

N42237.AR.000204  
NSB KINGS BAY  
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING RESULTS OF COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS AT CROOKED RIVER  
PLANTATION SUBDIVISION  
1/27/1994  
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL



31547.000  
13.04.00.0002

January 27, 1994

Commanding Officer  
Naval Submarine Base  
Kings Bay, GA 31547

ATTN: Robert Steller  
Public Affairs Office

Subject: Results of Community Interviews at Crooked River Plantation Subdivision  
NSB Kings Bay, GA  
Contract Task Order #041  
Prime Contract No. N62467-89-D-0317

Dear Bob:

This letter is to document that community interviews were held at the Crooked River Plantation Subdivision on January 13 and 14, 1994. The purpose of the interviews was to assess if the community had any concerns which should be addressed. The interviews were intentionally held after the field program was conducted so that issues raised by the program could be identified. A summary of the results of the interviews is provided as Attachment A. Attachment B provides recommendations for addressing concerns which were voiced during the interviews. Attachment C contains the actual interview schedule and the response to questions voiced by each of the interviewees. Attachment C is provided for your records. This information should be considered confidential, and should not be released to the public.

Please give me a call at (703) 769-8156 if you have any questions.

ABB Environmental Services Inc.

Sincerely,

**ABB ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.**



for Nancy Rouse  
Community Relations

Attachments: A) Overview of Response to Questions  
B) Recommendations in Response to Community Concerns  
C) Record of Community Interviews

cc: Ed Lohr (SouthDIV)  
David Driggers (SouthDIV)  
Sue Lawley (SouthDIV)  
John Garner (3) (NSB Kings Bay)  
Frank Cater (ABB-ES)  
Marland Dulaney (ABB-ES)  
Ann Johnson (ABB-ES)

## ATTACHMENT A

### OVERVIEW OF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS IN THE CROOKED RIVER SUBDIVISION NSB KINGS BAY SAINT MARYS, GEORGIA

1. How long have you been a member of this community?

*1.5 - 5 years*

2. Are you familiar with the base, its activities, and the Installation Restoration Program?

*Interviewees were generally familiar with the base and its activities. They were generally not familiar with the term "Installation Restoration Program".*

3. Are these environmental investigations of interest to you? Do they raise any concerns/questions for you? If so, what?

*The investigations were a concern to all interviewees. Some of the concerns, in perceived order of importance, are listed below:*

- *Resale value of homes;*
- *Schedule for start-up and completion of the actual cleanup;*
- *Continuing use of groundwater wells by neighbors;*
- *Rust color of surface water in neighborhood ditches;*
- *Health and safety of children (generally followed by a comment that this was an initial concern, but that as a result of communication from the base, this was no longer a major concern);*
- *Residual contamination of soils after groundwater is remediated (one question); and*
- *The actual location of the plume.*

4. Do you think that the Navy is keeping you fully informed about the progress of the IRP program at NSB Kings Bay? If not, how could we provide information so that it would be more available to you?

*The general consensus was that the base is keeping the community fully and adequately informed. One interviewee, however, was suspicious that information was being withheld. He asked that information be provided in terms of risk comparisons. Another interviewee stated that she especially appreciated Captain Scullion's participation in the public meetings.*

5. Are you aware of the status of the environmental cleanup of the old county landfill site? Are you pleased/displeased with the progress that the Navy is making at the site?

*With one exception, the consensus was that the community is pleased with the progress. One interviewee stated that she was particularly pleased with the Navy's approach of explaining the next step in the process, then reporting the results of completion of that step.*

6. Did you feel that the Navy took adequate measures to minimize inconvenience to you during field investigations in your neighborhood?

*Yes. One interviewee, however, would have liked for the field crews to have quit at around 3:30 p.m. Several interviewees stated that they lost water, but there were no overt complaints about being inconvenienced by this.*

7. Was the neighborhood left in good condition (i.e., were lawns reseeded, debris removed, etc.)?

*Yes. There was one interviewee who was concerned that his sprinkler head may have been damaged, but he had not yet tried to turn it on to test it. Bob Steller gave him his card and invited the interviewee to call him if he discovered a problem. There was also a complaint that the "flush-mounted" wells were raised above the street surface by 2 to 3 inches.*

8. Do you have any concerns about health and/or safety during field investigations and remediation activities? If so, what are your concerns?

*No concerns were voiced.*

9. Do you feel that public meetings are held too often/not often enough? When should we hold the next meeting?

*Interviewees were generally happy with the meeting schedules. There were some concerns that the meetings are not addressing new information. One interviewee requested that we repeat the public meeting presentation more than once, (i.e. over a week at different times during the day), so that more people could work attendance at the meeting into their schedule. There were several requests to provide more information through mailouts so that more people would be reached.*

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY CONCERNS COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS IN THE CROOKED RIVER SUBDIVISION NSB KINGS BAY SAINT MARYS, GEORGIA**

The following recommendations are based on the results of the community interviews, which were summarized in Attachment A and are provided in detail as Attachment C.

1. Based on the interviews, it appears that dissemination of information through mailouts is very effective. Many community members are not attending the public meetings, and voiced a clear preference to have information appear on their doorsteps. To accommodate this preference, we could prepare more frequent mailouts. The mailouts should be scheduled around public meetings and other milestones in the project. Mailouts prepared before public meetings could contain the key points to be addressed in the meeting, therefore encouraging attendance by community members. This approach will also get the important information that will be presented at the meeting out to the community members who do not attend.

In general, the mailout/newsletter/fact sheet could be streamlined through preparation in a standardized format, such as:

- Open with a status report, containing all new information;
- Include a question and answer column to address any questions which were actually posed (such as the rust colored surface water issue) and request that additional questions be submitted to Bob Steller to be addressed in the column; and
- Provide historical information which would not change much between issues, such as a description of the IR Program, the location of the information repository, continuing requests not to use the groundwater wells, and the long-range schedule of the program.

The first mailout/newsletter/fact sheet should state that community interviews have been conducted and address the following concerns:

- a. Renew efforts to make the community aware that the investigation and cleanup of the landfill is part of a larger program, the Installation Restoration Program.
- b. Provide information on Navy's investigation of the rust-colored surface water.
- c. Provide the latest diagram of the plume.

- d. Discuss the next step in the process (i.e., what happens after the groundwater is remediated?)
- e. Provide a schedule of anticipated activities to include estimates of:
  - Completion of the pilot study;
  - Start-up of the actual remediation;
  - Completion date for groundwater cleanup (with an explanation of the difficulty of targeting a date);
  - Schedule for the cleanup of contaminated soils, etc (should that be necessary).

All of these dates may be stated in very general terms (i.e., season/year or even year). What the community seems to be looking for is a sense of the timeframe (e.g., will the cleanup take years or months?).

- f. Address suspicions that information is being withheld by making the community more informed about the existence of the information repository. Prepare a separate fact sheet describing the purpose, content, location, and how to use the information repository/administrative record.
- g. Provide a common sense comparison of the risks associated with exposure to groundwater to other familiar life situations.
- h. Remind the community that the Navy is continuing to request that the residents do not use their groundwater wells.
- i. Remind the community that their drinking water is not impacted by the groundwater contamination. (This is still a source of confusion with some residents.)
- j. Provide some basic information on the technologies which are being considered and pilot tested, and refer to a more complete fact sheet that is being developed (i.e., to discuss the bioremediation and air stripping technologies).
- j. A fun idea, Captain Scullion suggested that we provide a graphic showing a broken water main as a "blooper", with an apology for any inconvenience.

2. Continue to hold public meetings, but focus more on regular mailouts. When announcing public meetings, include the agenda in the mailout, along with a notice that the first 15 minutes or so will address historical information, and that new information will be provided beginning at a particular time. This will allow persons who have attended previous public meetings an opportunity to arrive a bit later, while still providing a needed framework for persons attending for the first time.

In addition, we should consider providing two sessions of the next public meeting: a 3:30 session, to capture possible attendees on their way home from work, as well as a 7:00 session.

We could also encourage community members to attend public meetings by pointing out in the pre-meeting mailout that persons who attended public meetings were especially well informed about the program.

3. The fact that the monitoring wells are not flush with the land surface is of some concern to the community. If the finishing of the wells can be modified so that the "bump" is not as conspicuous (e.g., bevel the edges), some effort should be made to make that modification. At the very least, the fact sheet should explain the reason for the raised nature of the concrete (i.e., to minimize water flow into the wells and to provide clearance for future paving of the roads).

4. Resale value of property is a major issue. However, this issue should not be addressed directly. The community may be comforted by having a clearer understanding of the timeframe for the cleanup and an understanding of the technologies that may be used to achieve the cleanup.