

**Senior Management Board
 Bridge Bourne Hotel
 March 25, 2009
 6:30 – 9:10 p.m.
 Meeting Minutes**

Members:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-mail:
Virginia Valiela	Town of Falmouth	508-563-9028	valiela@hotmail.com
Stephen Mealy	Town of Bourne	508-759-0600	smealy@townofbourne.com
George “Chuckie” Green	Town of Mashpee	508-539-1400	ggreen@ci.mashpee.ma.us
Linell Grundman (sitting in for Dana Barrette)	Town of Sandwich	508-888-2601	grundmans@comcast.net
Mark Harding	Mashpee Wampanoag	508-477-1600	mark@wampworx.com
Dr. Mike Ciaranca	E&RC	508-968-5121	Michael.ciaranca@us.army.mil
Martha Steele	MDPH	617-624-5757	Martha.steele@state.ma.us
Mary Sanderson	US EPA	617-918-1381	sanderson.mary@epa.gov
Millie Garcia-Serrano	MassDEP	508-946-2727	millie.garcia-serrano@state.ma.us
Attendees:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-mail:
Jon Davis	AFCEE/MMR	508-958-4670	jon.davis@brooks.af.mil
Mike Minior	AFCEE/MMR	508-968-4670	mike.minior@brooks.af.mil
Rose Forbes	AFCEE/MMR	508-968-4670	robes.forbes@brooks.af.mil
Tom Sims	AFCEE	404-562-4200	Thomas.sims@us.af.mil
Bill Sullivan	E&RC	508-968-5147	William.g.sullivan@us.army.mil
Lynda Wadsworth	E&RC	508-968-5152	Lynda.e.wadsworth@us.army.mil
Emily Derbyshire	E&RC	508-968-5146	Emily.derbyshire@us.army.mil
Sally Hartmann	E&RC	508-968-5145	sally.a.hartmann@us.army.mil
Hap Gonser	IAGWSP	508-968-5107	kent.gonser@us.army.mil
Ben Gregson	IAGWSP	508-968-5821	ben.gregson@us.army.mil
Paul Nixon	IAGWSP	508-968-5620	paul.nixon@us.army.mil
Chris Faux	102 nd IW	508-968-4247	
Joanne Palmer	MAARNG	508-233-6517	
Mike Koski	MAARNG	508-968-5888	
Barbara Burnett	6 th SWS	508-968-3283	
CDR Paul Rendon	USCG	508-968-6480	
Bob Cannon	USCG	508-968-6487	rhcannon@dl.uscg.mil
Randy Cordeiro	HQCE	508-968-6487	randall.j.cordeiro@us.army.mil
Mark Begley	EMC	508-968-5127	mark.begley@state.ma.us
Dale Young	MA EEA	617-626-1134	dale.young@state.ma.us
David Dow	Sierra Club	508-540-7142	ddow420@comcast.net
Jim Quin	Aerostar Environmental	303-692-8838	jpg9123@msn.com
Philip Elsan	Aerostar Environmental	904-565-2820	pelsan@aerostar.net
Jane Gasper	Innovar	508-759-9114	jgasper@innovar-env.com

Handouts Distributed at Meeting:

1. Presentation handout: Overview Textron NRD Settlement at MMR
2. 3/26/09 News Release: Air Force Completes PAVE PAWS Public Health SEIS
3. Environmental Assessment (EA) Timeline (as of 3/25/09): EA for the Proposed Construction Projects at the 102nd Intelligence Wing Massachusetts
4. Presentation handout: Small Arms and Simulated Munitions Training
5. Presentation handout: Demolition Area 1 Source Area
6. Presentation handout: BA-4 Disposal Area Overview

-
7. Presentation handout: L Range Soil Update
 8. IAGWSP 6-Month Look-Ahead
 9. Presentation handout: Ashumet Valley and Chemical Spill 10 ROD and Construction Update
 10. Presentation handout: Chemical Spill 19 Groundwater Proposed Plan and Community Involvement Activities
 11. IRP 6-Month Look-Ahead
 12. 3/6/09 Mashpee Enterprise article: Survey on Fish Tumors in Mashpee Ponds Raises More Questions
-

Agenda Item #1. Introductions, Approval of November 19, 2008 SMB/MMRCT Minutes, and Agenda Review

Ms. Valiela convened the meeting at 6:35 p.m. and the Senior Management Board (SMB) members introduced themselves. Ms. Valiela asked if there were any additions or corrections to the November 19, 2008 SMB/Massachusetts Military Reservation Cleanup Team (MMRCT) meeting minutes. No changes were offered and the minutes, which had already been approved by the MMRCT, were also approved by the SMB, as written.

Agenda Item #2. Late-Breaking News

Natural Resources Damage (NRD) Process Update

Ms. Young reminded the group that state and federal trustees settled natural resource damages (NRD) with Textron at the Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR). The total settlement was \$1.3 million, to be used by the trustees for restoration of injured resources, and for reimbursement of some trustee costs. The consent decree was entered into U.S. District Court in February 2008.

Ms. Young noted that \$1M was paid to the state, specifically the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EOEEA), for groundwater injury – \$40K for assessment costs and \$960K for restoration. She also reported that \$300K was paid to the federal trustees – \$125K for assessment costs and \$175K for restoration; however, tonight she will be discussing the process for spending the state's allocation.

Ms. Young then reviewed the schedule associated with the state's Request for Responses (RFR) on how to spend the \$960K in restoration funds: January 12, 2009, EOEEA posted the RFR; January 26, 2009, EOEEA held a bidder's conference; February 2, 2009, was the deadline for questions related to the RFR; February 9, 2009, EOEEA posted its responses to questions; March 11, 2009, was the deadline for submission of proposals; May/June 2009, EOEEA anticipates announcing how \$460K will be spent on projects; and August 2009, EOEEA anticipates announcing how \$500K will be spent on projects.

Ms. Young reviewed the project proposals that EOEEA received, which, she noted, are public record, should be posted soon, and total about \$4.6M: from the Town of Falmouth, \$154K for technical/legal services to develop a regional wastewater treatment facility at MMR; from the Town of Falmouth, \$425K to develop a nitrogen total maximum daily limit (MDL) at seven estuaries; from the Town of Mashpee, \$31K to develop a guide to protect Cape Cod waters; from the Town of Mashpee, \$58K for a diagnostic study at Santuit Pond; from the Town of Sandwich, \$600K for a comprehensive water resources management plan; from the Sandwich Water District, \$61K for a land acquisition project (Thicket Run property); from the Sandwich Water District, \$1M for a water supply transfer station; from the Sandwich Water District, \$839K for a PCE bleeder reduction program to re-line an existing water main; from the Cape Cod Commission, \$50K for a regional wastewater management plan public

participation project for Upper Cape Cod; from Orenda Wildlife Land Trust, \$259K for land acquisition (Lovells Lane) to augment the Mashpee National Wildlife Refuge; from John Todd Ecological Design, \$665K for an eco-station to restore groundwater at MMR; and from the Upper Cape Regional Water Supply Cooperative, \$395K to develop a safe yield analysis/water resource recovery project for the Sagamore Lens. Ms. Young stated that the projects will be reviewed and recommendations made.

AFSPC'S PAVE PAWS Public Health SEIS Notice of Availability Posted to Federal Register

Ms. Burnett, with PAVE PAWS, announced that the Air Force has completed its Public Health Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), culminating the studies and the community involvement of the past several years. She thanked the community for the progress that's been made and noted that the document is posted on the Peterson Air Force Base website, the link for which is included in the news release available at tonight's meeting. She also reported that the Federal Register has the Notice of Availability and that the Record of Decision (ROD) will be signed no sooner than mid April.

Agenda Item #3. SMB/Community News

MMR Renewable Energy

Ms. Wadsworth stated that on February 6, 2009, a news release was issued to announce that the Massachusetts National Guard and the U.S. Coast Guard are exploring renewable energy sources at MMR, including wind power. Both are actively consulting with the state, including EOEEA, as they explore ways to enhance environmental stewardship, support military missions on the base, and increase energy independence. Ms. Wadsworth stated that the effort is in the information-gathering phase at this time, but once a proposal is on the table the SMB and other community groups will be updated.

Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Construction Projects at the 102nd Intelligence Wing Massachusetts Air National Guard Public Comment Period

Col. Faux stated that copies of the timeline for the "Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Construction Projects at the 102nd Intelligence Wing (IW), Massachusetts Air National Guard" are available at tonight's meeting. He noted that the dates shown in red indicate that those tasks will be occurring later than originally scheduled, but it's hoped that everything will be wrapped up soon, by the last week in April. He also mentioned that the schedule is somewhat flexible, that the 102nd IW is happy to see things moving along, and that very few comments were received, but all them were constructive.

Discussion on the Future of the SMB

Ms. Wadsworth stated that the goals of the SMB review are: to provide a forum for community involvement, on a regular basis, that ensures two-way communication with the opportunity for input and discussion, and to avoid duplication of effort. She also reminded the group that last year it was decided that the Plume Cleanup Team (PCT) and Impact Area Review Team (IART) would combine, this has been accomplished successfully, and the combined team is now known as the MMR Cleanup Team (MMRCT). She further noted that it was agreed last year that the topic of the SMB as a community involvement forum would be revisited, which is the basis for tonight's discussion. Ms. Wadsworth also stated that the Massachusetts National Guard, which adopted administrative support of the SMB from the former Joint Program Office (JPO), views the elected officials and Wampanoag representative on the SMB as very important key stakeholders at MMR who should continue to be

kept engaged and informed on a regular basis, although the atmosphere is less controversial than it was in the past.

Ms. Wadsworth showed a slide listing the current MMR community advisory groups: the MMRCT, which focuses on cleanup program activity; the Environmental Management Commission (EMC) and its two advisory groups, the Science Advisory Council (SAC) and the Community Advisory Council (CAC), which focus on current training and environmental protection in the Upper Cape Water Supply Reserve; the MMR Military Civilian Community Council (MC³), which focuses on planning issues and base development, and meets fairly infrequently as there are not a lot of military construction dollars coming into MMR at this time; and the SMB, which covers all MMR environmental issues and is unique in that it is chaired by citizen members. Ms. Wadsworth also displayed a slide showing an excerpt from the SMB charter outlining the board's goals.

Ms. Wadsworth then spoke about concerns/questions that have arisen during internal discussions among the regulatory agencies and environmental program managers: an overwhelming demand on team members, regulators, and the military programs' time and resources; a redundancy of effort, and whether there might be other activities that could ensure the community is engaged; low public attendance/interest; and the concern that multiple meeting venues may be confusing to the community.

Ms. Sanderson of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) noted that this topic was discussed a couple weeks ago at the SMB planning meeting. She also said that although the SMB has "come a long, long way," she thinks that the tenor and topics are now quite different. She then said that the MMRCT, which combined two teams under different authorities, has been successful, goes into more detail and meets more frequently than the SMB does, and has reasonable citizen involvement for input at the table. She further noted that she thinks the purpose of the current effort is to determine the best forum for cleanup issues. For example, EPA is not involved in the MC³ because that group deals with very local development decisions and there's really no role there for EPA. Rather, EPA's role, like the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection's (MassDEP's) role, is regulatory oversight on all parts of the cleanup programs. She also noted that she just recently learned that the cleanup programs meet with the towns on an annual basis, and she would be happy to have regulator representation at those meetings, if that makes sense. Ms. Sanderson further stated that "it's a sure sign of success that you've graduated and you can become something else," but the question is how to do that in a nonthreatening way that values the contribution and the forum, and that's executed in a meaningful way that still provides the forum that's needed.

Ms. Sanderson said that a couple of options are available, one of which would be to establish a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) to meet one to three times a year, the community forum that exists at the 14 other bases in New England, and is attended by the local selectmen. She also noted that a RAB could be supplemented with town-specific meetings. She further stated that the SMB has been a fabulous group and she's happy to keep coming to SMB meetings, but is just looking at the attendance, the agenda, other avenues for cleanup issues, and whether community involvement at MMR could be more streamlined.

Ms. Valiela asked when EPA anticipates that MMR cleanup projects will be complete. Ms. Sanderson replied that the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment's (AFCEE's) Installation Restoration Program (IRP), which started its work earlier, is much further along than the Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP). She noted that the IRP is "looking at the homestretch" and will be entering a much different phase of the program – a long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) phase where all major decisions will have been made, all major construction completed, and the focus will be on continuing to optimize systems. Ms. Sanderson also said that there are many more decisions to come on the IAGWSP side of the house. Although a lot of great work has been done,

some difficult decisions remain, such as cleanup of the Central Impact Area. Ms. Valiela inquired about a specific month and year when the IRP decisions will have been made and the major construction done. Ms. Sanderson replied that the anticipated date is September 2009.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano stated that in concert with discussions with EPA and participation in the planning meetings, MassDEP had “a very interesting dialogue” with all the selectmen, with the exception of Mr. Mealy, with whom she didn’t have the chance to speak today. She then said that she basically thinks that the message is to try to ensure that there’s “bolstered community involvement,” and as a state regulator she thinks that her vested interest at the SMB table is “slightly different from selectpersons.” She explained that she comes to SMB meetings as a “service person,” to look at decisions and recommendations based on compliance with state law and offer input on technical issues. She further noted that as a regulator at SMB meetings, she hopes to glean insight regarding community acceptance, a factor that MassDEP incorporates into its decision-making – however, “at the risk of sounding non-team-player,” she feels that she gets “very little in terms of hearing that feedback from the community.” She also said that while she doesn’t know if it has to do with having become complacent, or with duplication of effort, it seems that MMRCT meetings generate much more energy, activity, and questions to the state.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano also said that MassDEP will be wherever the community wants it to be; if the community wants MassDEP at the SMB table, MassDEP will participate. She further noted that, thankfully, MassDEP has access to information “at the technical table,” but the piece that’s missing is “community input and involvement,” which the state will have to find elsewhere if not at the SMB. Ms. Garcia-Serrano then said that MassDEP respectfully offers its opinion that the group should “either move forward in some sort of optimized way” so that the state can get more feedback from the SMB table, and/or that “it’s time to streamline and think about options that will serve to bolster the community involvement and opinion with regard to the decisions that remain to be made between now and finalization of decisions and remedy-in-place...” She also noted that MassDEP will continue to be present during the long-term monitoring/O&M phase.

Ms. Wadsworth stated that one of the roles that the Environmental & Readiness Center (E&RC) took over from the JPO was arranging annual briefings to the Boards of Selectmen, some of which have been attended by Jim Murphy of EPA and Mark Begley of the EMC. She mentioned that the E&RC is looking at increasing the number of briefings to two a year, and also noted that while the briefings are “a great thing to do” and will continue to be done, the E&RC is wary of dominating the meeting agendas and taking up too much of the boards’ time. Ms. Wadsworth then said that the E&RC wants to ensure that the selectmen and Wampanoag representative have a beneficial two-way communication forum to discuss all MMR issues that affect the surrounding communities – not only cleanup issues, but also current training issues, development issues, renewable energy, and so forth. Ms. Wadsworth further noted that the E&RC cannot ignore the needs of MassDEP and EPA in terms of making discussions more beneficial for them, as the regulators are also stakeholders.

Ms. Wadsworth then offered a number of ways to “open the dialogue to make this better,” including better utilizing technology and continuing with the SMB as it is, but also meeting two or three times a year in conjunction with the MMRCT so that team is able to benefit from a wider range of knowledge. She also noted that in the past Ms. Garcia-Serrano had requested an SMB briefing by MassDevelopment to help fulfill a desire for a “holistic, bigger view,” and she thinks it would be nice to continue to have the kind of venue where such topics can be discussed.

Ms. Wadsworth then suggested that if the current number of SMB meetings (five per year) were scaled back to three per year, there would be ways to ensure that the community and selectmen continue to be engaged and make up for those other two meetings. She also said that she thinks it would be fine to

forego SMB agenda planning meetings in the future, as they are basically administrative in nature and often difficult for people to attend. Ms. Sanderson stated that she doesn't consider those meetings to be administrative. Ms. Wadsworth clarified that she considers them important but thinks that agenda topics could be planned by phone or email, and actual meetings could be limited to instances when there's some kind of controversial agenda item. She further noted, however, that typically there is not a lot of controversy over agenda items and the E&RC is able to distribute "good draft agendas" before the agenda planning meetings.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano said that she thinks agenda planning is crucial for any stakeholder; an important benefit is knowing which issues require preparation so that MassDEP can have a "better sense of service" when questions are asked. She further stated that any functioning board always has an opportunity to prep before a meeting, and she thinks the SMB is a bona fide board, which she treats with a lot of respect, and she puts much "energy and a lot of thought process into this kind of meeting." Ms. Wadsworth acknowledged Ms. Garcia-Serrano's excellent point, but also noted that MMRCT agendas are developed by just the program managers and community involvement people, which may be an option to consider, as well as planning SMB agendas at the same time as MMRCT agendas are being planned.

Ms. Wadsworth then spoke about employing the following additional involvement methods to ensure that the SMB is engaged and informed: working with the regulators to coordinate environmentally-focused briefings to the local Boards of Selectmen; emailing the selectmen and other stakeholders a monthly one-page update on the programs, with links to websites for additional information; producing an online magazine (two to three times a year) that's similar to the Minuteman, a Mass Guard publication, with more in-depth articles; and publishing monthly media notices and ads that include all upcoming meetings to make it easier for the public to distinguish between base-related meetings, and thereby alleviate confusion.

Ms. Valiela asked the SMB members to talk about what the board has meant to them in the recent past, and whether the IRP's transition into a long-term monitoring/O&M phase affects their viewpoint in terms of the role of the SMB.

Ms. Grundman, Sandwich selectman and former SMB member filling in for the current Sandwich representative (Selectman Dana Barrette), stated that she had served a full year on the SMB. She also mentioned the Cape-wide associations of selectmen and councilmen and said that she considers SMB meetings to be an opportunity for selectmen to educate themselves about MMR, cleanup issues, and the sole-source aquifer, which, she noted, are issues that affect the entire Cape, not just the towns that border MMR. Ms. Grundman also said that while she understands a desire to cut back on the number of committees, she thinks that a forum that allows two-way communication between the communities and the various elements of the SMB is vital. She also said she always brags about the SMB, which she considers to be "one of the most professional government committees in existence (on the Cape) that selectmen participate in on an ongoing basis." Ms. Grundman further noted that the SMB deals with issues related not only to the towns that surround MMR, but also related to the Cape "as a community and a county," with the leaders at the SMB part of the representation that feeds back into the county government. She then said that she thinks the SMB is the board "that specifically offers sharing of information and broader ideas about the role of the community, which really is right."

Mr. Green stated that it's his opinion that SMB members have not become complacent – rather, they've become comfortable, as have their constituents. He also noted, however, that he thinks that a sudden disruption of the SMB would create "a strong influx of (upset) people" coming to meetings, which would be going backwards. He also said that while he agrees that this forum "isn't needed as it was," he believes that it should change slowly, in phases, perhaps as Ms. Wadsworth suggested, by

scaling back to three meetings a year and combining the other two with MMRCT meetings. Mr. Green further noted that in his experience, whenever it seems that the point of completing cleanup is getting near “we get a surprise.” He then reiterated that he thinks that ending the SMB would make the public think that the military is going backward to “no communication.”

Mr. Green also said that he believes that the public views the selectmen as trustworthy individuals on whom they can rely “to convey a message” and bring back any information there might be to report. He then noted that everyone is pleased when he has no MMR issues to report at Mashpee selectmen’s meeting, but he thinks that if he were to announce that the SMB is no longer meeting, it would incite people to think that the military is hiding something. Mr. Green also remarked “we’ve come a long way from where we started,” but until there are no problems at all, some sort of SMB presence should be maintained. He further noted that he doesn’t think that emailed updates would be respected by the community as much as the selectmen coming out to attend an SMB meeting, and he wouldn’t want to see the public lose its confidence in the cleanup programs, the military’s openness, and the regulators’ ability to share information.

Ms. Valiela noted that the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH) fought hard to get membership on the SMB, and then asked Ms. Steele to weigh in on the discussion. Ms. Steele confirmed that Suzanne Condon of MDPH, with whom she spoke earlier today, fought very hard for SMB membership about 12 years ago as there were so many public health issues at that time. She then said that she and Ms. Condon both want to do what the community wants to do – MDPH is happy to continue with the SMB, but is also fine with the idea of discontinuing it – either way the department will address health issues as they arise.

Mr. Mealy, who acknowledged that he is the newest member of the SMB, said that he’d like to echo many of Ms. Grundman’s comments. He also said that in his brief time with the board, he’s been struck by the depth and complexity of the presentations and is just now becoming accustomed to them. Mr. Mealy further noted that he thinks there could be better use of technology – not to replace the verbal and visual communication of meetings, but to supplement it. He then referred to Ms. Wadsworth’s idea of a brief update with links to more detailed information. Mr. Mealy remarked on the difficulty of summarizing 50 pages of handouts into a five- to ten-minute briefing on what was covered, and said that he thinks this could be done more effectively in conjunction with the use of links to town websites, MMR websites, news bulletins, and the like.

Mr. Mealy also said that the SMB strikes him as unique in that it is run by local elected representatives. He noted that he thinks this is significant because, like Mr. Green, he believes that the people are depending on the SMB representatives to maintain first-name-familiarity with the players at MMR, absorb all the information that’s presented at SMB meetings, and tie all that together “back to the people that live here.”

Mr. Harding noted that he became a member of the SMB about nine years ago, when it was being supported by the JPO. He said that there were many problems and issues then with regard to the cleanup programs, how they were being managed, and how the public perceived the military, and he thinks that a good job has been done of calming fears, moving forward, and ensuring that the remediation programs work well along with the public. Mr. Harding, who noted that he’s a member of nearly all the committees that Ms. Wadsworth mentioned as well as a member of the Cape Cod Commission, said that he recalls providing reports about MMR at monthly meetings with the Wampanoag Tribe in 2001. He also said that recently he’s been elected to a much higher position, and so much of the information he provides is being used “on a much larger level.”

Mr. Harding then stated that he views his participation on the SMB as important, noting, for example, that the MC³ and EMC don’t discuss the same issues discussed at SMB meetings. He said that he sees

the SMB as staying together as a group, although scaling back the meeting schedule might be amicable, while participating a little more with the MMRCT. Mr. Harding also said that, as others noted this evening, many people look toward the leadership of SMB members, and he wants to ensure that “the leadership still has a place and still has a voice to bring back to our people.”

Ms. Valiela asked Mr. Dow, “our one most faithful public at large,” if he would like to share his thoughts on the future of the SMB. Mr. Dow, who noted that he’s been involved with base issues for more than 20 years, said that he thinks the SMB performs a viable role. He said that the elected officials speak for a contingent of people and serve as two-way conduits, receiving input from the public and providing information back to the public. He further noted that MMRCT meetings involve members who are fairly new to the team and who mostly represent themselves and provide their own input; they do not represent any group or stakeholder interest. Mr. Dow also said that he can see where the SMB might want to have fewer meetings, and he thinks it might benefit the board to meet with the MMRCT occasionally. He further stated that he always thought it unfortunate that no one from the MMRCT ever attends SMB meetings. He concluded by saying that he thinks that attending SMB meetings and MMRCT are both important.

Ms. Valiela said that she thinks these were “very thoughtful comments” with many “sincere messages,” but not mentioned was that the SMB actually serves as a safety net. She explained that because the SMB is an existing structure made up of elected leaders, regulatory agencies, public health, and so forth, it is a mechanism that is immediately available “when there is something serious that arises.” Ms. Valiela said that an enormous amount of energy went into creating this structure and she believes that one should think carefully about dismantling it. She also noted, however, that she thinks that “modifying it, slimming it down, using modern technology” is worthy of consideration. She further noted that she thinks that SMB members should attend the next MMRCT meeting to learn about how that team operates and the level of detail in its presentations. She said that she agrees with Mr. Dow that MMRCT members individually represent themselves, and she believes that collectively they help the regulators understand “where the hotspots are,” and that’s “where the energy is.” The selectmen, however, have more of a policy and conduit role, and need to look at the larger picture – which is why the SMB exudes less energy unless something is “really headed in the wrong direction.” Nevertheless, this doesn’t mean that the interactions that go on at the SMB table aren’t very important.

Ms. Valiela said that she thinks that SMB members should attend the next MMRCT meeting, think about the group’s future, and prior to the May SMB meeting perhaps have a small caucus to come up with recommendations “that would streamline things.”

Agenda Item #4. Environmental & Readiness Center Update

Camp Edwards Small Arms Ranges Update

Dr. Ciaranca reminded the group that COL Bill Fitzpatrick is no longer with the E&RC and announced that Alan Cowles has also moved on. He said that he is trying to “fill their shoes” right now and will update the SMB when he has any news about filling these vacant positions. He also announced that the Annual State of the Reservation Report is available on E&RC’s website and on the state’s Environmental Monitor publication. With regard to Natural Resources, Dr. Ciaranca reported that field crews continued to be hired to conduct natural resource monitoring on Camp Edwards (the northern 15,000 acres of MMR). He also noted that prescribed fire season is ongoing, and that the Mass Army National Guard has an extensive GIS program designed to support training soldiers at MMR and those that are deploying.

Regarding cultural resources, Dr. Ciaranca informed the group that the post chapel, which was built in 1941 and meant to last only 10 years, is being refurbished in cooperation with the State Historic

Preservation Officer. He also noted that the Army Guard is consulting with the Mashpee Wampanoag, as it did around 2001 with the Wampanoag of Aquinnah. He then mentioned that there were recent articles in the newspaper regarding some questions about land and economic development, which would be addressed in "another forum with state representatives." Regarding community involvement, Dr. Ciaranca reported that a career day for Falmouth juniors was held on March 10, 2009, and that the annual Environmental Fair will be held on May 7, 2009. He also mentioned that the Mass Guard received some stimulus funding for energy efficiencies on base.

Dr. Ciaranca stated that the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) pertaining to Small Arms Ranges activity was a requirement of the November 2006 Notice of Project Change. The draft was sent to the Small Arms Ranges (SAR) Working Group for review on March 11, 2009 and the projected filing date is April. Once the document has been filed it will be open for public comment.

Dr. Ciaranca informed the group that on January 28, 2009 the Guard received EPA and EMC approval letters to extend the Tango Range pilot program and utilize Juliet & Kilo Ranges. He also noted that April 2, 2009 is the due date for submission of the final Tango Range Pilot Program Report to the agencies, which are currently reviewing the draft document. He further noted that the Tango Range STAPP system cover, which is considered substandard, is being replaced this spring, and that the Guard is working with the EMC and SAR Working Group to address under-shot/over-shot protection and drainage correction issues associated with Juliet & Kilo Ranges.

Dr. Ciaranca also discussed pyrotechnics, noting that the Guard would like to use artillery and grenade simulators again, as they make training more realistic. He noted that because of the chemical of concern (COC) perchlorate, grenade and artillery simulators have been reformulated, with the grenade simulator now perchlorate free and only a small amount of perchlorate present in the ignition train of the artillery simulator, which is consumed if the whistle sound is heard. If the whistle sound in the artillery simulator is not heard, however, the perchlorate was not consumed and the item needs to be picked up and thrown away. Dr. Ciaranca stated that in conjunction with the SAR Working Group, the Guard is conducting a design evaluation of the simulators; a Project Note was developed and sent this morning to the SAR Working Group for review.

Ms. Valiela asked if the perchlorate in the artillery simulator is a concern. Dr. Ciaranca clarified that that is the very reason for the Project Note to be reviewed by the regulatory agencies, after which testing will be conducted. Mr. Green asked if it's correct that if the whistle isn't heard, the perchlorate would remain contained in the device, which simply needs to be picked up and thrown away. Dr. Ciaranca replied that that is correct, but clarified that for safety reasons, the items wouldn't just be (casually) picked up.

Dr. Ciaranca then reported that soldiers at Camp Edwards are now training with simulated munitions known as Ultimate Training Munition (UTM) or Man Marker Rounds, which are much more effective than blanks because they leave a mark to indicate where someone has been hit. He also noted that these training rounds, which contain melamine and formaldehyde, were thoroughly vetted, as those substances raised all sorts of questions. Dr. Ciaranca then explained that the combination of melamine and formaldehyde creates a resin that does off-gas formaldehyde, but the substance cannot go back to a free melamine except by extraordinary means (i.e., strong acids, high heat). He also noted that indoors, spent UTM cartridges and projectiles can be swept up and disposed of, while outdoors they can be picked up (where practical) after training exercises and turned in at the Ammunition Supply Point (ASP). He also mentioned that EMC's executive director had recommended using a magnet to collect these items outdoors, which he demonstrated successfully. Dr. Ciaranca also showed photographs of some of the facades used with the UTMs and reported that on March 16, 2009 the EMC approved the Guard's request for an 18-month pilot period to use these rounds at MMR.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Ms. Sanderson thanked Dr. Ciaranca for the update. She also informed the board that EPA has asked the Guard for an integrated schedule of training needs, pilot programs, and IAGWSP activities in order to be able to “sort out what are the priorities.” Dr. Ciaranca noted that the request for an integrated schedule was made at a Command Group meeting, and since that time the Guard has met with the IAGWSP and is in the process of developing a schedule to bring to the next SAR Working Group and Command Group meetings.

Mr. Dow asked if particles of resin from the UTMs would break off on impact, enter the soil, and possibly become a threat to groundwater. Dr. Ciaranca replied that that would not happen, noting that the resin is the color carrier in a wax. He also noted that even if it reached the groundwater, it would stay in the form of a resin, not as free melamine or free formaldehyde.

Agenda Item #5. Impact Area Groundwater Study Program Updates

Before Mr. Gregson started his presentation, Mr. Gonser took a moment to inform the board that the IAGWSP has 14 sites (involving groundwater, source, or unexploded ordnance [UXO] components, or even groundwater plumes). He noted that the IAGWSP’s goal is to have remedies-in-place/decision documents for half of those sites by the end of this fiscal year, September 2009, and the rest done by September 2010, with perhaps a few of the more difficult sites, perhaps associated with UXO issues, carried over into the following year. Mr. Gonser also said that for 12 of the 14 sites it was entirely clear “what needed to be done and we’ve done it.” However, it’s not clear how the J-1 Range and Central Impact Area sites should be addressed – not because of technical issues, but because of value issues – and he thinks the community plays a big role in determining what those values are. He explained that these sites don’t pose a health risk, so the questions pertain to the degree to which natural resources or economic resources are valued – and the same questions apply to the munitions issue. Mr. Gonser said that he thinks that a mechanism to obtain “true community input” will be very important with regard to these sites.

Ms. Valiela asked if it’s correct that the J-1 Range is one of the ranges where Textron operated. Mr. Gonser confirmed that it is, adding that there are two plumes emanating from the J-1 Range – one heading into the Forestdale neighborhood (with all the complications of being in a residential area), and another heading into the Impact Area (where no one will ever have to be affected by it because it’s downgradient of all the rifle ranges).

Demolition Area 1 Decision Document Addendum

Mr. Gregson stated that the final remedy for the Demolition Area 1 (Demo 1) plume was put in place a few years ago, and currently the IAGWSP is wrapping up the Demo 1 source area and issuing a complete Decision Document (DD) for both the plume and source area. He also noted that: the plume extends from the source area to the west, toward the base boundary; the primary COCs in the plume are perchlorate and RDX; and the active groundwater treatment system pumps at about 800 gallons per minute (gpm). Mr. Gregson then reminded the group that the Demo 1 source area was used by Department of Defense (DoD) for the disposal of munitions and by the state police for disposal of confiscated fireworks, and for engineering training. Over the years explosives residues built up in the soil, leached to the groundwater, and created a groundwater plume. Rapid Response Action (RRA) source area removal work conducted several years ago involved excavating 20,000 cubic yards of soil, treating the soil in the thermal desorption unit, and returning it to the site, where it was re-vegetated.

Mr. Gregson reported that the Demo 1 Groundwater DD, which was issued in November 2006 and expanded the existing RRA system that was in place, had not included the source area, pending some

additional investigation. The source area removal action, which was conducted from 2003 to 2005, involved the excavation of burn pits, post-excavation sampling, geophysical surveys, and, and as already noted, backfilling of the Demo 1 depression. Post-screening and supplemental post-screening investigations were conducted outside the perimeter road to determine whether in fact the majority of the source had been removed. Mr. Gregson showed the “Demo 1 Final Excavation Status Map” and pointed out the area excavated to a depth of one foot, the area excavated to a depth of two feet, and the area in the center, excavated to a depth of eight feet. He also displayed a figure that showed sampling locations for the supplemental post-screening investigation.

Mr. Gregson reviewed the following summary statements: the RRA removed areas of significant contamination inside the perimeter road; post-screening investigation results confirmed that the perimeter road delineated the extent of significant soil contamination and was an appropriate delineation for the RRA excavation; residual contamination outside the perimeter road (some low-level, very intermittent detections of DNT and lead) pose no significant threat to the aquifer or public health; no further investigation or removal action is necessary either inside or outside the perimeter road; and ongoing groundwater monitoring is in place to ensure that there’s no future threat to groundwater. Mr. Gregson also stated that next steps are to issue the draft Demo 1 DD Addendum to include the source area, hold a public comment period on the document in April 2009, and issue the final document in June 2009.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Mr. Gonser clarified that, unlike with the Air Force cleanup program, EPA is the party that will be actually make the decision and issue the DD.

Ms. Sanderson acknowledged that the Demo 1 DD will be the first that addresses both the source and groundwater, which is “a big deal.” She also encouraged doing whatever can be done to reach closure with the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) as well, adding that she knows that “may take a little extra time in some cases...”

Mr. Gregson said that the IAGWSP is working closely with MassDEP and he thinks that it will be possible to close out the site during the same timeframe, in terms of the MCP. Ms. Garcia-Serrano thanked Ms. Sanderson for her support, adding that she thinks that the “federal counterpart has always fostered state concurrence with the remedy,” and expects that MassDEP will draft a concurrence letter “in support of the selection of a remedy.” She also noted that the source area has to do with the MCP process, whereas the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) really pertains to the leaching groundwater pathway and the groundwater itself as a resource. She added that the state law complements the overall comprehensive cleanup and selection of a remedy, and also noted that MassDEP is arranging a meeting with the IAGWSP to discuss Demo 1 with regard to the MCP, and EPA has been invited.

BA-4 No-Further-Action Decision Document

Mr. Gregson stated that the IAGWSP is in the process of finishing work required at the Bivouac Area 4 (BA-4) Disposal Area site for a No-Further-Action DD. He showed a map of the site, which he described as a small portion of the southwest corner of the BA-4 training area, and noted that geophysical surveys were conducted at five areas at the site. Two disposal sites, with lead and dioxin in soil, were found, and in 2006/2007 the IAGWSP conducted RRAs to remove those soils (about 100 cubic yards) for off-site disposal.

Mr. Gregson noted that additional geophysical surveys were conducted, as was a groundwater investigation that included drive-points and permanent monitoring wells. He noted that there was an historic detection of lead in an old water supply well at the ASP, but that detection went away after the

well was reconstructed. He also reported that sampling confirmed that no further soil removal was necessary. He added that no impacts to groundwater have been seen or are anticipated in the future, and the lead that was detected previously was likely caused by the well construction material. Mr. Gregson noted that the BA-4 site is scheduled for closure in April 2009.

L Range Update

Mr. Gregson reviewed soil sampling results from L Range, which was formerly used for training with 40-mm rifle grenades. He reminded the team of the UXO removal work at the range conducted by the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) robotics group, and noted that subsequent soil sampling involved the collection of 37 multi-increment soil samples from 23 areas. Sampling results showed explosives and low levels of perchlorate detected in shallow soils. RDX (at 0.02 parts per million [ppm] to 9.2 ppm) was found at eight locations and HMX (at 0.44 ppm to 9.7 ppm) at four locations, at levels that exceeded S-1/GW-1 standards. TNT exceeding the RCS-1 standard was found at four locations (at 0.19 ppm to 450 ppm). Mr. Gregson also noted that the detections occurred in the mid-range area, with up-range and down-range areas being clean. He said that the IAGWSP is recommending soil remedial actions at eight mid-range areas, which were shown in colors other than green on the figure titled "L Range Post-AFRL Soil Sample Results."

Mr. Gregson reviewed the soil treatment technologies being considered: excavation and off-site disposal; excavation and on-site asphalt batching; excavation and on-site thermal desorption; excavation and on-site treatment with DARAMend (a proprietary iron and carbon source); excavation and on-site treatment with lime; in-situ treatment with DARAMend; and in-situ treatment with lime. He said that each of the alternatives has its pros and cons, but currently the IAGWSP is looking most closely at on-site treatment with either DARAMend or lime. He also explained that this approach would involve excavating the soil, putting into treatment piles, treating the soil with the amendments, reaching cleanup goals, and putting the soils back in place.

Mr. Gregson also reviewed next steps: continue to evaluate treatment technologies with the agencies; implement soil treatment bench and pilot tests in spring and summer of 2009; and conduct the cleanup work later this year.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Mr. Harding asked if the thermal desorption option would be economically feasible for such a small project, and whether other excavation projects would be undertaken. Mr. Gregson replied that the IAGWSP is looking to excavate other sites, which would increase the economies of scale somewhat. He also noted, however, that the thermal desorption unit was used for a fairly large project at the base in the past, is the most costly option, and results in greenhouse gases. He noted, for example, that the unit was burning 17,000 gallons of propane a day, and suggested that other options might be better.

Ms. Sanderson said that EPA is happy to look at better options, but also mentioned that there are many engineering issues associated with them, such as managing moisture content and leachate. She also remarked that while the robotics effort was very successful, "it chewed up all the stuff," which is now in the soil. She then said that she thinks the current challenge is to work through the next steps of the pilot tests and look at how they should be conducted.

Ms. Valiela asked if this information had already been presented to the MMRCT. Mr. Gregson replied that similar slides were presented at the March 11, 2009 MMRCT meeting, and the team will probably be updated on the bench scale tests at the next meeting. Ms. Valiela then inquired about MMRCT comments on the alternatives. Mr. Gregson replied that one team member thought the DARAMend and lime approaches would be good. Some members expressed concern about the energy consumption

associated with the thermal desorption option, and one member was very against the asphalt batching option.

6-Month Look-Ahead

Mr. Gregson noted that the six-month look-ahead schedule includes community involvement activities, upcoming documents, and source removal actions. He also mentioned the following: the public comment period on the Demo 1 DD Addendum and BA-4 Disposal Site DD will occur in April, with the final DDs in June; the Western Boundary, Northwest Corner, and Demo 2 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) documents are scheduled to be completed in April, with a combined Remedy Selection Plan (RSP) for those sites issued in May, a public comment period in June, and a final DD in August; source removal actions at L Range and J-1 Range will occur over the summer, the RI/FS documents for those sites are being completed, the RSP will be issued in July, with a public comment period in August, and a final DD toward the end of the fiscal year; an investigation report regarding Former K Range (an old rocket range on the east side of the base) will be completed in July, with a public comment period in August and a DD in September; and the RI/FS for the Central Impact Area should be completed in August, with an RSP in September.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Ms. Valiela asked if the RI/FS and RSP for the Central Impact Area pertain just to soils. Mr. Gregson clarified that they are for both soil and groundwater. Ms. Valiela inquired about the acreage of the Central Impact Area. Mr. Gregson replied that it is 2,000 acres in size, but what is believed to be the current active source is a few acres in size. He also explained that the definition of the current active source is based on wells with detections at the water table – but doesn't take into account "future sources that haven't made it there yet or past sources that have already passed by that spot." Ms. Valiela recommended that a future SMB meeting include a thorough briefing on the Central Impact Area. Ms. Sanderson said that the IAGWSP's "ambitious" schedule amplifies the agency's need for an "integrated schedule and prioritization."

Mr. Dow asked how long it will take to design a study, conduct an RI/FS, and issue a DD (if necessary) for the Gun & Mortar Positions. Mr. Gregson replied that the Gun & Mortar Position DD is scheduled for next year. He also noted that the RI workplan should be finalized tomorrow, a final round of soil sampling will be conducted, and then the RI report will be written. Mr. Dow inquired about plans to investigate the groundwater under the sites. Mr. Gregson replied that the groundwater work for the RI has been completed, and no groundwater contaminants were detected. He also said that a number of wells and drive-points were installed as part of that groundwater investigation.

Ms. Valiela asked about the distance from the ground to the groundwater in the Central Impact Area. Mr. Gregson replied that it is about 100 feet.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano mentioned the question of "How clean is clean?" with respect to UXO, and suggested that the SMB be updated on UXO Working Group discussions and perhaps try to resolve the "how clean is clean" issue. She also said that she agrees with Mr. Gonser that "there are some competing interests in terms of tradeoffs that need to be discussed in the selection of a remedy and feeling comfortable with how much you can clean with regard to munitions that are currently existing at these particular areas."

Agenda Item #6. Installation Restoration Program Updates

Ashumet Valley and CS-10 ROD and Construction Update

Mr. Davis showed a map of the toe of the Ashumet Valley plume, pointed out Route 28, and noted that the selected remedy involves one new extraction well located in the middle of a residential neighborhood, with a short pipeline run to a mobile treatment unit (MTU) and discharge of the treated water into the Backus River via a surface water bubbler. He then showed a close-up view of the system layout, pointed out town property and private property, and confirmed that in the last few days the IRP obtained permission for access to the private property.

Mr. Davis reminded the group that it was determined that a revision of the Ashumet Valley Proposed Plan that was issued in the summer of 2007 was not needed, as the final remedy was actually a variation of EPA's and MassDEP's preferred remedy. He also mentioned that the public was notified of the Ashumet Valley Proposed Plan through the Plume Cleanup Team (PCT), the SMB, an Ashumet Valley public meeting, the Falmouth selectmen, and through the local media. Mr. Davis reported that the Ashumet Valley ROD language has been approved and early May is the target date for a signed ROD.

Mr. Davis then reported that: construction of the new extraction well is complete; verbal agreement regarding access for the MTU and bubbler was obtained on March 17, 2009 and the signed paperwork secured today; the project will be addressed at the April 22, 2009 meeting of the Falmouth Conservation Commission; paperwork outlining the project has been delivered to the Mashpee Wampanoag; and construction is scheduled to occur in the April through July timeframe.

Mr. Davis continued his presentation by reminding the group of the existing systems currently treating the Chemical Spill 10 (CS-10) plume and noted that the IRP had agreed on the need for an additional CS-10 plume extraction well on Currier Road, as well as an additional reinjection well near the former MMR sewage treatment plant. He reported that the construction work has been completed and the wells are operating, but the CS-10 ROD has not yet been signed. He then noted that the draft CS-10 Proposed Plan was issued on January 8, 2009, and was followed by a 30-day public comment period that yielded three comments from the public. The draft CS-10 ROD will be submitted to the regulatory agencies on April 7, 2009, and the target date for signing the ROD is July 2009.

Mr. Davis then showed a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) line graph entitled "Water Level near New CS-10 Extraction Well," and pointed out movements in the line that indicated when the extraction well began operating, when there was a power outage, when some snowmelt hit the aquifer, and the like. He said that water levels in the well can be watched on line, noting that the aquifer in that area is being closely evaluated because of the nearby phosphate plume, USGS research area, and the CS-10 plume. Mr. Davis concluded his presentation by showing several photographs of the construction work.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Ms. Valiela asked if any CS-10 contamination ever reached the south end of Ashumet Pond, or where the fairgrounds are located. Mr. Davis replied "not by the fairgrounds," but there are two monitoring wells under the Holly Reservation that define the southern lobe of the plume. He also said that the decision was made to forego treatment there "to right at the bottom of the aquifer." Ms. Valiela inquired about contaminant concentrations there. Mr. Davis replied that the highest concentration toward the top of the southern lobe is about 45 parts per billion (ppb), and towards the bottom the highest concentrations are in the single digits. He also noted that the conceptual model remains the same; that contamination will dilute and not travel very far. He further noted that there are monitoring wells on the fairgrounds. Ms. Valiela asked if there's a supply well on the fairgrounds. Mr. Davis

replied that he does not know, but noted that the IRP is conducting a verification program, looking at all wells in plume areas. He also said that the IRP could make a quick call to find out, if Ms. Valiela thinks there's a well there.

CS-19 Groundwater Proposed Plan and Community Involvement Activities

Mr. Davis reminded the group that the CS-19 plume – one of two sites in the northern part of the base that falls under the IRP – is located within the footprint of the Central Impact Area plume. He also noted that: it is an RDX plume; the current maximum concentration is 15 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$); the GW-1 standard for RDX is 1 $\mu\text{g/L}$; the historical maximum concentration is 21 $\mu\text{g/L}$. He further noted that the monitoring network is made of 10 wells that are sampled periodically and that perchlorate was also detected in the past, at a maximum of 1.4 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (the Massachusetts Maximum Contaminant Level [MCL] is 2 $\mu\text{g/L}$), but has not been detected for a couple of years.

Mr. Davis reported that the preferred remedy in the CS-19 Groundwater Proposed Plan is monitored natural attenuation (MNA), with Land Use Controls (LUCs) to prevent drilling in the area. He also noted that there had been a briefing on CS-19 Feasibility Study (FS) alternatives at the joint SMB/MMRCT meeting in November. He further noted that what was selected for CS-19 does not predetermine or limit remedial options for the Central Impact Area plume, for which there will be an appropriate action at a later date.

Mr. Davis then reported that: the MMRCT just finished its review (for readability) of the CS-19 Proposed Plan; the CS-19 public meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2009, as part of the MMRCT meeting; the public comment period on the Proposed Plan will run from April 9 through May 8, 2009; the public hearing on the plan will take place on May 6, 2009; the draft CS-19 ROD will be submitted to the agencies on May 21, 2009; and the target date for a signed ROD is by August 24, 2009.

6-Month Look-Ahead

Mr. Davis stated that the IRP's six-month look-ahead schedule brings the program to "remedy-in-place," a huge milestone for the DoD and for EPA. He then reviewed the schedule, noting that: the active source area removal at CS-19 is anticipated to continue through the end of May; the final CS-19 source area document will be a Draft Removal Action Report (in July 2009); the anticipated final document for CS-18 groundwater is a No-Further-Action DD (in August 2009); and CS-18 source area removal work is ongoing and a draft Removal Action Report is expected to be submitted to the regulators in July 2009. Mr. Davis reminded the group that the Ashumet Valley and CS-10 dates were already reviewed at this meeting, and also noted that the wind turbine construction is ongoing, with a commissioning ceremony anticipated sometime in September. He also reported that a joint fact sheet, based on the groundwater findings map, is expected to be issued at the end of June 2009, and a full Plume Booklet is expected to be issued toward the end of year.

Mr. Davis also mentioned that the program will soon be dealing with the "how clean is clean" issue with respect to a couple of the plumes. He noted, for example, that CS-4 plume concentrations are really dropping off in the extraction wells, and although there are still some above-MCL concentrations in the groundwater, the question will arise as to whether it's worthwhile to continue pumping "that last bit." He said that these kinds of decisions, which are really value judgments, will have to be addressed over the next few years, mainly with respect to the Southwest Plumes – and then later, with respect to Fuel Spill 1 (FS-1), Ashumet Valley, portions of FS-12, and so forth.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Ms. Valiela asked if the IRP has had any experience with this type of value judgment. Mr. Davis referred to the Storm Drain 5 (SD-5) plume, for which the decision was made to stop operation of the treatment system once it was no longer effective and allow the remainder of contamination to attenuate naturally. He noted that this had turned out to be a good decision. Ms. Valiela asked if the decision was coordinated with the regulators, and Mr. Davis confirmed that it was, noting that it was actually part of the ROD process to make that final decision.

Ms. Valiela informed the group that the “how clean is clean” question was a huge issue in the very early days of the cleanup program, and it was finally determined that cleanup should begin before that question could be answered. However, now the time has nearly arrived when this question must be answered, and while she thinks the communities would be comfortable knowing that the issue has been worked at the staff level, it may happen that agreement cannot be reached, in which case it might be worked out at an MMRCT or SMB meeting. Ms. Valiela added that she thinks this has been “a very interested meeting,” with topics raised that indicate that “there definitely is a role where dialogue is going to be needed.” Mr. Davis noted that he was thinking of using the CS-4 plume as a case study and developing a template for going forward on other plumes in the future.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano noted that whether state law is considered an Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement (ARAR) or not (applicable for this project), the “MCP does afford an opportunity to do precisely that...” She explained that there’s a point where cleanup is no longer cost effective from a financial/technological viewpoint, and there’s very clear guidance regarding the feasibility of achieving or attaining background. Ms. Garcia-Serrano said that “the state is willing to collaborate with all parties to ensure that we get to a point where we feel comfortable in terms of decisions with regard to how clean is clean for the constituents in the groundwater.” Mr. Davis said that it’s known that background will eventually be reached in this aquifer, so it’s really a time issue, deciding “where that pumping helps that timeframe to a point we think is valuable.”

Agenda Item #7. Public Health Issues

Survey on Fish Tumors in Mashpee Ponds

Ms. Steele stated that MDPH does occasionally get questions from the public on fish tumors observed in a catch – and brown bullhead is one that comes up with some frequency. She also said that consumption of these fish does not pose a health concern in the sense that there are any known health effects resulting from their consumption.

Ms. Steele also mentioned that she’s not certain that this was the question raised at the planning meeting, but she can report that several fish testing efforts have occurred at Ashumet Pond over the years, as early as 1992 and as recently as 1999. She said that there were at least four sampling rounds during this time period, all of which included brown bullhead (among other species such as yellow perch and large-mouth bass), with testing for contaminants including volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, PCBs, and metals. She reported that in no case did any concentration detected in the brown bullhead exceed health-based guidelines or warrant an advisory. She also mentioned, however, that there has been a mercury advisory for Ashumet Pond since about 2000, which recommends that sensitive populations (pregnant women, women of child-bearing age, and children) not eat fish from Ashumet Pond due to mercury contamination.

Ms. Steele also noted that MDPH has reviewed surface water and sediment sampling data since the early 2000s and has seen nothing that would indicate a concern about health effects in people who use

Ashumet Pond recreationally. She further stated that she has no idea what may be causing the tumors on the fish in Ashumet Pond, but in terms of eating the fish or any environmental data that's been reviewed in terms of human health issues, MDPH hasn't seen anything from Ashumet Pond that would cause one to conclude that health effects would be likely.

Questions and Comments from SMB and Public

Ms. Valiela asked if there was something discussed at the planning meeting that raised this issue. Ms. Sanderson explained that it came up in response to the USGS report with the "unbelievable" cover photo. Mr. Harding added that the USGS study involved sampling at several ponds and found Herring Pond (located on the border of Bourne and Plymouth) to be pretty clean. The study also found a high incidence of tumors on the fish from Ashumet and Santuit Ponds. He said that the issue is being discussed at the SMB because there was public concern "and that's what we're here for." Mr. Green noted that both Ashumet Pond and Santuit Pond (which is also in Mashpee) were "extremely phosphorus impacted," and while an alum treatment has been applied and an iron barrier installed at Ashumet Pond, no action has been taken at Santuit Pond thus far, although it is under study.

Ms. Steele mentioned that it's her understanding that the Department of Fisheries & Wildlife is planning to conduct additional sampling of the bullhead to determine if a large number of tumors are still being seen.

Agenda Item #8. SMB Meeting Schedule and Adjourn

Ms. Valiela stated that the SMB is scheduled to meet next on May 27, 2009 and she encouraged all SMB members to attend the next MMRCT meeting, on April 8, 2009. The SMB meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.