

Massachusetts Military Reservation Cleanup Team (MMRCT)
Forestdale School
Sandwich, MA
May 19, 2010
6:00 – 8:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

<u>Member:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
Mike Minior	AFCEE/MMR	508-968-4670	mike.minior@us.af.mil
Hap Gonser	IAGWSP	508-968-5107	kent.gonser1@us.army.mil
Jane Dolan (sitting in for Lynne Jennings)	US EPA	617-918-1272	dolan.jane@epa.gov
Paul Marchessault	US EPA	617-918-1388	Marchessault.paul@epa.gov
Len Pinaud	MassDEP	508-946-2871	Leonard.pinaud@state.ma.us
Jean Crocker	MMRCT/Barnstable	508-428-4283	jhccotuit@comcast.net
Daniel Dinardo	MMRCT/Falmouth	508-547-1659	ravnests1@live.com
Ron Reif	MMRCT/Falmouth	508-289-3788	rreif@whoi.edu
Harold Foster	MMRCT/Falmouth	508-564-4818	
Phil Goddard	MMRCT/Bourne	508-759-3043	pgoddard@aol.com
Wade Saucier	MMRCT/Sandwich	508-833-6002	wdjsaucier@aol.com
Greg Taylor	MMRCT/Sandwich	508-790-4686	taylor1@yahoo.com
<u>Facilitator:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
Doug Karson	AFCEE/MMR	508-968-4678	doug.karson@us.af.mil
<u>Attendee:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
Lori Boghdan	IAGWSP	508-968-5635	lori.boghdan1@us.army.mil
Pam Richardson	IAGWSP	508-968-5630	Pamela.j.richardson@us.army.mil
Dave Hill	IAGWSP	508-968-5621	dave.hill@us.army.mil
Bill Sullivan	E&RC	508-968-5147	William.g.sullivan@us.army.mil
Desiree Moyer	US EPA	617-918-1257	moyer.desiree@epa.gov
Henry Cui	MassDEP	508-946-2889	henry.cui@state.ma.us
Mike Speth	NGB	508-968-5936	mike.speth@us.army.mil
Jane Gasper	Innovar	508-759-9114	jgasper@innovar-env.com

Action Items:

1. Mr. Goddard suggested that AFCEE have available on its website, accessible to well-drilling contractors and others, the same detailed information on current plume shells and existing private wells that's provided to the local Boards of Health.
2. MassDEP will check with the state Department of Public Health on the status of the annual ponds fact sheet and distribution thereof.
3. A response to the MMRCT's inquiry about fish testing will be provided either in writing (as an action item response) or as an agenda topic at the July MMRCT meeting.

Handouts Distributed at Meeting:

1. Responses to the Action Item from the April 14, 2010 MMRCT Meeting
2. Presentation handout: Former K Range Update

-
3. Presentation handout: Testing of Private Wells, Ponds, and Harbors
 4. Remedy Selection Plan for L Range
 5. MMR Cleanup Team Meeting Evaluation form

.....

Agenda Item #1. Introductions, Agenda Review, Action Items Review, and Approval of April 14, 2010 MMRCT/SMB Meeting Minutes

Mr. Karson convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m., reviewed the agenda, and asked if there were any corrections or additions to the April 14, 2010 Massachusetts Military Reservation Cleanup Team (MMRCT) meeting minutes. No changes were offered and the minutes were approved as written.

Agenda Item #2. Former K Range Investigation

Mr. Hill stated that the Former K Range was built in 1960 and functioned as a 3.5-inch rocket range until 1967, after which it was converted to an M79 grenade launcher range in 1968 and functioned as such until the early 1970s. Investigations at the range began in 2000 as part of the Phase IIb investigation. Groundwater sampling involved some drive-point locations along the northern boundary of the range and two monitoring wells, one being monitoring well 170 (MW-170), which was installed downgradient of an obvious target location at the range, but none of these yielded any detections of explosives or perchlorate. A small amount of perchlorate was found in the other monitoring well, MW-366, but that was believed to be associated with the J-2 Range, and the well continues to be monitored under the J-2 Range site.

Mr. Hill also noted that geophysical surveys (air magnetometer, EM-61, and handheld) were conducted at presumed target areas, at transects/firebreaks, in the woods between target areas (meandering path reconnaissance), at prescribed burn areas, and at a couple of trenches in Area E. In addition, multi-increment soil sampling was conducted at presumed target areas.

Mr. Hill then showed a figure entitled "Former K Range Multi-increment Sample Locations" and noted that no explosives were found except in a small section at Area E. He also showed a figure entitled "Former K Range Reconnaissance Locations," pointed out the meandering paths, and noted that no explosives were detected in samples from Areas A, B, D, and F. He further noted, however, that there were a couple of exceedances of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) cleanup standard of 1,000 parts per billion (ppb) for RDX in Area E, where the maximum RDX detection was 2,800 ppb, and 125 cubic yards of soil was removed for on-site treatment. He also reported that some perchlorate was detected in a multi-increment sample from Area F, but not at concentrations high enough to warrant excavation. In terms of munitions, nearly all the items recovered were inert 3.5-inch rockets or inert 40mm grenades. However, two suspected high-explosive 3.5-inch rockets and one 57mm anti-tank round were also recovered and blown in place. Mr. Hill also referred to a map, pointed out where these items were found, and also pointed out where a perforator (presumed to be kick-out from the J-2 demolition area) was found, and where an unfired 30mm round and an unfired 20mm round were found, all of which were taken to the contained detonation chamber (CDC) for management.

Mr. Taylor inquired about the detection limits. Ms. Dolan stated that the groundwater detection limit for RDX was 0.25 ppb and for perchlorate was 0.35 ppb. Mr. Hill then concluded his presentation by reporting that a final Investigation Report will be prepared this summer and a Decision Document, which will undergo a public comment period, will be issued in the fall.

Mr. Foster asked about the depth of the well screens at MW-170 and MW-366. Mr. Hill replied that his recollection is that the well screen at MW-366 is about 55 feet below the water table (bwt) and the one at MW-170 is about 75 feet bwt.

Mr. Dinardo inquired about the prescribed burns that Mr. Hill had mentioned. Mr. Hill referred to a map and pointed out areas that were burned by prescribed fire in 2008, after which MEC (munitions and explosives of concern) evaluations were conducted but nothing much was found except residue from practice grenades and rockets. He also pointed out another area that was burned yesterday, but added that it's not really within the range fan.

Mr. Dinardo also questioned whether any of the encampments having to do with the June training event were located in the Former K Range area. Mr. Gonser replied that none of the Exportable Combat Training Capability (XCTC) program sites are located on that side of the Impact Area. He also stated that the purpose of yesterday's prescribed burn was to create a buffer in order to be able to "let the fire go" the next time some of the "backend area" can be burned. He said that MassDEP has given approval to burn during the summer, when wind conditions are exactly right, and that area will be burned as soon as possible so that unexploded ordnance (UXO) personnel can examine it and determine if anything was missed.

Mr. Goddard asked if there's a plan to burn in the Central Impact Area. Mr. Gonser replied that there is. He noted that the state has promised some funds to Camp Edwards to burn there for habitat purposes as soon as it can be orchestrated. He also said that the Guard is coordinating with the Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP) on creating firebreaks to better manage the fire, as the Central Impact Area is a large area that is likely to have UXO on it.

Agenda Item #3. XCTC Update

Mr. Gonser reminded the team that nothing significant had been found in any of the areas at MMR where the XCTC training is to occur this June. He also noted, however, that there were a couple of outstanding issues that needed to be addressed, and the data pertaining to those were not available at the last MMRCT meeting.

Mr. Gonser then reported that some multi-increment samples were collected at one of the helicopter landing zones (XCTC Site #3) and nothing significant was found, only a very low level of perchlorate (0.00076 milligrams per kilogram). He also noted that a magnetometer survey was conducted at what's called the Southern Inactive Demolition Site, and only some small arms links and small arms brass were found. He added that soil sampling conducted at the site in April yielded no detections of explosives. Mr. Gonser also reported that no explosives or perchlorate were found in MW-150, which is located downgradient. Also, the Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) training area was sampled for metals, explosives, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and perchlorate, with the following results: no explosives were detected; perchlorate was detected at a very low level of 0.0002 milligrams per kilogram; metals were all around background; and any SVOCs were below the reporting limit. Mr. Gonser also said that samples were collected at the grassy area near the KD Range parking lot, as it was thought that perhaps the back-blast from the range might have pushed some perchlorate propellant behind the firing point. Test results, however, showed no detections of perchlorate. He then said that all of this sampling was conducted just to confirm what was already believed about the sites, and the plan is to begin the XCTC exercise in early June.

Ms. Crocker asked if other states have perchlorate standards that are as stringent as those in Massachusetts. Mr. Gonser replied that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) health advisory for perchlorate in groundwater, which is applicable across the country, is 15 ppb. He also mentioned that California has a standard of 6 ppb and Massachusetts has a standard of 2 ppb. Ms. Crocker then asked if any change in the Massachusetts standard is expected. Mr. Gonser replied that he's heard of no intention to change the standard. He also said that in California a lot of people are drinking water that contains perchlorate, as it exists in some of the major river systems and aqueducts that feed Los Angeles, and so it wouldn't be feasible to make the standard too low there. Mr. Pinaud added that although there is no current plan to change the perchlorate standard in Massachusetts, the

state is open to revisiting the standards if the science changes and would make adjustments either up or down as appropriate. Mr. Gonser added that the Army has conducted a number of studies looking at the RDX standard, and it's possible that the state and federal RDX standards could change within the next year or two as the studies indicate that perhaps some of the original RDX toxicity numbers were a bit too low.

Agenda Item #4. Pond, Harbor, and Residential Well Sampling

Mr. Karson began his presentation with a summary of private well sampling results from 2009, noting that: ten private wells in Falmouth and Mashpee were tested for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the April/May timeframe, with an additional nine wells tested between July and September; not all homeowners took advantage of the Air Force's free well testing offer; all residential drinking water samples met applicable safe drinking water standards; and low levels of chloroform, which is commonly found in groundwater on Cape Cod, were detected, mostly at concentrations less than 1 microgram per liter (μL), with the standard being around 70 μL .

Mr. Karson then informed the group that the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE) Residential Well Program is being transitioned into the Private Well Verification Program, one of AFCEE's Land Use Controls (LUCs). He noted that all of the wells in the Residential Well Program are being evaluated to determine whether they meet the criteria for the Private Well Verification Program LUC. He then explained that Private Well Verification Program areas are defined by properties located on top of a groundwater plume, approximately two years travel time downgradient of a plume, or within a 500-foot buffer zone on either side of a plume. He further noted that this means that some properties that have been offered free well testing over the past five to ten years will be dropped from the program, but the change also will mean maintaining consistency with AFCEE's formal requirements in Records of Decision (RODs) that were signed over the past few years.

Mr. Karson reported that the first RODs to include specific language about the Private Well Verification Program pertained to the Landfill 1 (LF-1) and Chemical Spill 23 (CS-23) plumes and were signed in September 2007. The requirement involves verifying the use/non-use status of all private wells, including irrigation wells and whether or not they are safe for use. Mr. Karson also noted that AFCEE has received regulatory concurrence to transition the Residential Well Program into the Private Well Verification Program.

Mr. Karson stated that there are about 2,000 parcels or properties for all the different groundwater plumes involved in AFCEE's cleanup program. AFCEE has been in the process of contacting property owners in most of those areas, particularly focusing on the village of Cataumet in Bourne, which deals with the LF-1 plume. He noted that 471 parcels make up the LF-1 LUCs program, and 442 of them have been contacted so far. He said that 70 wells having been identified, 59 of which will undergo some type of analysis (visual inspection, testing, review of available well data) to determine whether or not the well could be used safely in the future.

Mr. Karson then showed a map depicting the plumes, the LUC boundaries around the plumes, wells from the Residential Well Program that are being dropped, and wells from the Residential Well Program that will remain as part of the Private Well Verification Program. He also mentioned that over the years AFCEE tested hundreds and hundreds of private wells, but the particular area where testing has continued is east of Johns Pond. He then reiterated that residential wells outside the established LUC areas will no longer be tested, and property owners will be notified of this change by mail. He also noted that the many years worth of data pertaining to wells at those properties have never shown anything approaching unsafe drinking water conditions, with only one or two locations ever having had any contaminants also found in Installation Restoration Program (IRP) plumes.

Mr. Goddard inquired about the criteria that eliminated some properties from inclusion in the Private Well Verification Program LUC. Mr. Karson referred to the footprint of the plume plus, as an extra measure of precaution, extended areas downgradient and on either side of the plume. Mr. Goddard then asked why an area would have shrunk in size. Mr. Karson explained that because of the agreement AFCEE has with the regulatory agencies, some properties were dropped from the testing program as they are well beyond any known or anticipated migration of the plumes. Mr. Goddard also asked if this was based on the science of where the plumes are located and the risk involved. Mr. Karson confirmed that it was based on the science of what's known about the plume and groundwater flow.

Mr. Goddard then asked if it's correct that the town's Boards of Health have regulations in place to prohibit private or public water supply wells within plume areas. Mr. Karson replied that it was verified last year that such regulations are in place, and will be verified again this year. Mr. Goddard also asked if the towns are provided with plume maps in order to make determinations about requests for wells. Mr. Karson replied that they are, and this is done on an annual basis. He also mentioned that he would be going before the Boards of Health in two of the towns in the next couple months. He then invited the MMRCT members to take a look at a map illustrating the different categories of wells identified through the Private Well Verification Program, which would be provided to the Boards of Health. Mr. Goddard asked if it's correct then that the Boards of Health will have "parcel by parcel" information to review when a well proposal comes before them. Mr. Karson confirmed that they will have the most current information very soon. He also noted that Falmouth's health agent just contacted him yesterday regarding a property owner's request to re-drill a well on a parcel near one of the plumes.

Mr. Goddard requested that the same level of detail that's provided to the Boards of Health also be made available on AFCEE's website for drilling contractors, health agents, and others. Mr. Karson said that he would have to check on that. He also said that the updates to the Boards of Health include re-verifying that the towns' prohibitions on private wells in plume areas remain in place and providing updates on Private Well Verification Program areas on an annual or even more frequent basis. Mr. Godard then asked if the local well drillers are aware of the prohibitions. Mr. Karson said that he doesn't know, but would assume that they are since they have to receive a drilling permit from the Board of Health. Mr. Goddard then suggested that maps like the one shown to the team tonight be provided to the local drillers or an association.

Mr. Goddard also questioned whether a homeowner whose property no longer falls within a plume LUC area could have a well drilled. Mr. Karson replied affirmatively and explained that defining LUC boundaries is an ongoing process as data become available. Mr. Goddard then asked if this delineation is based on maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). Mr. Karson clarified that plume boundaries are based on MCLs. Mr. Marchessault added that the LUC area also includes a buffer zone beyond the MCL boundary. Mr. Goddard then asked if it's correct that a homeowner could have a well drilled as long as the property is located in a below-MCL area. Mr. Minior replied that that is the Board of Health's decision to make, although AFCEE does provide the necessary information. Mr. Goddard also asked if AFCEE would pay for decommissioning of a private well where contamination is found, should the homeowner request it. Mr. Karson replied that it's been made very clear to all of the property owners who have been contacted that AFCEE will offer free decommissioning of any well that's either currently functional or nonfunctional or is determined through testing to be unsafe.

Mr. Saucier said that in his Internet research on the local Boards of Health private well regulations he found that each town addressed possible contaminants in private wells "before the well was drilled or after the well was drilled" and therefore he thinks the Boards are aware of the activities at the base. He also said that the Boards are notified about private wells and able to review the well parameters if the well is a sole source of drinking water for a property. An irrigation well, however, "could probably go underneath the radar" if the driller doesn't report the well to the Board of Health. Mr. Saucier also noted the possibility of a homeowner drilling a well with a high-powered hose, although it would probably be quite shallow.

Mr. Saucier then asked what steps would be taken to minimize risk of exposure in the event that it's determined that a well has an exposure pathway; for example, well abandonment and providing a new water supply, or perhaps providing filter systems. Mr. Karson replied that a filter system is always an interim option, but the goal would be to decommission the well if it's unsafe and predicted to continue to be unsafe for a considerable amount of time. He also said that only three or four properties that have a private well as their only source of water have been identified and analysis of those wells is being arranged. Other in-use wells are being used for secondary purposes, such as outside watering; however, it will still be necessary to go through the analysis process, and if something unsafe is found, decommissioning will be offered. And if decommissioning is not accepted and there's contamination that poses a risk, the next step would be to ask the Board of Health to come in and do whatever can be done legally to require decommissioning and prevent exposure. Mr. Saucier said that one possibility is that the Board of Health could attach literature to the deed of the property so that anyone who bought the property would know that the well contains contaminated water. He said that Boards of Health have "enormous authority" on private wells.

Mr. Marchessault noted that the LF-1 plume, for example, is very deep, about 150 feet below ground surface, while most private wells are only 20 to 30 feet into the water table. Therefore, depending on sampling results, it may be determined that a well in a LUC area is still acceptable to use. Mr. Saucier said that he's learned through his research that the groundwater is very deep and so any well would have to be a deep well, especially to ensure that water is available year round. He said that it's not unusual for a private well to be 150 to 200 feet deep. Mr. Marchessault noted, however, that the top of the LF-1 plume might be 100 feet below the water table, whereas private wells are only 30 to 40 feet into the water table. He also told Mr. Goddard that the update for the Bourne Board of Health is scheduled for June 23, 2010 at 7:00 p.m., while the Mashpee update is scheduled for July 28, 2010 at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Foster inquired about the buffer zone that Mr. Karson had mentioned. Mr. Karson explained that the buffer zone is just an extra area around the plume boundary (which is drawn to the MCL) to provide an extra measure of precaution and make the homeowners in the area feel more comfortable. He added that buffer zones average 500 feet cross-gradient and two years travel time downgradient, depending on groundwater flow in the particular area. He also clarified that the buffer zones are included in the Private Well Verification Program LUC.

Mr. Dinardo asked if AFCEE would be willing to test wells that were at one time, but are no longer, in a LUC area, should homeowners request testing when selling their home. Mr. Karson replied that if a well is no longer in a LUC-defined area, testing will not be offered. AFCEE would, however, provide to a potential homebuyer, banker, etc. information about a well that's been evaluated, but only if the current homeowner makes such a request. Mr. Dinardo said that in light of the impact that groundwater contamination has had on Cape Cod property and the "whole concept of water on the Cape" he wonders why that wouldn't be offered as an option to anyone who might be concerned. Mr. Karson explained that as government employees spending taxpayer dollars, it's necessary to follow the requirements that have been established, and as it stands right now, AFCEE would not be authorized to offer free testing of wells outside the LUC areas.

Ms. Crocker noted that the county offers free well testing for any resident who provides a water sample. Mr. Dinardo said that while perhaps that is the case, the samples wouldn't be tested for RDX and perchlorate. Ms. Crocker said that she believes that her water has been tested for perchlorate, but she's not sure what else.

Mr. Karson then continued his presentation by informing the group about the recreational ponds monitoring scheduled to occur this month. He noted that sampling for ethylene dibromide (EDB) will be conducted at Coonamessett, Round, Snake, Jenkins, and Deep Ponds, and that sampling for plume-

related VOCs will be conducted at Ashumet, Johns, Deep, and Coonamessett Ponds. He also said that, based on what's been seen in previous years, he would expect results to be nondetect. He further noted that results will be reported to the MMRCT at the July meeting and a news release will be issued. Mr. Karson also mentioned that the IAGWSP conducts its own sampling for explosives and perchlorate at Snake Pond and results have been nondetect since that program began in 2000.

Ms. Crocker asked if the individual homeowners would be notified. Mr. Karson said that if Ms. Crocker is referring to the private wells being dropped from the well sampling program, yes, they will be directly notified. He also said that with respect to the recreational ponds sampling, notification to area homeowners would come by way of a news release. He then mentioned that recreational ponds are sampled twice a year.

Mr. Karson also discussed the sampling of harbors and seeps, which occurs once a year. He said that last year's results were fairly consistent with what was seen in previous years. He noted that the seep at Red Brook Harbor tested nondetect in 2009, and the seep and surface water sampling at Squeteague Harbor showed a detection of PCE at 1.8 µ/L in one seep, some below reporting limit detections in surface waters, and some detections of chloroform. Results from the May 2010 sampling will be reported at the July MMRCT meeting. Mr. Karson then displayed a map and pointed out the sampling locations at the ponds and harbors.

Mr. Taylor asked if there's going to be any testing of fish in the ponds, as it's been quite a few years since such testing was done. Mr. Karson replied that there are no plans at this time to conduct fish testing at the ponds.

Mr. Goddard inquired about the status of public health advisory posters and handouts regarding swimming and fishing at the ponds. Mr. Karson noted that the most recent publication from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH), the annual ponds fact sheet, was issued in June 2008, and is available on the MDPH website and on AFCEE's website. He added that he does not know when the next version of the fact sheet will be issued. Mr. Goddard then asked if the 2008 fact sheet was distributed to the local town halls/Boards of Health. Mr. Karson replied that he does not know. Mr. Goddard then requested that MassDEP contact MDPH to find out if the fact sheet can be updated and distributed to the town halls. Mr. Pinaud agreed to contact MDPH and inquire about issuing a current version of the fact sheet.

Mr. Reif asked if AFCEE's technical evaluation to determine well safety is a documented procedure. Mr. Karson replied that it is; a Project Note that includes all the data collected on the well and the interpretation of that data will be issued to the regulatory agencies for their approval. Mr. Reif asked if it's correct then that the process is not arbitrary, but instead a documented approved process is followed. Mr. Karson confirmed that that's the case.

Mr. Reif also inquired about the pond sampling technique as well as pond sampling locations. Mr. Karson replied that he believes the pond sampling involves wading out into water that's about waist-deep, collecting water about 1.5 to 2 feet below the surface, screwing the cap on the sample jar while it's still underneath the water, and bringing it above the water and shaking it, ensuring that there's no air in the sample jar. He also noted that sampling is done at the public beaches, which is the area of the pond that is used the most, but not necessarily where there might be or has in the past been plume discharge. Mr. Minior added that the pond sampling was originally coordinated with the local Boards of Health and MDPH, so they were informed about the plan – how the samples would be taken, where they would be taken, and to whom the information would be provided. Mr. Karson noted that in fact many years ago AFCEE used to just provide the money to the towns so they could schedule their own testing at areas of their choice. Then, as the cleanup program transitioned from construction of treatment systems into monitoring, it made more sense to just include the recreational pond sampling in AFCEE's monitoring program and then provide the data to the Boards of Health.

Mr. Saucier told Mr. Reif that grab-sampling techniques often come from the certified laboratory that's conducting the testing, and the state and local entities accept their protocol. He said that he's not even certain that the Boards of Health have the technology or knowledge about how to develop a procedure; rather, they just follow what the lab requires them to do. He also referred to Mr. Goddard's inquiry about posting notifications at ponds and said that usually the state posts notifications at state ponds, and they are determined by certain sizes. He further noted that he's seen advisories about heavy metals in the water, with those metals coming from acid rain rather than coming in from beneath the pond. Mr. Saucier also remarked that he thinks it's a good idea to test the fish. Mr. Taylor said that the testing that was done a number of years ago resulted in a Board of Health alert for people not to eat fish from Ashumet and Johns Pond. He also said that he doesn't know why fish testing isn't being done again.

Mr. Marchessault said that EPA was recently approached by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) about fish testing, as EPA funded the first study. He also noted, however, that EPA doesn't currently have the money to fund any kind of follow-up fish study. Mr. Minior added that if MMRCT member Steve Hurley of the Massachusetts Division of Fish & Wildlife (MDFW) were at this meeting he could tell everyone that all of the freshwater ponds in Southeastern Massachusetts are posted with statements that people are not supposed to consume the fish, but instead catch and release them. And this has to do with mercury contamination that comes in from atmospheric fallout.

Ms. Crocker noted that she hasn't heard any assurances that there will be postings at the ponds, and she thinks it's very important to have them. She also mentioned that a gentleman from MDFW and a woman from MDPH used to be on the team. Mr. Karson clarified that, as Mr. Minior mentioned, MMRCT member Mr. Hurley works for MDFW, but was unable to attend tonight's meeting. Mr. Karson also clarified that the ponds do have postings limiting or prohibiting the consumption of fish (primarily predator fish) because of mercury contamination. Ms. Crocker asked if it can be assumed that the Boards of Health are responsible for these postings. Mr. Karson replied that he believes that the postings are done through the MDFW. He also suggested that a more thorough response to the team's inquires about fish testing could be provided either in writing, as an action item response, or as an agenda topic at the July MMRCT meeting.

Mr. Goddard said that he would assume that information about any 2008 MDPH ban on swimming at any of the ponds would have been widely disseminated. Mr. Karson stated that there are no such bans on the Upper Cape. Mr. Goddard also asked if a private well can be used for irrigation purposes, such as at a golf course, even if is located within a LUC area. Mr. Karson replied that Well Determination Project Notes are done for irrigation wells.

Agenda Item #5. Public Comment

Mr. Karson noted that an L Range Remedy Selection Plan poster session took place just prior to this meeting, and the public comment period on that document runs through June 4, 2010.

Mr. Karson also announced that the IRP 2010 Plume Booklet is expected back from the printer in about two weeks, and copies will be mailed to the team members, and distributed to the libraries, real estate offices, and so forth.

Mr. Karson stated that the MMRCT will meet next on July 14, 2010 at Building 1850 on the base.

Mr. Goddard inquired about the status of the Senior Management Board (SMB) and whether that group plans to meet separately or only jointly with the MMRCT in the future. Mr. Minior said that there's a meeting planned for September but he doesn't know whether that will be a joint meeting. Ms. Richardson noted that it's her understanding that the September meeting will be a joint meeting and that the SMB plans to continue to meet jointly with the MMRCT approximately twice a year.

Mr. Foster inquired about the makeup of SMB membership. Mr. Taylor replied that the group is no longer what is used to be, when its membership included selectmen from each of the four Upper Cape towns. He noted that the Mashpee selectman who used to be on the board (Chuckie Green) was not reelected and is no longer on the SMB, and the Falmouth representative on the SMB (Virginia Valiela) is no longer a selectman in her town. Mr. Taylor also said that he's disappointed that none of the selectmen from Sandwich were interested enough to attend tonight's MMRCT meeting. Ms. Crocker remarked that a decrease in community attendance at these meetings isn't necessarily due to a lack of interest, but instead might be due to an increased comfort level that things are going well.

Agenda Item #6. Next Meeting Schedule and Adjourn

The MMRCT will meet next on Wednesday, July 14, 2010. Mr. Karson adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.