



**TETRA TECH NUS, INC.**

55 Jonspin Road ■ Wilmington, MA 01887-1020  
(978) 658-7899 ■ FAX (978) 658-7870 ■ www.tetrattech.com

C-NAVY-9-98-1238W

September 9, 1998

Project Number 5278

Mr. James X. Shafer  
Remedial Project Manager  
Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82  
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298  
Contract Task Order 218

Subject: RAB Meeting Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed are the minutes from the August 19, 1998 RAB meeting. Please note that the next RAB meeting has been re-scheduled for September 30. You should be receiving an amended invitation from NETC in the near future.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 978-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Betsy Horne".

Betsy Horne  
Community Relations Specialist

BH:b

Enclosures

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)  
Ms. Barbara Barrow (w/enc.)  
Ms. Anne Berman (w/enc.)  
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)  
Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)  
Mr. Richard D. Coogan (w/enc.)

Mr. James Shafer  
September 9, 1998  
Page Two

c: Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)  
Mr. Anthony D'Agnew (w/enc.)  
Ms. Beth Everett (w/enc.)  
Mr. Byron J. Hall (w/enc.)  
Ms. Elizabeth Mathinos (w/enc.)  
Mr. Joseph Mello (w/enc.)  
Mr. Thomas McGrath (w/enc.)  
Mr. John Palmieri (w/enc.)  
Mr. Howard L. Porter (w/enc.)  
Ms. Claudette Weissinger (w/enc.)  
Ms. Mary Philcox (w/enc.)  
Mr. David Egan (w/enc.)  
Mr. Tom Nicholson (w/enc.)  
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM (w/enc.)  
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA (w/enc.)  
Capt. Jon Wyman, NETC (w/enc.)  
Capt. Bogle, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. James Barden (w/enc.)  
Hon. Paul W. Crowley (w/enc.)  
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)  
Mr. Joseph F. McEnness (w/enc.)  
Mr. Paul D. Russell (w/enc.)  
Mr. Charles Salmond (w/enc.)  
Mr. John Torgan (w/enc.)  
Councilman Dennis McCoy (w/enc.)  
Mr. Vincent Arnold (w/enc.)  
Dr. David Kim (w/enc.)  
Mr. Brian Bishop (w/enc.)  
Sister Annie Marie Walsh (w/enc.)  
Brother Joseph (w/enc.)  
Newport Public Library (w/enc.)  
Ms. Joanne Gorman, Middletown Free Library (w/enc.)  
Portsmouth Free Public Library (w/enc.)  
Mr. Bob Jones, Groton (w/enc.)  
Mr. David Sanders, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. David Dorocz, NETC (w/enc.)  
Ms. Melissa Griffin, NETC (w/enc.)  
Mr. Woody Monaco, NETC (w/enc.)  
Ms. Sarah White, EPA (w/enc.)  
Ms. Jennifer Hayes, Gannett Fleming (w/enc.)  
Mr. Tim Prior, USF&WS (w/enc.)  
Mr. Ken Finkelstein, NOAA (w/enc.)  
Mr. R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)  
Ms. Diane McKenna, TtNUS, Wilmington (w/enc.)  
Mr. Garth Glenn, TtNUS, Philadelphia (w/enc.)  
Ms. Meg Price, TtNUS, Philadelphia (w/o enc.)  
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

**NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
AUGUST 19, 1998**

**MINUTES**

On Wednesday, August 19, 1998, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at NETC's Officers' Club for its monthly meeting. The meeting began at 7:10 and ended at 10:20.

Eleven of the 20 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Mary Blake, David Brown, Dick Coogan, Byron Hall, Liz Mathinos, Tom McGrath, Joseph Mello, John Palmieri, Howard Porter, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager; and Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV's Remedial Project Manager. Melissa Griffin, the IR Program Manager, was present from the NETC Environmental Division. Mary Sanderson, EPA's Federal Facilities Section Chief and Sarah White, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator, also attended. Mary Philcox, representing AICAB, the TAG recipient, and Dave Egan, their technical advisor, were present. Barbara Barrow, Tony D'Agnerica, and Beth Everett indicated they would not attend. Anne Berman, Paul Cormier, Mike Foley, Chuck Salmond, and John Torgan were not present.

Tom McGrath, the Community Co-chair, welcomed the group and asked if there were any amendments to the June or July minutes. Hearing none, they were adopted as written.

Tom stated that the site tour conducted at the last meeting was one of the most effective RAB meetings he has attended. He praised the Navy's and RIDEM's efforts to make it a success.

Jim Shafer introduced the evening's two speakers. Paul Yaroschak, Director for Environmental Compliance and Restoration Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, would provide an overview of the DoD budgetary/IR funding process. Paul is the highest ranking civilian in the Navy's environmental program. Franco La Greca, Jim's section chief at NORTHDIV, would discuss how NORTHDIV participates in that process. The group introduced themselves around the room.

Agenda items are denoted by underscoring.

**OVERVIEW OF THE DoD BUDGETARY/IR FUNDING PROCESS**

Paul used a series of overheads that supported his effort to demystify the process. He left copies of the Guide to the DoD Environmental Security Budget for the RAB. His presentation was divided into three parts: the federal budget process, the DoD budget process, and role playing. Paul addressed the public's concern about the process; it is like the sun. If you stand too close, it is too complex. You can only see it if you step back. There is no need to know each detailed component. You only need to understand the major steps in the process.

Income minus spending equals either a surplus or a deficit. In 1997, the national debt was approximately \$4 trillion. To address that debt, Congress passed the Gramm-Rudman law (the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act (that set 5-year spending targets) and then the Budget Enforcement Act that limited funding discretionary accounts and required a pay-as-you-go system). The latter law included a provision that targeted 2002 as the fiscal year in which the budget would finally be balanced. Because of the strong economy, however, the budget is expected to be balanced in FY 1999.

There are two types of spending: non-discretionary (fixed amounts that cannot be reduced to balance the budget such as social security, medicare, entitlements, and debt repayment), and discretionary. Non-discretionary spending accounts for 68 percent of the budget; the remaining 32 percent (discretionary) is comprised of defense (15 percent) and non-defense (17 percent) spending. Deficit reduction decisions must be made from this 32 percent piece of the pie.

DoD's 15 percent translates into approximately \$252 billion. Of the \$252 billion, the Navy is allocated approximately 28 percent, or \$79.7 billion. Of the \$79.7 billion, about 2.1 percent (\$1.69 billion) is spent on a variety of environmental activities, about the same amount as corporate America spends on environmental programs. The \$1.69 billion is divided among BRAC (base closure cleanup), compliance, cleanup, pollution prevention, and research and development. Of the 16 percent allocated for the cleanup piece of the pie, about 10 to 12 percent is used for overhead expenses, 60 percent for cleanup, and the rest for cleanup studies.

**Comment:** Will the amount allocated for BRAC activities decrease over time?

**Response:** Yes. It already has. Many of the physical moves to other facilities have already occurred. As the Navy completes cleaning up the vacated facilities, more funding will be distributed for pollution prevention.

**Comment:** Do you anticipate additional BRAC rounds?

**Response:** Yes. Probably after each of the next two presidential elections.

Paul defined three concepts:

**Budget** - The actual budget is a document that the president sends to Congress in January. It is a fixed element and not one that is important to the RAB's understanding of the process. The other two concepts are important.

**FYDP** - Future Year Defense Plan - DoD determines how it will spend its funding for the next six fiscal years.

**POM** - Program Objective Memorandum - DoD's process for reviewing the FYDP and adjusting the numbers.

The targeted spending number for the sixth year is much less certain than that for the upcoming fiscal year since we have a better grasp of what the economy will look like; major economic changes could occur between now and the sixth fiscal year.

**Comment:** To what level of detail does the FYDP go? To the facility level?

**Response:** Yes.

**Comment:** Is that information shared?

**Response:** Yes, it is, but it comes with the responsibility of understanding the process we are discussing tonight.

**Comment:** If the level of spending depends on income, how accurate are the income estimates?

**Response:** The Congressional Budget Office is constantly crunching numbers. Politics also is an element that may come into play. The numbers only really become fixed when the president submits his budget.

The president submitted the FY 1999 budget last January. Congress held hearings and hopefully will enact appropriations bills before FY 1999 begins on October 1, 1998. Currently, DoD is working on the POM for FY 2000 and the FYDP for from FY 2000 to FY 2005.

**Comment:** How firm are the numbers?

**Response:** There are always adjustments. The Asian economic crisis could reduce corporate income, thereby reducing the taxes the federal government collects.

The budget process for FY 2000 began in November 1997, when DoD requested that each facility itemize its requirements (both for approved amounts and a "wish list"). In January 1998, each facilities' sponsor made a case for their needs and the Navy made internal decisions about how to divide its share of the funding. That information was passed up the chain where the top brass made decisions about allocating funding among its service branches. That information will be passed on the OMB, which will create the document that the president submits to Congress.

**Comment:** How does Congress judge the budget?

**Response:** It holds hearings to receive testimony. It is there that they decide how the nation's dollars will be spent.

Paul is always juggling different aspects of three fiscal years at the same time. He is now working on adjustments to FY 1998, which ends in September. Hearings on the FY 1999 budget were held in the spring, and they are preparing the facility level information for the FY 2000 budget right now. The process requires planning several fiscal years ahead.

**Comment:** As sites move through the cleanup process, costs become higher when the actual cleanup stage is reached. How does the Navy handle that, when the greatest expense comes toward the end?

**Response:** Although the study phase takes years longer, the increase in funding that appears toward the end of each project is factored into the process.

**Comment:** If the public only has a chance to participate in the process at the congressional hearing stage, have you tried to mobilize support for funding increases?

**Response:** An anti-lobbying law was enacted to prevent that kind of activity. There are really two places in the process where citizens can impact the process. They can help prioritize a facility's requests 3 years before the relevant fiscal year and they can contact members of their congressional delegation about appropriations issues.

**Comment:** Which is more important, authorizations, or appropriations?

**Response:** Authorization bills must precede appropriations. Authorization bills establish a program but the actual funding for that program can only be obtained through the appropriations process.

Paul devised a role playing game to demonstrate the process. Community members were assigned roles. Tom McGrath was named Secretary of the Navy and provided with poker chips representing \$75 billion. Five other members became admirals and were given a script advocating for one of five naval areas: military operations; ships, planes, and equipment procurement; base closure and maintenance; cleanup program; and personnel and training. Paul likened the arguments each needed to make to obtain funding to a food fight. It's where major decisions are made. Real life topics were aired, pitting such issues as funding for dealing with terrorism against adequate training for naval pilots against IR site cleanups. After these pleas, "Secretary" McGrath divided his chips into five piles. "Congressman" Yaroschak decreased the number of chips the Secretary had and reprogrammed its use because Congress did not agree with the Navy's assessment of its mission's needs relative to other national priorities.

**Comment:** What effect would letters have in lobbying Congress?

**Response:** Very little. It becomes cyclic. The elected official's staff forwards the letter to the Navy. It then filters down to NORTHDIV, which prepares the response. The response is sent back to the official's office, which then forwards it to the original sender. The place to make a real difference with Congress is at the appropriations hearing stage.

**Comment:** How effective are advocacy groups?

**Response:** Advocacy groups exist for every conceivable issue and Congress hears from them all. You need to make a really good case for spending increases so the place to have the most impact is at the stage when priorities are being established.

**Comment:** Are adjustments often made to appropriations once they have been allocated?

**Response:** Yes, that can happen and did recently. When it was determined that our troops needed to stay in Bosnia longer than expected and when disaster relief was needed to assist North Dakotans in recovering from massive flooding, a rescision

was instituted. One percent of every program was pulled in the middle of the fiscal year, requiring quite a scramble internally.

Comment: Do you have a sense that the cleanup process at NETC is not moving fast enough?

Response: I deal with 5,000 sites over 200 installations. All things considered, NETC's cleanup is moving at about the right pace. To be honest, I have never attended a RAB that didn't want cleanups to move more quickly.

#### NORTHERN DIVISION'S PREPARATION FOR SUBMITTING THE CLEANUP BUDGET

Franco La Greca, NORTHDIV's head of the Environmental Restoration New England Branch, oversees five remedial project managers that manage facilities in ten states. Franco stated that his presentation would cover only non-BRAC sites. He used a series of overhead graphics to support his presentation.

They rely on the relative risk ranking program to prioritize project funding. Dunny Wingo gave a presentation to the RAB on that process last year. It classifies each site high, medium, or low. The relative risk classification process levels the playing field for sites across the country. As new information is received on a site, it is remodelled and, if necessary, reclassified. The information submitted up the chain of command for the Navy's budget is created by plugging this information into the NORM computer model that allows NORTHDIV to track the cost to complete each project by site, by cleanup phase. The cost to complete number is really only a place holder since more accurate information is usually not available until a feasibility study has been issued. DoD has a target of committing 70 percent of funds for actual cleanup; the remaining 30 percent is allocated for overhead and site studies.

Comment: Can you fund medium and low ranked sites before sites that are ranked high?

Response: Yes. But the goal is to address the high risk areas first, with about 80 percent of the cleanup funds.

Comment: Is the 70-30 split realistic?

Response: The ratio was 60-40 a few years ago. There never are enough funds to do what everyone wants to do.

Franco showed a list of the facilities NORTHDIV supports. There are 18 bases (3 require minimal effort) comprising 367 IR sites. Of the 367 sites, 99 are high risk, 55 are medium risk, 170 are low risk, and 43 are not evaluated/not required. NETC's 18 sites (6 high, 7 medium, 3 low, 2 not evaluated/not required) compare with 67 at Earle and 20 at Brunswick. These 367 sites compete against sites in the seven other Engineering Divisions across the country, for a total of 3,450 sites that need Navy cleanup funding.

The overhead graphic of NETC funding from FY 1995 through FY 2000 showed more than \$9 million was obligated in FY 1996 (McAllister Point Landfill cap construction, and significant work at Derektor and Melville). Approximately \$4 million and \$9.5 million is planned for FY

1999 and FY 2000. Jim Shafer indicated he wants to switch these figures; NORTHDIV is investigating whether another NORTHDIV facility has fallen behind its projections sufficient to make the trade possible so NETC can proceed with the Melville North Landfill cleanup sooner.

Money beyond the figures on the graphic has been spent at NETC by the Major Claimant (the Florida facility in overall charge of naval training and education). They opted to implode the tank farm tanks (not necessary for cleanup) after the tanks were finally cleaned and closed.

**Comment:** Melville is a FUDS site. Why isn't it a BRAC site?

**Response:** FUDS sites are all funded under DERA but are usually administered by the Army. By the time the federal facilities agreement was signed, Melville had been sold to the state, but the site was included in the FFA because the Navy had already begun work there. Had the Navy not taken that responsibility, the site would have been placed at the bottom of the Army's priorities. The Navy did the right thing in retaining responsibility.

**Comment:** Melville was not ranked as a high priority under the relative risk process.

**Response:** The Navy made an adjustment with Melville, as it did for Gould Island. Both are now high priority sites. Originally, Melville was in the budget for cleanup to commercial/industrial standards in keeping with the commercial nature of a marina. However, RIDEM's position was that a marina is a recreational use, which requires that recreational (residential) standards be attained. The difference in standards translates into an increase in cleanup costs. The sites that NETC is actively working on are the sites that the RAB voted as priorities last year.

Newport has received the lion's share of the NORTHDIV budget recently. NETC sites cleanup usually costs more because of the impact on the waterfront.

**Comment:** It is too late for the RAB to do anything about FY 1999? What can we do about FY 2000?

**Response:** It is almost too late to affect FY 2000 decisions.

The steps NORTHDIV takes to prepare its budget submission begins with each RPM creating a schedule for sites cleanup with his RAB. When all 18 activities' numbers are totalled, they compare it to the control number (amount allocated to NORTHDIV), which is always less than the total needed. NORTHDIV personnel then put their heads together to review performance to date and what legal requirements need to be met. They are also mindful that no big dollar cleanups can be conducted in consecutive years to ensure equitable funding among the bases.

The most important thing RABs can do is be sure that their priorities are lined up in the right order, while remembering that recisions and cost overruns can obviate the best planning objectives.

About half way through the fiscal year (March) NORTHDIV reviews the bidding to see what commitments have been or are still likely to be met. Where slippage has occurred, they reallocate funds among other NORTHDIV bases that can obligate the funds within that fiscal year; sometimes, however, that money is used for DoD commitments elsewhere. Try to understand this process as one in which you try to balance a checkbook for a year using estimates only.

There are lots of competing interests. At times, when there is little hard data, we have to make professional judgments. For instance, a landfill would rank higher than a construction disposal area. There just are not enough dollars to study all sites at once. Other bases are in the same situation. A base may decide to spend a finite amount of money to take a few more samples to see if the risk ranking changes for a site that has little data to date. However, to date, we have not seen any real changes in risk classification for these sites.

**Comment:** When the RAB went through the risk ranking, there was no data on some pathways so that component scored zero. That does not level the playing field.

**Response:** The Navy would need to identify the contaminant and make some "what if" determinations in the relative risk ranking model for that site. We need to be comparing apples to apples. Personally, before starting new work on another site, I like to see site work completed.

**Comment:** Of the 18 NETC sites, 16 are still in the investigation phase.

**Response:** That is why we break cleanup activities into operable units. RABs need to decide if they want to move sites along at the same pace or allow some to move ahead early. DoD's goal is to use 70 percent of its dollars on cleanup. It also wants 50 percent of the high risk sites to be completed by 2001.

Paul asked if the RAB feels there is appropriate progress at NETC sites. If the study phase is lengthy at complex sites, that may be a good, rather than a bad thing. The higher the potential cleanup cost, the better to air issues earlier in the process than later.

**Comment:** The RAB is reading the reports but it is difficult to know whether they are addressing the appropriate issues. Dave Egan reads them for the RAB.

Dave responded that he does not read them for the RAB but for the TAG recipient. Dave stated that his concern is not the level of detail in the reports but that the reports are taking too long to be issued. He recognizes that there is a FFA-mandated schedule for commenting on and responding to report comments, but the whole process should be fast tracked.

**Comment:** If there isn't much a RAB can do to help get more cleanup money, what might a useful RAB do?

**Response:** First, help prioritize site activities and second, help the Navy consider if it is doing the right things as well as doing things right.

**Comment:** Can FFA review steps be shortened?

**Response:** It would require pushing the envelope. There are identified shortcuts that could be implemented if all players would put on their common sense hats. We need to determine how wedded we are to ensuring 100 percent certainty about everything.

**Comment:** Report executive summaries need to be written more clearly.

**Response:** I agree. They shouldn't be more than 3 or 4 pages. NETC has tried to help the RAB understand complex documents by issuing fact sheets.

**Comment:** What can the RAB do to better help Jim do his job?

**Response:** Jim stated he received very little feedback from the RAB on the McAllister FS. Many individuals have approached him in private. What would help him most is for these issues to be aired during RAB meetings so they can be thrashed out by the RAB as a whole.

Paul stated that the entire consulting industry needs to be able to make less detailed, more relevant presentations to RABs about their reports. It is easy to lay out relative risk conclusions but everyone has different value systems so discussion needs to take place.

**Comment:** Adaptive reuse is a factor that needs to be addressed. Is it incorporated into funding decisions?

**Response:** It should be included in the relative risk ranking. At BRAC sites, reuse is very important. Once a parcel is in the base master plan for excessing, then one can rely on its disposition classification.

**Comment:** What about the weight of a municipal master plan for a site the Navy is excessing?

**Response:** When there are definite plans, they can be factored into decision making. Right now, however, excessing the tank farms is wishful thinking. In fact, NETC may end up expanding to handle tenants from BRAC facilities. Municipalities cannot count on anything until a decision is made through the base master plan. What you can do is pressure NETC to complete its master plan so you will know what they intend to do with their parcels.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Project Committee** - Kathy Abbass said that Kymberlee Keckler has a speaker prepared to address the committee at 6 pm before the October RAB meeting. Beth Everett has written a review of the draft McAllister Point Landfill FS, which should be enclosed with the minutes. She is concerned that the report was difficult to read and that she is not happy with any of the alternatives.

**Planning Committee** - Dave Brown met with his committee before the RAB meeting to talk about Gould Island. The investigation needs to produce enough information to determine if there is a problem. They would like to have the work plan implemented. Jim stated that the

problem is funding. The work plan development was funded with "found" money; originally there was not enough money to even develop the plan. Jim encouraged the RAB to repeat its ranking review again at the end of this summer. Paul emphasized that the RAB needs to hear information about relative risks in plain english. Dave encouraged the Navy to review its off-shore cleanup priorities in the context of a bay-wide perspective.

Dave also mentioned that the committee appreciates the updates Kymberlee prepares for the weekly regulators conference call.

**Public Affairs Committee** - Sarah White spoke for Claudette, who had to leave the meeting early. They are soliciting articles for the quarterly newsletter. They would also like to use a question and answer format and publish an update from the regulators. Melissa said NETC could have the newsletters ready for distribution a week after she had received all the articles. Sarah encouraged any RAB member to attend the committee meetings, which are held before each RAB meeting.

**Membership Committee** - Howard Porter reported that one member (Mike Foley) had resigned. [Chuck Salmond has also relinquished his seat, indicating he might "re-up" when he returns from Guam.] Howard has created a log of community members' attendance since the RAB first formed. He will present it to the RAB at an upcoming meeting and request that the group decide how to handle "delinquency" in light of the RAB charter. Dave Brown suggested that representation by Aquidneck Island planning groups be considered for these new vacancies.

#### NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting **HAS BEEN RE-RE-SCHEDULED. THE OPEN HOUSE FOR THE NEWLY ARRIVED VESSELS DOCKED AT PIER 1 IS NOW SLATED FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30.** The meeting will be held on board the Forrestal from 4:30 to 6:30. A new invitation will be forwarded from NETC.

A suggestion was made that an article be written on the ships and that the event be used to publicize the status of IR sites.

Enclosures:           NETC RAB Community Members (with draft)  
                          NETC RAB Member Roster (with draft)  
                          Beth Everett's comments on McAllister draft FS (with draft)  
                          NETC IR Agency Players

Handouts:             RAB Review Dates Calendar  
                          Guide to the DoD Environmental Security Budget  
                          Overheads - Strategy for Preparing the Cleanup Budget Submission

**NETC NEWPORT INSTALLATION RESTORATION AGENCY PLAYERS**

PLAYERS	REPRESENTATIVES	ROLE	ACTIVITIES	MAILING ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
Navy - NETC - Environmental Division	Melissa Griffin	IRP Manager		Code 40E NETC PWD Building 1 1 Simonpietri Drive Newport, RI 02841	401-841-6375
Navy - NETC - Public Works Department	Jon Wyman	Navy RAB Co-chair; Director, Public Works		NETC PWD Building 1 1 Simonpietri Drive Newport, RI 02841	401-841-3841
Navy - NETC - Public Affairs Office	David Sanders	Public Affairs Officer		NETC PWD Building K-61 61 Capodanno Drive Newport, RI 02841	401-841-3538
Navy - NORTHDIV	Jim Shafer Todd Bober Dave Barclift Brian Helland	RPM Technical contact Risk specialist Env. Eng. (USTs)		NORTHDIV, NAVFACENCOM 10 Industrial Hwy, MS 82 Lester, PA 19113	610-595-0567 x241 x160 x190 x124
Brown & Root Environmental (Contractor to NORTHDIV)	Diane McKenna Steve Parker Jim Forrelli Gordon Bullard Betsy Horne	Navy CLEAN contractor Project Manager Project Manager Project Manager Sr. Project Manager Community Relations Specialist	Sites 01, 09 Sites 01, 08, 17, 19 Site 02 Sites 12, 13 All IR sites	Brown & Root Environmental 55 Jonspin Road Wilmington, MA 01887	978-658-7899
SAIC (Subcontractor to Brown & Root)	Greg Tracey	Marine investigations	Sites 01, 09, 19	SAIC 165 Dean Knauss Drive Narragansett, RI 02882	401-782-1900
URI (Subcontractor to Brown & Root)	James Quinn John King Chris Kincaid	Marine investigations Organic Geochemist Inorganic Geochemist Physical Oceanography	Sites 01, 09, 19	URI Graduate School of Oceanography Narragansett, RI 02882	401-874-6219 401-874-6594 401-874-6571

USEPA - Environmental Protection Agency	Kymberlee Keckler Susan Svirsky Sarah Levinson Mike McGagh Sarah White	RPM (HBT) Eco Risk Assessor (HBS) HH Risk Assessor (HBT) TAG Coordinator (HBS) Community Involv. Coord. (RAA)		U.S. EPA JFK Federal Building Boston, MA 02203	617-573-5777 617-573-9649 617-573-9614 617-223-5534 617-565-9260
Gannett Fleming (Oversight contractor to EPA)	Jennifer Hayes Peter Golonka			Gannett Fleming, Inc PO Box 67100 150 Wood Road Harrisburg, PA 17106	717-763-7211 x2885
NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Ken Finkelstein	Natural Resource Trustee	Reviews ecological reports	c/o U. S. EPA (HIO) JFK Federal Building Boston, MA 02203	617-223-5537
RIDEM - RI Dept. of Environmental Management	Paul Kulpa Bob Richardson	RPM Water quality expert		Department of Environmental Protection 291 Promenade Street Providence, RI 02908	401-277-3872 x7111 401-277-6519 x7240
Aquidneck Island Citizens Advisory Bd.	Mary Philcox	EPA TAG recipient		AICAB Room 206A 747 Aquidneck Avenue Middletown, RI 02842	401-847-9196
Dave Egan (Contractor to AICAB)	Dave Egan	TAG technical advisor		2 Brier Court East Greenwich, RI 02818	781-769-7600 x238

IR - Installation Restoration; RPM - Remedial Project Manager; TAG - (EPA) Technical Assistance Grant

September 9, 1998