

**Impact Area Review Team
Bourne Best Western
May 22, 2007
6:00 – 8:30 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Attendees (cont'd):</u>	<u>Organization:</u>
Ben Gregson	IAGWSP	Lori Boghdan	IAGWSP
Mike Minior	AFCEE/MMR	Kris Curley	IAGWSP
Lynne Jennings	US EPA	Paul Nixon	IAGWSP
Len Pinaud	MassDEP	Shawn Cody	MA ARNG
Ellie Grillo	MassDEP	Doug Karson	AFCEE/MMR
Peter Schlesinger	IART/Sandwich	Bill Sullivan	E&RC
Jim Pierce	IART/Sandwich	Mark DeSouza	US EPA
<u>Facilitator:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	Desiree Moyer	US EPA
Jim Murphy	US EPA	Kevin Hood	UCONN/TOSC
<u>Attendees:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	Tom Fogg	East Sandwich
John McDonagh	IAGWSP	David Dow	Sierra Club
Pam Richardson	IAGWSP	Rick Carr	STL
		Jim Quin	Ellis Environmental
		Amanda Lehmert	Cape Cod Times
		Jane Shea Moran	e ² M

Agenda Item #1. Welcome, Agenda Review, Approval of 1/23/07 IART Meeting Minutes

Mr. Murphy convened the meeting at 6:10 p.m. and noted that future IART meeting cancellations would be better publicized than last month's meeting cancellation. He asked the Impact Area Review Team (IART) members to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda. Mr. Murphy also asked if there were any changes to the March 27, 2007 IART meeting minutes. No changes were offered and the minutes were approved as written.

Agenda Item #2. Late-Breaking News & Responses to Action Items

Mr. Murphy confirmed that there was no late-breaking news to report at this time, and that no action items were recorded at the March IART meeting.

Agenda Item #3. Remediation & Investigation Update

Mr. Gregson reported that the final remediation system for the Demolition Area 1 (Demo 1) plume, which consists of extraction wells and reinjection wells at Frank Perkins Road and at Pew Road, will become operational this month. He noted that the only change in the existing Rapid Response Action (RRA) system at Pew Road will be the addition of one reinjection well. He also noted that the treatment train will continue to consist of ion exchange to remove perchlorate and granular activated carbon (GAC) to remove explosives. Mr. Gregson also reported that the RRA system, which began operating in 2004, has treated about 450 million gallons of groundwater, and the expanded system will treat about 474 million gallons per year, with an estimated cleanup timeframe of 11 years. Mr. Gregson then showed several photographs of the newly-constructed Demo 1 treatment facility.

Mr. Gregson displayed a map of the base, pointed out the location of the Southeast Ranges, noted that the J-1 Range starts near the base boundary and runs towards the Impact Area, and said that the Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP) has mapped two plumes from that area – J-1 North and J-1 South. He also pointed out the locations of the J-2 North, J-2 East, and J-3

Range plumes, and noted that groundwater at the Southeast Ranges area flows radially from the top of the groundwater mound.

Mr. Gregson then discussed results from the investigation that was conducted in order to determine whether contamination detected downgradient of the J-1 Range might be emanating from the 2000-meter berm area. He noted that at monitoring well 477 (MW-477), installed northwest of the berm, RDX was initially detected at 12 parts per billion (ppb), and most recently detected at 7.3 ppb. Based on initial results at MW-477, additional wells were installed: MW-484, to help determine the width of the contamination at MW-477, which tested nondetect for perchlorate and explosives; MW-485 and MW-486, which were installed upgradient of the berm, and which had RDX detections of 7 ppb and 8.4 ppb respectively; and MW-487, which was installed downgradient, and had an RDX detection of 8.2 ppb and a perchlorate detection of 0.35 ppb. Mr. Gregson pointed out on a map the general vicinity where the source area is thought to be located and noted that reconnaissance work is being done to locate a source area, which could be addressed as part of an RRA. He also noted that his recommendation would be to move forward with a feasibility study (FS) process with respect to the RDX contamination identified during this investigation.

Mr. Schlesinger asked if MW-106 is screened properly to detect a downgradient plume, should it exist. Mr. Gregson reminded the group that due to multiple sources and multiple small plumes, RDX shows up at different depths and different locations throughout the area, such that a downgradient detection wouldn't necessarily indicate that the contamination was connected. Mr. Schlesinger asked if this means that the contamination at MW-487 may not then be connected to that at MW-484. Mr. Gregson replied that it's believed to be, based on depth, but there are no wells in between to confirm that information. He also noted, however, that more wells to define the plume will be installed before the investigation is completed.

Mr. Dow inquired about the depth of RDX contamination detected in MW-486, MW-485, and MW-484. Mr. Gregson replied that the deeper detection occurred in the most downgradient well, with detections becoming shallower farther upgradient. Mr. Dow then asked if a particle backtrack had been run, and Mr. Gregson confirmed that it had and noted that a source area is being sought based on the particle backtrack and some features seen in aerial photography that warrant additional checking.

Mr. Dow then asked if there is any kind of hydrological divide between the J-1 Range plume and the Central Impact Area source. Mr. Gregson replied, "not a strong one anyway," but because of the radial pattern, groundwater flow direction does change moving from east to west. Mr. Dow noted that he's interested in the width of the plume, since it's presumably near the top of the groundwater mound. Mr. Gregson said that based on available information so far, and based on groundwater flow, "it's a real narrow plume in this area."

Mr. Schlesinger asked if there's a plan to cover the area with monitoring wells to better understand what's happening there. Mr. Gregson replied that the area is like the Central Impact Area contamination – a series of plumelets that have been consolidated to create a single plume shell. He also said that he thinks that this approach to addressing the contamination is appropriate and adequate for moving forward with a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) and remedial design, as any future pump-and-treat system would not involve installing extraction wells at "each little level of contamination," but instead would involved installing larger capacity extraction wells to capture larger areas of contamination, including that which might not have been detected at any of the monitoring wells. Mr. Gregson also noted that very little was seen in the way of perchlorate contamination in this area.

Mr. Gregson then stated that MW-479, which was drilled as part of the J-1 North investigation to ensure that the eastern extent of the plume was defined, tested nondetect for perchlorate and

explosives. Ms. Jennings asked for further explanation of the purpose of MW-479. Mr. Gregson displayed a map that showed the well in relation to the J-1 North plume, pointed out the location of a need for data to ensure that the plume didn't splay out farther, and noted that the well was installed on Wood Road to fill that need.

Mr. Gregson then reported that the J-1 South plume has been fairly well defined. He reminded the group that the plume was first discovered a couple years ago during drive-point work along the base boundary and that subsequent investigation included drilling off-base wells on Little Acorn Lane and then on Windsong Road. He then reviewed data from the wells on Windsong Road: MW-480 had an RDX detection at 0.81 ppb; MW-481 had an RDX detection at 12 ppb and an HMX detection at 0.9 ppb; and MW-482 had an RDX detection at 0.28 ppb. Mr. Gregson also noted that MW-483, an on-base well that was drilled near an unsuccessful drive-point, had tested nondetect. He further stated that the IAGWSP is moving forward with an RRA treatment system this summer.

Mr. Schlesinger expressed concern that the plume might exist somewhere between the three downgradient wells that tested clean: MW-402, MW-400, and MW-403. Mr. Gregson noted that the distance between the wells is not very great, such that the data spread is consistent with other plumes that have been defined on the base. He also noted that there's a lack of roads in that area for access, and he thinks that the same objectives could be accomplished by "wells we put up here" and by continuing to monitor the wells at Little Acorn Lane. Mr. Schlesinger asked if the regulators are happy with this approach and Ms. Jennings responded affirmatively.

Agenda Item #4. Small Arms Ranges Investigation Update

Mr. Nixon showed a map of the Camp Edwards Small Arms Ranges (SARs) at the Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR) and noted that the Massachusetts Army National Guard (the Guard) is in the process of trying to return to the use of lead ammunition there. He also noted that when that process began, there were only two groundwater monitoring wells at the SARs – one at B Range and one at Former D Range. However, 17 additional monitoring wells have since been installed, as have some lysimeters, which allow sampling of pore water. Mr. Nixon also pointed out the locations of several new wells not yet shown on the map – one each at O Range, B Range, C Range, and T Range. Mr. Nixon then explained that the wells that were installed are to be used for the IAGWSP's investigation needs and the Guard's Pollution Prevention Plan, and some for the tungsten study.

Mr. Nixon then showed a slide that noted that the 16 new and existing monitoring wells for which sampling results are available all tested nondetect for lead, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and explosives. Mr. Schlesinger inquired about test results for tungsten and Mr. Nixon replied that he would be discussing tungsten in a few moments. Mr. Nixon then noted that there had been a lead detection near a berm in the past, but it hasn't been seen in the last four sampling rounds and was consistent with what's normally considered a background level. He further noted that some metals, such as barium, were also detected, but also at background concentrations.

Mr. Nixon continued by pointing out on the map MW-72S, the monitoring well that has had consistent detections of tungsten. He noted that tungsten was detected there at a concentration as high as 560 ppb, but in the past few sampling rounds concentrations have been in the single digits. He also noted that additional wells have been installed in that area as part of the U.S. Army Environmental Command (AEC) study, but results are not yet available. Mr. Nixon further noted that it's difficult to analyze for tungsten. A very precise method is used and there seems to be some carryover in some of the results from one sample to the next, which might be causing false positives. He also said that five or six locations have shown concentrations below the 2 ppb reporting limit, while the only well with consistent detections above the reporting limit has been MW-72S.

Mr. Nixon stated that soil sampling at the SARs has been focused on T Range, the first range where the Guard is trying to return to firing lead ammunition. He noted that in 2002 five-point composite samples and discrete samples were collected from six locations at the firing lines. Analysis at that time hadn't included testing for nitroglycerin, but a fairly high concentration of lead was detected in one sample, with all other lead concentrations being lower, in the 200 part per million (ppm) or lower range. In April 2006 soil sampling was conducted using a multi-increment sampling method, which is thought to provide a more representative sample as it involves taking 30 to 100 "little increments" from a sample area to make up one composite sample.

Mr. Nixon then showed an aerial photo of T Range and pointed out six mounds formerly used for 50-caliber machinegun training, the locations where targets used to be located, and the location where the STAPP bullet catcher system is now situated. He noted that soil sampling was recently conducted at the firing line, underneath where the STAPP system was to be located, and at the back of the range. The area near the firing line was found to be an area of concern due to the lead and nitroglycerin detected there. Mr. Schlesinger asked Mr. Nixon to point out the direction of groundwater flow, which he did. Ms. Jennings asked him to point out the location of the monitoring wells at T Range, which he also did, while noting that the wells are shallow in order to measure water that's percolating into the water table. He also showed another photo of T Range, as well as another aerial photo of the range, and pointed out the arrow indicating the direction of groundwater flow, the various locations where multi-increment sampling was done, and the two locations where nitroglycerin was detected. He noted that one nitroglycerin sample was about 36.5 ppm, and modeling indicates that that could be a potential source to groundwater, but not for about 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Nixon reported that the IAGWSP's next step was to create 12 sampling areas and analyze all of them for nitroglycerin, which led to mostly nondetect results, with the exception of three detections at 50 ppm, 31 ppm, and 6 ppm, and a couple of low detections in the 3-ppm range or lower. He said that both U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and IAGWSP modeling indicate that more contamination would be needed to affect the groundwater. He also noted, however, that based on the thus-far unvalidated data, two potential areas of concern were identified.

Mr. Nixon said that the Guard is looking into what can be done in terms of raising the firing line and the like, and in the meantime the IAGWSP has been doing some soil-to-groundwater transport modeling and defining parameters to better characterize what happens to nitroglycerin and lead when they're on the ground. He noted that both come out of the barrels of the guns to some extent, but it takes quite a few shots to build up any detectable concentrations. He also said that it's understood that something has to be done in the case of nitroglycerin, "at least in the short term."

Mr. Nixon then stated that the IAGWSP will be working with the agencies on refining the modeling parameter known as Kd, which is the dispersion coefficient. He explained that there's a significant range of values for that parameter (from 2 to about 150) and the results for it are very sensitive, and therefore the IAGWSP is focusing on doing some batch and column studies to better define it, for nitroglycerin in particular. He further explained that the lower the Kd number is for nitroglycerin, the more likely it is to leach – and the higher the number, the less likely. He also noted that the lower part of the range (2) is based on pure nitroglycerin, but it's believed that the nitroglycerin that's been detected was actually bound in another substance called nitrocellulose, a cotton fiber. This would slow the leaching rate of the nitroglycerin, which is "actually a fairly soluble compound." Mr. Nixon said that refining that parameter and improving

the modeling over the summer should result in “some hard-and-fast numbers for what should and shouldn’t be left in the ground.”

Mr. Schlesinger inquired about plans for the rest of the ranges, given the potentially significant levels of nitroglycerin found at T Range. Mr. Nixon responded by showing the slide entitled “Future Activities” and noted that the first step will be to complete the remedial investigations at T and E Ranges, submit a report to EPA, and then complete remedial investigations of the soil at the other ranges, with a target completion date of mid 2008. He also noted that a remedial investigation workplan will be out this summer, with work commencing in the fall. The workplan will involve soil sampling at the firing line, at the ranges’ midpoints, and at berms and the like, to characterize metals, propellants, and explosive concentrations.

Mr. Dow inquired about the relevance of precipitation rates to the modeled transport of the water, especially in light of the seasonal training that’s conducted on the base, when it’s generally drier. Mr. Nixon replied that while he’s not an expert on the modeling, he does know that precipitation data are input more precisely than annually, but doesn’t know if it’s by the day, the week, etc. Mr. Dow noted that Mr. LeBlanc of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) mentioned at a past Senior Management Board (SMB) meeting that a possible reason for such variability in the tungsten levels was that they accumulated in the soil and got washed out with the pore water during big storms. Mr. Nixon replied that that is entirely possible. He noted that at Demo 1, for example, pulsing of the perchlorate contamination has been observed. He also said, however, that the extent to which that happens with tungsten remains to be seen. Mr. Dow then referred to models he’s seen for marine sediment sampling, and suggested that an equilibrium type of approach for transport modeling associated with soils at MMR might not be the most useful method. Mr. Nixon replied that any model contains many inherent assumptions, or simplifications. He said that he doesn’t think it makes sense to hope for “a completely transient model that would account for every little variability.”

Mr. Dow also asked if other environmental factors, such as acidity, influence the transport rate. Mr. Nixon replied that they do, and noted that each of the 12 sampling areas was analyzed for pH, and showed levels in the 5 to 6.5 range. He noted that pH is a fairly important parameter with respect to metals in dissolution, and added that for lead, the lower the pH, the more likely it is to dissolve. He also said that total organic carbon (TOC) content was also measured and was found to vary with depth, with surface soil being in the 2% to 4% range. He noted that the greater the TOC, the less leaching is apt to occur. Mr. Dow asked if these factors are being incorporated into the model. Mr. Nixon confirmed that they are.

Mr. Schlesinger asked if comprehensive research on any existing fate and transport work pertaining to nitroglycerin and lead has been conducted, or if the IAGWSP is just being allowed to “define the model, define the fate and transport, and define the study.” Ms. Jennings replied that EPA was instrumental in reviewing the various lead fate and transport studies. She also said that although there’s a great deal of interpretation in terms of the right Kd value, everyone’s prediction is that the lead isn’t mobile enough to cause a problem. She then noted, however, that she doesn’t think an extensive study of the fate and transport of nitroglycerin has ever been conducted. She added that although there’s some information in literature about the Kd value for nitroglycerin, which was used to calculate what the appropriate soil number would be, both EPA and the IAGWSP have listed several different studies that would help refine that information. Ms. Jennings stated that the IAGWSP and the agencies plan to try to come to agreement over the next few months as to what are the more critical studies to help pinpoint the Kd value, how they should be conducted, whether they should be done using MMR-specific information, and so forth. She added that there’s probably a year’s worth of work just to get a good understanding of nitroglycerin.

Mr. Schlesinger asked if others in the country are working on the nitroglycerin question. Ms. Jennings replied that she doesn't know. Mr. Nixon, however, noted that quite a bit of work has been done – some by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and some by academic institutions – and more and more is being found. Mr. Schlesinger asked if it's correct that despite the work that's been done, the Kd value problem remains. Mr. Nixon confirmed that this is correct, and added that it's still not exactly known what mechanism takes nitroglycerin out of solid nitrocellulose fiber. He explained that most of the work that's been done deals with pure nitroglycerin. Mr. Schlesinger questioned whether it would make sense to hire an academic institution to carry out such a study.

Mr. Gregson mentioned the complicating factor that nitroglycerin biodegrades and photodegrades at the surface, which also needs to be considered. He then said that the Idaho National Lab is working with EPA on the leaching issue, and that the USACE has been working with the IAGWSP to develop specific recommendations for next steps regarding further defining the Kd and other parameters for nitroglycerin in order to better define the model. He said that Ms. Jennings had alluded to the comparison of recommendations from both groups to come up with a scope for additional studies to answer the nitroglycerin leaching question.

Mr. Schlesinger asked what leaching rate was used in the groundwater model to predict the tens-of-years travel time for the contamination from the source areas to reach particular downgradient wells. Mr. Nixon clarified that EPA's fast rate – that is, the conservative rate based on a Kd value of roughly 2 – was used. However, using a Kd value closer to 150 would probably mean that the contamination would never reach the groundwater, or a Kd value around 47 would probably mean that it would take thousands of years to reach groundwater. He also confirmed that the initial "fast" model predicted 20 to 30 years for the nitroglycerin to reach groundwater.

Mr. Schlesinger noted that the soil differs at various locations across the base. Mr. Nixon replied that the modeling he'd mentioned pertains specifically to T Range and the exact nitroglycerin concentrations detected there. He also noted that TOC samples were taken every 20 feet down to groundwater, and that information was put into the model. Mr. Schlesinger asked if a core sample was taken in order to know what the soil was like at each level. Mr. Nixon replied yes, although not every single layer was sampled – nevertheless, he believes that the soil there is fairly well understood. He also clarified for Mr. Schlesinger that two-foot cores were taken every 20 feet or so down to the water table, which is approximately 100 feet below ground surface.

Agenda Item #5. Massachusetts Army National Guard Small Arms Ranges Update

Mr. Cody, director of Environmental Affairs for the Massachusetts National Guard, reported on recent activities pertaining to the effort to return to the firing of lead ammunition at MMR. He noted that the draft final lead assessment has been completed and is currently available on line; that the T Range Operation & Maintenance Plan is in the final stages of being completed, with the draft final scheduled to go to the agencies by the end of next week; and that once the final draft Environmental Assessment is back from the National Guard Bureau, it will go out for a second 30-day public comment period.

Mr. Cody also reported that an Administrative Order (AO) modification petition letter is going to be sent to EPA, asking the agency to modify the statement of work of AO#2. In addition, a new environmental performance standard (EPS) is being written for Chapter 47 of the Acts of 2002 through the Environmental Management Commission (EMC). The EPS has gone out for public comment through the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) office; the environmental officer with the EMC, Mark Begley, has received those comments; the EPS will be discussed at the upcoming Scientific Advisory Council and Citizens Advisory Council meetings; and ultimately the EMC will be asked to institute the new EPS, which would lift the prohibition on firing lead ammunition. Mr. Cody also noted that a mid-June public meeting involving all the

agencies is being planned as a follow-on to the public meeting held on February 28, 2007. Mr. Murphy inquired about the specific date of the June meeting. Mr. Cody replied that that date has not yet been set.

Mr. Schlesinger noted that Mr. Dow had provided him with a copy of the Sierra Club's letter to Ms. Jennings, in which the organization expressed concern that the current models are inadequate to meet the task of helping design an effective monitoring program and developing appropriate pollution prevention measures and mitigations. He then inquired about the status of a reply to the Sierra Club's comments. Mr. Dow clarified that the letter is still in draft form and has not yet been sent to Ms. Jennings.

Ms. Jennings said that the June meeting is going to be critical. She also said that there are two outstanding issues from the February meeting: whether or not T Range requires cleanup before it can be used again (with the investigation results just having become available today, and evaluation of the results needed before that decision can be made); and what would be the specifics of the Pollution Prevention Plan, especially with respect to action levels, which are in the process of being determined. Ms. Jennings also said that she carefully noted the Sierra Club's remarks about the model, which Mr. Schlesinger mentioned, and said that because of those issues the action levels being established are on the conservative end. She further noted that all of this information will be provided in detail at the June meeting. She then suggested that Mr. Dow wait until after the June meeting before submitting the letter because she thinks much of the information that's been lacking to date will be available for review at that time.

Mr. Dow stated that at the April 21, 2007 executive meeting of the Sierra Club's Massachusetts Chapter, a motion was passed disapproving the return to the use of lead ammunition until the Pollution Prevention Plan, the monitoring program, and mitigation measures are in place and subject to public comment. Ms. Jennings said that she believes that the documents will be available for review at the end of May, and that EPA's decision about the use of lead ammunition won't be made until the end of June or early July. She also said that EPA is in full agreement about not making a decision until all of that information is available for the public and for the agency to review.

Agenda Item #6. Open Discussion

Ms. Curley announced that the IAGWSP has successfully completed its 8-page Overview & Update document, which will be published as an insert in the Enterprise newspapers. She then distributed copies of the Overview & Update to the IART members. She also noted that work on the Plume Booklet (a 32-page piece containing individual plume maps and more detailed information) is still ongoing and that document is expected to be completed in the near future. Mr. Schlesinger asked when the regulators last reviewed the Overview & Update. Ms. Curley replied that it went to press about a month ago, and the regulators' last review probably occurred around April 15, 2007.

Mr. Schlesinger asked if the IAGWSP's website isn't being updated, and that's why the cancellation of last month's meeting wasn't posted. Ms. Richardson of the IAGWSP clarified that the IAGWSP's website actually had been updated regarding the meeting cancellation; however, the Environmental & Readiness Center (E&RC) and EPA websites had not.

Mr. Schlesinger then inquired about any plan to measure the usefulness of the Overview & Update publication. Ms. Richardson said that one way to measure is to see if the publication generates telephone calls to the IAGWSP. She also noted that recently her office has been communicating a great deal with the residents of the Forestdale neighborhood in Sandwich regarding the installation of monitoring wells there as part of the J-1 South investigation. She also noted that the IAGWSP routinely looks at website trends reports, which indicate which parts of

the site are most active. She further mentioned that it's sometimes possible to track website links included in paid advertisements, but noted again that with respect to the Overview & Update, the IAGWSP will have to wait until the publication starts generating telephone calls.

Mr. Minior invited IART members to attend the June 13, 2007 Plume Cleanup Team (PCT) meeting at the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship on Sandwich Road in Falmouth, where Mr. LeBlanc of the USGS will be making a presentation on the hydrology of the Upper Cape, a repeat of a presentation he made a couple months ago as part of a Massachusetts Institute of Technology lecture series. Mr. Murphy agreed to send out a notice to the IART email list.

Mr. Schlesinger asked about the status of fellow IART member Dick Conron's request for information about the budget and plans for the future. Ms. Richardson stated that the IAGWSP responded to the request Mr. Conron emailed in February for information about the budget. She also noted that Mr. Conron had since requested additional information and a meeting was set up with Ms. Jennings, Mr. Murphy, and others to discuss how to answer some of his questions; however, that meeting ended up being canceled. Ms. Richardson then said that it's hoped that the two IAGWSP publications discussed this evening will help answer some of Mr. Conron's questions, and the IAGWSP is also working internally to determine how best to answer some of his more specific questions. Mr. Schlesinger said that he hopes the answers would be shared with the entire IART, and Ms. Richardson replied that they would. Ms. Grillo added that the forthcoming Plume Booklet will include a graphic to help the public understand the status of each source area and groundwater plume in the overall cleanup/investigation process, although future timeframes are model-predicted, which is a challenge in developing that graphic. She also said that the regulators are following up to ensure that Mr. Conron receives the information he'd requested from the E&RC and that that too is shared with the rest of the IART members.

Mr. Schlesinger then asked if the cleanup program has been taking advantage of the large swath of clear-cutting being done in the northern part of the base in preparation for the pipeline that's going to be installed there. Ms. Grillo noted that Mr. Begley notified the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) to say that the pipeline is being installed in close proximity to an abandoned fuel pipeline, and MassDEP plans to have staff oversee the work being done at the specific locations near the abandoned line in order to ensure that nothing goes wrong.

Mr. Schlesinger indicated that his question is whether the program has or is considering taking advantage of investigation opportunities, given the swath of area that's being cleared. Mr. Gregson replied that historically there's always been some kind of roadway along that area of the base boundary to provide access, if there had been any evidence to suggest that investigation was needed. However, neither archive searches nor tracking of existing plumes has led to the belief that that area warrants investigating. Mr. Schlesinger asked if the IAGWSP is fully confident about the downgradient extent of the Demo 2 contamination. Mr. Nixon replied that it is, and noted that the Demo 2 plume ends significantly south of the east/west pipeline road. He said that the Demo 2 plume is the farthest north and is "nowhere near that road."

Agenda Item #7. Adjourn

Mr. Murphy mentioned the SAR public meeting planned for June and said that the team would be notified by email regarding the date of the next IART meeting, after the summer schedule has been determined. He then adjourned the meeting at 8:08 p.m.



Future Agenda Topics:

- J-2 Range Groundwater Remedy Selection Plan (public comment period)
- J-3 Range Groundwater Remedy Selection Plan (public comment period)
- Gun & Mortar Soil Rapid Response Action (public comment period)

Handouts Distributed at the Meeting:

1. Presentation handout: Remediation & Investigation Update
2. Presentation handout: Small Arms Ranges Investigation Update
3. Presentation handout: Small Arms Ranges Update
4. UXO Discoveries/Dispositions Since Last IART (Ending 5/18/07) All Awaiting CDC
5. News Releases, Neighborhood Notices, and Media Coverage 3/24/07 – 5/18/07
6. Spring 2007 Impact Area Groundwater Study Program – Overview & Update:
Transitioning to Cleanup