

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MICROSOFT TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES
FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2025**

INTRODUCTION

Lisa Shanahan (Resolution Consultants) opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. This meeting was in an online format with virtual attendees. Lisa Shanahan reviewed the Microsoft Teams tools for the meeting, including closed caption and screen layout options (Slide 3). Rachelle Knight (Navy) welcomed attendees to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the former Naval Air Station Brunswick (NASB). Rachelle reviewed the virtual only meeting information (Slide 4) and ground rules (Slide 5). Rachelle discussed the ways in which the public notice for the RAB meeting was published in local newspapers, posted to the Navy's website and the Town of Brunswick's website, distributed to the mailing list, and distributed to cable ads (Slide 5). Rachelle noted that the agencies can take questions any time and that the agency point of contacts (POCs) will be provided on a later slide. Rachelle reviewed the meeting agenda (Slide 6).

Restoration Advisory Board – Rachelle Knight (Slides 7-9)

Rachelle Knight summarized the information on Slide 7 about the RAB, including what a RAB is, who can participate, how often the Brunswick RAB meets, and who to contact with questions. Rachelle noted the Brunswick RAB meets three times per year in January, May, and September. Rachelle asked that all media inquiries be directed to the Base Realignment and Closure Act (BRAC) Program Management Office (PMO) Public Affairs Officer David Bennett. David Bennett's contact information is available on Slide 7.

Rachelle reviewed the RAB members (Slide 8) and explained that RAB members are expected to attend all meetings. Rachelle provided a reminder that interested parties may register for GovDelivery updates on the Navy's Brunswick website (Slide 9). Members of the public can self-subscribe to receive GovDelivery for updates. When signing up, users will receive email confirmation welcoming them as a new user and confirming their subscription selection. These confirmations will appear in two separate emails. Rachelle indicated that the Navy is working to provide a semi-annual newsletter to aid in communicating the status of the Navy's cleanup. The goal is to issue the newsletter twice per year, and the Navy is targeting Spring/Summer for the first release.

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 10)

Lisa provided instructions on how questions could be asked by online and phone-only attendees when Q&A slides appear.

Robert Mac Ewen provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Is the Navy providing ongoing performance evaluations of MRRA and its compliance with CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act) issues on properties transferred to them and of their management of CERCLA contaminants? For example; was the Navy aware that the annual airport inspections were not done on Hanger 4?”

Rachelle stated that, to the Navy’s knowledge, the Midcoast Regional Development Authority (MRRA) is not conducting a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) clean-up. Rachelle was unable to answer the latter portion of the question regarding the annual airport inspections but stated that a response would be provided in the meeting minutes.

Post meeting addition: *The Navy continues coordination of land use controls with all property owners including MRRA following property transfer. Annual airport fire protection inspections are not part of the CERCLA cleanup being conducted by the Navy. Navy had not been informed by MRRA of the status of, nor results of, annual inspections at the Hangar.*

Josh provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“considering the wide spread wind distribution at the time of the foam release, is it safe to walk my dog, what if he drinks from a puddle?”

Rachelle stated that this question is not for the RAB to answer because the RAB reports on the status of Navy cleanup. According to Rachelle, this question was asked in a public forum held immediately after the release. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provided a response, which Rachelle said would be provided in the meeting minutes.

Post meeting addition: *Following the release of the foam from Hangar 4, Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) was issuing Press Releases on their website in which several of the press releases included the following statement from the Maine CDC: “The Maine CDC advises the public to exercise caution and abstain from any recreational activities (such as swimming, boating, and wading) that may come into contact with the foam or waters until the possible effects of the AFFF release on waterbodies in the vicinity have been thoroughly evaluated.”*

Robert Mac Ewen expressed concern over MRRA’s confidence with taking over properties that contain toxic waste. Robert also questioned why, given the per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) release that occurred in August 2024, the Navy has not installed a PFAS filter station either above or below the settling ponds instead of relying on the settling ponds alone that may leach into the groundwater.

Rachelle stated that the Navy has expanded the PFAS investigation to include stormwater indicating that the Navy is evaluating the current condition of the stormwater system, which will lend itself to the different filtration media that may do what Robert had described. Rachelle stated that the Navy is very early in this process and there is more data to be collected. Additionally, Rachelle noted that the Navy has installed extraction well EW-11 in the highest concentration area of PFAS at the former base. It was noted that EW-11 has been brought online (but not currently operating).

David Page asked when the numerical data from the 2022 and 2023 Remedial Investigation (RI) would be available.

Rachelle stated that the Navy provided the electronic data deliverable to MEDEP and that they have been using this as the conduit to share that data. With regard to producing a report, the Navy has received the same feedback from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and is prioritizing producing a report to release that data as soon as possible. In the short term, the data is available in the slides, and they are expanding their data collection effort.

Peggy Siegle provided a comment in the meeting chat and asked the question virtually:

“Is there a release of legacy Navy PFOS-based AFFF foam which still exists on the property, which MRRA just confirmed for the Town exists in Hangar 6 will the Navy respond for contamination related issues should there be a release of their contaminant?”

Rachelle stated that Hangar 6 has aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) in the hangar, but the Navy would not respond if there was a release of AFFF from the hangar. However, during the PFAS RI the Navy identified concentrations of PFAS below the building (i.e., in the soil and groundwater). The Navy is in the process of investigating the source of this release.

MAJOR SITE ACTIVITY UPDATES

Historical & Ongoing Navy PFAS Efforts – Caryn DeJesus & Dustin Moore (Slides 11-20)

PFAS Remedial Investigation Update (Slides 11-12)

Caryn DeJesus (Resolution Consultants) provided an update on the PFAS RI (Slide 11) and presented the nine PFAS Reporting Areas identified in the 2020 PFAS Investigation Summary Report (Slide 12). The PFAS Reporting Areas are primarily based on groundwater divides, groundwater flow, and source areas. The RI used these same reporting areas, noting that Area 5 and Area 9 were expanded to capture the entire base boundary. Additional PFAS investigations are planned in Areas 1, 8, and 9.

Hangar 6 Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) (Slide 13)

Caryn provided an update on AFFF at Hangar 6. Hangar 6, which is located between PFAS Reporting Areas 1 and 7, houses a fire suppression system which uses AFFF. Although no historical releases were documented during the 2013 preliminary assessment, approximately 2 to 3 accidental releases are thought to have occurred. Results from the RI indicate PFAS in groundwater above project screening levels in the vicinity of Hangar 6. Additional investigations are planned to assess PFAS impacts in the vicinity of Hangar 6 (Slide 13) and will be discussed later in the presentation.

Stormwater at former NAS Brunswick (Slides 14-20)

Dustin Moore (Tetra Tech) provided an update on stormwater at former Naval Air Station (NAS) Brunswick (Slide 14) and presented an overview of the basewide stormwater system (Slide 15).

Dustin discussed the stormwater Conceptual Site Model (CSM) (Slide 16) and presented an example CSM figure showing how contaminants may be transported through various site media (Slide 17). Dustin reviewed previous stormwater investigations at former NAS Brunswick and explained that the Navy is beginning the process of completing a stormwater evaluation (Slide 18). The Navy expects the stormwater system evaluation to be completed in several phases, including an evaluation of surface runoff/stormwater catchment areas, a stormwater system condition assessment, a closed-circuit television (CCTV) video camera survey of the stormwater system, and a stormwater baseflow evaluation (Slide 19). Dustin presented a figure showing the area for which the stormwater system evaluation will be completed, noting that the area includes the stormwater system that discharges to Ponds A and B of the former Picnic Pond Stormwater Retention System (Slide 20).

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 21)

Lisa provided instructions on how questions could be asked by online and phone-only attendees when Q&A slides appear.

Ralph Keyes provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Who is studying the impact of the AFFF release on area wildlife (terrestrial, estuarine and marine) as well as the impact on area community residents who grow their own food and raise chickens and other livestock on their properties? There is a rich hunting tradition in the area, and deer and turkey commonly move in and out of the known AFFF-impacted areas. Waterfowl are hunted in the Harpswell Cove estuary. Numerous invertebrate and vertebrate freshwater and marine creatures are targeted by local area commercial and recreational harvesters. Can we expect enhanced and continued monitoring of AFFF-related toxin levels in these organisms? How will any of this information be shared with gardeners, farmers, gleaners, hunters and marine growers and harvesters?”

Rachelle stated that this comment is related to the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) which is conducted as part of the RI and embedded within the CERCLA process. Mike Daly (USEPA) concurred that this comment would fall within the jurisdiction of the Risk Assessment, which includes the ERA and a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA). The Navy has started to collect biota tissue data, and Mike noted that Brunswick Area Citizens for a Safe Environment (BACSE) has performed some of the earliest work regarding biota tissue. A more robust data set has been collected for fish and shellfish within Harpswell Cove and for fish within freshwater drainage areas that ultimately discharge to Harpswell Cove. Additionally, the State has issued “do not eat” advisories for freshwater fish on much of the base. Mike also pointed out that prior to the AFFF spill, the Navy identified baseline contamination in all media that has been studied by the Navy (i.e., soil, groundwater, surface water, biota). According to Mike, a lot of the baseline contamination identified by the Navy was the result of historic releases over the base’s operational history. Unfortunately, there is now an overlay of the AFFF spill that will need to be considered through the CERCLA process. Rachelle addressed the question of how information will be shared, stating that the Navy has an Administrative Record online where the documents are posted. People are welcome to reach out to Rachelle directly for assistance with accessing documents or navigating the Administrative Record.

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“I am a Brunswick resident whose Well was polluted. The DEP test result of Hangar 6 coming in at of over 20 Thousand ppt - how will the Navy's investigation with respect to Fosts be handled and is it safe for land to be transferred? How can MRRA be able to deem a site "clean"? part 2- Given the test results from the DEP on Hangar will the Navy offer to aid in the shutdown of Hangar 6 and offer MRRA the opportunity to hand over all AFFF? Thank you.”

Rachelle asked Caryn to explain the difference between the shallower groundwater and where they expect to find drinking water in the wells. Caryn stated that the groundwater near Hangar 6, where PFAS was detected, is in shallow groundwater. This is based on releases from overland on the ground surface or potentially from shallow underground sources, and this groundwater is much higher underground than what would be in a private drinking water well. The majority of the private drinking water wells are typically bedrock wells in this area which are hundreds of feet deep. These are generally not from the same groundwater layer, which are referred to as aquifers. Rachelle stated that her contact information will be provided on the last slide of the presentation if Petunia would like to reach out regarding their well.

Rachelle asked that the question related to the FOSTs be held until Rachelle reviews the slide addressing FOSTs.

David Page provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“There are big gaps in the areas covered by the current RI, particularly the North, West and eastern near off base areas. These gaps are based on untested assumptions, like the assumption that the Town Water supply would be somehow protected by the infamous bedrock ridge. Historical records also show that there are likely PFOS-contaminated areas west of the runways.”

Rachelle stated that the Navy expects that the Hangar 6 investigation and the stormwater evaluation will aid in fulfilling the data gaps noted by David. Rachelle stated that a model is worthy of more discussion but that the Navy is embarking on more investigation to understand how groundwater and surface water are flowing across Brunswick Landing. The steps presented by Dustin and Caryn are steps that have been in motion for some time.

Haley provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“I am on the North end and what was reported about the North side, I have concerns. I would like the Navy to test a radius, especially around the east, south, and north side, of testing. And I'd like to see blood testing, soil testing, and any streams and vernal pools that are not being currently tested. Myself and many neighbors have been ill with a variety of illnesses, many related to PFAS and/or heavy metal poisoning, and I'd like to make sure our health is okay, especially with Hanger 6. When gardening, I become ill. With knowing what the numbers are at the Jordan Ave Wellfield, and the "inconsistency" with the well results, we should all have testing available since the Navy is at fault.

I guess ultimately my question, is what testing will the Navy be doing more than what they have planned, now we know more about Hanger 6 and the groundwater migration at the North end.”

Rachelle stated that some of this testing Haley discussed is outside of the purview of this project, however, Rachelle told Haley that she will follow-up to address her questions.

Jeffery Jordan provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Would it be possible to put some time frame around this stormwater evaluation process?”

Rachelle stated that the Navy is working on the evaluation, but they are unsure of the timeline due to the amount of data involved. The Navy will keep the public posted on the timeline of the evaluation through the RAB meetings and the syncs with MRRA.

Town of Brunswick provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“When is the stormwater evaluation expected to be complete?”

Rachelle emphasized that stormwater is complex in that they are dealing with a few different things at once. The infrastructure is changing as a result of redevelopment, so they are trying to get a baseline for the condition of the system to help understand how that water is infiltrating and getting into the groundwater. The condition of the infrastructure is key, but the Navy has also learned from construction contractors that the stormwater system has breaches at certain locations by design. The baseline goal is to understand the condition of the system and how that system was designed to function, then they will incorporate sampling into that evaluation. The evaluation also includes wet weather and dry weather events which can be tricky, but the Navy is invested in the process and will keep the public informed.

Carol White asked if the Navy is planning to issue a supplemental RI Work Plan prior to undertaking the work so that everyone can understand what the Navy is doing, and if so, what the process would be to do this. Carol also asked if the Navy has considered a Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) or a non-Time Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) to treat the stormwater in the interim prior to completion of the RI.

Rachelle stated that the Navy does not plan to modify the RI Work Plan. However, a work plan will be developed for the investigations in and around Hangar 6 and on the north side of the base. This process began recently so there will be more information to follow. Regarding interim actions, RIs provide information that allow the Navy to take interim actions. The Navy has started to plan for these interim actions, but first the Navy needs the data to determine what these interim actions would be. So yes, interim actions are being considered but the Navy does not know what they are yet. Mike Daly added to the conversation, stating that in regard to the documentation, the entire work plan does not necessarily need to be updated. Work plan addendums or technical memorandums can be issued instead.

Jane Arbuckle provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Has there been any sampling of peat in the Mare Brook saltmarsh for PFAS? Any plans to do that?”

Dustin Moore stated that there were not any samples collected for peat within the salt marsh. Samples were collected for fish tissue and from surface water, but samples were not collected from the peat itself. Rachelle stated that the Navy has quite a bit of evaluation and data collection planned but she does not have an answer for Jane at the moment regarding peat sampling.

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“What is the Navy's plan and timeframe to repair and replace the aged storm water system that is as old as the 40's? in order to protect the environment and human beings?”

Rachelle stated that the repair and replacement of the stormwater system is not part of the Navy's plan. There may be opportunities in the future for this, but the Navy is still very early in this process. Rachelle emphasized that the goal of this cleanup program is to protect human health and the environment.

David Page provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Was the Navy made aware in 2012 of the 2000 gallon release of Ansulite in Hangar 6. How does the replacement of that with PFOS-based AFFF from Hangar 4 affect the current RI?”

Rachelle stated that she does not know the answer to the first part of David's question but that she will work on getting an answer. As for the second part of the question, it does not affect the RI. This is because hazardous material stored in a container for its intended purpose does not constitute a release to the environment. The RI is evaluating the nature and extent of releases to the environment, so there is no impact on the latter part.

Post meeting addition: During the PFAS preliminary assessment, historical documents were reviewed, and interviews were conducted with former staff, including the former deputy fire chief. Based on this information, while the exact dates and volume of releases were unknown, it was reported that two to three accidental releases of AFFF from the fire suppression system likely occurred at Hangar 6. Therefore, the Navy is aware of potential releases, but the exact date and volume were not identified.

James Ecker provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“When will the Navy's "Hangar 6" investigation be done (rough timeframe)?”

Rachelle stated that the Navy does not have a timeline, but they should have more information on this at the May RAB. The Navy is preparing the preliminary documentation and the desktop review to determine what the field effort will look like, so it is underway, but there are additional components that need to be prepared before a timeline can be provided. This timeline would include

the field effort, turnaround times for sampling, evaluation of data, and eventually production of the report.

Joel provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“In addition to airport employees there are a lot of construction workers putting up homes and apartment buildings around the former base right now. Is OSHA hazardous waste training in place for these workers who may come into contact with hazardous substances like PFOA and PFOS? e.g. is there hazardous waste training, OSHA compliant health & safety plans, chemical safety officer, Material Safety Data Sheets on file, things of that nature to protect workers? When Hangar 4 was originally leased to MRRRA, did the Navy ensure all safety equipment/PPE was on site?”

Rachelle stated that employers are typically responsible for meeting the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirement, so this is not an action the Navy would take. Rachelle noted that construction workers are a part of the HHRA, but for PFAS they are currently in the RI phase and the Risk Assessment is not complete. Rachelle suggested that Joel reach out to her directly for more information on this, if needed.

Historical & Ongoing Navy PFAS Efforts, continued – Caryn DeJesus & Derek Pinkham (Slides 22-26)

Off-Property PFAS Drinking Water Sampling (Slides 22-23)

Caryn provided an update on off-property PFAS drinking water sampling, including a brief history of off-property private drinking water well PFAS sampling. The Navy has historically sampled for PFAS in off-property private drinking water wells in 2016 and 2020/2021 in areas that have the potential for PFAS-impacts related to historical operations at former NAS Brunswick. The Navy plans to conduct sampling in the same areas that were historically sampled, which are the areas north and east of the former base boundary, but property owners can reach out to the Navy to discuss whether sampling is warranted at their property.

Sampling requires permission from the property owner via an access agreement. A questionnaire will also be provided to the property owner to gather information regarding the private well and any treatment systems being used (Slide 22). The property owner will be contacted by the Navy’s contractor, Resolution Consultants, to schedule an appointment once they have granted permission for the Navy to sample their property. The Navy plans to conduct sampling in early 2025. Sampling should take one hour or less to complete, and individual results will be provided to the property owner (Slide 23).

Jordan Avenue Wellfield PFAS Source Identification (Slide 24)

Caryn discussed the Jordan Avenue Wellfield PFAS Source Identification, stating that PFAS-containing AFFF related to fire suppression systems and operations (e.g., Hangar 6) located upgradient from the Jordan Avenue Wellfield may be a potential source of PFAS to the Jordan Avenue Wellfield. A desktop evaluation of historical PFAS investigations conducted by the Navy

between Hangar 6 and the Jordan Avenue Wellfield has begun. The evaluation will identify any data gaps and propose additional investigations, if necessary (Slide 24).

Jordan Avenue Wellfield (Slide 25)

Derek Pinkham (Navy) provided an update on activities at Jordan Avenue Wellfield. The Navy and Brunswick/Topsham Water District (BTWD) are operating under an Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) for treatment plant upgrades valued at \$21,000,000. The upgrades will be conducted in two phases. Phase I included supporting the current action of hydraulic containment using the lower wellfield and the design of a treatment system, which was completed in early 2024. Phase II, which was awarded in mid-2024, supports the construction of the PFAS treatment system. A Notice to Proceed was issued to the contractor by BTWD in late Summer 2024, and construction began in Fall 2024 (Slide 25).

Hangar 4 Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) (Slide 26)

Derek discussed Hangar 4 AFFF, stating that a total of 14,150 gallons of rinse water and AFFF concentrate have been removed from the Hangar 4 fire suppression system and transported to a CERCLA Subtitle C Landfill in Emelle, Alabama. Contractors de-mobilized from the site on November 6, 2024 (Slide 26).

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 27)

Lisa provided instructions on how questions could be asked by online and phone-only attendees when Q&A slides appear.

Robert Mac Ewen asked if there is any plan to extend the PFAS drinking water sampling to include Princes Point Road and the side roads extending off Princes Point Road due to the number of positive PFAS test results in this area. Caryn explained that the areas that have been historically sampled were downgradient from PFAS-impacted areas. The two primary areas include the area north of the former base boundary but east of the Jordan Avenue Wellfield and the area east of the Eastern Plume area with the active Groundwater Extraction Treatment System (GWETS). As of right now, the Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) that is being developed will cover these areas in particular. However, Caryn stated that if you are outside of these areas, it is recommended that you contact Rachelle at the Navy to discuss whether or not your property can be included in the program.

Rachelle explained that the Navy is asking Robert and others to contact the Navy directly so that they can look at the specific properties and explain in detail why the property was/was not included in the sampling program. The Navy considers private well information to be private, so this information will be disclosed to property owners only. Rachelle encouraged anyone with concerns to reach out to discuss their property.

Peggy Siegle provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Landing tenants and employees working on the Landing needed material safety data sheets to refer to when the August 19 spill occurred. Are those MSDS available now?”

Rachelle explained that this is not a question that the Navy can answer. The employer is responsible for providing safety data sheets.

David Page provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Is the Navy aware of the results of the 7/29/24 MEDEP sampling of Hangar 6 effluent yielding a high PFOS level = 20,600 ng/L)). There are important Occupational Health and Safety implications to this because PFOS is now on the CERCLA list.”

Rachelle stated that the Navy has always handled PFAS in accordance with CERCLA. Rachelle is unaware of whether the Navy was aware of the results that David referenced. Regarding Occupational Health and Safety, Rachelle stated that construction workers or other workers that might be exposed to contaminants are considered during the Human Health Risk Assessment. Rachelle clarified that this is only regarding the cleanup, not the operation of an active hangar that sits with the employer.

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“MRRA sent the Navy a letter 1/15/2025 advising there as never been a mapping of the geology or hydrology for Brunswick Landing . Yet they continue to state contamination cannot travel as far as our location. Respectfully, How are you able to state with any degree of certainty that the surface water at Hangar 6 is not travelling/migrating to wells on Coombs road or other locations? My well is not hundreds of feet deep and a DEP test result of 23ppt came back in December to a neighbor 1 plot away and Hangar 6 is still leaking. Thank you.”

Caryn explained that groundwater divides were identified as part of the initial PFAS investigations in 2013. There are certain areas where groundwater flows to the north. At Hangar 6, groundwater flows north towards the Jordan Avenue Wellfield. However, there are several areas, primarily on the industrialized portion of the base, that are in a separate groundwater divide area. Groundwater in these areas flows southeast, ultimately towards the Picnic Pond System. Groundwater flow information is gathered by collecting depth to water from monitoring wells across the base. Caryn clarified that the groundwater in the area of Hangar 6 is not flowing south towards the Coombs Road area.

Iver McLeod (MEDEP) added to Caryn’s response, stating that MRRA’s letter may be referring to the fact that there is not one unified document which maps the geology or hydrology over the entire base. Iver noted that the PFAS Summary Report gets close to this, though, and that the Navy has been studying the base and the groundwater hydrology since former NAS Brunswick became a CERCLA site in 1987. Iver explained that the monitoring wells provide groundwater elevations which allow for the interpretation of flow direction. Iver also noted that the Navy has bored a lot of the wells through the soil, the overburden (the soil on top of the bedrock), and into the bedrock, which has provided a good understanding on soil at the sites. Iver explained that because all the reporting at former NAS Brunswick is done separately by site, they do not have one overarching document, but they do have a good understanding of groundwater flow. In terms of where the AFFF spill occurred, a major hydrogeologic study was performed by the Navy at the Eastern Plume in the 1990s because the Navy was aware of contamination in this area related to solvents in groundwater.

The Navy installed a pump and treat system which extracts the groundwater, pulls it from its normal flow path, and pumps it through the system to treat it.

Chris provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“MRRA just corrected the AFFF inventory for Hangar 6. It seems to say different kinds of AFFF are combined together in the same container, with no secondary containment. Was that also the case for the AFFF that spilled from Hangar 4? Do the AFFF Material Safety Data Sheets say it is proper to mix AFFF from different manufacturers like this (3M light water and Ansulite)?”

Rachelle stated that the Navy is unable to answer this question because they do not manage the operations within the hangars.

Jane Arbuckle provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“A follow up to the earlier question: Could peat sampling be added to the sampling plans? We are planning marsh restoration which will involve digging runnels to improve the hydrology of the marsh. (which has been messed up by colonial ditching and creation of embankments)”

Rachelle stated that she does not have enough information to answer this question but asked that Jane reach out to her directly. Rachelle and her team work with Ashley Charleston as part of the restoration. Rachelle explained that the Sampling and Analysis Plans are developed to establish data quality objectives, so if this is consistent with the goals of the investigation that they seek to embark on, then yes, it could be included.

Robert Mac Ewen provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“With high number of drilled wells on Princes Point Rd reporting PFAS/PFOS contamination it seems prudent to extend the well water investigation to Princes Point Rd and the many spurs off of it?”

Rachelle explained that the Navy will go where the data takes them, but it needs to be consistent with the contamination that is associated with the Navy’s former operations. Rachelle encouraged Robert to reach out to her directly to discuss.

Jane Nichols-Ecker provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“When does the Navy, in conjunction with MRRA, plan to remove the still existing AFFF at the former NAS? What”

Rachelle explained that the Navy does not own the hangars at the air station that hold AFFF. The Navy owns Hangar 4, where AFFF removal has been completed. The Navy does not take action on transferred properties outside of the cleanup.

Joel provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“In the aftermath of the August 2024 AFFF spill, is the Navy committed to provide clean water to nearby residents with private wells if PFAS levels rise above the current Department of Defense action levels?”

Rachelle explained that there is a prioritized order per the guidance, including providing connections to the public water system, installing whole house treatment systems, providing point of use treatment system, and providing bottled water. According to Rachelle, none of the wells sampled by Navy or MEDEP has reached that action level. Rachelle asked that any residents who believe their well may have reached this action level to reach out to the Navy.

Suzanne Johnson provided the following comments in the meeting chat:

“What sharing of private well data is being done between the Navy and DEP. DEP has made their information public. Will the Navy do that as well?”

“Is there a workplan for review of the Jordan Avenue Wellfield? I've never heard the concept of desktop evaluation. What parties are involved in this?”

Rachelle stated that the Navy will not make private drinking water well information public. The Navy/DoD have different policies regarding private wells than MEDEP; the Navy does not release private well information without written consent from the property owner. Rachelle stated that she would provide Suzanne with a link to this policy.

Rachelle explained that when they are discussing work plans, they are discussing sampling and analysis plans which establish the data quality objectives. There is no plan to develop this for the Jordan Avenue Wellfield. The Navy has an action, the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, which is the \$21 million treatment plant being constructed by the water district. The Navy is just the funder for this project so there is no work plan associated with it. In terms of desktop evaluation, Navy consultants are performing a desktop evaluation to evaluate the source of contamination at the Jordan Avenue Wellfield which will inform their planned field work and investigation.

The Navy has taken an immediate action to address the wells today, but they still want to address the source that is migrating from the Air Station.

Land Use Control (LUC) Compliance Activities – Caryn DeJesus (Slides 28-30)

LUC Compliance (Slide 28)

Caryn provided an update on Land Use Control (LUC) compliance activities at former NAS Brunswick. The 2024 certification forms, which are for property owners to acknowledge and adhere to existing conditions associated with the property (i.e., LUCs), will be mailed by the end of January 2025 with the addition of a LUC fact sheet. Open Houses are scheduled for March 18-19, 2025. Caryn explained that approval must be obtained prior to the start of construction activities for properties on Brunswick Landing. The Navy requests these be completed, signed, and returned by late March 2025 (Slide 28).

CERCLA LUC Inspections (Slides 29-30)

Caryn explained that LUC inspections are required annually for Sites 1 and 3, Site 2, Site 7, Site 9, Site 12, Site 17, the Eastern Plume, and the Quarry Area (Slide 29). The 2023 LUC inspection recommended well repairs and the installation of additional No Trespassing signs throughout the sites. These well repairs have been conducted, and 10 additional No Trespassing signs have been installed in the vicinity of Picnic Pond (Slide 30).

LUC Compliance & Redevelopment Activities – Caryn DeJesus (Slide 31)

Reminder for Construction Permission Process (Slide 31)

Caryn provided a reminder for the construction permission process for within Brunswick Landing, stating that if planned construction activities involve any soil displacement and/or potential contact with groundwater, the Navy, in consultation with USEPA and MEDEP, must provide approval before the Town of Brunswick will approve a construction permit. Caryn provided a link to the Brunswick Landing Construction Permission Request form in the presentation. Completed forms are submitted to MRRA for review, after which the Navy will review and approve the request. To date, 50 forms have been submitted and approved (Slide 31).

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 32)

David Page provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“David Page: Will the Navy refill the fire suppression system with PFAS-free AFFF before the transfer of Hangar 4 to MRRA? This is important because there is concern that the system could be refilled from unused PFAS-based AFFF stocks from Hangar 7.”

Rachelle stated that the Navy has no intention of refilling any containers with AFFF, PFAS-free or otherwise.

Keith and Denise Meiler provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“And Coombs Rd please”

Rachelle asked Keith and Denise to provide more information related to this comment in the chat.

Steven Levesque (MRRA) explained that the goal of MRRA is to remove all PFAS-containing AFFF materials in all of the hangars. This is an expensive endeavor, so MRRA is looking at federal, state, and other resources for support with removing and replacing the PFAS-containing AFFF. In response to David Page’s last question regarding Hangar 4, MRRA does not intend to use Hangar 4 with a foam system.

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Regarding transfer of property of and near Hangar 4 and Hangar 6 or the hangars themselves, - how to you classify, address the substantially contaminated ground water that exists under both hangars? Part 2- How is remediation of this contamination impacted if there are ongoing commercial operations and development- for example a 10T hangar planned with MRRRA's Airport Expansion Plan. Thank you”

In response to the first part, Rachelle explained that there is a groundwater use restriction across Brunswick Landing, meaning that anyone who encounters groundwater requires written approval from the Navy to do so. The construction permission request form should be used to gain approval. These are reviewed several times a month. In response to the second part of the question, Rachelle stated that the Navy actively works with the developers and construction contractors. For instance, a construction contractor will come in with a plan. As they are developing their plan, their technical team will typically perform geotechnical work where they identify where they expect to encounter groundwater. The Navy has extensive knowledge and information about where groundwater exists across Brunswick Landing. So, through a combination of those efforts, the Navy will work with that redeveloper, usually the property owner and the contractor, to identify where they are digging, whether or not they will encounter groundwater, and whether or not that groundwater is impacted by PFAS or any other contaminant. As of late, it is largely PFAS, and in order to pump groundwater, the contractor will need written permission from the Navy, with coordination of MEDEP and EPA, to confirm that they are not causing or moving or making the groundwater conditions at Brunswick Landing worse than they already are. Rachelle stated that this is time consuming but that the Navy has developed a good relationship with the contractors. The Navy has personnel on-site that monitor activities, so if any unapproved activities are observed, the team will be notified. The Navy will engage with the property owner and/or contractor to make sure they fulfill the necessary steps to secure the approval.

James Ecker provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Will the Navy suspend any further property transfers until the Remedial Investigation for PFAS is completed and appropriate LUCs developed? Our understanding is existing LUC's do not fully address PFAS since it was only recently designated a CERCLA contaminant. Please respond.”

Rachelle confirmed that it is true PFAS was recently designated as a CERCLA contaminant and that the Navy recognizes they have work to do on the LUCs. The dominant media affected by PFAS is groundwater. Across Brunswick Landing, there is a groundwater use restriction. If the Navy were further along in the CERCLA process with PFAS, it is likely that the remedy would also include the same groundwater use restriction that exists currently. Rachelle emphasized that LUCs are a layering effect – they have LUCs as stated in the deed, the construction permission request process which is embedded in the Town of Brunswick permit approval process, team members on the ground monitoring site activities and reporting any non-compliant site activities back to the technical team, plus contractors to support Navy cleanup efforts. They also have at least one of the regulators actively on Brunswick Landing which provides a point at which they can understand and glean information about managing LUCs. Finally, the annual LUC inspections provide “boots on the ground” to monitor these activities that are occurring across Brunswick Landing. Property owners also are required to certify that they are managing their LUCs consistent with the deed. The forms sent out are expected to be sent at the end of the month for property owners to acknowledge their

understanding that LUCs exists on their property. The Navy does not just rely on one mechanism for LUCs across Brunswick Landing.

Robert Mac Ewen provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“One of my new neighbors on Princes Point Rd just completed construction this fall and had a new well drilled in September. The test results came back with very high levels of PFAS and PFOS. I find this result very telling because this well is brand new at a new house with a new septic system that hasn't even been utilized. This means that any detected infiltration is coming from elsewhere. I would argue that it is very likely coming from the base.”

Rachelle explained that the Navy will work with the property owners if they have concerns about their test results. From the information shared by Robert, Rachelle stated that she cannot answer questions as to where the contamination is likely coming from. If Robert would like to reach out, Rachelle stated that they can look at the property along with what they know about the conceptual site model, and they can talk through whether they think sampling is warranted at the property.

Joel provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Given that substantial discharge into the Brunswick Sewer District is confirmed from DEP tests near the PFAS contamination you have discussed around Hangar 6, could the EPA wastewater pretreatment authority for PFAS offer a path to mitigate the ongoing impacts to the Androscoggin River from this contamination?”

Rachelle stated that this is possible. Under the Clean Water Act, wastewater treatment plants have treatment requirements and effluent limits. It could be a path, but regardless, it does not stop the Navy's efforts to address source areas from legacy contamination that it created.

Picnic Pond Sediment Remedial Action – Derek Pinkham (Slides 33-35)

Derek discussed the sediment removal action conducted at Picnic Pond in accordance with the September 2020 Record of Decision (ROD). The remedy stated in the ROD includes removal of impacted sediments in the three impacted ponds, Pond A, Pond B, and Picnic Pond. The sediments were impacted with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides, and lead. During the RI, perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) were evaluated as part of the HHRA. PFOA and PFOS were not identified as sediment contaminants of concern (COCs) (Slide 33).

Dredging was conducted between 2022 and 2023. To date, a total of 9,635 tons of sediment has been dredged and disposed off-site at a RCRA Subtitle C landfill. Approximately 1,300 cubic yards of sediment remains on-site awaiting disposal. Water generated during the dredging work was containerized, stabilized, and treated at the on-site construction dewatering system. Post-dredging confirmatory sample results from Pond A and Picnic Pond indicated that the remedial goals for the project were met, and no further dredging was necessary (Slide 34).

Further evaluation of the samples collected from Pond B was necessary to confirm that no excessive risk from the remaining sediment was present. This risk evaluation will be included in the Remedial

Action Completion Report (RACR). The sediment from Pond B will be transported and disposed once additional funding is received by the Navy. The dredging contractor has begun developing the RACR for this remedial action and will complete the document once all the remedial activities have been completed. The RACR will include a summary of the work performed, along with documentation of the post-excavation sampling, sediment disposal, and data evaluation (Slide 35).

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 36)

Lisa provided instructions on how questions could be asked by online and phone-only attendees when Q&A slides appear.

Rachelle acknowledged that she missed the following comment from Ralph Keyes in the meeting chat:

“Thank you for addressing my earlier question about the impact of the August spill on area flora and fauna. As a follow-up to the last part of my question about how area residents might be notified about contamination findings - It was suggested that information could be found on a specific website. Do we expect the casual turkey hunter, the backyard hobby gardener, or the recreational Harpswell Cove clam digger to know about this website resource, or can you do a better job at publicizing the potential dangers associated with harvesting and consuming organisms impacted by the contamination? Thank you”

Rachelle stated that the Navy works together with the regulators. The Navy provides the data to the regulators, who then provide the data to the Maine CDC. This is how the fish consumption advisory came about. Rachelle invited people to reach out to her with ideas on how the Navy can communicate more effectively and recognized that not everyone has access to the online posts.

Chris provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“How are construction projects being monitored for impacts to groundwater and to ensure that the soil is free of PFAS and other hazards? For example there is a large construction project adjacent to Site 7 near Katahdin Drive. Many trees taken down and there are large piles of removed soil. We emailed the Navy a couple months ago but did not hear anything back. If removed soil is not cleared of PFAS, who monitors to ensure that children or animals do not interact with potentially contaminated soil sitting on the property?”

Rachelle stated that she has not had a chance to get back to Chris. Rachelle reminded the audience that construction projects are also subject to regulatory oversight, including stormwater, which addresses the runoff but also addresses inevitably PFAS, or the control thereof. The project is required to go through the construction permission form process. They are on site treating groundwater and were required to provide models showing that their technology is effective. We know it is effective because it is the same treatment that the Navy uses at the groundwater treatment plant and at installations across the country, but it is still incumbent upon the project owner to prove that to the Navy, MEDEP, and EPA. The Navy is monitoring this project very closely. The project owner is required to submit daily reports to both MRRA and the Navy, which are also shared with MEDEP and EPA.

Iver McLeod returned to the question posed by Ralph Keyes. Iver explained that at least with the commercial shellfish harvesters, Maine Department of Marine Resources (DMR) has closed Upper Harpswell Cove. The commercial harvesters do pay attention to these DMR closures, which Iver believes are posted on-site in addition to online. As for the hunters, the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife (INFW) received the biota and surface water data that was collected from the spill. They are the ones who will determine whether there needs to be a hunting advisory or do not eat advisory for deer and turkey. Iver was unsure of the best way to inform the hunters of advisories, noting that hunting is not allowed on the base but there is hunting around the base.

Chris provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Can you clarify who is responsible for sharing LUC information with renters and prospective tenants? (HOAs, landlords, Navy, DEP? Or nobody?) Will there be efforts to inform all residents about LUC?”

Rachelle stated that, generally speaking, the homeowner associations (HOAs) have been difficult to navigate because they function in different ways. The Navy has been engaged with the town manager who has helped with this. At the last Open House, the Navy engaged with one HOA president and another at the Spring 2024 RAB meeting. According to Rachelle, they seemed like they would help with the HOA, but the Navy has not received much feedback. As for property owners, they can manage the LUCs in different ways. For example, a property owner can manage a LUC by restricting all digging on their property, which would be protective of human health and the environment. Rachelle encouraged anyone that has an HOA or a president to reach out to her or to share her contact information with them.

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Regarding Development and Construction-If there is construction that comes into contact with groundwater or impacted soils (PFAS/PFOS) is the Town immediately notified/alerted to this? How? Same with EPA/DEP notification? Where is this information and on posted for public awareness/Comment? Thank you.”

Rachelle stated that this exists in every deed, but was unsure if they are required to notify the town. If an owner is performing earthmoving activity and they encounter contamination, they typically reach out to the Navy. Rachelle believes this is one of the check boxes on the construction permission form. While the contamination may be in the ground, if the project is what uncovers the contamination, there may be a conversation with the project owner to deal with those materials. Rachelle stated there would potentially be a notification to MEDEP or EPA, but not to the town, but asked for Mike and Iver’s input.

Iver McLeod stated that they should know ahead of time if anyone is going to contact contamination, which is why they have a strong oversight on all the construction. They don't have to get permission to excavate soil on some of those lots, but if they come across previously unknown contamination, as it stated in the LUCs, they have to notify MEDEP. If there is PFAS in the soil, it would not be evident so it would be different. In terms of the Katahdin project, preliminary work involved interviewing former base firefighters to identify areas where AFFF may have been emptied onto the

ground. When Katahdin came to MEDEP with the project there was no concern about them coming into contact with PFAS contaminated soil. The construction notifications are important because they allow MEDEP to evaluate whether the contractors are going to run into PFAS ahead of time.

Rachelle stated that there are instances where the Navy has asked the project owners to conduct sampling to confirm that there is or is not contamination and to aid in determining how that material is handled.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Five-Year Review – Caryn DeJesus (Slides 37-38)

Caryn explained that Five-Year Reviews are required under CERCLA if a remedial action results in CERCLA hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at a site at levels that do not allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. The Five-Year Review does not include sites without signed RODs or contaminants not identified as a contaminant of concern (COC) in the signed ROD. Contaminants not identified in a ROD have not yet had a remedy determined and therefore, are not included. To date, five Five-Year Reviews have been conducted at former NAS Brunswick, with the first review signed in 2000. Preparation of the sixth Five-Year Review report began in August 2024. Public notice for the sixth Five-Year Review were published in September 2024. The sixth Five-Year Review will include Sites 1 and 3, Site 2, Site 7, Site 9, Site 12, Eastern Plume, Quarry Area, and the former Picnic Pond Stormwater Retention System. Caryn noted that because PFAS is in the investigation stage of the CERCLA process, there is limited discussion in the Five-Year Review; the Navy is still determining the extent of contamination and the appropriate remedy, which will be documented in a future ROD (Slide 37).

Caryn explained that the Five-Year Review will include a document review, site inspection, technical assessment, and an evaluation of the protectiveness at each site. The site inspections for the sixth Five-Year Review were conducted in October 2024. Caryn noted that responses have been received from the questionnaire distributed by the Navy and presented the reporting schedule for the sixth Five-Year Review (Slide 38).

Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) CERCLA Sites/CERCLA LTM Sampling – Caryn DeJesus (Slides 39-41)

Caryn explained that Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) CERCLA sites are sites where COCs remain in place at levels that do not allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. Caryn noted that monitoring is different at each site as each site is monitored for the COCs in environmental media as documented in each site's ROD. Caryn also presented a figure indicating the sites where LTM occurs (Slide 39).

Caryn stated that the spring 2024 LTM event was conducted in August of 2024 and included sampling at the Eastern Plume. The fall 2024 LTM event was conducted in October 2024 and included sampling at Sites 1 and 3, Site 7, Site 9 and the Eastern Plume. In terms of reporting, Caryn explained that the Navy is working to finalize the reports documenting sampling results. The Draft 2024 Annual LTM Report is anticipated to be issued in Spring 2025 (Slide 40).

Caryn explained that groundwater sampling is also conducted at the Quarry Area concurrent with the CERCLA LTM. The 2017 ROD for the Quarry Area states that groundwater monitoring will be conducted to confirm that groundwater contaminants are not migrating from the waste disposal fill area. The ROD indicates that PAHs, metals, and explosives will be monitored semi-annually for two years. Sampling was first conducted in 2020, and the groundwater monitoring program was added to the 2022 CERCLA LTM SAP. The sampling frequency was changed from semi-annual to annual sampling for four consecutive years. The first round of the sampling was changed to be 2022 rather than 2020. After four years of sampling, which will be completed during the 2025 annual sampling event, the monitoring program will be evaluated to determine if LTM is necessary (Slide 42).

Non-CERCLA (Petroleum) LTM Sampling – Dustin Moore (Slide 42)

Dustin explained that LTM, completed on a biennial basis, is also conducted at two petroleum sites, including the Old Navy Fuel Farm (ONFF) and the Naval Exchange (NEX) Service Station. LTM for these two sites is completed in accordance with MEDEP remediation guidelines for Petroleum-Contaminated Sites. Biennial LTM was completed in June 2024. As part of the LTM program, groundwater samples are collected and analyzed for volatile petroleum hydrocarbons (VPH), extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (EPH), PAHs, and natural attenuation parameters. Well maintenance was also conducted during the June 2024 event.

In terms of reporting, the responses to MEDEP comments on the 2022 Draft ONFF and NEX LTM Reports are being finalized. The 2024 Draft ONFF and NEX LTM Reports are anticipated to be submitted in March 2025. Dustin noted that sampling results for both sites are consistent with historical results which indicate that petroleum hydrocarbon plumes are stable to decreasing (Slide 42).

Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System (GWETS) – Caryn DeJesus (Slides 43-44)

Caryn explained that the GWETS is associated with the Eastern Plume, which is a CERCLA site. In June 1992, an interim ROD was signed to address groundwater contamination at the Eastern Plume identified during the 1990 Remedial Investigation. This included a treatment plant to control and prevent further migration of contaminated groundwater off the former base property and to begin reducing the concentrations of contaminants prior to selecting a final remedy. The Final ROD was later signed in February 1998 and retained the pump and treat system as a selected remedy and added LTM and Five-Year Reviews. The GWETS began operation in the mid-1990s to treat groundwater impacted with chlorinated volatile organic compounds (CVOCs). The GWETS is very effective at treating CVOCs and providing hydraulic control of the Eastern Plume. There are six extraction wells to maintain the hydraulic control, which is what prevents the migration of groundwater off the former base. The GWETS treats approximately 2,000,000 gallons of groundwater per month. Monthly operations and maintenance reports include reporting of the GWETS performance as well as laboratory analytical results (Slide 43).

Initial investigations, beginning in 2012, identified PFAS in groundwater at the Eastern Plume. The GWETS was modified in 2015 to use treatment materials capable of treating both CVOCs and PFAS-impacted groundwater. Although the system was modified to treat PFAS, the extraction wells were designed to treat CVOC impacted areas. An evaluation was conducted recently to optimize the

extraction wells in PFAS-impacted areas. New extraction well, EW-11, was installed and connected to the GWETS to treat PFAS. Caryn presented a figure showing that EW-11 is located outside of the Eastern Plume, west of Pond A, where the highest PFAS concentrations are located basewide. The GWETS is currently treating PFAS in addition to CVOCs in groundwater from only the Eastern Plume; it does not treat the PFAS-impacted groundwater outside of the Eastern Plume. Caryn noted that there is also a separate PFAS treatment system designated for construction related activities (Slide 44).

GWETS PFAS Treatment Update – Caryn DeJesus (Slide 45)

Caryn provided an update on the GWETS PFAS treatment. Since the modification of the GWETS in 2015, monthly samples have, and continue to be, collected for PFAS. Samples are collected throughout the treatment system - before, during, and after the treatment process. A reduction in influent PFAS concentrations has been seen over the last five years. Effluent concentrations are below laboratory detection levels and below the MEDEP Interim Drinking Water Standard and USEPAs maximum contaminant levels. In terms of reporting, a monthly summary of results is provided to MEDEP, USEPA, and BACSE. Annual reporting of the PFAS treatment is also conducted. The next reporting period is for July 2023 through June 2024 and the internal draft report was provided to the Navy in October 2024. The draft report is anticipated to be submitted in Spring 2025 (Slide 45).

Construction Dewatering Treatment System (CDWTS) – Derek Pinkham (Slide 46)

In 2020, the Navy installed a treatment system referred to as the Construction Dewatering Treatment System (CDWTS) to support redevelopment activities by property owners of Brunswick Landing. The system was designed to treat PFAS-impacted groundwater generated during redevelopment activities. The Navy expected that potential PFAS-impacted water would be generated during construction dewatering activities occurring across the former base. The CDWTS is located outside of the existing Eastern Plume GWETS. Before contractors can bring the water to the system for treatment, they are required to submit a groundwater management plan to the Navy, USEPA and MEDEP, which documents how the contractor will ensure that the water brought for treatment will meet the acceptance parameters of the CDWTS. The plan requires approval by the Navy, EPA and MEDEP before a contractor can bring water for treatment. To date, this system has treated just over 429,000 gallons of construction water (Slide 46).

Sites 1 & 3 Radiological Survey – Caryn DeJesus (Slide 47)

Caryn explained that Sites 1 and 3 contain radioactive materials believed to be from naturally occurring material that has been disposed of and concentrated at the site. Radiological contamination is not leaving the site and appears to be settling out at the outfall locations. It should be noted that Sites 1 and 3 is a restricted area and is not publicly accessible because a LUC for the site includes a gated fence restricting physical access. A draft SAP to conduct the radiological assessment was submitted in November 2024. The radiological assessment is anticipated to be conducted in Spring 2025 and will include surface scans to determine the presence of residual radiological impacts and to identify where surface soil samples will be located. Soil samples will be collected where elevated

radioactivity is detected. A draft report summarizing the findings of the radiological assessment is anticipated in Fall 2025 (Slide 47).

Findings of Suitability to Transfer (FOSTs) – Rachelle Knight (Slide 48)

Rachelle discussed the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) process and presented a figure displaying the areas to be transferred at former NAS Brunswick. Rachelle explained that in order to transfer land, the Navy must prepare a FOST to document that all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements have been satisfied. The FOST will include the final approved remedy and should be provided to the property recipient. The environmental remedy, a description of which is included in the FOST with supporting documentation in the appendices, states how the Navy expects to protect human health and the environment once property is transferred. The FOST will state any covenants required for inclusion in the property deed. The Navy finalized the Quarry FOST which will be transferred to MRRA with LUCs in 2025. MRRA is required to enter into an agreement with the MEDEP to affirm its understanding and commitment to maintaining any and all LUCs applicable to the property post transfer. Although the property transferred, the Navy continues to monitor compliance for LUCs for as long as they remain in place. With PFAS, environmental cleanup has become a significant hurdle to property transfer. The remaining FOSTs, which include AIR-16, Public Works, and Hangar 4, will be evaluated together with regulatory agencies to determine how the Navy can meet those statutory and regulatory requirements to facilitate property transfer. Rachelle emphasized that it is not expected that these properties will be FOSTed or transferred quickly (Slide 48).

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 49)

Chris provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“I’m still not fully understanding LUCs where I live. I have looked up the map and found a link to the FOST but it seemed to be talking about many different properties. Is there a more user-friendly map that locates the properties on the Landing and lists the contaminants of concern for each parcel and the LUC in place? It would also be nice to have FAQ to answer practical questions like “can I have a garden?” Also, will LUC be updated with the new PFAS investigation?”

Rachelle explained that sometimes the Navy will FOST multiple parcel IDs together in one FOST. Subsequently, parcels are oftentimes subdivided, resulting in one FOST that covers multiple parcels or a small parcel that has been subdivided in a FOST. Rachelle explained that the Navy can work with Chris to help him understand and suggested that Iver discuss the MEDEP map. Regarding the FAQs, a fact sheet will be sent to property owners this year with the certification forms. In terms of the LUC being updated, Rachelle reminded Chris of the groundwater restriction across Brunswick Landing. Since the groundwater restriction covers any groundwater pollutant over the entire base, the LUCs is not expected to be updated or lifted with the new PFAS investigation. Other LUCs are dependent on the remedy.

Chris provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Will this remediation work need to be repeated because of the AFFF spill?”

Rachelle stated that the Navy is still actively navigating this question with the regulatory agencies.

Iver McLeod discussed the MEDEP map that Rachelle referenced, which was originally designed to help construction companies understand what was required before any work began at the site. The map needs to be updated, so Iver suggested that people reach out to him directly via email if they would like help understanding the FOST parcels.

Jeffrey Jordan provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“would it be possible to amend the slide regarding the Five Year Review to add your comments about PFAS/PFOA? Thank you.”

Rachelle provided a response in the meeting chat:

“Yes.”

Suzanne Johnson provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Would the Navy be willing to meet with the residents on Princes Point Road who have been conducting well testing which shows PFAS contamination. A one and one conversation doesn’t consider the array of test results that have been obtained.”

Rachelle provided a response in the meeting chat:

“Yes, we encourage the property owners to reach out to the Navy and I will work with the team to get the property owners responses. The drinking water slide recommends the same with contact information – Navy and regulatory agencies – included on the closing slide.”

Petunia Flower provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“The Navy made an offer to MRRA in 2023 to remove the AFFF from the Landing Property prior to transfer of the airport. MRRA declined the offer and kept the AFFF-(public record) Given the catastrophic PFAS/PFOS chemical disaster that occurred on August 19,2024 - the largest chemical spill in Maine History and 6th largest in the nation, Is the Navy able to reconsider their position regarding taking back / removing all AFFF from the Airport/ landing property in the interest of protecting the victims of this spill ? Thank you.”

Rachelle stated that, at this time, the Navy does not have the authority to remove AFFF from the hangars. As discussed earlier in the meeting, MRRA is working on removing the AFFF.

James Ecker provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“Will the Maine DEP require a UECA covenant for all remaining property transfers?”

Rachelle explained that anytime there are LUCs they require a Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA). Iver has started the process of working on the UECA with MRRA.

MEETING WRAP UP

Rachelle noted that the next RAB meeting is scheduled for May 28, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. The meeting will be in a hybrid format, both in-person in Brunswick and online. Rachelle reminded to subscribe for updates and to reach out to the community co-chairs, herself or Suzanne Johnson, for more information.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDEES

W. Rachelle Knight, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Derek Pinkham, Navy RPM
Dave Barney, Navy Base Closure Manager
Thuane B. Fielding, Navy BRAC East Director
David Bennett, Navy BRAC PMO PAO
Michael Daly, USEPA RPM
Iver J McLeod, MEDEP RPM
Finn Whiting, MEDEP
Carol White, BACSE Technical Advisor
Suzanne Johnson, RAB Co-Chair
David Page, RAB Member
Paul Ciesielski, RAB Member
Caryn DeJesus, Resolution Consultants
Jake Dateno, Resolution Consultants
Keefe Askin, Resolution Consultants
Lisa Shanahan, Resolution Consultants
Spencer Meek, Resolution Consultants
Dustin Moore, Tetra Tech
Katherine Super, Tetra Tech
Town of Brunswick, Town of Brunswick
Steven Levesque, Midcoast Regional Reuse Authority
Alex Small
Ann Havener
Anne Henshaw
Barry Valentine
Barry Woods
Brad (Freeport)
Bruce Kantner
Carol O'Donnell
Catherine Ferdinand
Catherine Longley
Charlotte Mace
Chris
Dan Ankeles
Dana Husnay

Daniel Stevenson
Deborah Vose
DMH
Eric Perkins
Frank Marshal
Haley
Jake Levesque
James Ecker
Jamie Logan
Jane Arbuckle
Jane Nichols-Ecker
Jeffery Jordan
Jenn Hicks
Jim
Joel
John Shortreed
Josh
K Start
Kathy E Wilson
Kathy G
Kathy Guay
Keith Meiler
Kristian Moravec
Lea Carnevali
Loren Arford
Macey Hannan
Martha Otto
Mike Duguay
Nat Shed
Paul Guay
Peggy Siegle
Petunia Flower
Ralinda Miller
Ralph Keyes
Rebecca Hoff
Rick Powers
Rob Whitehouse
Robert Mac Ewen
Rosalie Deri
Shelley Fritz
Steven Weems, District 7 Councilor
Student
Tony Sprague
Tricia Moore
Wayne Deri
Online attendee (joined by phone)

Online attendee (joined by phone)
Online attendee (joined by phone)
Online attendee (joined by phone)