

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MICROSOFT TEAMS HYBRID MEETING MINUTES
FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2025**

INTRODUCTION

Lisa Shanahan (Resolution Consultants) opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. This meeting was in a hybrid format with online and in-person attendees. The in-person meeting was held at the Brunswick Town Hall located at 85 Union Street, Brunswick, Maine 04011. Lisa Shanahan reviewed the Microsoft Teams tools for the meeting, including closed captioning 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 hybrid meeting information (Slide 4) and ground rules (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 discussed the ways in which the public notice for the RAB meeting was published in local newspapers, newspaper digital ads, in GoMagazine, 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 reviewed the meeting agenda (Slide 6).

Restoration Advisory Board – Rachelle Knight (Slide 7)

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 Program (BRAC) Program Management Office (PMO) Public Affairs Officer Chris Dunne. Chris Dunne's contact information is available on Slide 7.

Rachelle introduced the RAB members (Slide 8) and explained that RAB members are expected to attend all meetings. Rachelle explained that the community can submit comments to Suzanne Johnson, RAB community co-chair, at any time or at the RAB 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 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.

Questions & Answers – Lisa Shanahan (Slide 10)

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

Suzanne Johnson welcomed the RAB attendees. Suzanne reminded attendees that RAB participation is governed by a charter and explained that the purpose of the RAB is to foster discussion and to

encourage participation. Suzanne encouraged attendees to ask questions throughout the meeting and suggested an additional open-forum meeting be held for questions if the meeting were to run late.

MAJOR SITE ACTIVITY UPDATES

Ongoing Navy PFAS Efforts – Chelsea Fellows-Stanley (Slides 11-20)

Chelsea Fellows-Stanley (Tetra Tech) provided an update on the per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) Remedial Investigation (RI) (Slide 11) and presented a timeline of the RI/Feasibility Study (FS). PFAS RI sampling was conducted between the summer of 2022 and October 2023. More than 500 samples were collected from various environmental media and included soil, groundwater, surface water, sediment, stormwater, pore water, seeps, springs, and biota samples (fish and shellfish tissue). Results of the PFAS RI sampling were discussed during the May 2024 RAB meeting and are available on the Navy's website (https://media.defense.gov/2024/Jul/09/2003499941/-1/-1/0/NASB_22MAY2024_RAB_SLIDES_FINAL_1.PDF). The objectives of the RI are to collect data to characterize site conditions, to determine the nature and extent of contamination, and to assess risk to human health and the environment. The Navy is continuing PFAS investigations to determine the extent of impacts and to refine the conceptual site model.

Derek Pinkham (Navy) explained that in addition to the work that has already been completed, the Navy continues to thoroughly investigate PFAS at the site. The Navy is planning a focused investigation to pinpoint the source of PFAS affecting the Jordan Avenue Well Field. This focused investigation will involve the collection of additional soil and groundwater samples to better understand which areas on the base may be contributing to this issue. The goal is to identify the best ways to prevent further spread of PFAS to the well field. Beyond this, the Navy is expanding the overall investigation to get a complete picture of PFAS on the site, which includes delineating PFAS in soil. The Navy plans to fully define areas where they have already found PFAS in the soil. The Navy will also be taking samples from areas where a release has not been identified to establish background levels and to understand regional PFAS concentrations in soil. The Navy also plans to conduct further groundwater studies and testing, which may include the installation of new shallow monitoring wells to confirm the extent of PFAS in shallow groundwater. Bedrock groundwater will also be studied to provide an understanding of how PFAS is moving in bedrock and how to best manage it. This work is part of the ongoing RI and is designed to provide the information needed to develop an effective, long-term solution for PFAS at the site.

Environmental Cleanup Process (Slide 12)

Chelsea presented a graphic illustrating the steps of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) environmental cleanup process and explained that the former NAS Brunswick is currently in the RI stage for basewide PFAS. Chelsea explained that removal actions can occur at any time during the CERCLA process and that the Department of Defense (DoD) guidance is supportive of interim actions. A removal action can be implemented at any phase to mitigate risk, and the removal action can be completed as a Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) or Non-Time-Critical Removal Action (NTCRA). A TCRA must occur within 6 months, whereas an NTCRA can take longer.

Example Conceptual Site Model (Slide 13)

Chelsea presented an example Conceptual Site Model (CSM) and explained that the development of a CSM is part of the CERCLA process. The CSM summarizes site conditions, the distribution of contaminants of potential concern (COPCs), how far and wide the chemicals travel, and potential exposure pathways. The initial CSM is developed during the Preliminary Assessment step of the CERCLA process and continues to be refined throughout the CERCLA process as new data is collected and evaluated. Chelsea explained that the example CSM illustrates a typical CSM for PFAS and reflects the current understanding of PFAS for former NAS Brunswick. At the former base, PFAS were used primarily as constituents in aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF). AFFF was stored in buildings and used for firefighting and fire training purposes, and as a result of spraying AFFF, PFAS was released to the environment. Once PFAS were released to the environment, they infiltrated into the soil and groundwater and/or migrated through the stormwater system to surface water via overland runoff and transport and/or erosion of PFAS-impacted soils. PFAS-impacted groundwater also discharges to nearby surface water features.

Stormwater at former NAS Brunswick (Slides 14-15)

Chelsea explained that the stormwater system at former NAS Brunswick is a direct migration pathway to both surface water and groundwater. By design, the stormwater system channels run off to nearby bodies of water such as Mere Brook, Merriconeag Stream, and the Androscoggin River, taking pollutants that are present on the ground surface with it. Chelsea reviewed the components of the stormwater system and noted that because of the age of the system and ongoing projects related to stormwater within the former base property, there are data gaps in the current understanding and configuration of the system which may be important for understanding PFAS migration within the former base area.

Chelsea presented a figure illustrating the stormwater evaluation project area (Slide 15) and explained that the Navy is in the process of completing a stormwater evaluation. The initial focus of the evaluation will be on Pond A and Pond B stormwater systems to refine the CSM and identify how PFAS may or may not be entering and moving through the stormwater system. The Navy is also completing an inventory of the system with the goal of designing mitigation measures. Chelsea reviewed the phases in which the stormwater system evaluation will be conducted, including an evaluation of surface runoff and stormwater catchment areas, completion of a stormwater system condition assessment, completion of a closed-circuit television (CCTV) video camera survey of the stormwater system, and an evaluation of stormwater baseflow.

Chelsea explained that the Inventory, Condition Assessment, and Mapping Study and the CCTV survey were conducted in March 2025. The field crew completed CCTV on 20,285 linear feet of storm pipe within the project area. The field crew was able to find and include several connections to Hangar 4 that were not previously mapped. The evaluation focused on the Pond A and Pond B drainage area and their associated stormwater systems. At this time, the Navy is focusing on this area around Hangar 4 due to the AFFF spill. The results of the stormwater system condition assessment will be included in a Condition Assessment Report. The Final Stormwater Evaluation Report is expected in 2026 and the information will be used to inform the PFAS RI.

PFAS RI Study Areas (Slide 16)

Chelsea presented a figure which shows the areas on the former base where the PFAS RI is being conducted. Due to the significant number of samples collected between 2010 and 2019, the 2020 PFAS Investigation Summary Report broke up the former base into smaller areas to easily report the data. These areas are referred to as “study areas” or “reporting areas” and were primarily based on groundwater divides, groundwater flow, and identified source areas. The RI uses these same reporting areas, noting that two areas were expanded so that the entire former base boundary was captured. Additional PFAS investigations are planned in most of these areas.

Basic Overview of Geology (Slide 17)

Chelsea stated the geology and groundwater flow across the former base is generally well understood based on 35 years of investigations. Chelsea presented a cross-section which illustrated the geologic units across the base.

Basewide Shallow Groundwater Flow Map (Slide 18)

Chelsea presented a figure illustrating shallow groundwater flow across the base and explained that a basewide groundwater synoptic water level event was completed in April 2023 during the PFAS RI. Updated basewide groundwater flow maps for the shallow and deep groundwater aquifer and the bedrock aquifer have been generated using the measured water level data. Chelsea pointed out the groundwater divide in the northern portion of the base and explained that groundwater north of this divide generally flows north towards the Androscoggin River and groundwater flow south of the divide generally flows towards Merriconeag Stream and Mere Brook.

Basewide Deep Groundwater Flow Map (Slide 19)

Chelsea presented a figure illustrating deep groundwater flow across the base and explained that groundwater flow patterns are similar to flow within the shallow groundwater and flow towards the surface water bodies.

Basewide Bedrock Groundwater Flow Map (Slide 20)

Chelsea presented a figure illustrating bedrock groundwater flow across the base. Chelsea explained that groundwater flow directions within bedrock are similar to the flow patterns within the shallow and deep aquifers, where groundwater flows toward the surface water bodies. Groundwater north of the groundwater divide flows toward Androscoggin River and south of the divide groundwater flow is toward Merriconeag Stream and Mere Brook. In the southwestern portion of the former base near the Quarry Area, groundwater in bedrock indicates a groundwater high is present where groundwater flow is radial or in the west and east direction.

Chelsea explained that because the focus of the historical investigations have been on the overburden and due to the current CSM, there are fewer monitoring wells installed within the bedrock aquifer than in the overburden. There are a few bedrock monitoring wells within the northern area of the

former Base and several bedrock monitoring wells within the southern portion of the base but specifically within the Quarry Area, Eastern Plume and Sites 1 and 3. An additional bedrock investigation is planned.

Chelsea summarized that the basewide water level measurement data collected in April 2023 will be incorporated into the PFAS RI and will be used to update the Basewide PFAS CSM and groundwater flow directions within each of the PFAS RI Study Areas to further develop the CSMs.

In-Person Questions & Answers

Jamie Ecker provided in-person comments:

Jamie Ecker asked how many deep bedrock wells are present in Areas 4 and 5 (as shown on Slide 16). Rachelle Knight stated that they could not provide an exact count during the meeting but could provide a count to Jamie at a different time.

Post meeting addition: *There are 23 monitoring wells in Area 4 and five monitoring wells in Area 5.*

Jamie noted that earlier in the presentation it was stated that new wells would be installed in Areas 4 and 5, to which Rachelle replied the Navy is looking to expand its bedrock investigation.

Jamie asked if these areas are considered the least characterized of the areas on the former property, to which Rachelle stated that prior sampling has not indicated that there was reason to conduct additional investigations in these areas.

Jamie cited the 35 years of investigations noted in Slide 17 and the Navy's indication of a deep understanding of the property. Rachelle replied "correct", confirming that the Navy has a deep understanding of the property.

Jamie referred to a well located at the golf course and the Jordan Avenue Well Field and expressed concern over this area. Jamie stated Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) requested the two homes within 1,000 feet be tested over three months ago and asked when these homes would be tested. Rachelle stated the Navy responded to this letter and communicated there are data gaps between those homes and detections that are on the installation. Rachelle explained that the Navy also communicated their plan to sample the southernmost wells on the southeast side *[post meeting addition – the wells are on the southwest side of the runway, not the southeast]* of the runway and to resample the golf course and the irrigation pond. The two wells southeast *[post meeting addition – southwest]* of the runway were sampled and the results were non-detect. Rachelle stated the Navy recently finalized their Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for sampling the golf course well. Once regulatory approval is secured, the Navy will proceed with sampling the golf course well. Jamie followed up and questioned the two homes, to which Rachelle stated that, at this time, the Navy does not have plans to sample these homes because the data does not support the action. This indicates that the plume has not moved.

Post meeting addition: The two wells are located southwest (not southeast as stated) of the runway and are located in the Red Label Area. Results from sampling indicate PFAS was not detected in one well and PFOA was detected at an estimated concentration of 1.2 parts per trillion (ppt) in the other well. Results from the sampling will be incorporated into the ongoing PFAS RI.

Note: 'Estimated concentration' (flagged with a "J" in laboratory reports) occurs when the compound is detected at low levels but cannot be quantified with certainty. Detection limits are determined by processing laboratory created samples with a known low concentration to determine the smallest amount of a compound that can be reliably detected.

Jamie stated there are approximately 20 homes that abut the base along Harpswell Road. Jamie noted this area is the least characterized and mentioned a memo recently released by Dr. Page which indicated the presence of a dumping area, also known as the "red label area", the golf course, and referenced PFAS sampling at the Quarry Area in 2016. Jamie asked if the Navy has concerns over the 20 homes that abut this side of the property, to which Rachelle replied that, at this time, there is no evidence to support sampling those homes. Jamie followed up and questioned the golf course well, to which Rachelle stated the Navy is planning to re-sample the golf course well.

Post meeting addition: The Red Label Area was not historically used as a dumping area. This is an area where, during the base's operation, planes may have been staged southwest of the runway. Historical PFAS sampling at the Quarry Area was conducted in 2014 and included the analysis of PFOS and PFOA. A copy of the Quarry Area Record of Decision (ROD) is available on the Navy's Administrative Record at [N60087_003768.pdf](#).

Jamie questioned the amount of money the Navy spends on sampling and analysis per year, on average. Rachelle stated she could not answer the question at this time. Jamie discussed the cost of sampling the 20 homes and suggested the Navy sample these wells to give the homeowners peace of mind or, alternatively, to provide the Navy with information regarding an issue. Rachelle stated the Navy does not agree with this approach. Rachelle stated that the Navy follows the data, and at this time, the data does not support offsite sampling. Rachelle explained the Navy is charged with cleaning up the contamination it caused. Should the investigation go offsite, the Navy will continue to take action, similar to the Jordan Avenue Well Field.

Jamie replied, noting the 35 years of investigations stated during the RAB presentation and the Navy's acknowledgment of PFAS contamination within the past couple of years. Rachelle referred to Mike Daly (United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA]) to comment on PFAS and when it was declared a hazardous substance as well as a Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL), which did not occur within the past 35 years. Mike explained that when they say they know a lot about the site, they are referring to the data that has been collected for other identified releases over time. With PFAS, they are looking at different release areas. Many of these release areas touch sites where previous releases were identified, also referred to as legacy sites. There are data points in these areas, but unfortunately, the data may not be for PFAS because PFAS is a new phenomenon. Mike explained there is a presence/absence determination made when investigating a site, noting that PFAS first became prevalent at AFFF sites with airfield missions, similar to former NAS Brunswick. Mike reiterated that they do know a lot about the site, but when it comes to PFAS release

areas, they continue to build on the CSM. According to Mike, there is no data indicating that there have been PFAS releases in the areas Jamie is questioning at this time.

Jamie acknowledged the investigation process but noted the dumping in the “red label area” and the break in surface topography at the southwest area of the base. Jamie pointed out that there are no deep groundwater wells in the area he referenced even though the residential drinking water wells are deep. Jamie questioned how the Navy could justify not performing investigations now to inform the public of a potential issue and urged the RAB to reconsider the decision to wait until they have more data. Jamie asked the Navy to provide a date for when the two wells MEDEP requested would be sampled. Rachelle stated the sampling of the two wells was complete and the data was undergoing validation, but following clarification in the conversation, the wells Rachelle referenced were not the two wells Jamie was referencing. Rachelle stated the Navy has no plans to sample the two wells Jamie referenced because the data does not support a need for sampling.

Ralph Keyes provided in-person comments:

Ralph Keyes expressed concern about terrestrial wildlife, including turkeys, deer, and waterfowl. Ralph asked if there has ever been testing of these animals, and if the answer is no, if the Navy could coordinate with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the Maine Department of Marine Resources to perform the sampling and to notify the public of which animals they should not consume. Rachelle explained that the Navy has been contacted by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to work with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to conduct the sampling. Rachelle also explained that the Navy is required to conduct a risk assessment as part of their investigation, which will look at both ecological and human health risks. This assessment is forthcoming.

Ralph asked how information will be shared with the public if there is evidence that people should not be consuming the wildlife. Rachelle stated the Navy is not charged with issuing advisories for consumption; the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention (Maine CDC) is responsible for issuing these advisories. The Navy works with Iver McLeod (MEDEP) who engages with Maine CDC, which is how the previous shellfish advisory was issued. Iver explained that the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife is in consultation with the Maine CDC, who serve as the state toxicologist, when they sample deer and turkey tissue. If there is a need for an advisory, a press release would be issued by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or Maine CDC, at a minimum.

Iver asked the in-person meeting attendees if they were aware of the freshwater fishing advisory announced in August 2024. Iver stated this advisory was issued by Maine CDC based on the data that the Navy collected as part of the RI. Ralph stated he was aware of the advisory, but the Navy needs to do a better job at reminding people of these existing issues.

Post meeting addition: Maine CDC fish advisories can be found at the following website:
<https://www.maine.gov/dhhs/mecdc/environmental-health/eohp/fish/2kfca.htm>

Ralph asked if the community outreach portion of the RAB meeting had been completed, to which Rachelle explained the public outreach referenced in the presentation is the Navy's public outreach as it pertains to the Navy's cleanup. It does not include the fish advisory.

Ralph expressed his surprise to find that there is no complete fence around the Quarry Area and that there is an informational kiosk in place with unexploded ordnance (UXO) safety sheets inside. Ralph asked if it was wise to encourage public access to a place that has potentially known hazards, including the potential for legacy pollutants. Ralph stated there should be more publicity regarding the potential for PFAS or other pollutant hazards that may have been dumped in the Quarry Area. Rachelle explained the Quarry Area was recently transferred for the purpose of passive recreation. The remedy at the Quarry Area considers the future use of the property as passive recreation. The kiosk supplied with documentation is in place as part of a Land Use Control (LUC) to communicate to the public what they can and cannot do when using it for the prescribed use of passive recreation. Mike Daly (USEPA) stated that the Record of Decision (ROD) is significant in terms of the amount of investigation and cleanup performed and he is confident in the level of detail. Mike explained that the Quarry Area was essentially a dumping area, but the level of explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) activity was sparse, and that the ROD summarizes all the information collected as part of these investigations. Additionally, Mike provided a comparison of the Quarry Area investigations to the investigations at Fort Devens.

Post meeting addition: A copy of the Quarry Area ROD is available on the Navy's Administrative Record at [N60087_003768.pdf](#).

Amy Self provided in-person comments:

Amy Self expressed concern over the well testing at the golf course, noting that the sample results exceed the federal standards. Amy stated the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority (MRRRA) has run into roadblocks trying to install water filtration systems. Amy asked who in the RAB could help MRRRA get the water filtration systems installed. Dan Stevenson (MRRRA) replied, stating the filtration systems were installed today [May 28, 2025]. Dan explained that part of the hold up with the installation was that there was testing done, meters installed, and then they had to wait for the water to go through the meter. MRRRA then had to wait for approval from the state. As soon as MRRRA received approval, the systems were installed.

Amy asked if the golf course irrigation water is included in the filtration system. Dan replied no, stating that the well being filtered is not used for irrigation on the golf course. The golf course draws water from a surface pond for irrigation. According to Rachelle, sampling of this surface pond is complete, and validated results should be available within the next couple of weeks.

Post meeting addition: Results from sampling the golf course irrigation pond indicate PFOS was detected at 4.5 ppt, and estimated concentrations of PFOA, perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS), perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA), and perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA) were detected at 1.2 ppt, 3 ppt, 0.53 ppt, and 0.91 ppt, respectively. These concentrations are well below human health project screening levels developed during the PFAS RI.

Note: ‘Estimated concentration’ (flagged with a “J” in laboratory reports) occurs when the compound is detected at low levels but cannot be quantified with certainty. Detection limits are determined by processing laboratory created samples with a known low concentration to determine the smallest amount of a compound that can be reliably detected.

Robert Mac Ewen provided in-person comments:

Robert Mac Ewen stated he is baffled by the logic of only testing a few sites on the former Navy base without addressing the water flowing to people along the western border. Robert referenced the groundwater flow direction illustrated in the presentation, which showed the Quarry Area with water flowing east to west. Robert explained that this flow direction would mean that contaminated water in the Quarry Area or elsewhere on the former base would flow towards people in the off-site neighborhoods. Robert expressed concern over the Navy not investigating these offsite wells.

Rachelle clarified the Navy is trying to explain that groundwater is flowing towards surface water. The Navy has no reason to believe or understand, based on the data that has been collected, that groundwater is flowing towards Princes Point Road. Robert clarified that he was referring to Route 123 on the western side, not Princes Point Road. Rachelle stated the situation is the same for Route 123 on the western side; groundwater is flowing towards surface water, so the data does not support sampling in this area.

Robert stated that he had his water tested after the AFFF spill. Robert described the construction of his well and stated that PFAS was detected in his water. Robert stated that his house borders Harpswell Cove and asked if it is safe to swim in Harpswell Cove. Iver McLeod (MEDEP) replied “absolutely” and acknowledged Finn Whiting (MEDEP) sitting in the meeting audience. Finn stated that they continue to sample in the meanders of Merriconeag Stream and that concentrations are back to pre-spill levels.

Iver stated that concentrations are below the levels at which Maine CDC would consider there to be a risk to human health by wading in the water and accidentally ingesting it, adding that the biggest risk from PFAS comes from ingestion. Robert expressed concern about kids specifically, to which Iver replied that the USEPA numbers that have come out take into account vulnerable populations, including children and immunocompromised people. Iver concluded that the water in Harpswell Cove is well below any dermal USEPA numbers or swimming USEPA numbers with incidental ingestion.

Robert shared a personal story which described the presence of an unexplained rash on his body for two years prior to the AFFF spill that would not go away. Robert installed a filter in his well as a result of detecting PFAS in his well. Robert stated that after about two months of using the filter the rash had disappeared. Robert expressed that it is difficult to believe the USEPA numbers based on his personal experience. Iver stated these numbers come from toxicologists. Robert stated that people are getting sick and dying because of PFAS and suggested that Iver start looking into this.

Suzanne Johnson provided in-person comments:

Suzanne asked for clarification on which levels of PFAS the Navy is screening against. Iver asked Suzanne to clarify if she was referring to detection levels, to which Suzanne referenced discussions of changing PFAS levels in the news. Iver explained that they screen for many PFAS and noted that the State of Maine guideline for drinking water is 20 ppt whereas the federal guideline is 5 ppt. According to Iver, the State is looking at lowering this level, but he is not sure of the status with Maine CDC.

Mike Daly (USEPA) explained that folks may have seen an announcement from USEPA in the news recently. Mike stated that in April 2024, USEPA passed drinking water standards for six PFAS. The recent announcement dropped four of the six PFAS and retained perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS). At the time of rulemaking, the standard for PFOA and PFOS was 4 ppt. USEPA's intention of dropping those four PFAS was to re-evaluate the four PFAS and to possibly propose new standards for them in the future. Mike clarified that the federal standard for PFOA and PFOS is 4 ppt. Mike also reminded RAB attendees that the State of Maine has interim drinking water standards established for six PFAS at a total summation of 20 ppt.

Joel Wagner provided in-person comments:

Joel Wagner stated MRRA had the sewer pit near Hangar 6 cleaned by Clean Harbors, but that subsequent testing performed by a community group showed reduced but still high concentrations of PFAS. Joel recalled that a groundwater investigation was taking place in the vicinity of Hangar 6 per the January 2025 RAB meeting. Joel asked if given the ongoing and persisting levels of PFAS in the sewer system and given the discussion of potential weak points in the infrastructure whether there has been an investigation into potential infiltration to groundwater that is causing these elevated levels of PFAS. Joel also asked that if there has not been an investigation if there are plans to investigate.

Rachelle explained this is the reason why the Navy is conducting a stormwater evaluation. The Navy learned from the construction contractors that some stormwater systems are designed to have breaches in the system whereas other portions of the system may be deteriorating. The CCTV survey will provide information about which are deteriorating. The Navy is nearing completion of the Hangar 4 area stormwater evaluation. Once this is complete, the Navy plans to move north to the Hangar 6 area. Simultaneously, Resolution Consultants is working on a groundwater investigation to install wells to investigate the area and determine the source of contamination.

Poppy Arford provided in-person comments:

Poppy Arford asked what level non-detect is set at. Mike Daly (USEPA) explained that USEPA Method 1633 is the current USEPA-approved method for non-drinking water. Mike explained that the detection limits can usually measure PFAS down to approximately 1-2 ppt or lower, but typically non-detect is referring to 1 ppt. Anything less than 1 ppt is near a quadrillionth. According to Mike, this is what the laboratories are currently offering as the standard for investigations.

Poppy asked who the non-detect level is set by, to which Iver McLeod (MEDEP) explained the chemists and the laboratories set the non-detect level based on the equipment that they are using. The non-detect value is not a regulatory criteria. Iver stated it is very important to MEDEP that the

detection limits are below regulatory criteria, but the level that the laboratories can achieve is contingent upon the equipment they are using.

Poppy stated she understands that the non-detect level has changed over the years and referred to changes in detection limits at the Brunswick public water supply. Poppy stated she is interested in public access to the data so the public can understand what the term “non-detect” means. Rachelle stated this information is included in every report that the Navy produces. If the Navy is collecting data, the report will include the laboratory report which provides a method detection limit. The laboratory report also provides a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) that demonstrates the laboratory was able to re-produce the same result multiple times to say with certainty that their equipment can test to a certain level. All of this data is included in the Navy’s reports, and Rachelle encouraged Poppy to reach out directly with any questions.

Post meeting addition: The laboratory reports are available on the Navy’s Administrative Record which is located at the following website: <https://administrative-records.navy.mil/?ML324WXMKRG47WL>. Note that in the Navy’s reports, results are provided in summary tables. For non-detects, results are listed as the laboratory detection limit for each PFAS with a laboratory qualifier of “U” indicating it was non-detect.

Poppy explained that Maine is moving in the direction of potentially passing legislation that will adopt the 4 ppt limit for PFOS and PFOA. Poppy asked for clarification on whether this is still the current USEPA level, to which Mike stated “yes” and that this was reinforced with the recent USEPA announcement. Poppy explained that herself and the public want to understand what the scientifically recommended safe limits for PFAS are. Maine is in the process of changing their current 20 ppt limit to match the most restrictive level. Poppy asked if the Navy would use the 4 ppt limit moving forward or if they would use the non-detect level.

Rachelle explained that the test method for groundwater is USEPA Method 1633 and the test methods for drinking water are USEPA Method 533 and 537.1. The Navy does not change the MCL. Rachelle stated DoD has an action level, which is a DoD prioritization policy that requires results to be three times the MCL for the Navy to take action. If the Navy samples a well and the results are between the MCL and the DoD action level, the Navy may not be able to take action until it is above 12 ppt (i.e., three times the USEPA level of 4 ppt [for PFOS or PFOA]). Rachelle noted that DoD does not promulgate standards.

Poppy questioned why the 12 ppt is acceptable and asked that the Navy provide information as to why this has been deemed a safe level. Rachelle referenced the DoD policy.

Post meeting addition: DoD Policies for PFAS can be found here <https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/eer/ecc/pfas/tf/policies.html>.

Earl Rosner provided in-person comments:

Earl Rosner provided an analogy between PFAS and cigarettes. Earl explained that when he was younger, cigarettes could be purchased in restaurant vending machines for a quarter. By the time he got to high school, the first “black box warning” was released which stated that cigarettes may be

hazardous to human health. Today, the “black box warning” states that cigarettes can kill you. Earl stated that he thinks human exposure to PFAS is in the “black box warning” stage.

Earl described the 11-foot tides at Harpswell Cove and stated that he only swims when the water is at a certain height. Earl and his neighbor had his water tested for PFAS and the results were positive. Earl began using the Brunswick Topsham Water District water and learned about the Jordan Avenue Wellfield from the engineers who work there. Earl stated that he learned PFAS has a “fingerprint”, that is, a distinct chemical composition, that makes it easy to identify that PFAS in two separate areas came from the same source area. Earl stated about half a dozen of his neighbors have had their water tested and the results were positive for PFAS. Earl had his water tested twice, and the results went down the second time. This led Earl to speculate that the results may have been higher the first sampling round because the samples were collected closer to when the AFFF spill occurred. Earl stated that the University of Maine uses his property to access Harpswell Cove to test the effects of PFAS on shellfish. In speaking with the University of Maine researchers, Earl learned that filtering his water might be enough to remove the PFAS depending on how low the level is. Earl stated that he plans to get a permanent filtration system installed. Earl thinks there are potential direct effects from exposure to PFAS and that he does not like the feeling that he should be protecting himself from the Navy; he likes to feel that he is being protected by the Navy. Earl hopes that his fellow residents get guidance on how they can use the water and hopes the Navy will broaden their scope.

Suzanne Johnson stated that many of the Princes Point residents provided their well tests and a community member has categorized them into a sheet. Suzanne stated they will share those results with the Navy.

Bruce Kantner provided in-person comments:

Bruce Kantner stated MRRA recently held a public meeting where they proposed taking up one of the runways at the former base as a possible plan for expansion. Bruce asked if the Navy could describe what that expansion would look like given the volume of PFAS under the airport apron, which to Bruce’s knowledge is still owned by the Navy, as well as the impact to groundwater flow. Bruce emphasized the importance of easily accessible and understandable information and asked if a model is available to the public to help them understand the impacts of MRRA’s plan. Bruce questioned the ramifications to the groundwater, the systems in place, and rebound, including the remains in the concrete.

Rachelle explained there is a construction permission form process as part of LUCs that is utilized when a project is proposed. This recently came up with the Katahdin Utility project and the Priority Property Group project. These projects proposed onsite treatment of groundwater. The Navy vetted the project with the technical team and regulators and rebound was a question that was discussed. This project incorporated comments from the regulatory agencies into their mitigation strategy and implementation plan. If the MRRA expansion project were to move forward, the Navy would review the project just like they would with any other construction project. They would ask questions about how they plan to manage water onsite and would evaluate the impacts, but they can’t do this until a project crosses their desk. Daniel Stevenson (MRRA) clarified the Airport Master Plan Upgrade includes only a portion of the outward runway. The rationale behind the expansion is to potentially build an air traffic control school.

Bruce stated that during the recent public meeting held by MRRA, MRRA announced that they are planning to release parcels around the airport and runway that are not being used. Bruce asked if this is possible given that this is a CERCLA Superfund Site. Bruce also asked who is in charge of oversight.

Rachelle referenced Slide 31 of the presentation and explained that if there are LUCs on a property, the Navy manages those LUCs in perpetuity until they are released. Rachelle does not expect these controls to be released anytime soon, and these controls are stated in the property deed. The Navy also requires property owners, including MRRA, to certify that they are complying with the LUCs. The graphic on Slide 31 is the strategy that Navy uses to ensure the controls stay in place. The Navy conducts inspections of their CERCLA sites to ensure that the LUCs are remaining in place. Rachelle explained that the signage at the Quarry Area mentioned earlier in the meeting is a LUC to communicate that there is material at that site that the public should be aware of. Each time the Navy works with a new project owner and they complete the construction permission form, the Navy works together with USEPA, MEDEP, Tetra Tech, and Resolution Consultants to ensure there will be no adverse impacts from the project.

Peggy Siegle provided in-person comments:

Peggy Siegle discussed excavations and piles of stockpiled excavated soil near her apartment building. Peggy noted a Brunswick Landing official construction permission request form that all authorized representatives of a property or the owner of a property must complete, and those representatives must certify acknowledgement of any residual contamination and records thereof. Peggy stated she understands that contractors and subcontractors must check and sign off on properly managing and testing excess soil disturbance with disposal based on results. Peggy asked where this information is made publicly available.

Rachelle explained that the construction permission form is embedded in the Town of Brunswick construction permit process. Any time a permit application is submitted, it cannot be approved without an approved construction permission form. Rachelle noted that some of these requirements are embedded in regulations. The form states what must be done when handling materials. A property owner and their contractor must certify that they understand what they are signing, and the Navy works with them to make sure they understand what they are signing. Some projects may not need to remove soil from the site and therefore may not need to dispose of soil from the site, so it depends on the project. This information is stated in the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) which is attached to the property deed when a property is transferred.

Peggy asked if the soil is tested when it is excavated. Rachelle stated it depends on whether there is a need to sample the soil. For instance, if the Navy is aware of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) on a property, which are usually present in urban area soil, they may not require the property owner to test the soil if they are not going to remove soil from the site. There are other instances where the Navy may not know, that is, PFAS, or the contamination may not be fully delineated, so they would require sampling of the soil, groundwater, or an existing monitoring well, if present, in the area that is representative of what they would likely encounter. Rachelle clarified that this is a project-specific review that is conducted with the regulatory agencies.

Peggy asked how the public would know if excavated soil is safe. Peggy noted seeing footprints in the excavated soil piles and mentioned that children and pets could access the soil piles because they are not fenced off. Peggy mentioned the potential presence of pesticides in certain areas. Peggy also asked how they would know if they can breathe that soil when it is windy and they are walking outside.

Suzanne Johnson asked Peggy to clarify if she was referring to the soil piles on Admiral Fitch Avenue. Peggy indicated she was referring to those soils as well as the many soil piles in the area. Suzanne asked if these soil piles have been characterized or tested for contamination. Suzanne noted that these soils may have come from Site 17, which she believes was a pesticide site. Rachelle explained that if the soils came from a Navy site the soil would have been characterized. Suzanne stated that only the top foot would have been characterized but that the piles being discussed are massive. Suzanne asked if these piles are being regularly tested, to which Rachelle replied no because they would not be required to be tested.

Suzanne questioned why these soils would not be regularly tested if they came from a Superfund Site. Mike Daly (USEPA) explained that PFAS is a qualifier, but otherwise, the environmental conditions were well documented when these properties were conveyed. Mike referenced a website that Iver McLeod (MEDEP) created and stated that there is a knowledge base of what contaminants are in the soils. For example, if there is a location where there are assumed PAHs in the soil they would avoid moving that soil. Suzanne stated that the excavation at Site 17 included just the top foot of soil and everything beneath was left uncharacterized. Mike stated Site 17 was excavated and effectively remediated. A thorough RI was completed for Site 17 and the remaining residual contamination was incinerated. Mike does not believe that the soils Suzanne is questioning would have come from Site 17 and reiterated that even if they were, the soils at Site 17 were remediated. Suzanne asked again if these soil piles would be sampled, and Mike explained that it depends on where the soils are coming from.

Suzanne asked where a community member would find the source of the soil piles in the construction permit. Iver asked for clarification of where the piles being referenced are located, and the in-person attendees discussed the location in the meeting room. Iver explained that he discussed the source of the soil for a project by Blue Dog Daycare with a contractor. The contractor informed Iver that the top foot of the soil was being excavated from a wooded area. Iver stated that if there was a soil management plan they would need to follow it, but he does not believe there was one for this area. Peggy stated these piles likely were not tested based on what Iver stated. Iver stated he believes the area is considered non-industrial and is not a CERCLA site or an area where there was believed to be a release of hazardous chemicals. Iver offered to review the transfer documents for Peggy to provide additional information.

Mike explained that supporting due diligence investigations may occur when a base has announced closure or when a reuse plan is in development. The Navy conducts studies above and beyond the CERCLA process as part of the conveyance process. Mike explained that many documents referenced in the FOST are essentially environmental due diligence surveys going above and beyond. When the Navy provides this conveyance, they specify if there is a need to manage soil or

groundwater. Regarding the project Suzanne and Peggy were discussing, Mike does not believe there was anything on that parcel that required management.

Jeanie Johnson provided in-person comments:

Jeanie Johnson asked the RAB members to apologize on behalf of the Navy. Rachelle thanked Jeanie for her comment.

Online Questions & Answers

Paul Ciesielski provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“I am present on the line and not absent as you said”.

This comment was acknowledged.

Ryan provided a comment in the meeting chat:

“And if we privately test our residences, and data supports PFAS contamination, what are the next steps? Especially living in close proximity to established contamination?”

Rachelle stated that she was unable to answer that question at the moment without getting through the RI process which determines nature and extent, which is why the Navy has not gone offsite to sample additional drinking water wells. If the data supports, they may be able to revisit this, but that would require input from other folks not in the meeting room.

In-Person Questions & Answers

Charlie Wallace provided in-person comments:

Charlie Wallace discussed the Comprehensive List of Lists published by USEPA in November 2024, which Charlie described as a comprehensive list of all substances that are harmful or known to be harmful to humans. Charlie described the CERCLA process as being “static”, inferring that the cleanup process cannot begin until a problem has been identified, and questioned when the process becomes dynamic. Charlie asked if in the list of lists, which identifies all regulatory work associated with the safety and management of chemicals harmful to human beings, is any of that considered in the reuse process the Navy uses to determine what are and are not appropriate land use controls.

Mike Daly (USEPA) stated he was not familiar with the Comprehensive List of Lists. Mike asked if Charlie to clarify if he was asking whether they have done their due diligence regarding all universal chemicals related to the base. Charlie stated he was asking about the static process of the USEPA, the founder of the CERCLA list, only being able to identify a Superfund Site if it is on this list. Charlie stated the status process became dynamic in November 2024 when the USEPA released the Comprehensive List of Lists of hazardous substances for which it is responsible for managing. Charlie asked what they are doing in the BRAC process to stay abreast of these chemicals rather than behind them. Mike stated he often gets the question of “what do we not know that we should know about”. Following a brief audio issue, Charlie provided an additional statement that the

USEPA has publicly listed the Comprehensive List of Lists for which people working in the environmental field have to take into account when conducting assessments. Charlie asked if the Navy is doing anything to become more dynamic in its reuse process for this base or elsewhere. Charlie also asked if anything has been done to recognize Comprehensive List of Lists that effects Superfund Sites since these sites are only sampled for certain parameters, that is, have they used the Comprehensive List of Lists to “re-look” at the sites.

Mike asked for a summation of the chemicals Charlie was referencing in the Comprehensive List of Lists, to which Charlie explained that there are hundreds of chemicals on the list. Iver McLeod (MEDEP) discussed the field of emerging contaminants, including PFAS and methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE), indicating that they do try to keep abreast of these chemicals. Iver also explained that when they say, “waste is left in place”, the responsible party must go back every five years to assess whether conditions have changed or if there are new chemicals or criteria to assess. Charlie concluded that the Comprehensive List of Lists has not been reviewed for former NAS Brunswick.

Regarding hydrology at the site, Charlie asked if a predictive groundwater model has been prepared for both bedrock and overburden and soils. Charlie asked if the groundwater flow is being looked at from a predictive modeling perspective to determine how exactly these watersheds are interacting with surface waters.

Derek Pinkham (Navy) stated models do exist for the site, including a model created for the Eastern Plume. New data is still being collected to input into a model. Charlie concluded that a predictive model for groundwater has not been created, stating that the Navy drilled wells, utilized pump and treat hoping that it would take the cone of depression and capture it, but the plume is for some reason “sneaking away”. Mike stated this is not true because they have used forward and reverse particle tracking as part of groundwater remediation, which uses a predictive model to assess a theoretical pump and groundwater extraction. Charlie requested a copy of the predictive models. Mike referenced the Administrative Record and explained that the model originated in the 1980s.

Charlie discussed the golf course well and questioned how the contamination could have been a “surprise” if this work has been modeled. Mike explained that the process begins with where the known releases are, then they look into groundwater flow. Mike emphasized that PFAS is still relatively new, the process continues to change over time, and the Navy continues to adjust to these changes. Mike explained that as part of the RI, the Navy needs to identify the nature and extent of contamination in groundwater and determine how that moves over time, which is where a model would be useful.

Charlie stated it appears the Navy is dealing with a dynamic situation, to which Mike agreed. Charlie suggested it might be time to re-look at the institutional ways in which these dynamic situations are being looked at and to overcome the fact that these processes are being driven by after-the-fact static determinations like the CERCLA process. Mike stated they are being dynamic, noting that they have enough information on the contamination on the northeast corner of the installation is impacting a major water supply for the Town of Brunswick and indicated that the Navy jumped on this, and a treatment system is being constructed.

Charlie provided a handout to the RAB meeting panel.

Josh Katz provided in-person comments:

Josh Katz stated he hopes the Navy will conduct a full investigation of the golf course well because it is situated in a key area. In addition to typical sample collection, Josh would like information to be collected regarding the well itself and for the Navy to collect additional samples at known fractures.

Josh expressed concern over the golf course surface pond sample being collected during a “wet time”, indicating that the results may be diluted. Josh requested the Navy collect an additional sample in the fall when there is dry weather.

Josh stated there is likelihood that the bedrock wells on Princes Point Road and possibly Harpswell Road are contaminated from old PFAS put in the ground during the firefighting training days. The bedrock surface on the western side of the base is high and the surface is not flat, so there has been ample opportunity for the AFFF to go into the ground. The base is sitting on a fault zone running roughly northeast to southwest, resulting in major fractures that may have the potential to transport fairly large quantities of water, possibly from these old firefighting areas, in that direction.

Josh stated his opinion is the PFAS at Princes Point is probably not from the August 2024 AFFF release but instead from historic firefighting practices. Josh discussed that at a former state agency job, bottled water would be provided to residents while the investigation was ongoing. Josh stated it would be good for community relations and likely low-cost to provide bottled water or filtration systems to the community on a temporary basis.

Rachelle thanked Josh for his comments.

Jamie Ecker provided in-person comments:

Jamie Ecker asked if the RAB makes recommendations as a board. Rachelle stated they take feedback back as a team that is consistent with Navy policy and vet it internally. The Navy may or may not accept the recommendations.

Jamie asked if the deliberations for formation of a recommendation are public. Rachelle stated that it is part of the greater cleanup CERCLA process that Navy undertakes at former NAS Brunswick.

Jamie asked how the board makes recommendations. Rachelle stated recommendations can be made at any time. Jamie clarified he was wondering how decisions get made, to which Rachelle stated this is not a decision-making body. Jamie provided further clarification, asking if the body makes recommendations to the Navy. Rachelle explained the Navy takes feedback for consideration and adjusts the cleanup accordingly.

Jamie asked if the RAB meetings are the only times persons can provide feedback. Rachelle stated any community member can provide comments and feedback at any time.

Christine Foster provided in-person comments:

Christine asked if a process could be implemented to notify tenants that live on Brunswick Landing about LUCs. Christine stated she was only made aware of the LUCs following the August 2024 AFFF spill. Rachelle stated the Navy is working on a newsletter and noted information regarding the newsletter is listed in the public outreach slide of the presentation (Slide 9). Rachelle stated she recognizes the gap that exists with the annual certification forms being sent to property owners and not tenants, noting that the homeowner's association (HOA) "web" at Brunswick is complex. Rachelle also noted a recommendation from a previous RAB to include a fact sheet with the LUC certifications that can be made available and was included with the current mailing. Rachelle stated her contact information is included in the last slide of the presentation and offered to share this information with Christine. Christine noted it would be ideal to share this information before someone signs a lease. For example, if folks are looking for an apartment on Zillow, they will not see this information.

Christine asked if the LUCs could be made easier to find and make sense of, to which Iver McLeod (MEDEP) referenced MEDEP's online LUC map. Christine suggested that the map show each property by address with the contaminants of concern listed for each property. Iver explained that this is what he tried to do but because the Navy transferred properties under different FOSTs and MRRA piecing these areas together, some parcels have multiple FOSTs attached. Iver stated most residential areas are under the same FOST and offered to follow-up with Christine. Christine explained the map is not user friendly and would like to understand whether the soil at her property is contaminated using the map. Christine noted that information such as whether or not she could have a garden at her property would be useful information to have. Christine also recommended that a Frequently Asked Questions list be put on the website. Rachelle explained the newsletter is likely the best avenue to communicate out and this would be posted on the website. Iver also clarified that communities at risk and levels of exposure are taken into account with the LUCs.

Jim Carslik provided in-person comments:

Jim Carslik explained his water is contaminated with PFAS, and although MEDEP determined it is safe to drink, Jim worries about the uncertain health risks his family is assuming and the future resale value of his home. Jim expressed that he wants safe drinking water for himself and his neighbors and wants the Navy to pay for it.

Rachelle thanked Jim for his comments.

Shelly Fritz provided in-person comments:

Shelly Fritz paid respect to the service members in light of Memorial Day. Shelly explained that the military has a duty to protect the natural resources and stated that she personally, and on behalf of Brunswick and other areas facing contamination from the Navy, is calling on the Navy to fulfill its duty to remediate as thoroughly as possible any damage it has caused and to honor the solemn duty to protect Americans that has been violated. Shelly noted internal industry studies, including a study by 3M, indicate that levels of PFAS above 1 ppt is toxic to humans.

Shelly asked what air and surface testing has been done inside Hangar 4 following the August 2024 AFFF spill. Shelly asked when the testing was performed, what the results show, where the information is made available to the public, what signage is available to notify the public of what was found, and what the response from the Navy and any other relevant stakeholders to concerns that PFAS are rebounding in steel and concrete surfaces that may retain PFAS is, specifically inside Hangar 4.

Rachelle stated she is not aware of any air testing but that there is a research study being conducted. As a result of the spill, Brunswick was selected to be a sample site for a number of research studies. Rachelle referenced Slide 28 and noted the second heading on the slide, PFAS Transport and Interaction with Portland Cement & Asphalt Concrete (ER23-3683), is where cement outside of the hangar where foam was observed to be sitting on the concrete was sampled to identify PFAS leaching capabilities. This is not a Brunswick project team effort but instead is a DoD research effort. Rachelle pointed out the website link at the bottom of Slide 28 and stated that there is quite a bit of research occurring across the DoD. When they reach a point where they are ready to take an interim action, this ongoing research will ideally meet the technical need. Rachelle acknowledged there are many moving parts and encouraged Shelly to reach out with questions. Rachelle also noted that the Principal Investigator's contact information is available at the link on Slide 28. The Principal Investigator will be able to provide an update on when the literature will be released.

Shelly stated she would like to stay in communication with the relevant stakeholders in this and noted it seems important to conduct both internal and external testing of these surfaces and the air.

Rachelle thanked Shelly for her comments.

The remainder of the slides were not presented due to the significant number of comments and questions received by community members. Therefore, a summary of the slides not presented are provided below.

MAJOR SITE ACTIVITY UPDATES

Ongoing Navy PFAS Efforts, continued – (Slides 22-25)

PFAS Drinking Water Sampling Program (Slide 22)

Drinking water sampling is planned to confirm results in areas that have been sampled previously. The drinking water sampling program is designed to provide flexibility to sample in areas where potential data gaps are identified as part of the ongoing PFAS remedial investigation. Sampling will begin in June as the Navy continues to secure the necessary access agreement documentation. Individual sampling results will be provided to the property owner.

Jordan Avenue Wellfield (Slides 23-24)

The Navy identified impacts to the Jordan Avenue well field in 2022. The Navy entered into an Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement with the Brunswick Topsham Water District to install a PFAS treatment system at the Jordan Avenue wellfield. The treatment system is comprised

of an ion exchange resin along with granular activated carbon to treat PFAS. The treatment system is expected to be online in Spring 2026.

Jordan Avenue Wellfield PFAS Source Identification (Slide 25)

Historical PFAS investigations in the northern portion of the former base indicated impacts at the Jordan Avenue Wellfield are likely attributable to the historical use of PFAS-containing AFFF. Identifying the source of PFAS will allow the Navy to implement a removal action to prevent continued PFAS-impacts to downgradient areas. A work plan is currently being developed to document the potential sources and data gaps.

DoD's SERDP/ESTCP – Brunswick Selected as a Research Site – (Slides 27-29)

Congress established research programs in 1990 to develop innovative, scalable technologies to tackle the breadth and scope of challenges experienced at DoD's installations and former NAS Brunswick was selected as one of many sample sites. The Navy project team supports the research efforts via coordination, only providing knowledge and information in furtherance of the research project. Additional information can be found on the SERDP-ESTCP website.

Navy Funded – Brunswick Selected as a Research Site – (Slide 30)

Navy received congressional funding to evaluate PFAS migration from historical releases and background concentrations. That research was conducted by the Engineering and Expeditionary Warfare Center in Port Hueneme, CA. The Navy has not received the final publication but can share it when it becomes available.

Land Use Controls (LUCs) – A Layering Strategy – (Slide 31)

Prior to property being transferred from Navy ownership, the property is evaluated to document the environmental conditions and determine appropriate land use restrictions, or controls, commonly referred to as LUCs. These findings and the associated LUCs are documented in FOST and included in the property's deed.

Property owners on Brunswick Landing are required to certify annually that they comply with the LUCs.

CERCLA sites are inspected with LUCs and are inspected annually to confirm that LUCs are implemented and functioning as stated as part of each site's remedy.

All property located on Brunswick Landing where construction activities are planned requires a Construction Permission Form as part of the town's construction permit approval process.

LUCs by the Numbers – (Slide 32)

Property owners are required to certify annually that they acknowledge and adhere to existing LUCs associated with their property. For the 2024 calendar year, 64% of the forms have been signed and received.

LUC Corrective Actions – (Slide 33)

During the 2024 annual inspection, corrective action items were identified to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment. At the Quarry Area, signs at access points were observed to be faded, the box holding fact sheets was broken, and well repairs were identified. Corrective action was completed in April 2025.

LUCs by the Numbers – (Slides 34-35)

Construction at Brunswick Landing requires a Construction Permission Request form. The construction permission form is reviewed by the Navy, in consultation with USEPA and MEDEP, to determine if mitigation measures are required. The form is available from the Navy or on the Town's website. To date, 55 forms have been approved, 18 of which were requested and approved in 2024.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Former Picnic Pond Stormwater Retention System Sediment Remediation – (Slide 37)

Sediment disposal and site restoration for the Picnic Pond remediation is planned for this year. A completion report will be prepared following the field work.

Five Year Review – (Slide 38)

As part of the CERCLA process, five-year reviews are required for sites where a final remedy (e.g. Record of Decision) and contamination remains in place to ensure that implemented remedial actions remain protective of human health and the environment. The 6th five-year review includes eight (8) CERCLA sites. The FYR does not evaluate PFAS since it is in an earlier phase (e.g Remedial Investigation phase) of the CERCLA process. The Draft Sixth FYR report was issued in April and the final report is to be signed by late September 2025.

Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) CERCLA Sites – (Slide 39)

LTM sites are where chemicals of concern remain at the site and monitoring is required to evaluate plume stability for the chemicals of concern in groundwater as documented in each site's ROD.

CERCLA LTM Sampling – (Slide 40)

The 2024 spring and fall LTM events were completed in August and October 2024 and indicate that the selected remedy for each site is functioning as intended. The Draft Annual LTM report is anticipated to be released in late spring 2025. In April 2025, an additional radiological survey

investigation was conducted at Sites 1 & 3 to confirm if radioactivity is still present at site outfall and drain locations.

The spring 2025 LTM sampling event was completed the week of May 19, 2025.

Eastern Plume GWETS – (Slides 41-42)

The Groundwater Extraction Treatment System (GWETS) is a component of the Eastern Plume remedy with tangential benefit of treating PFAS. This pumping controls groundwater from migrating offsite, commonly referred to as hydraulic control.

Extraction well, EW-11, was installed in an area where PFAS concentrations are the highest across Brunswick Landing. Effluent concentrations for PFAS continue to be below laboratory detection levels, MEDEP Interim PFAS Drinking Water Standard, and USEPA maximum contaminant levels.

GWETS PFOS Concentrations – (Slide 43)

PFOS concentrations in the plant influent show a decreasing trend over the 10-year period that samples have been collected. PFOS is not detected in the effluent samples.

GWETS PFOA Concentrations – (Slide 44)

PFOA concentrations in the plant influent also show a decreasing trend over the 10-year sampling period. PFOA is not detected in the effluent samples.

Petroleum Cleanup Program LTM Sampling – (Slide 45)

The Petroleum LTM Program includes sampling on a biennial basis at the Old Navy Fuel Farm and Naval Exchange Service Station. Sampling is completed in accordance with MEDEP remediation guidelines, most recently in June 2024. The 2024 draft reports are expected in June 2025. Sampling results for both sites indicate the petroleum hydrocarbon plumes are overall stable and concentrations are decreasing.

Findings of Suitability to Transfer – (Slide 46)

To transfer land, the Navy must prepare a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (commonly referred to as a FOST) to document applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. The FOST will state any covenants required for inclusion in the property deed. PFAS has become a significant hurdle for property transfer as PFAS is much earlier in the CERCLA process compared to other sites. The Navy will continue discussing options with the regulatory agencies to determine how to meet statutory and regulatory requirements.

MEETING WRAP UP

Rachelle reminded the meeting attendees that contact information for herself, Michael Daly (USEPA) and Iver McLeod (MEDEP) is available on Slide 48 and encouraged attendees to reach out with questions. Rachelle noted that the next RAB meeting is scheduled for September 2025 at 6:00 p.m. The meeting will be in a hybrid format, both in-person in Brunswick and online.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDEES

In-Person Meeting Attendees

W. Rachelle Knight, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator

Derek Pinkham, Navy RPM

Michael Daly, USEPA RPM

Iver J McLeod, MEDEP RPM

Daniel Stevenson, MRRA

Susan Schow, RAB Member

Carol White, BACSE Technical Advisor

David Page, RAB Member

Suzanne Johnson, RAB Co-Chair

Caryn DeJesus, Resolution Consultants

Tessa Murphy, Resolution Consultants

Steven Surrusco, Resolution Consultants

Chelsea Fellows-Stanley, Tetra Tech

Ralph Keyes

Susan Pelley

Dalene Rogers

Joel Wagner

Shelley Fritz

Bruce Kantner

Richard E.

Steven Weems

Charlie Wallace

James Ecker

Earl Rosner

Peggy Siegle

Christine Foster

Amy Self

Robert Mac Ewen

Poppy Arford

Jeanie Johnson

Josh Katz

Jim Carslik

*Note that not all in-person attendees signed the sign-in sheet.

Online Meeting Attendees

Lisa Shanahan, Resolution Consultants

Paul Ciesielski, RAB Member

Jeffery Nay, Brunswick TV3

Jim Nelon, Brunswick TV3

Brunswick Cable TV

Brad Guay (Freeport)

CD

Deborah Vose

Gina Calderone

Jake Dateno

Jeff

Katherine Super

Kathy E Wilson

Keefe Askin

Lea Carnevali

Leslie

Martha Otto

Ralinda Miller

Ryan