first was an update on the Fire Fighting Training Area (FFTA). A significant test pit excavation was performed at the FFTTA. The excavated soils were shipped offsite to Taunton where they are being used as landfill cover. Test pits were completed in August and reached a depth of about 4 feet. Clean fill was placed into the excavated areas. The current status of the FFTTA is

there will be a couple of rounds of groundwater monitoring to follow up the removal action. See selected slides in Attachment E.

Construction was completed earlier this year at the RDA site after the last PCB areas were excavated and hydro seeded. The long term monitoring program is being finalized and O & M activities have begun. D. Barney showed pictures of the RDA site in its restored state. See selected slides in Attachment E.

D. Barney stated that due to the time the October update summarizes the remaining updates.

MCP Update: See October RAB Update.

EBS Update: See October RAB Update.

FOST Update: See October RAB Update.

SSTTDC Update: S. Ivas stated that negotiations continue.

M. Skelton Roberts reviewed the seven action items listed on the Action Item Tracking List (see Attachment B) for this RAB meeting:

1. P. Scannell to provide the reference for the 1995 EPA study to D. Barney - Any confusion regarding this issue has been resolved.
2. Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update – The October update has been distributed.
3. Were runways in the transferred land tested for fuel oil and PCBs? – D. Barney stated that during the EBS program the runways were visually inspected and looked to be in relatively good shape. Due to sloped areas at the edges there was a concern associated with runoff to the sides of the runways. Older documents from the fire department were checked and there was evidence of spills at the ends of the runways. The fire department's procedure was to spray any spilled fuel off the runway which ran off onto the soils around the area. Samples were collected from around the area for analytical testing, including herbicides. EPA also collected samples of the runway paint and the developer collected samples of the concrete to be analyzed for asbestos.

D. Galluzzo restated his concern about scarifying the runways and then using the materials elsewhere for roadbeds; there could be the possibility of spreading the contamination. D. Chaffin

stated that if the developer does want to reuse the runway materials they will have to follow the state solid waste regulations which include provisions for sampling and characterizing the material before the process begins. This does not need to be investigated prior to transfer of the property. It is not a CERCLA issue if the runways remain intact. Only when the runways are demolished and reused do the solid waste regulations apply. R. Kleiman stated that samples have been collected and there is no asbestos in the runway material.

4. 1997 DEP letter re: non-potable drinking water source areas on the Base - A. Malewicz sent the letter to D. Galluzzo.
5. Map showing sampling locations on the Base - D. Barney had posted the maps on the wall.
6. Old Swamp River additional sample collection; data available? - P. Whittemore stated that data was collected in 2004 and was discussed at a RAB meeting in 2004. Beta, Inc. conducted a study around 2001. D. Barney has a copy with figures from the Beta report that can be made available.
7. Status of release of MDPH ALS/MS study – D. Barney stated that he received a letter from Dr. Knorr (Attachment F). The MDPH report is under final preparation for submission to the ATSDR. It has to go through peer review, Mass Public Health will respond to any comments received, and public release will follow after ATSDR acceptance of the comments received.

Possible Topics for future RAB Meetings

The following updates/action items were suggested for the next meeting:

1. D. Barney stated that the Basewide Program will have four technical memoranda available soon. The Hydrogeologic and Geochemical tech memos will be available in December and could be discussed at the January meeting.
2. A number of items related to development, not environmental cleanup, were mentioned.
3. A suggested topic was to have D. Chaffin discuss the viability of monitoring at landfills and how it relates to the landfill at Weymouth and the longevity of the landfills.
4. M. Bromberg suggested a FOST 4 presentation.

5. M. Parsons suggested a presentation on AULs (Activity & Use Limitations) - where are they on the Base and what are the restrictions.

J. Cowie is applying for a TAG grant. P. Harting-Barrett suggested that if any other group would like to join with Jill's group it is a perfect opportunity to be able to hire your own technical assistant. The deadline for TAG grant applications is thought to be December 27, 2006.

J. Cunningham asked where the developers are going to get the water to develop the land so it would not jeopardize the water that is on the Base and if it will jeopardize the Weymouth water supply. R. Kleiman stated that the Draft Environmental Impact Report is available through the MEPA office or the South Shore website (<http://www.ssttdc.com/index.html>). It fully describes the preferred alternatives for water supply and waste water. The preferred alternative for the water supply is the MWRA in Quincy through a dedicated pipeline from their facility to the Base. It is under review by MEPA and Secretary of Environmental Affairs as part of the Environmental Impact Report process. There are similar rules for the waste water treatment plant, which will be held to the highest modern day standards for water treatment. There has been an extensive process to arrive at the preferred alternatives.

Conclusion/Next Meeting

The meeting concluded at approximately 10:10 pm. The next RAB meeting was set for Thursday, January 11, 2007.



**Naval Air Station South Weymouth
Weymouth, MA
Restoration Advisory Board
RAB Meeting Agenda**



9 November 2006

Conference Center on Shea Memorial Drive

7:00 PM

<i>Agenda Items</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Projected Time</i>
1. Introduction, Review of Meeting Notes	Facilitator	7:00 - 7:15
2. Sewage Treatment Plant Feasibility Study; FOST Update	Navy	7:15 - 7:45
3. Updates and Action Items	Navy	7:45 - 8:15
4. Questions, Agenda Items, Next Meeting	Facilitator	8:15 - 8:30

Facilitator: Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution: Mary Skelton-Roberts

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members:

Abington: James Lavin, (Alternate: Steve Ivas); Phil Sortin (Alternate: Beth Sortin)

Hingham: no current representation

Rockland: no current representation

Weymouth: James Cunningham (Community Co-Chair); Ken Hayes; Dan McCormack;
Steve White

Navy: Dave Barney (Navy Co-Chair)

EPA: Patty Marajh-Whittemore (Alternate: Pamela Harting-Barrat)

MA DEP: David Chaffin (Alternate: Ann Malewicz)

BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Points of Contact:

Navy: Dave Barney, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Base Realignment and Closure Office, Program Management Office, Northeast (617) 753-4656

Brian Helland, Remedial Project Manager, Base Realignment and Closure Office, Program Management Office, Northeast (215) 897-4912
Email: brian.helland@navy.mil

MA DEP: David Chaffin, Environmental Engineer, Federal Facilities (617) 348-4005
Email: david.chaffin@state.ma.us

EPA: Patty Marajh-Whittemore, Remedial Project Manager, Federal Facilities Section (617) 918-1382 Email: whittemore.patty@epamail.epa.gov



Naval Air Station South Weymouth Restoration Advisory Board Action Item Tracking List



9 November 2006 – Next RAB Meeting

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
ACTION ITEMS		
P. Scannell to provide the reference for the 1995 EPA study to D. Barney	D. Barney	Next RAB
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update	D. Barney	October
Were runways in the transferred land tested for fuel oil and PCBs?	D. Barney	Next RAB
1997 DEP letter re: non-potable drinking water source areas on the Base	A. Malewicz	Next RAB
Map showing sampling locations on the Base	D. Barney	Next RAB
Old Swamp River additional sample collection; data available?	P. Whittemore	Next RAB
Status of release of MDPH ALS/MS study	J. Cunningham	Next RAB
UPDATES		
RAB Administrative Actions	D. Barney	Each RAB
MA DEP Update	D. Chaffin	Each RAB
Coast Guard Buoy Facility Update	R. Marino	Each RAB
IR Program Sites Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
MCP Release Areas Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
EBS Review Item Areas/ Various Removal Action Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
FOST/FOSL/CDR Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
SSTTDC Update	J. Lavin/ S. Ivas	Each RAB
COMPLETED ITEMS		
Contact Dr. Knorr regarding access to NAS South Weymouth EGIS (7/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (7/06)		
Check availability of MDPH to give a presentation on MS/ALS data (5/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (3/06; 4/06)		
Provide copies of SSTTDC and Mayor Madden letters re: Small Landfill CAAA to M. Parsons (2/06)		
Provide information on vernal pools to M. Byram (2/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (2/06)		
Small Landfill CAAA Update (12/05)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (12/05)		
Provide details of RDA contractor's upcoming work (10/05)		
Provide details about SSTTDC's unescorted access policy (10/05)		
Provide turtle activity update (8/05)		
Check where upcoming RAB meeting times are posted (8/05)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (8/05)		
Provide RDA construction cost, cap design life, address safety issues (6/05)		
Provide copies of DoD directive regarding environmental issues (6/05)		
Provide DEP Small Landfill letter to M. Parsons and S. Ivas (6/05)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (5/05)		