

To: jfa\_c105@ns01.ports.navy.mil, dab\_c105@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
jab\_c105@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
John=M.=Tarpey@C105@pns@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
ams\_c105@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
Michael=A.=Pedersen@C120@pns@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
kwp\_c120@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
mam\_c100pa@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
Todd=L.=Wilson@NRR0@pns@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
tjd\_c105@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
Jerry=M.=Solich@NRR0@pns@ns01.ports.navy.mil  
cns\_c100@ns01.ports.navy.mil

Cc:

Bcc:

From: "Francis J. Endyke" <fje\_c120@ns01.ports.navy.mil>

Subject: RAB Meeting of 7/11/95

Date: Wednesday, July 12, 1995 2:07:44 EDT

Attach: Headers.822

Certify: N

Forwarded by:

-----

A Restoration Advisory Board orientation and training session was conducted at 7 PM in the Kay Howells Room of the Rice Public Library in Kittery, Maine. The following agenda was followed:

- Introduction and Team Building Exercise
- Review of Actions from Last Meeting
- Development of the Charter
- Agenda for Next Meeting

Attendees:

PNS: Ken Plaisted, Fran Endyke, Mary Anne Mascianica  
EPA: Meghan Cassidy, Patty Whittemore  
MEDEP: Nancy Beardsley  
TAG: Cathy Wolff  
Community: Doug Bogen, Phil McCarthy, Guy Petty, and Onil Roy

Not in Attendance:

NORTHDIV: Lt Conroy  
MEDMR: Don Card  
Community: Juanita Bell, Jeff Clifford, Michele Dionne, Eileen Foley,  
Jack McKenna, and John Nelson

Meeting Summary:

The meeting went as planned. Please find below significant questions or concerns raised during the meeting.

Past Business:

Attendance:

- \* The three community members (Foley, Nelson and Roy) who had not been attending the meetings had been contacted with the following results:
  - Nelson requested to be changed to a Natural Resource Trustee because he works for New Hampshire Fish and Wildlife. This change was approved by the RAB.
  - Foley requested to remain a RAB member as she believes the City of Portsmouth has a vested interest in the RAB. The RAB will request that an alternate from the city attend the meeting when Mayor Foley is not available.
  - Roy will attend the RAB meetings.
  - A selection committee for a new RAB member was formed with Guy Petty as chairman. The RAB nominated Mary Marshall as the replacement for John Nelson.

*mtg of July 11, 1995*

Work Schedule:

\* A Process Flow Diagram will be presented at the next meeting as Lt Conroy was on leave.

Charter Development:

\* With minor changes to Draft #2 of the Mission Statement and Operating Procedures Guide the RAB approved their charter. Signing of the charter by all RAB members will occur at the next RAB meeting.

First RAB Meeting Agenda:

\* After lengthy discussion of the Proposed RAB Meeting Topics the following was decided:

1) A Technical Assistance Grant presentation was not needed and that SAPL was causing the delay in hiring their consultant as they have not submitted a Request for Proposal to the EPA.

2) That a presentation/discussion of a Process Flow Diagram, Work Schedule, Funding, and Relative Risk Site Evaluations would be given at the First RAB meeting scheduled for 8/17/95.

3) That a Feasibility Study presentation would be made the week of 9/17/95 (the day is not known yet).

C-52-7-5-2412W

Project Number 2364

July 17, 1995

Lt. Jim Conroy, Remedial Project Manager  
Northern Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop #82  
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298 (CLEAN)  
Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 183

Subject: Community Relations Support for TRC/RAB  
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine  
Minutes from the July 11, 1995, RAB Development Meeting

Dear Lt. Conroy:

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes from the July 11, 1995, RAB development meeting. Since the next RAB meeting will be the first official meeting, these minutes will not be distributed for review and comment. As I understand it, this exercise was a rehearsal to establish the level of detail, format, etc.

Please contact me at (412) 921-8659 or Betsy Horne at (508) 658-7899 if you have any questions or comments.

Very truly yours,



Linda Klink  
Project Manager

LK/gmd

Enclosure

c: R. Boucher - NAVFAC NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)  
F. Endyke - PNS (w/enc.)  
J. Trepanowski - HNUS, Wayne (w/enc.)  
D. Hutson/M. Perry - HNUS, Pittsburgh (w/enc.)  
B. Horne - HNUS, Wilmington (w/enc.)  
File 2364-3.2 (w/enc.)

**RAB DEVELOPMENT MEETING  
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD  
RICE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
JULY 11, 1995**

The meeting began at 7:14 pm and ended at 9:15. Attending were community members: Doug Bogen, Cathy Wolff, Guy Petty, Phil McCarthy, and Onil Roy; regulatory members: Meghan Cassidy, Patty Marajh-Whittemore, and Nancy Beardsley; and Navy member Ken Plaisted. Others attending were Fran Endyke, Mary Anne Mascianica (PAO), and Betsy Horne (HNUS). Absent were: Juanita Bell, Jeff Clifford, Michele Dionne, Eileen Foley, Jack McKenna, John Nelson, LT Conroy, and the Natural Resource Trustees.

Ken Plaisted, the Navy co-chair, welcomed those attending and showed an overhead graphic displaying the agenda he and Doug Bogen, the community co-chair, had agreed upon the previous day. Topics included: conduct a team exercise; discuss outstanding issues from the last meeting; review charter changes; schedule the next RAB meeting. Doug asked if a mailing would be sent before the next meeting reminding the members of its date and time. Ken agreed that a notice would be sent; none was prepared for this meeting because he and Fran were on vacation. However, telephone calls were placed as reminders. Doug also asked if minutes from the last RAB meeting would be distributed. Fran indicated they would not, since the RAB was still in development. Ken introduced Betsy Horne, a community relations specialist from HNUS, who will be preparing RAB meeting minutes.

**CONDUCT A TEAM EXERCISE**

Ken showed an overhead graphic entitled, "Features of a Penny". He asked that each RAB member take a few minutes to write down penny properties for three categories: the front side, the back side, and in general. After a short time, Ken asked how many people had the maximum number of correct answers for each category. No one did. Then the members were asked to pool their responses. In each category, the collective effort resulted in a larger number of correct answers than did any individual effort. Ken suggested that it shows that a group is much smarter when it works as a team rather than as individuals.

**DISCUSS OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE LAST MEETING**

- Contact TRC members who have not attended RAB meetings. Ken spoke with three members. Their responses:
  - Onil Roy promised to renew his commitment to the process and his presence at this meeting supports that promise.
  - Mayor Foley feels strongly that the City of Portsmouth should be represented. She is busy but will attend as many meetings as she can. It was requested that if she cannot attend a RAB meeting, she should send someone to represent her.
  - John Nelson, the representative from New Hampshire Fish and Game, has requested to be transferred from a community member to a Natural Resource Trustee, so he would only attend meetings that dealt with those issues. This change was approved by the RAB.

His transfer created a community member vacancy. The community members present decided to convene as a selection panel, chaired by Guy Petty, to review the four applications remaining from the initial selection process. Fran Endyke reminded the RAB that the Shipyard Commander would have to review the names to ensure sufficient diversity in RAB community membership.

The community members reviewed the applications and ranked them as follows: Mary Marshall, York, ME; Paul Vatcher, Dover, NH; Fred Muehl, York, ME; and Paul Peter Jesep, Portsmouth, NH. Ken and Doug will contact Mary Marshall to assess whether she is still interested in becoming a RAB member and will provide her with some orientation material once the Shipyard Commander accepts her nomination.

- Prepare and present a process flow diagram. Jim Conroy, who would prepare this material, is on vacation. Therefore, this presentation was rescheduled for the next meeting.
- Schedule a presentation on the technical assistance grant program. The RAB decided they did not need a presentation.
- Respond to some bewilderment concerning the community relations plan. Members have asked what its scope is and how it bears on the RAB. A five minute explanation will be scheduled for an upcoming meeting.

#### **REVIEW CHARTER CHANGES**

The members reviewed the changes to the first draft of the charter, as indicated by a change bar in the right margin of draft #2. Minor changes were made to draft #2. Those changes will be incorporated into the charter, which will be ready for the members to sign at the next RAB meeting.

#### **DISCUSSION OF NEW BUSINESS** (added at Doug's request)

Doug passed along a concern expressed by Jeff Clifford, since he could not be present for this meeting. The RAB community members have not seen the comments the Navy prepared on the ME DEP's comments on the data gap study or the CMS draft; he requested that the Navy share these documents and provide them with copies of other comments as they are issued. Fran state that the community members are on the mailing list for all correspondence with the regulators and that these document were issued prior to the RAB formation. Copies of these documents will be issued to RAB members.

#### **SCHEDULE THE NEXT RAB MEETING**

Ken passed out a list of proposed meeting topics (attached), selected by Fran based on when documents were available for review or as issues were raised in RAB meetings. They are not listed in any priority. Those items ending with the word "Presentation" are issues for which regulatory-required documents exist. Items beginning with the word "Discussion" do not have regulatory timelines and are intended to inform or provide orientation to the RAB.

A lengthy debate ensued as to what the RAB members' information needs are versus which documents are most crucial for RAB attention. Community members generally felt they needed to grasp the framework of the process (how everything fits together) before being briefed on substantive issues (the results of specific studies).

Some sentiment existed for waiting for substantive briefings until the TAG grant advisor is hired (see discussion under the first bullet below concerning the delay in hiring a TAG advisor). Fran and Meghan stated that the schedule for proceeding toward remediation is specified in the Shipyard's RCRA permits and, as a result, PNS cannot stop cleanup activity to accommodate the TAG group.

Discussion focussed on several of those topics:

- **Technical Assistance Grants (TAG).** Meghan indicated that the use of the word "Expectations" was misleading. EPA has no specific expectations of any TAG grant or group other than that they use the money wisely and in accordance with the regulations. Although the Seacoast Anti-Pollution League has been named the PNS CERCLA site TAG recipient, SAPL has not forwarded the Request for Proposal (RFP) necessary to select a technical advisor to EPA for its approval. Issuing the RFP, reviewing the responses, and obtaining EPA approval to select SAPL's choice, under the most optimistic conditions, will take at least two months. Additionally, EPA cannot promise to provide a timely response if material for its review is sent in September, when the grants section that is responsible for TAG reviews is busy closing out contracts at the end of EPA's fiscal year.
- **Feasibility Study.** It deals with on-shore issues only. The PNS technical team has recommended that the FS be separated into three operable units: the landfill and adjacent areas; the DRMO; and tank areas. The Project Team will make a decision on the use of operable units. Halliburton NUS (the Navy contractor) would need about an hour to present the FS, but it would not make sense to conduct the briefing after the operable unit approach has been decided.
- **Interim Groundwater Monitoring Plan.** Since sampling is scheduled to begin in September, it is important that RAB members review and provide comment on the approach.
- **Work schedule and funding.** These documents provide the overall process flow for the clean-up actions. The big picture is what the community members are asking for.
- **Relative risk site evaluations.** This is the process used to determine relative risk (high, medium, low) among all DOD Installation Restoration Program sites, and is one of the tools used to allocate funds. Some RAB regulatory members recently attended a briefing: the evaluation is based on qualitative information (the contaminants and their levels, plugged into a formula) and subjective information (exposure routes, migration potential). The community members requested that the person to brief them on this topic prepare lots of graphical information (as opposed to relying on a verbal emphasis) and that the members receive a hard copy of that material to review before the presentation.

The agenda for the next meeting, scheduled for **Thursday, August 17**, will include a presentation of a process flow diagram, a discussion of the project work schedule and funding, and an explanation of the relative risk site evaluation process. A specific request was made that the presenters dispense with the overuse of acronyms.

A week was tentatively selected for the September RAB meeting to give presenters sufficient time to prepare presentation material. The **week of September 17** was selected.