Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst (JB MDL) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes Meeting No. 54 – 17 August 2016

SUBJECT: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting No. 54 – Meeting Minutes

1) Place: Edward Holloway Senior Citizen Community Center, 5 Cookstown Browns Mills Road, Cookstown, New Jersey

2) Date/Time: Wednesday, 17 August 2016; 6:30 PM

3) Co-Chairs: Col Gregory McClure, 87th Civil Engineer Group Commander, JB MDL
Mr. Michael Tamn, Resident, Southampton Township, New Jersey

4) Attendees:

Mr. Frank Storm	RAB Member
Ms. Theresa Lettman	RAB Member
Mr. Tom Besselman	RAB Member
Mr. Doug Pocze	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region II (EPA)
Ms. Carla Struble	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region II (EPA)
Ms. Donna Gaffigan	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP)
Mr. Curtis Frye	JB MDL, AFCEC/CZO, Chief, Environmental Restoration Program
Ms. Nicole Brestle	JB MDL, AFCEC/CZO, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. Michael Figura	JB MDL, AFCEC/CZO, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. King Mak	JB MDL, AFCEC/CZO, Environmental Restoration Program
Ms. Erin Laux	JB MDL, AFCEC/CZO, Environmental Restoration Program
Mr. Joseph Rhyner	JB MDL, 787 CES/CEIE, Chief Environmental Element
Ms. Agnes Marsala	Resident
Mr. Pat Miller	Resident
Ms. Jodi Miller	Resident
Mr. Tim Llewellyn	Arcadis
Ms. Katrina Harris	Bridge Consulting Corp./Arcadis

5) Handouts

- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Meeting No. 54, 17 August 2016, Agenda
- JB MDL Restoration Advisory Board, Meeting No. 54, 17 August 2016, Presentation Slides
- JB MDL, List of Documents Provided to Mr. Tamn as of 17 August 2016
- JB MDL, Community Involvement Plan, Final, August 2016
- Public Notice Affidavit for the Asbury Park Press citing commencement of the 30-day public comment period on the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the Removal Action, Former Dix Small Arms Range, Site SR002
- Notice of Public Comment Period for the Burlington County Times for the commencement of the 30-day public comment period on the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the Removal Action, Former Dix Small Arms Range, Site SR002

6) Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Col Gregory McClure, 87th Civil Engineer Group Commander, JB MDL. Col McClure welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for attending.

7) Minutes of Previous Meeting and Review of Agenda Items:

Mr. Michael Tamn, RAB Community Co-Chair, asked for any comments on the minutes from the 12 May 2016 RAB meeting. Several members did not recall receiving the draft minutes sent on 20 July 2016, and it was agreed to defer approval until the next meeting. Several members expressed interest in receiving the minutes by email, and Ms. Brestle asked the community members to let her know their preference for receiving minutes by email or regular mail. Ms. Brestle provided her phone number in the event RAB members have any questions in the future about the meeting date: 609.754.0068.

Mr. Curt Frye reminded all that the meeting was being recorded for purposes of preparing meeting minutes. He introduced a new member of the JB MDL Environmental Program staff, Ms. Erin Laux, a contract employee.

Mr. Frye noted there were no action items from the last meeting.

Mr. Frye stated the Final Community Involvement Plan (CIP) update was distributed this evening. He suggested community members place the document in their RAB Handbooks. He said a copy would be put in the Information Repository and on the RAB web site. He stated while the CIP had been finalized, the Air Force is open to comments at any time.

Mr. Frye noted that the RAB web site is active (www.envirorestorejbmdl.com) but still being developed, and feedback is welcome. He noted it will eventually link to the base web site.

8) Perfluorinated Compounds Update:

Mr. Frye reminded the RAB that Mr. Cornell Long from the Air Force Civil Engineer Center in San Antonio, the Air Force's subject matter expert, had given an in-depth briefing at the May meeting on perfluorinated compounds (PFCs). He stated PFCs are associated with Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) which is a fire fighting foam used at the base, generally a military-spec foam used for fighting petroleum fires. Mr. Frye said that AFFF contains PFCs which are a class of emerging contaminants. He reminded everyone that at the May RAB meeting he briefed that the base was at the Site Inspection stage of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process, with a work plan being developed and planned sampling work to begin later in the summer. Mr. Frye said since the last meeting a draft Site Inspection work plan has been submitted to the regulators, comments have been received and discussed at meetings, responses have been provided, and the Air Force has worked with the regulators to select appropriate sampling locations for all of the JB MDL sites.

Mr. Frye stated the final Preliminary Assessment in 2015 identified 34 sites across the base where there was potential for release of PFCs associated with AFFF releases—either a release from a hanger or a release from the use of AFFF in putting out a fire associated with a plane crash or from use in a designated fire training area. He advised some of the 34 Preliminary Assessment sites were combined so the Site Inspection addresses 21 sites--11 at McGuire, four (4) at Dix, and six (6) at Lakehurst.

Mr. Frye advised the sampling crew had mobilized in early August and completed about 30% of the sampling so far. He stated they would be collecting 300 to 400 samples of soil, surface water, sediment and groundwater. He noted the final work plan would be distributed in about two (2) weeks.

Mr. Tamn asked when the sampling would be completed, and Mr. Frye responded it would take about six (6) weeks to complete the sampling effort, with a validated data package being received in November and a draft report distributed in the late winter or early spring. Mr. Tamn asked if any of the data would be available to discuss at the November RAB meeting, and Mr. Frye said some initial data may be able to be presented.

Mr. Frye displayed a map showing the 21 sites. Mr. Tamn asked about the site were there had been an aircraft crash near Texas Avenue around 1972. Mr. Frye said the sites did not include every site of a crash, but were selected based on where there was evidence that AFFF was used. In response to a question about AFFF being used in training, Mr. Frye confirmed that AFFF had been used in training exercises at numerous fire training areas across JB MDL for many years, and civilian firefighters from surrounding communities had also conducted training on base using AFFF at the fire training areas.

A member of the public asked how many of the sites were close to streams. Mr. Frye responded the exact details of the distances to surface water would be in the reports as they do vary. He explained during the Site Inspection phase, where it is appropriate, the Air Force had worked with the regulators to select surface water and sediment sample locations; if there is a body of water or stream near one of the releases, it would be sampled. The member of the public asked about the drains that run into the streams, and Mr. Frye responded those are being assessed also, along with waste water treatment plants.

9) Military Munitions Response Program at Lakehurst Update:

Mr. Michael Figura, Lakehurst Program Manager and JB MDL Military Munitions Program Manager displayed a map showing all the Military Munitions Response Program sites, noting there are six (6) at Lakehurst, two (2) at McGuire, and two (2) at Dix.

He stated he would be giving an update this evening on the Small Arms Range on Dix, south of the former practice mortar range, which is now the Holly Crest Military Housing area. The Dix Golf Course is located just to the north.

- The Small Arms Range is a 6.75 acre site and included two berms used for testing of both automatic weapons and pistols and rifles. The firing range was used from 1918 to 1945. One of the berms was removed in the 1950s and the other one remains. The area is now woods.

- As part of an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) study, soil sampling was performed throughout the area, both horizontally and vertically to delineate the levels of lead, antimony, and copper in the soil. A map was displayed showing the impact at different depths throughout the area. Samples were analyzed in the field as well as in the laboratory. A removal action is planned to remove contaminated soil to a depth of up to three and a half feet.

- The Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis and Work Plan have been prepared, as well as an Action Memorandum to support the removal of the contaminated soil; the documents are available at the Burlington County Library. As part of the process, a Public Notice was published in the Asbury Park Press and Burlington County Times on 11 August 2016 to notify the community of the planned action. The 30-day public comment period runs through 11 September 2016. The removal action is targeted to begin November 2016. Trees will be cleared first, and then the soil removed. The soil to be removed is more than originally projected, so additional funding has been requested which may impact the schedule. The goal for the site, after the removal of the soil, is to meet the unrestricted

use/exposure standard so the site can be used for other purposes and need no further cleanup actions. A Removal Action Report will be prepared after the work is completed, and the estimated date for that report is November 2017.

- There will also be a groundwater investigation to make sure the groundwater at the site has not been impacted; typically there is not an impact to groundwater at this type of site, as the lead it not very mobile. Multiple rounds of groundwater samples will be collected through February 2017.

- The Remedial Investigation Report will identify any remaining soil or groundwater exceedances and will be issued in November 2017. If needed, a Feasibility Study would be completed in January 2018. If the Remedial Investigation Report indicates no further action is needed, the next document would be a decision document.

Mr. Figura noted he had been providing status updates at the last couple meetings on the investigation of the Lakehurst Proving Grounds Parachute Jump Circle Bombing Targets. Mr. Figura stated he would give a brief update on the most recent activities at these two short-range target areas inside the Lakehurst Parachute Jump Circle.

- A map was displayed showing the almost 800 locations (green dots) of anomalies that were excavated after being found by the metal detector. The yellow dots indicated the 37 locations where a high-explosive munition was found; these were consolidated and detonated on-site on five or six separate occasions. There were two chemical munitions found—a 75 mm projectile that contained mustard and a Livens projectile that contained phosgene. Both of these items were stored in sealed containers in a holding facility that had been placed nearby in the event any chemical munitions were found. The plans and an Emergency Destruction System were then put in place to safely destroy those two items as briefed at previous meetings.

- In early July, the Chemical Materials Activity from Aberdeen Proving Ground set up a large self-contained tent facility and the trailer-mounted Emergency Destruction System. They also set up laboratories, storage facilities and a command post, as well as other facilities, near where the items were found. Several tours were conducted, including one with Col McClure and David Glass, Deputy Commissioner for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP).

- A series of photographs were shown of the items being loaded into the Emergency Destruction System and what remained after the destruction. Linear charges are placed around the item to break open the item within the sealed unit, and chemicals then neutralize the item's contents. The chemicals are then drained and placed in sealed drums for proper disposal. The Livens projectile was destroyed on 15 July 2016, and the mustard round was destroyed on 17 July 2016.

- The tent and other facilities have been demobilized, and the roadways have been re-graded.

- An internal draft Remedial Investigation Report is under review by the Air Force and will be distributed to the regulators and stakeholders in early 2017. The report details what was found and what is proposed for future actions.

- Funding has been requested for a full surface clearance of the Jump Circle and for using advanced classification which is using a high-end metal detector that detects from several different angles; the detector shows what an item looks like before it is dug up so scrap is not dug up, only intact munitions. A contract is targeted for award in fiscal year 2017, with the work to be conducted in 2018.

- The removal action after the advanced classification will process 100 percent of the Parachute Jump Circle target area. A contract is targeted for award in fiscal year 2018, with the removal action in 2019-2020 to remove any remaining high explosive or chemical munitions. Plans are also being developed to do full surface clearance on other target areas at the Proving Grounds.

- Ms. Donna Gaffigan asked if the drums containing the chemicals are stored onsite, and Mr. Figura responded the drums are stored in the holding facility where the intact munitions were originally held. He advised they are inspected on a weekly basis and will be properly disposed of shortly as the facility is a 90-day generator.

- Mr. Doug Pocze asked if there would be a final report on the destruction. Mr. Figura said he would check whether the information will be in a separate report or part of the Remedial Investigation Report.

- Mr. Frank Storm asked if there was any danger with respect to the destruction. Mr. Figura said there was not as the munitions were not leaking, and they were inspected before being placed in the sealed containers which were built to safely hold an item if it were to detonate or leak. The air was monitored when they were removed from the containers for destruction, and no chemical agent was detected.

10) Lakehurst Five-Year Review:

Mr. Figura stated that once remedies are put in place at sites where unrestricted exposure has not been reached, the remedies need to be assessed every five years to ensure they remain protective of human health and the environment. He advised the fourth five-year review has just been completed for Lakehurst. He stated Lakehurst had 45 sites under the Environmental Restoration Program, and 35 sites have decision documents in place. A member of the general public asked if the list includes Military Munitions Response Program sites, and Mr. Figura said it does not as these sites are still being investigated and do not yet have decision documents. Mr. Figura said the most recent report concluded the remedies in place continue to be protective, and EPA and NJDEP agreed with the assessment. He advised the report is being routed within the Air Force for final signature, and there will be a public notice when the final report is available.

Mr. Figura then showed a video produced by the EPA on five-year reviews. (A link to the video is on the JB MDL environmental web site at www.envirorestorejbmdl.com under the Overview tab.)

Ms. Theresa Lettman asked when the Public Notice would appear, and Mr. Figura said he expected it to be within the next month.

Ms. Lettman asked about a map contained in the Land Use Control Implementation Plan and areas marked “use caution”; she asked what that designation means. Mr. Figura explained areas marked as “use caution” are areas that are not former range or target areas, but the possibility exists that munitions could be present. He said if someone plans to dig in one of those areas, they need to go through the dig permit process and be trained to be aware they might encounter an item. Ms. Lettman asked if this would apply to the entire length of the proposed New Jersey Natural Gas pipeline. Mr. Figura responded it would apply. Col McClure added that while there is no expectation that any items are going to be found, because of the proximity to areas that were impact areas, there is a warning for workers to be on the lookout for items. Mr. Figura said there are areas on base, such as former range target areas, where a survey must be completed to look for and excavate metal objects prior to any digging; however, the areas identified as “use caution” are areas where the possibility of finding

munition items is less, and therefore the survey does not have to be done before digging.

A member of the general public asked about when the removal of contamination would occur at Site TS875. Mr. Figura said this site is the McGuire Skeet Range and is still in the Remedial Investigation phase. He said the extent of soil impacts have been delineated, and groundwater monitoring wells installed where the highest levels of compounds were detected in the soil. Mr. Figura said this type of site would be expected to possibly have elevated levels of lead in soil. He said there was not sufficient information on the nature and extent of contamination at this site for a removal action to be included as part of the current contract. He said the Remedial Investigation Report will document the complete delineation of the site, and then any needed removal action will be put out for bid. The member of the general public asked why the sites at Lakehurst were given priority when there is no one close by who could be impacted as compared to TS875 where there are people who work around that area. Mr. Figura responded there is no data that shows there is any immediate impact on human health or the environment; there are no elevated levels of lead contamination on the downgradient farm field, although there are impacts in the forested areas. He explained as part of the investigation there will be a human health and ecological risk assessments performed that will evaluate any potential risk.

A member of the general public asked if Area I/J will not be looked at again for another five years after the five-year review report has been approved. Mr. Figura responded that groundwater monitoring is performed annually as part of the Monitored Natural Attenuation remedy. He said the Air Force continues to monitor and treat groundwater and generate reports in the time between five-year reviews. He noted the formal five-year review process assesses the remedy to ensure it remains protective. Mr. Pocze added that the five-year review summarizes the other annual reports as well as other information.

Ms. Lettman asked if the five-year review report would be put on the web site when it is out for public review, and Ms. Brestle responded that it would be added to the online Administrative Record and in the library. Mr. Frye clarified the report will be available for the public to review, but there is no formal public comment period.

11) Land Use Control Implementation Plan and Performance-Based Contract Field Work Update:

Mr. Tim Llewellyn of Arcadis stated the five-year review process assesses the effectiveness of remedies, but it also assesses the continuing effect of Land Use Controls which may be part of the remedies. Mr. Llewellyn said he would be presenting information on how the Land Use Controls are memorialized and enforced at the base.

- Land Use Controls are any physical means or administrative mechanism that prevent exposure to contaminants above the permissible level that may cause a human health risk. Land Use Controls are divided into two types: Institutional Controls and Engineering Controls. Institutional Controls are administrative or legal controls, such as a Classification Exception Area (CEA) if there is contaminated groundwater or, for a private site, it might be a deed restriction. At DoD sites, the Land Use Controls are put into the Joint Base's General Plan. Engineering Controls are physical controls, such as fences, signs, and caps.

- The Land Use Control Implementation Plan is a document that discusses the responsibilities and procedures for establishing, maintaining and tracking the Land Use Controls. It is a living document that is updated annually. As part of the annual update, an inspection is conducted of all the sites which have Land Use Controls across JB MDL, including National Priority List sites, Military Munitions Response Program sites, or state-led petroleum sites.

- The Land Use Control Implementation Plan divides sites into three groups: sites without a

selected remedy (pre-decision document sites); sites with a selected remedy; and sites which require no further action.

- One a decision document is in place, a Remedial Design document is prepared which specifies what the Land Use Controls will be for that site. The Land Use Controls are legally enforceable.

- Prior to a decision document being in place, there is no specific requirement for Land Use Controls. However, elective Land Use Controls can be put in place.

- For sites that have gone through the remedial action process and where no further action is needed, there are no Land Use Controls. To keep track of all the Environmental Restoration Program sites, the no further action sites are included in the Land Use Control Implementation Plan.

- There is a Land Use Control awareness program which includes primarily the institutional controls which would be listed in the installation's Master Plan, and the GIS and Air Force data tracking systems. There is a Land Use Control training and awareness program for Air Force managers. The program also includes obtaining waivers for construction, dig permits, munitions sweep requirements, and annual inspections.

- An example of a Land Use Control is this GIS layer of JB MDL (graphic display) showing the sites and their Land Use Controls.

- A member of the general public asked what controls are in place at Operable Unit 1, LF003. Mr. Llewellyn advised no decision document has been signed yet, and cleanup alternatives are being evaluated. He said there are elective controls in place, such as the need for a dig permit.

- Inspection forms are used during the annual inspection process to ensure the controls are in place, and there are no changes in the site usage which may impact the controls. For example, if there is a groundwater use restriction in place, looking for any signs of groundwater use would be part of the annual inspection. Engineering controls would be examined annually to ensure signs and fences are in place and in good condition. Caps on landfills would also be inspected to ensure there are no erosion issues.

- The 2015 and 2016 plans are undergoing review with the regulators. In October, inspections will be conducted and an inspection form completed for each site. In January, the report will be submitted to the regulators. In March 2017, the process begins again. Every five years, the five-year review process occurs and the plan is an important part of that review.

- Ms. Lettman asked if the reports are put in the library, and Mr. Llewellyn responded the reports are put into the Information Repository.

Mr. Llewellyn next provided an update on the current field work being conducted under the basewide performance-based contract.

- For the McGuire National Priority List (NPL) Sites, the draft final Feasibility Study for Operable Unit (OU) 3, a group of landfills, was the document which led to the dispute between EPA and the Air Force so that will be the first document modified to meet the dispute resolution which recognizes the applicability of Pinelands Standards to groundwater. The document is being revised to address Air Force comments and will be distributed to the regulators soon. A major field event was just completed to update

groundwater data; 300 wells were sampled and the laboratory is analyzing the samples. Once the data is received, it will be used to fully evaluate the sites and recommend potential remedies. A second round of confirmatory sampling of the 300 wells will be conducted in September. Pilot tests are also underway to evaluate alternatives. At OU2, a pilot test of multi-phase extraction (a possible technology to address the solvent plume at SS036) is underway this week. At OU4 where there is pure-phase jet fuel in the groundwater, a natural source and depletion study is underway to see if there is natural degradation. At OUs 7 and 8, microcosms have been deployed into the wells to access the effectiveness of bioremediation.

- For the 13 McGuire State-Led Compliance Sites (former petroleum storage areas), there are six sites which have been under remedy for almost a year. For the monitored natural attenuation remedy (four sites), data is being collected on a quarterly basis; the first annual report will be issued soon and will show any data trends. An air sparge/soil vapor extraction system was just installed at TU013 and is now running full time. At Storage Site TU018, the first of three chemical oxidant injections has been completed, and the sampling shows good destruction of the chemicals of concern. There are a few remedies under design, including bio-sparging at one site, where oxygen is injected to increase the natural degradation process. A pilot test for air sparge/soil vapor extraction was conducted at TU003; the results showed this was not a good technology for this site as the soils were too impermeable. An excavation remedy is now being considered for TU003 with natural attenuation. At DP501, site closeout is almost achieved, and site closeout is proceeding at TU022.

- At BOMARC, a meeting was held with NJDEP on July 13 to discuss the remedies evaluated in the Feasibility Study—air sparge/soil vapor extraction, permeable reactive barrier walls, and monitored natural attenuation. Numerous technologies were evaluated in the Feasibility Study to try and address the very complicated geology at the site where TCE is bound up in the soil and continues to move into the groundwater. The remedy under consideration would restore most of the aquifer to the Pinelands Standards within 10 years, as well as mitigating the surface water impacts. There is a two-acre area where the TCE is bound up in the tight soils where the best alternative is a containment remedy with an air sparge line which will have to run about 100 years, but it will prevent contamination of the aquifer. The preferred remedy for the area where a small underground storage tank was removed some years ago will be no further action as groundwater samples around that site are clean. Recent sampling has shown decreasing levels across the site. A final Feasibility Study is targeted for November 2016. A Proposed Plan, public meeting and 30-day public comment period is estimated for April 2017, followed by a Record of Decision in November 2017, and the remedial action constructed in late 2017/early 2018. Mr. Tamn asked how far down the stream the contamination has moved; Mr. Llewellyn said the groundwater does discharge to the stream, and he would get the exact distance after the meeting and also the last date of surface water sampling.

- At the 0900 Area on Dix, a Proposed Plan and public meeting is targeted for January 2017; a Record of Design is targeted for summer 2017, Remedial Design in the winter of 2017, and the Remedial Action in 2018. All the buildings have been removed, but some contaminated soil remains from the application of pesticides to treat termites. The proposed remedy is an in-situ soil mixing remedy; a pilot test was conducted and showed positive results. The goal would be to return the site to unrestricted use, meeting all New Jersey standards.

- At three former fuel storage sites at Dix (TU019a, TU970, and NW044), the three air sparge/soil vapor extraction systems have been operating since March. At TU970, 35 pounds of petroleum-contaminated product has been recovered, with consistent recovery week to week. At TU019A, almost 180 pounds of product has been recovered. At NW044, almost 100 pounds of product has been recovered. The remedies seem to be operating successfully.

- At Dix Site TU026 (New Egypt Armory), the Remedial Action Report and Explanation of Significant Differences have been approved by the NJDEP and are going through the final signature process within the Air Force. Once these documents are finalized, a Response Complete designation is expected for the site by September 30, 2016, with most of the site returned to unrestricted use. An Explanation of Significant Differences is being prepared to update the Decision Document as there is a small shed over soil that was not removed so institutional controls will be in place. There is a new task to evaluate low-levels metals and other compounds in soil just downgradient of this site near Jumping Brook to determine if they are naturally occurring or not.

- At Lakehurst Areas A, B, and C, the semi-annual groundwater sampling was completed in April, and the next sampling event is planned for October 2016. The plume stability study data collected so far indicates four of the sites would not have reached the goals in Arcadis' contract with only monitored natural attenuation; the four sites have been removed from the plume stability study and active remedies are being designed. Some pre-design work is underway to gather data for more substantial pilot tests this summer. At Area D, annual groundwater monitoring is scheduled for October. At Area H, electrical issues have been fixed which caused the pump and treat system to be down for a few weeks.

- Another emerging contaminant in addition to PFCs is 1,4 dioxane which is a stabilizer added to solvents (TCE and TCA). The NJDEP has issued an interim standard, and sampling will be conducted to determine if it is present in solvent plumes at JB MDL. The sampling is planned for the fall of 2016

- Prior to the last RAB meeting, a public meeting was held on Sites SA018 and LF016. A remedy of no further action was proposed for Site SA018, and institutional controls and groundwater monitoring was proposed for site LF016. JB MDL received comments, and the Record of Decision is being developed. The Record of Decision is moving forward with the proposed remedies and will include a Responsiveness Summary for all the verbal and written comments received during the public meeting and comment period.

10) Public Comments:

Mr. Tamn invited public comments.

A member of the general public asked about Land Use Controls at Areas I/J. Mr. Llewellyn responded there are Land Use Controls in place, and they are documented in the Land Use Control Implementation Plan. He noted a remedy has been in place for more than 20 years, and the controls would include a groundwater use restriction. He said there is no restriction on walking around the site. Mr. Figura added there is a Classification Exception Area (CEA) in place to restrict groundwater use because of the presence of chlorinated solvents; he advised the contaminated groundwater is 50 to 70 feet below ground surface. The member of the general public asked if the hydrogeology of the area changed, would it perhaps change the Air Force's findings. Mr. Figura said it would be unlikely unless groundwater was being pumped from 50 or 60 feet below the ground surface. Mr. Figura said there are wells around the plume for monitoring. Mr. Frye added that one of the State requirements as part

of the CEA is certification every other year that there have been no changes. Ms. Gaffigan added that when remedies for the site were being considered, the Pinelands asked for a remedy that would not dewater the wetlands, so instead of a pump and treat remedy, a treatment of the most contaminated area was done using some innovative technologies to reduce the concentrations which are now at low levels.

Mr. Tamn asked for any suggestion for the agenda for the next meeting. He requested an update on any fuel line leaks at McGuire; Mr. Frye said OU6 is addressing the impacts from historic leaks and a Remedial Investigation Report is being finalized. A draft Remedial Investigation was published in 2014. Mr. Frye said an update could be given at the next RAB meeting.

11) Meeting Adjourned:

Mr. Tamn asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 PM.

The next RAB is tentatively scheduled for 10 November 2016. Potential topics can be emailed to Mr. Curt Frye or Ms. Nicole Brestle.