

00198

FINAL

Community Relations Plan


for

Former Naval Surface Warfare

**Center—White Oak/
Federal Research Center**

at White Oak

Silver Spring, Maryland



Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order 0296

March 1998



Brown & Root Environmental

A Division of Halliburton NUS Corporation

FINAL

Community Relations Plan


for

Former Naval Surface Warfare

**Center—White Oak/
Federal Research Center**

at White Oak

Silver Spring, Maryland



Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order 0296

March 1998



Brown & Root Environmental

A Division of Halliburton NUS Corporation

**FINAL
COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN
FOR
FORMER NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER—WHITE OAK/
FEDERAL RESEARCH CENTER AT WHITE OAK
SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND**

**COMPREHENSIVE LONG-TERM
ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NAVY (CLEAN) CONTRACT**

**Submitted to:
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Environmental Branch Code 181
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Washington Navy Yard, Building 212
Washington, DC 20374-2121**

**Submitted by:
Brown & Root Environmental
600 Clark Avenue, Suite 3
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 1906-1433**

**CONTRACT NUMBER N62472-90-D-1298
CONTRACT TASK ORDER 296**

MARCH 1998

PREPARED BY:

Scott A. Nesbit

**SCOTT NESBIT, P.E.
PROJECT MANAGER
BROWN & ROOT ENVIRONMENTAL
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA**

APPROVED BY:

John J. Trepanowski
**JOHN J. TREPANOWSKI, P.E.
PROGRAM MANAGER
BROWN & ROOT ENVIRONMENTAL
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
2.0 WHITE OAK INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM	2-1
2.1 WHITE OAK LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.2 WHITE OAK HISTORY	2-1
2.3 INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM BACKGROUND	2-3
2.4 WHITE OAK'S INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM	2-7
3.0 COMMUNITY BACKGROUND	3-1
3.1 COMMUNITY PROFILE	3-1
3.2 CHRONOLOGY OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	3-2
3.3 KEY COMMUNITY CONCERNS	3-7
4.0 COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM	4-1
4.1 GOAL AND OBJECTIVES	4-1
4.2 COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES AND TECHNIQUES	4-3
5.0 RESPONSIBILITIES AND TIMING	5-1
5.1 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES	5-1
5.2 TIMING OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES	5-3

APPENDICES

A	LIST OF ACRONYMS
B	NTCRA AND RI/FS PROCESS COMPARISON
C	KEY CONTACTS AND LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES
D	PUBLIC INFORMATION REPOSITORY AND LOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS
E	DOCUMENTATION FOR ESTABLISHING THE TRC AND THE RAB
F	CRP QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLES

NUMBER

2-1	NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY HISTORY	2-5
5-1	ANTICIPATED COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES	5-4

FIGURES

NUMBER

2-1	AREA AND SITE LOCATION MAP	2-2
2-2	INSTALLATION RESTORATION/SUPERFUND PROGRAM PROCESS	2-6
2-3	NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL PROCESS	2-8

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Community Relations Plan (CRP) identifies community concerns regarding the former Naval Surface Warfare Center-White Oak (NSWC-WO) (now known as the Federal Research Center at White Oak (FRC WO)) and its Installation Restoration Program (IRP) in Silver Spring, Maryland. Throughout this document, the former name, NSWC-WO, will be used to discuss past, on-going and future clean-up activities.

The CRP outlines the community relations activities that the Navy has conducted and plans to undertake to inform the public about hazardous waste cleanup efforts at NSWC-WO. The CRP includes background information, a discussion about what environmental issues exist, a description of how the public perceives these issues and the NSWC-WO efforts to address them, and a presentation of the ways the NSWC-WO proposes to respond to the public's concerns.

Section 1 of the CRP is the introduction. Section 2 describes the Navy's IRP generally as well as the program at NSWC-WO specifically. Section 3 reviews background information describing the community around NSWC-WO and identifies concerns articulated during community interviews. The objectives and methods of implementing the community relations program are discussed in Section 4, while Section 5 is a summary of the responsibilities and timing for carrying out the community relations effort. Several appendices are included to clarify or support the main portions of this document. They include the following:

Appendix A	Acronyms
Appendix B	Non-Time-Critical Removal Action and Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Process Comparison
Appendix C	Key Contacts and List of Interested Parties
Appendix D	Public Information Repository and Locations for Public Meetings
Appendix E	Documentation for Establishing the Technical Review Committee and Restoration Advisory Board
Appendix F	Community Relations Plan Questionnaire

The IRP requires development of a CRP. The CRP is part of the public's right to be aware of the presence and extent of hazardous waste, and to participate in reviewing of plans to address the contamination. The immediate community includes businesses and residential areas (single family,

condominiums, and apartment buildings) surrounding NSWC-WO, as well as the U.S. Army Research Laboratories' Adelphi Center, to the southeast. The Navy intends to continue providing information to the surrounding community through its offices at Naval Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake (EFACHES), located in southeast Washington, D.C. This arm of the Navy will be referred to as EFACHES throughout this document.

The principal purpose of this CRP is to provide information about NSWC-WO to the community and to identify various strategies to enhance communication between EFACHES, the surrounding community (using the Restoration Advisory Board [RAB]), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Maryland Department of the Environment, and the General Services Administration (GSA) (new property owner). This plan outlines measures to inform the public, and federal and state agencies about current and upcoming site activities, to encourage comment and response on those activities, and to identify a central point-of-contact for inquiries about those activities. A list of acronyms used in the CRP is included as Appendix A.

2.0 WHITE OAK INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

This section describes NSWC-WO's location and its history, the history of the IRP, and past and present IRP activities.

2.1 WHITE OAK LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION


The NSWC-WO/FRC WO is located on 710 acres in Silver Spring, Maryland, east of Maryland Route 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately 1 mile north of the Beltway (see Figure 2-1). The easternmost portion of the facility is located in Prince George's County, with the rest located in Montgomery County. Nearly 635 acres are undeveloped. Most of the larger buildings are located on the western portion of the facility near the front gate and New Hampshire Avenue.

2.2 WHITE OAK HISTORY

In 1946, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory moved to the NSWC-WO site from the Washington Navy Yard. To accomplish its mission, the laboratory conducted research, development, and evaluation of the Navy's underwater mine systems; magnetic fields reduction technology for ships; explosive technology; materials research; fuzing for projectiles and bombs; battery technology; strategic systems for the Navy's first strategic missiles; and hypervelocity wind tunnel, hydroballistics, and hydroacoustic testing.


To support these activities, the laboratory operated administrative and technical offices; laboratories and environmental test facilities; machine, plating, carpenter, and print shops; and a photographic laboratory. The laboratory also maintained a full service public works department. These facilities were in turn supported by an infra-structure that included heating plants, and fuel oil distribution and containment, electrical transformers, wastewater treatment, and pesticide control.

In 1995, NSWC-WO was included on the list of military facilities slated for closure under the Base Realignment and Closure Act (BRAC). The mission terminated on January 1997; operations ceased in July 1997. The GSA took possession of 662 acres, while the remaining 48 acres have been turned over to the U.S. Army. Although no Navy presence is evident at the NSWC-WO, the Navy retains responsibility for ensuring that any hazardous waste on the property is addressed consistent with federal and state requirements.



LEGEND

-  STREAM CENTERLINE
-  NSWC-WO PROPERTY LINE
-  STREAM FLOW



Brown & Root Environmental

FIGURE 2-1
AREA AND SITE LOCATION MAP
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER-
WHITE OAK

2.3 INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM BACKGROUND

IRP Program History

Until the late 1970s, industry and the Department of Defense (DoD) followed conventional, accepted, hazardous waste disposal practices. Over time, better waste disposal practices were developed and employed. As a result, formerly acceptable waste disposal operations had to be investigated to ensure protection of human health and the environment.

During the mid-1970s, the DoD and the U.S. Congress became more active in addressing environmental issues. The DoD established the Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants (NACIP) program to identify and remediate sites potentially affected by past operations or releases of hazardous materials. Major components of NACIP included an Initial Assessment Study (IAS) and confirmation studies (CS). An IAS was a screening investigation to identify whether a site posed a potential threat to human health and the environment as a result of past activities. If the IAS determined that a potential threat did exist, a CS was conducted to obtain more information about the nature of the threat.

In 1980, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) was passed to investigate and clean up problems resulting from past, formerly accepted, hazardous waste management practices. CERCLA addresses past disposal practices.

In 1986, Congress passed the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), which, among many things, outlined broader roles for the U.S. EPA and the states in determining appropriate action for investigating and remediating waste disposal sites at federal facilities. SARA also required the Secretary of Defense to establish a Technical Review Committee (TRC) at all installations that were required to address hazardous waste. The TRCs would review and comment on proposed actions dealing with hazardous waste and would include a public representative of the community involved.

In 1990, the BRAC directed the Secretary of Defense to close or realign those installations recommended by the BRAC commission. The Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) of 1992 directed federal agencies with jurisdiction over real property slated for closure to identify "uncontaminated" parcels of the real property. The IRP would assist in identifying whether BRAC parcels are contaminated or uncontaminated; uncontaminated parcel property could readily be

transferred and contaminated parcel property would continue to be remediated under Navy jurisdiction.

IRP Program Process

The DoD meets its responsibilities under CERCLA through the IRP. Under the IRP, investigations are initiated with a Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI) (formerly known as IAS) to identify potential threats to human health or the environment. The PA/SI involves reviewing historic information, conducting a visual site inspection, and limited sampling of environmental media, such as soil or sediments. Table 2-1 illustrates the Navy Environmental History; Figure 2-2 is a diagram of the IRP/Superfund Program Process.

If the PA/SI indicates that contamination is present, a Remedial Investigation (RI) is conducted to learn more about site contamination and determine if any known contamination is leaving the site or presents an unacceptable risk to human health and/or the environment.

If the RI results indicate that a cleanup is necessary based on potential adverse impacts to human health or the environment, a Feasibility Study (FS) is initiated to evaluate remedial alternatives that can meet environmental standards, considering factors such as the degree of contamination and potential human health and environmental risks. A variety of remedial methods are considered, including the "No Action" alternative. Following release of the FS, a Proposed Plan is issued that outlines the feasible alternatives and recommends a preferred remedial method in a short, easily understood document.

If the PA/SI indicates the need for an immediate action, the RI/FS process is temporarily replaced with the removal action process. A removal action is accomplished where a specific activity could significantly reduce an environmental threat and the extent of the problem is clear. The document that identifies the objectives of the removal action and analyzes the various alternatives that may be used to satisfy these objectives for cost, effectiveness, and implementability is called an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). Appendix B compares the removal and RI/FS processes. Discussion of non-time-critical removal actions conducted at NSWC-WO is contained in Section 2.4.


TABLE 2-1

NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY HISTORY
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
WHITE OAK, MARYLAND

Year	Direction/Program/Law	Originator (Administrator)
1976	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Passed	Congress (EPA)
1980	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Passed	Congress (EPA)
1980	Installation Restoration (IR) Program Instituted	Department of Defense (DoD)
1981	Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants (NACIP) Established	Navy
1984	Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments to RCRA Passed	Congress (EPA)
1986	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) Passed	Congress (EPA)
1987	IR Program Reorganized to Address SARA/CERCLA Issues	Navy and DoD
1993	Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Required	President (Executive Order 12580)

FIGURE 2-2

INSTALLATION RESTORATION/SUPERFUND PROGRAM PROCESS



After the FS or EE/CA is released, the Navy issues a proposed plan FS or a fact sheet (EE/CA) that describes the Navy's preferred cleanup approach in a short, easy to understand document. A public meeting is held to provide the community an opportunity to learn more about the site and the proposed action. During the public comment period, required to be at least 30 days but no more than 60, the public may comment on the proposed cleanup. The public comments are reviewed and the responses recorded in a document called a Responsiveness Summary. After the public comment period, an appropriate alternative is selected that is protective of public health and the environment. A record of decision (ROD) (or, in the case of a non-time-critical removal action, an Action Memorandum) that explains the selected action is then issued. The Maryland Department of the Environment and EPA must concur with the selected remedy and sign the ROD. Following the signing of the ROD, the third phase, Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA), is started. (In removal actions, implementation of the cleanup approach begins immediately.) This phase involves preparing construction specifications of the selected cleanup/remedial method and implementing the action. Figure 2-2 depicts the IRP/Superfund program process. Figure 2-3 depicts the non-time-critical removal process.

Public comments and input are received throughout the IRP process. Aside from formal public comment periods, public meetings, and public hearings, a RAB meets at various stages in the IRP process to study IRP documents and provides comments to the Navy. The committee members include federal and state regulatory personnel, local government officials, and community members.


Appendix C includes a list of key contacts, including local officials and RAB members. All program documents are also available for public review at the public information repository (see Appendix D).

2.4 WHITE OAK'S INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

As part of its IRP, NSWC-WO established a TRC in March 1989. The TRC met numerous times and in the fall of 1995 reorganized into a RAB. Appendix E describes the history and composition of both entities. These deliberative bodies have reviewed NSWC-WO IRP documents since 1989.

In 1995, the NSWC-WO was selected for closure on the BRAC IV list. The mission termination date was January 1997, and operations ceased in July 1997. The NSWC-WO base was transferred to the GSA in October 1997 and to the U.S. Army in February 1998. The U.S. Army took possession of 48 acres of the site. The GSA took possession of the remaining 662 acres at NSWC-WO to facilitate property reuse.

FIGURE 2-3
NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL PROCESS



A NSWC-WO BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) was established in 1995, consisting of representatives from the Navy, Maryland Department of the Environment, and the EPA. Though not an official member of the BCT, GSA routinely attends meetings and participates in relevant discussions. The purpose of the BCT is to provide a means for addressing environmental cleanup matters and related property reuse activities.

The first of NSWC-WO's comprehensive environmental reports was an IAS issued in 1984. Of the 14 sites studied (Sites 1 through 14), seven were identified as posing a potential threat to public health and the environment. Those seven sites (Sites 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11) were included in a 1987 CS report. The CS was followed by a 1992 draft RI and a 1993 draft FS for these same sites. Because the Navy did not feel sufficient information existed to select cleanup strategies for these areas, they are (or have been) the subject of Design Verification Reports (DVR). The seven sites the IAS determined not to pose a threat have been reclassified as part of the IRP and are in various stages of site screening investigations, along with numerous Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) and Areas of Concern (AOC). One additional site, Site 46, has been placed on the list of IRP sites.

The remainder of this section contains an historical summary of each IRP site, the studies conducted, and the cleanup disposition, including projected dates for remedial activity.

Site 1 - Parking Lot Landfill

This site is southeast of Building 101A, where automobile batteries and other vehicle maintenance shop wastes were disposed of between 1948 to 1953. It measured 70 feet by 200 feet but may be larger based on visual observations. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action. The site is covered with asphalt, which was believed to limit potential contamination migration and exposure to site waste.

It is currently undergoing a site screening process to determine if additional investigation or cleanup is necessary.

Site 2 - Apple Orchard Landfill

This site was used as an open disposal/landfill area between 1948 and 1982; it covers approximately 4.3 acres. This site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. Solvents, paints, and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-contaminated oil disposed of there resulted in releases of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), PCBs, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), explosive compounds, and metals to soils, sediment, and groundwater. Potential ordnance items were also found.

Soil, sediment, and groundwater contamination need to be addressed. The Navy anticipates completing an RI/FS and signing a ROD in fiscal year (FY) 1999. Remedial action is scheduled to be conducted in FY 2000.

Site 3 - Pistol Range Landfill

This 1.1 acre site, located between Dahlgren Road and NSWC-WO's northern boundary, was operated as a landfill from the 1940s to the mid-1970s. This site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. Wastes include solvents, PCB-contaminated oil, and sodium nitrate. Potential ordnance items were also found.

Soil and groundwater contamination need to be addressed. The Navy anticipates completing an RI/FS and signing a ROD in FY 1999. Remedial action is scheduled to be conducted in FY 2000.

Site 4 - Chemical Burial Site

This 1.1 acre site was used as a chemical burial site from the mid-1950s through the early 1970s. This site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. Wastes include acids, explosives, kerosene, and chlorinated solvents. TCE contaminated groundwater appears to be the most significant concern on the site.

Soil and groundwater contamination will be subject to a removal action in FY 1998. The Navy anticipates completing an RI/FS and signing a ROD in FY 2001. Remedial action is scheduled to be conducted in FY 2001.

Site 5 - Open Burn Area

This site is located south of the old pistol range, between Dahlgren Road and NSWC-WO northern boundary. The site consists of three burn areas that cover approximately 1.5 acres. Paper, cardboard, and tires were burned there from the late 1940s to 1970. The site is now grass covered and inactive. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action.

The site is currently undergoing a site screening process to determine if additional investigation or cleanup is necessary.

Site 6 - Sludge Composting Area

This site is in the northeast corner of the base, in an area where sludge from the NSWC-WO Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) was composted between 1946 and 1982. The 1 acre site is now grass covered. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action.

It is currently undergoing a site screening process to determine if additional investigation or cleanup is necessary.

Site 7 - Ordnance Burn Area

This site, located in a gully west of Building 501, was used between 1948 and 1968 as a disposal site for waste and scrap ordnance. The site consists of a swale approximately 250 feet long and 20 feet wide. The site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, and the FS. Dozens of tons of explosives were burned, with resulting nitroaromatic contamination of groundwater, soil, and sediment.

An RI/FS is scheduled for FY 1998, with a ROD to be published in FY 2001.

Site 8 - Abandoned Chemical Disposal Pit

This site is a pit at the end of the southern boundary patrol road, where waste chemicals were disposed of between 1951 and 1971. The pit was reported to measure approximately 10 feet by 10 feet by 12 feet deep. The site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. VOCs and metals were found in soil and groundwater.

In the fall of 1996, a soil removal action was performed; waste and soil contaminated with mercury, arsenic, barium, chromium, lead, cadmium, and 1,1,2-trichloroethane (TCA) were disposed of off site.

An RI/FS to address groundwater is scheduled for FY 1998. Any remedial action that may be needed is planned for FY 2000.

Site 9 - Industrial Wastewater Disposal from "300" Area

This site is located along an intermittent stream east of the "300" Area and is comprised of 20 leaching wells/fields scattered throughout the 300 area that were used to dispose of wastewater. The site was used from the early 1950s to the mid-1970s. This site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. VOCs and nitroaromatic compounds were detected in soil, sediment, and groundwater.

In the fall of 1996, 27 tons of nonhazardous soil were removed from Site 9A; 81 tons of lead-contaminated soil were removed from Site 9B. An RI/FS to address groundwater, soil, and surface water and sediments, is scheduled for FY 1998. Remedial action is planned for FY 2001.

Site 10 - Radium Spill at Building 74

This site is the scene of a 1950s low-level radium spill at Building 74 and is approximately 16-square-foot in size. The spill was cleaned immediately and a 2-foot concrete protective barrier was placed on the floor. The building was locked from then until 1984, when it was dismantled and disposed of off site. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action.

This site has been cleaned of radioactive contamination. However, modifications to cleanup standards and advances in testing equipment may require site reevaluation. The BRAC Cleanup Team is considering whether additional remediation needs to occur.

Site 11 - Industrial Wastewater Disposal Area from "100" Area

The site is comprised of 13 leaching wells on 16 acres in the "100" Area, where approximately 20,000 gallons of wastewater were disposed. This site was included in the IAS, the CS, the RI, the FS, and a DVR. Wastewater constituents include silver, chromium, lead, acids, solvents, alcohols, and explosives. VOCs and metals were detected in soil and groundwater.

In the fall of 1996, a removal action involving the excavation and off-site disposal of 1,382 tons of non-hazardous soil was performed at Site 11A. At the same time, 110 tons of nonhazardous soil and 88 tons of lead, cadmium, and trichloroethylene (TCE)-contaminated soil were removed from Site

11B, as were 91 tons of lead-contaminated material from Site 11C. An RI/FS is scheduled for FY 1998. Remedial action is planned for FY 1999.

Site 12 - Wastewater Disposal from "200" Area

From 1945 to the late 1970s, battery acid was disposed of at the site north of Building 201. The site consists of 2 leaching wells within the "200" Area. Additionally, photographic chemicals may be present at this site. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action.

It is currently undergoing a site screening process to determine if additional investigation or cleanup is necessary.

Site 13 - Oil Disposal Area

The site was the repository for sludge from oil storage tanks from 1970 through 1978. The site is in the northeast corner of the base and covers approximately 0.7 acres. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action.

It is currently undergoing a site screening process to determine if additional investigation or cleanup is necessary.

Site 14 - Soil Near Building 70

Radioactive material (Radium-226) was spilled in the 1950s in a 25-square-foot area near a sidewalk, a few feet northeast of Building 70. The site was included in the IAS but not recommended for further action. The sidewalk was dug up, as were the top 2 feet of area soil; these materials were disposed of off base in 1983.

The site has been cleaned of radioactive contamination. However, modifications to cleanup standards and advances in testing equipment may require site reevaluation. The BRAC Cleanup Team is considering whether additional remediation is needed.

Site 46 - Investigation South of Facility 387

This site is the area south of Structure 387, a large centrifuge that has not operated since the 1950s. During the succeeding years, drums were stored on the floor of the centrifuge pit. It is conjectured

that the drums contained solvent. TCE-contaminated groundwater and surface water identified on adjacent Army and residential properties are suspected to originate from a source near the centrifuge (based on interview information).

An RI/FS is scheduled for FY 1998. Remedial action is planned for FY 2000.

A more detailed description of these sites, as well as other, non-IRP sites at NSWC-WO, can be found in its May 1997 Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Plan (BCP). A copy is available for public review at the White Oak Public Library.

In addition to the IRP Sites identified above, five additional IRP sites are undergoing examination to determine the need for additional investigation or cleanup. These sites include:

Site 28 - Building T-14 Scrapyard

The Building T-14 Scrapyard is a fenced area used to temporarily store materials prior to disposal or reuse. The site which measures 150 feet by 300 feet, was used between 1967 and 1975 to store transformers directly on the hard packed gravel surface. The specific location of this former transformer staging area within Site 28 is not known. Some areas of the site are currently covered with concrete.

In the fall of 1997 a site screening investigation was performed at the site which included the collection of surface and subsurface soil samples within and adjacent to the site. These data are being evaluated by the BCT from which a recommendation on the status of the site will be made.

Site 29 - Building 76 Plastics Laboratory Waste Storage Area

Site 29 is comprised of a concrete pad measuring 10 feet by 10 feet. The pad was formerly used to stage wastes generated within the Plastics Laboratory until final off-site disposal. Wastes staged at the site included epoxies and resin waste generated within the Plastics Laboratory. The pad was surrounded by a concrete berm.

In the fall of 1997 a site screening investigation was performed at the site which included the collection of surface and subsurface soil samples in proximity to and adjacent to the site. These data are being evaluated by the BCT from which a recommendation on the status of the site will be made.

Site 31 - Former Building 25 Outdoor Drum Storage Area

Site 31 is a four foot by fifteen foot asphalt pad located directly across Taylor Road from the east side of Building 25. The site was formerly used to temporarily store two 55-gallon drums of waste solvents and lubrication oils generated by operations located within Building 25. The solvents contained trichloroethylene, methylene chloride, 2-butoxyethanol, xylene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and other unspecified hydrocarbon based materials. The drums were stored on the pad for a one- or two-day period prior to transport off-site for disposal. Stressed vegetation observed immediately downgradient of the pad, in the direction of Building 24, indicate the possibility of a release of hazardous materials.

In the fall of 1997 a site screening investigation was performed at the site which included the collection of surface and subsurface soil samples in proximity to and adjacent to the site. These data are being evaluated by the BCT from which a recommendation on the status of the site will be made.

Site 32 - Former Outfall 009 at Building 112

Site 32 is located to the east of Building 112, adjacent to Outfall Number 002. The site is adjacent to the Site 1 Parking Lot Landfill and Site 2 Apple Orchard Landfill. The outfall received wastewater generated in various buildings within Area 100. Contributing sources included Building 100 car wash wastewater (300 [gallons per day] gpd), and steam condensate and backwash from water treatment equipment located in the Boiler Plant Building 101 (2,300 gpd). The outfall was permitted to discharge 2,600 gpd. It is suspected that the wastewater discharges may have contained explosive materials. The outfall was eliminated prior to applying for a modified National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, but was never formally closed under RCRA. The RCRA Facility Assessment (1990) stated that the unit was deactivated on an unknown date.

In the fall of 1997 a site screening investigation was performed at the site which included the collection of surface water and sediment samples downstream of the outfall. These data are being evaluated by the BCT from which recommendation on the status of the site will be made.

Site 33 - Building 25 Plating Shop Equalization Tank

Site 33 is comprised of a sump that is located on the east side of Building 25. The sump is a closed underground concrete tank measuring approximately 5 feet wide by 7 feet long by 8 feet

deep with terra-cotta inlet and outflow pipes. The sump is covered by a metal lid and contains a weir.

Historically, Building 25 housed an electronics shop, an electroplating shop, a paint shop and machine shops. Many of the shops used hazardous materials and generated hazardous wastes as a part of day-to-day operations. During its operation from the late 1940s until 1984, the sump received wastewater containing chromium, cadmium, copper, lead, nickel, and cyanide from Building 25 via the floor drains. Wastewater from the sump discharged to the sanitary sewer system. The sump was deactivated in 1984 when metal plating activities ceased in Building 25.

There have been no known releases from the sump, however, integrity testing on the sump has never been conducted. As a result, Site 33 was investigated in the fall of 1997 to determine if the surrounding environmental media had been impacted by a release of hazardous materials from the sump. This investigation included the collection of surface and subsurface soil samples adjacent to the sump. These data are being evaluated by the BCT from which a recommendation on the status of the site will be made.

3.0 COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

The target community for the CRP is White Oak. This section of the CRP describes the surrounding community and its involvement with the NSWC-WO base. The rationale for conducting community interviews is described, as are the results of those interviews. A copy of the questionnaire used to conduct the interviews is provided as Appendix F.

3.1 COMMUNITY PROFILE

The NSWC-WO facility property is bounded by Silver Spring and Beltsville (neighborhood areas of White Oak, Hillandale, Burnt Mills, Powder Mill, Montgomery Industrial Park/Westfarm Technology Park, Adelphi, Knollwood, and Maryland Farms), straddling Montgomery and Prince George's counties. The following paragraphs provide demographic information for Montgomery and Prince George's counties.

For Montgomery County, according to the Population and Household Profiles of the Eastern Montgomery County Master Plan Areas (White Oak section) published in May 1995 by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (based on the 1990 census), the typical adult resident of White Oak is in his late 20s to 30s, college educated, married, with one child. Median household income exceeds \$55,000. The 1991 median price for a single-family home was \$200,000. The area's racial composition is 63 percent white, 24 percent black, 10 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and 3 percent other. People of Hispanic origin, who may be of any race, represent 6 percent of the area's population.

For Prince George's County, according to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Planning Department, July 1992 (an internet source based on the 1990 census), the typical resident is 25 to 45 years of age and is a high school graduate. The typical household consists of a married family with one child and a median income of \$43,000. The population's racial composition is 50.7 percent black, 43.1 percent white, 3.9 percent asian or pacific islander, and 2 percent other. People of hispanic origin, who may be of any race, represent 4.1 percent of the area's population.

3.2 CHRONOLOGY OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The TRC and RAB, discussed in Appendix E, are the principal means of communication with the community. The following is a list of community relations activities that have occurred to date.

Community Outreach

NSWC-WO developed ways to promote positive interaction between civilian and military communities working toward a common goal. This goal was achieved through several mechanisms:

- NSWC-WO participated in an adopt-a-school program, inviting exchange students to work and learn at the facility's laboratory; NSWC-WO staff also tutored at local schools.
- NSWC-WO provided facilities to the U.S. Navy Band for concerts to which the community was invited.
- NSWC-WO held numerous "open houses" enabling the community to learn about its mission and the various activities that occurred at the base.
- The NSWC-WO base maintained a golf course that was later opened for public use.
- The NSWC-WO established a RAB information telephone line providing updates on environmental cleanup activities and RAB meetings.

Fact Sheets/Informational Handouts

RAB fact sheets are generated and distributed to inform the community of IRP activities at NSWC-WO. Fact sheet/informational handout subjects are listed below.

- The Restoration Advisory Board, November 1995
- Site 8, August 1996
- Notice of Environmental Clean-Up, August 1996
- Closure of Permitted Hazardous Waste Storage Buildings, September 1996
- Sites 9 and 10, September 1996
- Proposed Plan for the Installation Restoration Program, Sites 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11

Notices

A RAB information meeting notice (soliciting interest in membership) was published in both the *Prince George's Journal* and the *Silver Spring Gazette* prior to the RAB information meeting on October 19, 1995. Subsequent RAB meeting notices were also published in those two newspapers; notices were also mailed to individuals on the interested parties mailing list.

Tours/Open Houses/Sites Walked

- The TRC went on a bus tour of the base at the July 19, 1995 meeting.
- RAB member tours occurred on December 1 and December 19, 1995.
- The RAB landfill subcommittee toured the Navy Bainbridge Training Facility in Bainbridge, Maryland on July 22, 1996. They toured the facility to learn about capping landfills.
- An open house was held January 27, 1996 to answer questions regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement written for the GSA regarding consolidation of the Food and Drug Administration operations at the NSWC-WO facility.
- RAB subcommittees walked the base sites numerous times from 1995 through 1997.
- RAB members walked along the Paint Branch Creek in December 1996.

**TRC/RAB Meetings and
Updates**
Activity/Date

Discussion Topics/Activities

TRC Meeting
March 16, 1989

Marked the first TRC kickoff meeting, briefed the IRP at NSWC-WO. Discussed the TRC charter and logistics, discussed dissemination of information on future work.

TRC Meeting
July 26, 1989

Discussed the Draft Work Plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan, Health and Safety Plan, and the schedule for RI activities.

**TRC/RAB Meetings and
Updates
Activity/Date**

Discussion Topics/Activities

TRC Meeting March 12, 1990	Presented and discussed IRP RI; field data; analytical results and geophysical surveys for sites 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, Paint Branch Creek, background wells; and the future schedule and Phase II of the RI/FS.
TRC Meeting February 27, 1991	Discussed results of previous investigations, current field activities, and the RI/FS schedule.
TRC Meeting February 27, 1992	Presented overview of RI study activities for sites 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, Paint Branch Creek, and background wells. Also discussed the Risk Assessment and the schedule for RI/FS activities.
TRC Meeting July 19, 1995	Discussed the RCRA Corrective Action Permit; presented BRAC environmental issues, recommended changes to the soil remediation plan, and implications of the NSWC-WO base being selected for closure under BRAC; provided bus tour of the IR sites.
TRC Meeting September 7, 1995	Comments requested on the Design Verification Report for sites 8, 9 and 11; reviewed results of the DVR on sites 2, 3, and 4 and the new remedial design requirements from DoD Explosive Safety Board; discussed transition of the TRC to a RAB.
Public Information Meeting (White Oak RAB Membership) October 19, 1995	Introduced the BRAC Environmental Coordinator and Remedial Program Manager at NSWC-WO; provided background on the IRP; reviewed RAB guidelines and membership requirements.
RAB Selection Meeting October 26, 1995	Reviewed RAB applications and selected RAB members.
RAB Meeting November 27, 1995	Reviewed IRP history and recent events, BRAC implications, reuse possibilities, base closure implications and future reuse possibilities, RAB ground rules, selection of community co-chair, and draft RAB mission statement.
RAB Meeting January 4, 1996	Reported on the "other 7" IR sites (1, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14) identified in previous environmental hazard studies for no further action or cleanup; discussed base tour; reported DoD budget process for BRAC sites; reported on BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) conference in Texas.
RAB Meeting February 5, 1996	Presented BCT report, proposed Navy cleanup standards, Navy timeline, and budget for cleanup.

**TRC/RAB Meetings and
Updates
Activity/Date**

Discussion Topics/Activities

RAB Meeting
March 13, 1996

Presented BCT report, subcommittee reports, environmental contamination condition at the Adelphi Laboratory Center, and proposed amendments to the RAB operating rules. Subcommittees 1, 2, and 3 chairs selected and meetings scheduled.

RAB Meeting
March 20, 1996

Presented BCT and chair reports, and environmental contamination condition at the Adelphi Laboratory Center; and reviewed proposed amendments to the RAB operating rules. Held side meetings to select subcommittee chairs.

RAB Meeting (members visited
sites 2 and 3 and a landfill)
April 18, 1996

Provided update on the status of cleanup timeline and base transfer to GSA, subcommittee review of the work plan for sites 8, 9 and 11, subcommittee update on sites 2 and 3. Reported subcommittee update on the "7 other sites"; discussed amended RAB operating rules. A tour of the sites followed the RAB meeting.

RAB Meeting
May 6, 1996

Presented BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and chair reports; received updates on the action memorandum and from subcommittees.

RAB Meeting
July 1, 1996

Reported on status of action memorandum, describing the removals for sites 8, 9, and 11; presented subcommittee reports; provided update on the status of the cleanup timeline; BEC provided update.

RAB Meeting
July 30, 1996

Presented BEC report; and subcommittee updates.

RAB Meeting
September 26, 1996

Provided BEC report; reviewed cleanup timeline and budget reports; presented subcommittee updates.

RAB Meeting
December 4, 1996

Provided BEC report; reported on sites 8, 9, and 11, and on sampling results by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory; discussed election of new community co-chair and RAB subcommittee restructuring.

RAB Meeting
January 22, 1997

Heard statement by Maryland Department of the Environment on Hazardous Waste Building Closure; provided BEC update and subcommittee updates on sites 8, 9, and 11 closeout and on landfill design; provided "Risk Assessment" presentation..

RAB Meeting
February 27, 1997

Provided BEC update; reviewed restoration timeline; provided subcommittee updates; reviewed downloading report.

RAB Meeting
March 20, 1997

Provided Navy co-chair and BEC updates; reviewed restoration timeline; provided subcommittee updates.

**TRC/RAB Meetings and
Updates
Activity/Date**

Discussion Topics/Activities

RAB Meeting April 23, 1997	Presented NSWC-WO environmental remediation program overview and Maryland Department of the Environment role in the RAB, BRAC Closure Team and the CERCLA program. EPA provided an update on sites believed to require further investigation; discussed the proposed corrective action order.
RAB Meeting May 29, 1997	Provided BEST and landfill subcommittee reports; presented BCT mission/goals, EPA and BCT update on the corrective action order.
RAB Meeting June 26, 1997	Provided update on the BCT and Navy technical issues; and subcommittee reports; BCT and RAB discussed the BCP addendum.
RAB Meeting July 22, 1997	Provided BCP update, status of the EPA corrective action order; subcommittee updates; presented status of Navy FY 97 tasks; update on base transfer to GSA.
RAB Meeting September 16, 1997	Reviewed status of RCRA corrective action order; reported on decontamination of buildings, pond tests for cleanup needs, update on the transition to GSA, status of the BCP.
RAB Update October 1997	Provided EPA Order update, subcommittee updates, and RI update. Provided status of explosive decontamination report, update on site screening, off-site resident update, and CRP. Addressed plan for radiation sites, BCT pond review, and the upcoming open house.
RAB Meeting November 18, 1997	Presented BEC update, 9/97 RAB meeting action items, BCT update, FY97 task update, FY98 tasks for November/December, EPA order status; RAB membership update; subcommittee updates; and toxicology brief.
RAB Update December 1997	Addressed administrative items, off-site resident-WSSC water status, EPA Order status, BCT meeting update, and BRAC conference.
RAB Meeting January 20, 1998	Reviewed RAB membership status, provided environmental technical update, off-site resident status, BEC program update, WO FRC new reuse plans, and subcommittee reports.
RAB Update February 1998	Provided EPA Order status, BCT meeting update, groundwater subcommittee update, WSSC update, CRP update, and Remedial Investigation update.
RAB Meeting March 1998	Presented BEC update on field investigations, BCT, and BCP. Provided groundwater subcommittee and RI/FS reports. Provided RCRA Consent Order update.

All NSWC WO RAB meetings are held the second Tuesday of the month, typically every other month.

3.3 KEY COMMUNITY CONCERNS

During September and October 1997, a preliminary list of interviewees was formulated with the assistance of RAB members, active community residents, and the NSWC-WO base staff. This list consisted of a diverse selection of individuals who live, work, or represent stakeholders in the surrounding area. Approximately 30 people were telephoned requesting their participation in the NSWC-WO public outreach interviews. Of those individuals contacted, most were interested in the IRP at NSWC-WO and agreed to participate in one-on-one interviews. From September 22 to October 8, 1997, community interviews took place at the NSWC-WO facility as well as at business and residential locations. Fifteen community interviews were conducted, 11 of which were held face-to-face. Due to schedule conflicts, the remaining four individuals were interviewed by teleconference. The interviewees consisted of local residents, a local political figure who lives in the neighborhood, the priest at a local church, an employee of a commercial business that borders the base property, the director of a local nonprofit organization that has interacted with the base in past years, the manager of an apartment complex that borders the base property, a retired base employee, an individual representing a neighboring research laboratory, and two representatives of government organizations that would occupy the base property following base transfer. Three of the interviewees were women, 12 were men, and the age range was from approximately 30 to 65 years. Ten of the individuals interviewed have lived in the community from 8 to 42 years. The remaining five work in the White Oak area.

An analysis of the responses revealed a number of key concerns including human health issues, the potential spread of contamination and its affect on the environment, the potential for contamination from other sources (off base), public awareness, base closure and transfer issues, potential impact on real estate values, adverse publicity for the neighborhood, transportation issues, and timeliness of the cleanup. In addition, approximately half of those interviewed were knowledgeable to somewhat knowledgeable of the mission of the base while the other half knew very little or had no idea of the base mission activities. Interviewees first became aware of the environmental activities and issues at the base in the mid 1990's, when the base made the BRAC list, and later when the base property transfer was announced.

Human Health Issues

All individuals interviewed categorized human health issues as an important concern. Groundwater contamination (TCE) was a specific concern for those households with drinking water wells. Additionally, some felt that the Navy should have tested all neighboring home areas for potential

groundwater contamination. Interviewees requested that once TCE levels have been identified, the data be released to the community for review.

Public records indicate that three homes downgradient of NSWC-WO draw their water supply from private wells. The Navy concurs that households whose drinking water wells may be affected by contamination emanating from NSWC-WO should be informed about the potential impact to their water supply.

During recent activities, two of these wells were sampled to determine if they had been impacted. These results, along with sampling data collected from other environmental media (i.e., surface water, soil, sediment) on or in proximity to potentially affected adjacent residences, will be evaluated to determine if an increase risk to human health is present. Additional testing will be conducted in the future to monitor groundwater quality at any potentially impacted off-site residences. The Navy is currently conducting an investigation to identify the source(s) of contamination which may be adversely impacting any properties adjacent to NSWC-WO.

It is Navy policy to inform the homeowners of the test results collected on their property, but allow them to retain that information as private. Further dissemination of this data to others is the decision of the homeowners and not the Navy's.

Spread of Contamination

All interviewees were concerned with the potential spread of contamination. It was suggested that a separate forum be established to address cleanup of sources that have spread off base (through stream or groundwater transport). This forum would encompass the anticipated spread of contamination from both Navy and Army locations. As mentioned above, the spread of contamination into the groundwater was a concern of many individuals, specifically for those households using wells as their private drinking water supply.

Contamination from Other Sources

A majority of interviewees viewed contamination from other sources as an important area of concern. The only known source for contamination outside the base property would be the U.S. Army Research Laboratory. A few individuals were aware of the possibility of other contamination originating from the Army base. The Army has participated in RAB meetings, addressing questions from the community, as well as working with the Navy to identify potential sources of contamination which might migrate into the neighboring community. The Navy and Army need to work together to resolve the off-base spread of contaminants.

In 1996, the Navy began regular discussions with personnel from the Army Research Laboratory (ARL) about the potential impact of contamination originating from DoD property (either NSWC-WO or ARL) on neighboring properties. In addition, Bob Craig, of ARL has been a member of the NSWC-WO RAB since it was established in 1996. The Navy and the Army have been working toward resolving issues related to off-site impacts of contamination to neighboring properties since that time.

Public Awareness

Approximately half of those interviewed expressed a desire to be better informed of the cleanup activities at NSWC-WO. Two individuals were unaware of the IRP and the cleanup activities currently underway at the base. A couple of interviewees requested prior notice of explosion type activities so as not to alarm the surrounding community. Another individual requested that those community clusters not represented by a neighborhood association be kept informed of base environmental activities.

The Navy has built a basic mailing list; additions are continually sought. RAB meeting notices will be amended to solicit additional names for the list. The Navy also utilizes newspapers (i.e., the Silver Spring Gazette and the Prince George's Journal) to solicit attendance at RAB meetings and open houses. A point-of-contact is also provided for IRP questions.

No further explosive-type activities will be conducted by the Navy at NSWC-WO.

Base Closure and Transfer

One third of the interviewees rated base closure and transfer as an important issue. All those interviewed wanted the base to be reused and the community to prosper from the transfer. Some mentioned that the NSWC-WO location was well suited (location and space) for the GSA as well as for providing new jobs for the local community. Concern was expressed about how the reuse might affect the community as well as the environment. From an environmental perspective, an individual requested that property not used by GSA should revert to its original state (no mowing), that caution be taken not to deplete any existing forest during new development, that caution be taken with the stormwater management system during construction, and that the potential environmental concerns (potential contamination of pond sediment) of the golf course be evaluated after transfer to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The transfer of NSWC-WO from the Navy to the GSA was completed on October 18, 1997, but the Navy retains the responsibility for ensuring that existing hazardous waste management issues are addressed. The RAB is the forum the Navy created to ensure that the community is involved in decisions concerning this clean up; representatives from the Public/Private Partnership have been actively involved in RAB meetings. However, concerns about environmental issues related to ongoing site activities are now outside the Navy's jurisdiction because of the transfer (such as no mowing) should be directed to GSA. EFACHES will provide a copy of the CRP to GSA.

Real Estate

All interviewees, especially those bordering the base, viewed the impact of the base contamination on real estate values to be important. Residents were concerned about resale prices of their homes, since they are required to disclose information about potential contaminants near or on their property to potential buyers. The commercial business interviewee was curious about any potential impact the cleanup activities and contamination might have on its bordering property, which is slated for redevelopment.

The Navy understands the concern of homeowners that about NSWC-WO. However, the Navy has no knowledge of contamination that has migrated off base that could directly impact soil by adjacent properties. The Navy is aware, however, that contaminated surface water is present within two streams off base; and has tested it and will continue to test it. The owners of the property that about the streams have been kept informed of test results.

The only other people who are potentially impacted are those who use the groundwater as a source of drinking water. As noted above, the Navy has identified those people who have private wells and are testing these wells on a regular basis. The remaining local residents are connected to the public water supply system.

Adverse Publicity

Most interviewees felt that adverse publicity of both the base transfer and its contamination could affect them personally. One individual felt that the public needed education/clarification on the other forms of potential hazards such as lead paint and friable asbestos. Clarification of the dangers of these sources would show the slim possibility of risk to base neighbors unless the material was ingested. Also, as described in the Real Estate summary above, neighboring community members were concerned about the negative message that "cleanup of contamination" might send and the impact it might have on the resale of homes.

The Navy is committed to ensuring that it meets its responsibilities for addressing the contaminated cleanup issues it created. The Navy cannot, however, undo what has been. The BCP lists the various environmental concerns the Navy is addressing and contains a general schedule outlining when these issues will be addressed. A copy of the BCP has been placed in the White Oak Public library.

Transportation

Two individuals expressed concern about potential transportation issues when the base is transferred to GSA. It was suggested that a study be performed to determine the best methods of addressing any transportation issues that might occur. It was suggested that because of the major influx of vehicles by GSA employees, car pooling and bus commuting be emphasized for employees.

The Navy has passed these concerns along to the GSA, which has promised to identify and address community concerns related to its ownership of NSWC-WO.

Timing of Cleanup

Concern was expressed by a few individuals that final cleanup of all the sites would not be completed until the year 2005. Also adding to their discontent was the government funding process and the restrictions it has placed on the environmental cleanup at NSWC-WO. Additionally, because of the bureaucratic process, it has taken the Navy too long to respond to questions asked by the community.

As of March 1998, the Navy anticipates spending \$21 million on cleanup activities at NSWC-WO through the year 2006. Funding is allocated among DoD bases nationwide based on the magnitude of health risk posed by contamination issues. Although its presence can be unsettling and often inconvenient, the vast majority of the contamination presents no problem at NSWC-WO and is not a significant threat to human health. The Navy is spending the funds it does have on the areas where the risk is greatest. The Navy anticipates receiving \$4.9 million for the fiscal year that begins in October 1998.

In summary, interviewees felt that the NSWC-WO base had been a good community member. The many concerts, interaction with local schools, equipment donation to nonprofit organizations, provision of jobs, etc., made the base an asset to the community. Additionally, most believed the transfer to GSA would promote a fresh outlook for the community. Although most individuals on

the mailing list have been happy with the quality of information received in the past, it is apparent that the list needs to be expanded beyond the previously known housing clusters.

4.0 COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

Through the IRP, NSWC-WO has begun to inform and educate the public about the environmental issues present at the facility. The CRP serves as a guide to improve communication between NSWC-WO and the nearby civilian communities. This plan is based on information obtained during community interviews, meetings, telephone calls, and from historic community interaction. The plan provides recommended activities to improve the information distribution to the community. The effectiveness of this CRP will rely on timely information distribution, feedback from the public, and the EFACHES response to community concerns.

4.1 GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of the CRP is to promote communication between the local community, military and civilian personnel, and elected and public officials. This goal is consistent with principal DoD base closure objectives: early interaction and cooperation with affected communities, and provision for public interest.

To meet the goal of improved communication, the public must be informed of IRP activities and have an opportunity for input and comment. This goal will be met through several strategies, including site fact sheets and RAB meetings open to the public. The IRP fact sheets and other information are available for review at the information repository. RAB meetings are scheduled at appropriate points during the cleanup process. Public comments will be received through RAB meetings. The public is encouraged to call RAB members (see Appendix C) to learn about the IRP.

This CRP has been prepared in general accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-510), as amended, including Section 117 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-499, October 17, 1986).
2. EPA's Public Involvement in the Superfund Program (WH/FS-86-004) and CERCLA compliance with other environmental statutes [*Federal Register* 50(20):592859321].

3. *Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook* (Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response Directive Number 9230.0-3C, January, 1992).
4. The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP).

The CRP's principal objectives are to:

1. Inform all participants in the IRP of the CRP and encourage their involvement.
2. Ensure the community that their health and safety and their environment are of primary importance to EFACHES.
3. Develop, maintain, and use, as necessary, an "interested parties mailing list" for information distribution. Encourage interested community members to be added to the NSWC-WO list.
4. Provide general information regarding the IRP, and specific information concerning sites at critical stages in the cleanup process to members of the community. The information should be timely and be expressed in nontechnical terms.
5. Provide all interested members of the community the opportunity to review and comment on all IRP technical reports.
6. Provide all interested members of the community opportunities to present opinions and ideas during the IRP.
7. Provide the media with interviews, briefings, and requested information, as available, in a timely manner to ensure accurate coverage of the IRP.
8. Swiftly and effectively respond to expressed concerns of the community.
9. Provide a point-of-contact (see Appendix C) through whom all inquiries are directed, to ensure continuity and reduce confusion.

10. Cultivate and maintain a cooperative and productive two-way dialogue with the community by assigning a proactive EFACHES representative to promote trust and understanding during the IRP.
11. Periodically will review the CRP during the IRP process and revise it as needed.

NSWC-WO's community relations efforts focus on providing the community with accurate and timely information about findings and developments at NSWC-WO, and on promoting community communication.

4.2 COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES AND TECHNIQUES

Building and maintaining an effective communication network is important for successful community relations. Developing different communication techniques for several audiences and adapting these techniques according to changes in the public attitude is necessary to create and maintain public trust and participation.

Based on the key community concerns identified in Section 3.0, NSWC-WO has identified a number of activities that will be undertaken to address those concerns.

1. Publicize RAB Meetings

The RAB was established to enhance the role of sources outside the NSWC-WO Base and the participating agencies in providing input to the cleanup decision process. In October 1995, the RAB was formed to include more representatives of the local community on the roster of reviewers of technical documents and matters relating to the IRP.

2. Conduct Telephone Conference Calls/Meetings

Whenever a major project milestone is reached, EFACHES will schedule telephone conference calls and/or meetings with appropriate regulatory agencies to maintain the lines of communication and flow of information.

3. Publish Notices of RAB Meetings in the *Silver Spring Gazette* and the *Prince George's Journal*

To ensure adequate scheduling time for attendance by the agencies and the public, maximum advance notice is required. The notice for RAB meetings will be published in the *Silver Spring Gazette* and the *Prince George's Journal* 1-2 weeks prior to scheduled RAB meeting dates.

4. Proposed Plans/Public Hearings (Comment Period)

The proposed plan fulfills the public participation requirements of CERCLA Section 117(a), which specifies that the lead agency (the Navy) must publish a plan outlining remedial alternatives evaluated for the site and identifying the preferred alternative. Proposed plans will be developed for site(s) once they have reached this stage in the IR process.

5. Publish Public Hearing (Comment Period)

To provide adequate scheduling time for attendance, maximum advance notice is required. The public comment period and hearing notices will be published in the *Silver Spring Gazette*, the *Prince George's Journal*, and the *Washington Post* 2 weeks prior to the public hearing.

6. Establish Information Repository

To provide the public with access to IRP information, NSWC-WO program-related documents are placed in the White Oak Public Library. Appendix D identifies the information repository, with its telephone number and hours of operation. EFACHES will maintain this repository.

7. Distribute Fact Sheets

Fact sheets will be prepared to update the community on project milestones or major developments. The fact sheets will be prepared in clear, concise language and sent to people on the mailing list.

8. Provide Special Briefings for Local Officials

When people in the community have concerns or questions, they often call their local officials to obtain information or to register a complaint. To keep these key people informed, telephone contact/correspondence will be initiated by EFACHES. These contacts will provide a means for EFACHES to respond to community concerns voiced by local officials. Appendix C includes a listing of these officials.

9. Establish Mailing List

Mailing distributions will be made to all those on the interested parties list, including local congressional representatives. These mailings will inform all parties of meetings/events as well as provide IRP updates.

10. Prepare Press Releases

To adequately inform the public of significant IRP activities/milestones, press releases will be sent to the *Silver Spring Gazette*, *Prince George's Journal*, *Montgomery County Journal*, *Beltsville News*, and the *Washington Post* newspapers.

11. Site Tours

Site tours can be scheduled to present a realistic view of the site and a better understanding of the investigation and cleanup methods.

12. Open Houses

Open houses will be held to educate the community about environmental issues and cleanup activities at the NSWC-WO as needed.

5.0 RESPONSIBILITIES AND TIMING

5.1 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES

EFACHES is responsible for implementing the CRP. The Commanding Officer implements the CRP by sharing tasks with federal, state, and county regulatory agencies, and with technical personnel contracted to assist in the IRP process. Principal responsibilities are outlined below.

1. EFACHES

- a. Plans, schedules, and coordinates all activities to implement the CRP. Activities may include specific communication techniques for regulatory agencies, the local community, and the media.
- b. Provides a spokesperson for the IRP and responds to media queries using statements or plans.
- c. Informs the state and all appropriate federal agencies of activities and findings relative to the site in a timely manner.
- d. Ensures that Freedom of Information Act requests are acted on in a timely manner.
- e. Remains sensitive to the needs and concerns of the local community regarding the site, and implements activities of the CRP as appropriate.
- f. Updates the CRP as new developments and changes occur at the site.
- g. Holds and participates in RAB meetings, which are open to the public.

2. EPA (optional):

- a. Acts as spokesperson on policy or questions regarding programs within EPA's area of responsibility.
- b. Provides a spokesperson to respond to appropriate questions from briefings for local officials, interested community groups, citizens, and the media.
- c. Responds to press questions, as required, and notifies other involved agencies of responses and potential concerns.

3. State of Maryland, Department of the Environment:

- a. Acts as spokesperson on policy or questions concerning programs within its area of responsibility.
- b. Provides a spokesperson to respond to appropriate questions from briefings for local officials, interested community groups, citizens, and the media.
- c. Responds to press questions, as required, and notifies other involved agencies of responses and potential concerns.

4. *Montgomery County, Department of Environmental Protection and Prince George's Department of Environmental Protection and Health Department:*

- a. Acts as spokespersons on policy or questions regarding programs within each county's areas of responsibility.
- b. Provides spokespersons to respond to appropriate questions from briefings for local officials, interested community groups, citizens, and the media.
- c. Responds to press questions, as required, and notifies other involved agencies of responses and potential concerns.

5.2 TIMING OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES

Table 5-1 outlines IRP activities EFACHES plans to implement for NSWC-WO. The NSWC-WO, 1977, *Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Plan* (available in the repository at the White Oak Public Library) provides a detailed explanation of the status of all sites in the IR process.

The Public-Private Partnership plans to develop and reuse portions of the base following the transfer of NSWC-WO property to GSA. The Navy is committed to coordinating all environmental cleanup activities with the Partnership efforts.

TABLE 5-1

**ANTICIPATED COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
WHITE OAK, MARYLAND**

Activity	
Notices for Public Comment Periods	Published before each comment period
Proposed Plans/Public Hearings	As needed
Publish Public Hearing Notices	Published and mailed prior to public meetings
Public Hearing Meetings	Held as needed
Publish RAB Meeting Notices	Published and mailed prior to RAB meetings
Publicize RAB Meetings	Held every other month or as needed
Distribute Fact Sheets	Created as needed
Establish Information Repository	Established and updated as needed
Distribute Mailings	Mailed as needed
Submit Press Releases	Submitted as needed
Site Tours	Held as needed
Hold Open Houses	Held as needed
Conduct Telephone Conference Calls/Meetings	Conducted as needed
Provide Special Briefings to Local Officials	Held as needed
Miscellaneous Outreach	Performed as needed

APPENDIX A
LIST OF ACRONYMS

APPENDIX A

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AOC	Area of Concern
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
BCP	BRAC Cleanup Plan
BCT	BRAC Cleanup Team
BEC	BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BEST	BRAC Environmental Study Team
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
CRP	Community Relations Plan
CS	Confirmation Study
DERA	Defense Environmental Restoration Account
DoD	Department of Defense
DVR	Design Verification Report
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
EFACHES	Engineering Field Activity - Chesapeake
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FS	Feasibility Study
FY	Fiscal Year
GSA	General Services Administration
IAS	Initial Assessment Study
IR	Installation Restoration
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
NACIP	Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NTCRA	Non-Time-Critical Removal Action
PA/SI	Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
RA	Remedial Action
RAB	Restoration Advisory Board
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD	Remedial Design
RD/RA	Remedial Design/Remedial Action
RI	Remedial Investigation
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
ROD	Record of Decision
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986
SWMU	Solid Waste Management Unit
TCA	Trichloroethane
TCE	Trichloroethylene
TRC	Technical Review Committee
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

APPENDIX B

**NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION AND REMEDIAL
INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY PROCESS COMPARISON**

APPENDIX B

NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION (NTCRA) AND REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) PROCESS COMPARISON

NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL PROCESS

PREINVESTIGATION

1. EE/CA Approval Memorandum

- Secure management approval and funding for a NTCRA
- Include finding of actual or threatened release and, if present, an imminent and substantial endangerment, and general site information and costs
- Document that situation meets NCP criteria and action is non-time-critical

EE/CA DOCUMENT

2. EE/CA Executive Summary

- Identify threat
- Describe removal action objectives

Summarize recommended action

3. Site Characterization

- Collect site description and background
- Identify previous removal actions
- Determine source, nature, and extent of contamination
- Collect analytical data
- Perform streamlined risk evaluation
- Identify contaminant- and location-specific ARARs

RI/FS PROCESS

PREINVESTIGATION

1a. Pre-RI/FS Scoping

- Collect existing data
- Visit site/identify areas of concern
- Generate statement of work

1b. RI/FS Scoping

- Collect/analyze existing data
- Determine need for/implement additional studies
- Develop preliminary remedial action alternatives/objectives
- Evaluate need for treatability studies
- Begin preliminary identification of ARARs
- Identify data needs/data quality objectives
- Design data collection program
- Develop work plan
- Identify health and safety protocols

REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION

--

2. Site Characterization

- Investigate site physical characteristics
- Define sources of contamination
- Determine nature and extent of contamination
- Conduct laboratory analyses
- Conduct data analyses
- Conduct baseline risk assessment
- Identify contaminant- and location-specific ARARs
- Define remedial action goals
- Prepare Draft RI Report

4. Identification of Removal Action Objectives

- Evaluate statutory limits
- Determine scope of removal action
- Determine schedule of removal action

5. Identification and Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives

- Identify treatment technologies (presumptive remedy and treatability studies, as appropriate)
- Evaluate effectiveness
 - Overall protection of human health and the environment
 - Compliance with ARARs
 - Long-term effectiveness and permanence
 - Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment
 - Short-term effectiveness
- Evaluate implementability
 - Technical feasibility
 - Administrative feasibility
 - Availability of services and materials
 - State acceptance
 - Community acceptance
- Evaluate cost

6. Comparative Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives
(See criteria above)
Compare alternatives

7. Recommended Removal Action Alternative (summarized in Action Memorandum)
(Public comment period on EE/CA of at least 30 days)

FEASIBILITY STUDY

3a. Development of Alternatives

- Remedial action objectives
- General response actions
- Volumes or areas of media
- Screen technology and process options
- Process options identification
- Technology alternatives
- Action-specific ARARs

3b. Screening of Alternatives

- Effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost
- Innovative technologies

3c. Performance of Treatability Studies

- Data requirements
- Bench- or pilot-scale study
- Treatability test work plan
- Documentation of results

4. Detailed Analysis of Alternatives

- Overall protection of human health and environment
- Compliance w/ARARs
- Long-term effectiveness and performance
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment
- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost
- State acceptance
- Community acceptance
- (analyze alternatives against these nine criteria)

5. Comparative Analysis
(See criteria above)
Compare alternatives

6. Preferred Remedial Alternatives (summarized in Proposed Plan)
(Public comment period of at least 30 days)

APPENDIX C
KEY CONTACTS AND
LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES

APPENDIX C

KEY CONTACTS AND LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES

1.0 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Ms. Armalia Berry
Base Environmental Coordinator
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Washington Navy Yard, Building 212
901 M Street, SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

Telephone: 202-685-3273
Facsimile: 202-685-0979
E-mail: asberry@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

2.0 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Harry Debes
7th & D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20407-0001

Telephone: 202-708-7623, ext. 145
Facsimile: 202-708-4730
E-mail: harry.debes@gsa.gov

3.0 UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Ms. Yazmine Yap-Deffler
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mail Stop: 3H550
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: 215-566-3369
Facsimile: 215-566-3051
E-mail: yap-deffler.yazmine@epamail.epa.gov

* RAB Technical/Regulatory Members
** RAB Co-Chairpersons
*** RAB Subcommittee Chairpersons

4.0 MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Donna Lynch
Maryland Department of the Environment
Federal/NPL Superfund Division
2500 Broening Highway
Baltimore, MD 21224-6020

Telephone: 410-631-3440
Facsimile: 410-631-3472
E-mail: bdemarco@charm.net

5.0 MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Mr. Edward Herbert
Montgomery County Department of
Environmental Protection
101 Monroe Street
Rockville, MD 20850-6601

Telephone: 301-217-2177
Facsimile: 301-217-2386
E-mail: ed.herbert@co.mo.md.us

Douglas M. Duncan, County Executive
101 Monroe Street
Rockville, MD 20850

Telephone: 301-217-2500

Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850

Telephone: 301-217-7910
Gail Ewing (at large): 301-217-7906
Isiah Leggett (at large): 301-217-7955
Neal Potter (at large): 301-217-7966
Michael L. Subin (at large): 301-217-7828
Betty Ann Krahnke (District 1): 301-217-6617
Nancy Dacek (District 2): 301-217-7811
William E. Hanna (District 3): 301-217-7960
Marilyn J. Praisner (District 4): 301-217-7968
Derick P. Berlage (District 5): 301-217-7967

6.0 PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY

Mr. Paul Meyer
Prince George's County Health Department
Division of Environmental Health
9201 Basil Court, Suite 318
Largo, MD 20774-5310

Telephone: 301-883-7602
Facsimile: 301-883-7266

Mr. James Ng
Prince George's County Health Department
Division of Environmental Health
9201 Basil Court, Suite 318
Largo, MD 20774-5310

Telephone: 301-883-7624
Facsimile: 301-883-7601

Wayne K. Curry, County Executive
County Administrative Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-3050

Telephone: 301-952-4131
Facsimile: 301-952-3784

Prince George's County Council
County Administrative Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-3050

Walter H. Maloney (District 1): 301-952-3887
Stephen J. Del Giudice (District 2): 301-952-4436
Thomas R. Hendershot (District 3): 301-952-3060
Audrey E. Scott (District 4): 301-952-3094
Marvin F. Wilson (District 5): 301-952-3864
Ronald V. Russell (District 6): 301-952-3426
Dorothy F. Bailey (District 7): 301-952-3690
Isaac J. Gourdine (District 8): 301-952-3860
M. H. Jim Estep (District 9): 301-952-3820

* RAB Technical/Regulatory Members
** RAB Co-Chairpersons
*** RAB Subcommittee Chairpersons

7.0 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Kim Bellis, Remedial Project Manager
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Washington Navy Yard, Building 212
901 M Street, SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

Telephone: 202-685-6293
Facsimile: 202-685-0979
E-mail: kbellis@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

Ms. Armalia Berry, Navy Co-chair**
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Washington Navy Yard, Building 212
901 M Street, SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

Telephone: 202-685-3273
Facsimile: 202-685-0979
E-mail: asberry@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

Ms. Betsy Bretz
10733 Kinloch Road
Silver Spring, MD 20903-1227

Telephone: 301-439-8655 (h)
Facsimile: 301-439-8638

Mr. Gary Brown
3225 Cherry Mill Drive
Adelphi, MD 20783

Telephone: 301-937-8753 (h)

Mr. Kenneth Caudle***
1924 Narrows Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20906

Telephone: 301-924-5013 (h)
Facsimile: 301-260-0686
E-mail: keno@tidalwave.net

Mr. Arnold S. Collier
1425 Morningside Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20904-1533

Telephone: 301-394-1736(w)
Facsimile: 301-394-4631

Mr. Robert Craig
U.S. Army Research Laboratory
Attn: AMSRL-CS-IS-EQ
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1197

Telephone: 301-394-6301(w)
Facsimile: 301-394-2660
E-mail: rcraig@arl.mil

Dr. Hall Crannell
10,000 Branch View Court
Silver Spring, MD 20903

Telephone: 301-434-4600
Facsimile: 202-319-5313
E-mail: crannell@cua.edu

Ms. Marian Davenport
10403 Tulsa Drive
Adelphi, MD 20783-1153

Telephone: 301-434-3240(h)
E-mail: davensden@aol.com

Mr. Harry Debes
7th & D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20407-0001

Telephone: 202-708-7623, ext. 145
Facsimile: 202-708-4730
E-mail: harry.debes@gsa.gov

Mr. Edward Herbert*
Montgomery County
Department of Environmental Protection
101 Monroe Street
Rockville, MD 20850-6601

Telephone: 301-217-2177
Facsimile: 301-217-2386
E-mail: ed.herbert@co.mo.md.us

Dr. Gary Irby
3118 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

Telephone: 301-937-1573

Ms. Donna Lynch*
Maryland Department of the Environment
Federal/NPL Superfund Division
2500 Broening Highway
Baltimore, MD 21224-6020

Telephone: 410-631-3440
Facsimile: 410-631-3472
E-mail: bdemarco@charm.net

Ms. Barbara Medina***
11983 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904-1930

Telephone: 301-622-3289
Facsimile: 301-622-6567
E-mail: barbflo@aol.com

Mr. Paul Meyer*
Prince George's County Health Department
Division of Environmental Health
9201 Basil Court, Suite 318
Largo, MD 20774-5310

Telephone: 301-883-7602
Facsimile: 301-883-7266

Mr. James Ng*
Prince George's County Health Department
Division of Environmental Health
9201 Basil Court, Suite 318
Largo, MD 20774-5310

Telephone: 301-883-7624
Facsimile: 301-883-7601

Dr. Richard Price**/**
1801 Kimberly Road
Silver Spring, MD 20903-1218

Telephone: 703-525-7200 (w)
301-439-8241(h)
Facsimile: 703-525-7206
E-mail: rich-price@tamu.edu

Ms. Brenda Sandberg*
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning
Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910-3760

Telephone: 301-495-2162
Facsimile: 301-495-1303
E-mail: sandberg@mncppc.state.md.us

* RAB Technical/Regulatory Members
** RAB Co-Chairpersons
*** RAB Subcommittee Chairpersons

Mr. Marshall J. Tino**
10509 Edgefield Drive
Adelphi, MD 20783-1130

Telephone: 301-439-3140

Ms. Yazmine Yap-Deffler*
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mail Stop: 3HW50
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: 215-566-3369
Facsimile: 215-566-3051
E-mail: yap-deffler.yazmine@epmail.epa.gov

Mr. George A. Young
3611 Janet Road
Wheaton, MD 20906-4353

Telephone: 301-946-6490

8.0 ELECTED FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Senator Paul Sarbanes
309 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6133

Telephone: 202-224-4524
Facsimile: 202-224-1651
E-mail: senator@sarbanes.senate.gov

Senator Barbara Mikulski
709 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6133

Telephone: 202-224-4654
Facsimile: 202-224-8858
E-mail: senator@mikulski.senate.gov

Representative Albert Wynn
Fourth District
407 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Telephone: 202-225-8699
Facsimile: 202-225-8714
E-mail: albert.wynn@mail.house.gov

Representative Steny Hoyer
Fifth District
1705 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Telephone: 202-225-4131
Facsimile: 202-225-4300

Representative Connie Morella
Eighth District
2228 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Telephone: 202-225-5341
Facsimile: 202-225-1389
E-mail: rep.morella@mail.house.gov

9.0 ELECTED STATE OFFICIALS

District 20, Montgomery County

Senator Ida G. Reuben
204 James Senate Office Building
110 College Avenue
Annapolis, MD 21401-1991

Telephone: 301-858-3634
Facsimile: 301-858-3166
E-mail: ida-reuben@senate.state.md.us

Delegate Sheila E. Hixon
Lowe House Office Building, Room 100
6 Governor Bladen Boulevard
Annapolis, MD 21401-1991

Telephone: 301-858-3469
Facsimile: 301-858-2401
E-mail: sheh@mlis.state.md.us

* RAB Technical/Regulatory Members
** RAB Co-Chairpersons
*** RAB Subcommittee Chairpersons

District 21, Prince George's County

Senator Arthur Dorman
116 Presidential Wing
James Senate Office Building
110 College Avenue
Annapolis, MD 21401

Telephone: 301-858-3141
Facsimile: 301-858-3850

Delegate Barbara Frush
Lowe House Office Building, Room 210
6 Governor Bladen Boulevard
Annapolis, MD 21401-1991

Telephone: 301-858-3114
Facsimile: 301-858-3116
E-mail: barbara-frush@house.state.md.us

APPENDIX D
PUBLIC INFORMATION REPOSITORY AND
LOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC INFORMATION REPOSITORY AND LOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

INFORMATION REPOSITORY

White Oak Public Library
11701 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20904

301-622-2492

Hours of Operation:

Monday thru Thursday 10:00 a.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Friday 10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Saturday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

RAB MEETING LOCATIONS

Meetings will be held at a location easily accessible to the public and will be announced in advanced of each meeting. It is likely that public meetings will be held at the Federal Research Center at White Oak (Former Naval Surface Warfare Center - White Oak); however as an alternate, the Center for the Handicapped may be used.

Federal Research Center at White Oak
Former Naval Surface Warfare Center - White Oak
10901 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20903-1049
301-344-1147/1145

or

Center for the Handicapped
10501 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20904
301-445-3350

APPENDIX E
DOCUMENTATION FOR ESTABLISHING THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
AND THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

APPENDIX E

1.0 DOCUMENTATION FOR ESTABLISHING THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

NSWC-WO established a Technical Review Committee (TRC) in March 1989. TRC members included Navy representatives from NSWC-WO and EFACHES; the EPA, the Maryland Department of the Environment, and Montgomery County; and a retired Navy Captain from the Hillandale Citizens Association.

In 1993, the President issued Executive Order 12580 to establish Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs) at installations under the Base Realignment and Closure program. In 1994, the Department of Defense formally issued a policy for establishing RABs as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Management Guidance. In 1994, the DoD and the EPA jointly issued guidelines that provided a strategy for establishing RABs. Those guidelines are published in the DoD/EPA document entitled *Restoration Advisory Board Workshop Guidebook*. Where Technical Review Committees existed, their core members were encouraged to become RAB members; the RABs expanded representation by including members of the affected communities and are a means for stakeholder involvement in the cleanup process. RABs enhance communication and solicit input from the public on cleanup issues. They provide a forum for exchanging information between the community and government decision makers.

The NSWC-WO TRC was expanded into a RAB in October 1995. The White Oak community was solicited for individuals interested in participating on the RAB. A notice was placed in the *Silver Spring Gazette* and *Prince George's Journal* inviting individuals to attend the RAB information meeting or contact the NSWC-WO point-of-contact if they were interested in participating on the NSWC-WO RAB. The NSWC-WO RAB information meeting was held on October 19, 1995 to provide information on how to participate in the RAB process. On October 26, 1995, a RAB selection panel (composed of community representatives and environmental officials) reviewed applications and selected individuals for RAB membership. The first RAB meeting was held in November 1995.

Notices are placed in local newspapers and mailed to interested parties for all RAB meetings. Additionally, RAB members have received notices as well as information updates through the mail. RAB meetings are held approximately every or every other month and are open to the public. RAB membership includes representatives from: the EFACHES; the General Services Administration; the Maryland Department of the Environment; the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection; the Prince George's County Health Department; the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; the U.S. Army Research Laboratory; the Local Redevelopment Authority; local homeowners' associations and residents; and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

Appendix C, Section 7.0 contains a list of all RAB members and their affiliations.

The following section provides a list of operating rules estimated for the NSWC-WO RAB.

2.0 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD OPERATING RULES

Name

The name of this organization is the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) of the White Oak Detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC White Oak).

Mission

The RAB's mission is to establish and maintain a forum for the exchange of information in an open and interactive dialogue concerning the installation's restoration program. In performing its mission the RAB will:

1. Review and evaluate documents;
2. Identify project requirements;
3. Recommend priorities among sites or projects;
4. Identify applicable standards and propose cleanup levels consistent with planned land use;
5. Act as a forum for discussion and exchange of cleanup information between Government agencies and the public;
6. Keep meeting minutes and make them available to the public.

Purpose

The purpose of the RAB is to provide advice to the Government and the Navy on matters related to the proper restoration of the White Oak base. In developing recommendations each member is to give advice as an individual. It is not expected or necessary for the RAB to develop a consensus on all recommendations. All advice and recommendations will include both the majority as well as any minority opinions on the matter in question.

Organization

The RAB will be administered through co-chairs. A Navy co-chair will be appointed by the Officer in Charge (OIC) of NSWC White Oak. The community members of the RAB will elect a co-chair and an alternate co-chair. The co-chairs' responsibilities are to be jointly held between the Navy and community.

The Navy co-chair will coordinate with the community co-chair to prepare and distribute an agenda prior to each RAB meeting. He/she will also be responsible for coordination with the BRAC Cleanup Team, the Base Transition Coordinator, the OIC, and the Local Redevelopment Authority.

The Navy co-chair will ensure the minutes of the meetings are produced, that documents distributed to the RAB are also made available to the general public, and that an accurate list of interested/affected parties is developed and maintained.

The Navy co-chair will chair meetings of the RAB in absence of the Community co-chair and the Alternate Community co-chair.

The Community co-chair will chair the public meetings of the RAB. The Community co-chair will coordinate with the Navy co-chair and RAB members to prepare an agenda prior to each RAB meeting. He/she will also ensure that community issues and concerns related to restoration are raised, and assist with the dissemination of information to the general public.

The Alternate Community co-chair will assist with preparation of the meeting agenda, chair meetings when the Community co-chair is not present, and assume the position of Community co-chair should the co-chair be unable or unwilling to continue in the position.

The Navy co-chair, the community co-chair, and the alternate community co-chair, acting as an executive committee, may speak or take action on behalf of the RAB. In any such instance the co-chairs will inform the full Board of any actions taken at the next regularly scheduled RAB meeting.

Meetings

The RAB shall meet not fewer than four times in each calendar year. The time and date of the next regularly scheduled meeting will be determined as an item of business at each meeting. Emergency meetings may be called by either of the co-chairs, but RAB members shall be given two weeks notice in writing of such emergency meetings.

All meetings will be open to the public, and in-so-far as reasonable and possible will follow and address the issues in the prepared agenda. Time will be allocated in each meeting for receiving comments from any members of the public in attendance.

Membership

The RAB shall be composed of Navy members, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) members, and community members. Navy members shall serve at the pleasure of the OCI of NSWC White Oak. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Maryland Department of the Environment are invited to appoint a BCT member to participate in the RAB. The initial community membership shall consist of those persons nominated and selected by the selection panel and approved by the OIC of NSWC White Oak.

The number of members shall not exceed 25 in total.

Duties of Members

The RAB members will attend meetings of the full Board and of the subcommittees to which they belong or will provide alternates who will fully assume the duties of the member they represent at that meeting. Members will review, evaluate, and comment on environmental documents and other such materials related to installation restoration and closure, where applicable, and provide advice and comment on restoration issues to the decision makers.

The community RAB members will also represent and communicate community interests and concerns to the RAB, act as a conduit for the exchange of information among the community, Navy, and environmental oversight agencies regarding the installation's restoration and reuse programs.

RAB members have the duty and responsibility to report the activities of the Board to the community and to express their individual opinions about RAB issues. In performing these duties, individuals have the responsibility to make it clear that they are not speaking or acting for the full Board, unless they have been specifically directed to do so by the RAB.

Resignation and Removal of Members

A member of the RAB no longer able to continue in an active role may resign at any time by providing a written statement to either of the co-chairs of the RAB. Any community member who misses three consecutive meetings and does not provide an alternate will be removed from membership.

In order to assure that all proceedings of the RAB are fully accessible to the public, the RAB will not discuss classified, competition-sensitive, proprietary, or other restricted information.

Subcommittees

Ad Hoc subcommittees may be formed by the co-chairs acting as an executive committee, or by action of the RAB.

Subcommittees will elect their own community co-chair. The OIC may appoint a Navy co-chair for each subcommittee. The subcommittees will meet to consider the issues for which they have been established and report the results of their deliberations and recommendations to the full RAB.

As with the full RAB, both majority and minority opinions of subcommittee members will be presented. Subcommittee meetings will be publicly announced and open to the public.

New Members

If in the opinion of either of the co-chairs the number of active members no longer represents adequate balance and diversity, the chair of the meeting will entertain new nominations from the RAB members and community members present at the meeting. The co-chairs and the alternate co-chair will then select from this list of nominees as many new members as necessary to restore balance and diversity to the RAB and recommend them to the OIC. Upon the concurrence of the OIC these nominees will become members of the RAB.

Election of Community Co-chair and Alternate Co-chair

At the next to last regularly scheduled meeting of the calendar year the co-chairs shall appoint a committee of three members of the RAB to form a nominating committee. The nominating committee will select a slate of at least two persons for each elected position, the Community co-chair and the Alternate co-chair, to be presented for consideration by the full membership of the RAB at its last meeting of the year.

The Community co-chair and Alternate co-chair may be elected for up to three consecutive terms.

Amendment of these Procedures and Guidelines

Provided changes to these Procedures and Guidelines may be presented to the RAB in writing by any member at any regular meeting, and shall be acted upon at the next regularly scheduled meeting. No changes shall be adopted except by a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

Sunset

At the last meeting of each calendar year or at the request of the OIC of the base the chair of the RAB will entertain a motion to disband the RAB. When the motion passes by a simple majority vote the RAB will be disbanded.

Implementation

These procedures and guidelines will become fully effective at the next meeting after these rules are adopted by a majority vote of those members present.

[Approved at 3/13/96 RAB meeting.]

APPENDIX F
COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX F

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER - WHITE OAK
COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interviewee: _____

Interviewer(s): _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Telephone: () _____ H or W Date: _____ Time: _____

The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the level of knowledge/concern the public has of Naval Surface Warfare Center - White Oak (NSWC WO), the public's information pathways, and community involvement.

GENERAL AWARENESS

1. Approximately how long have you lived in the area? _____ Do you own or rent? _____

Approximately how far do you live from the Base? _____

2. Are you familiar with or have participated in any Base outreach programs or any of its facilities that are available for public use? _____ Which ones? _____

3. Do you have contact with the Base as part of your business/employment? _____
Do you know anyone who works or worked at the Base? _____ If so, please describe: _____

4. How do you receive information on local current events that may affect you or the community?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Local organizations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeowner's association |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

5. Are you familiar with the activities which occurred at the Base? Please use your judgment to gauge your level of understanding of the Base's operations:

- Knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Know very little
- Have no idea

6. Overall, which of the following would best represent your feelings regarding the Base and the effects of its activities on the community?

- Very concerned
- Concerned
- A little concerned
- Unconcerned

State any specific concerns you have about the Base: _____

7. Are you aware of any programs at the Base to protect the environment? ____ If Yes, what activities or programs? : _____

When did you become aware of them? _____

8. When did you become aware of/concerned about efforts to clean up the contamination found in the soil on Base? _____

9. What environmental issues around the Base are important to you?

- Human health issues
- Potential affects on real estate values
- Potential spread of contamination/affect on the environment
- Potential for other contamination from other sources/locations
- Adverse publicity for the neighborhood
- Other _____

10. Do you feel that the contamination at the Base has affected you, your family, the neighborhood or community in any way? _____ If so, in what way? _____

11. Have you any concerns about the Base closing and the Navy leaving?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very concerned | <input type="checkbox"/> A little concerned |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concerned | <input type="checkbox"/> Unconcerned |

State any specific concerns you have about the Base: _____

12. Have you any concerns about the Base transfer of ownership?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very concerned | <input type="checkbox"/> A little concerned |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concerned | <input type="checkbox"/> Unconcerned |

State any specific concerns you have about the Base: _____

13. Do you feel the Base has been a good community member? _____
Why, or why not? _____

**INFORMATIONAL NEEDS FROM NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER -
WHITE OAK**

1. How do you receive information about the Base? _____ How frequently do you obtain it? _____

2. If you receive Base information, are you satisfied with the quality/quantity of information you receive? _____

What suggestions do you have for the Base information distribution:

- Mail Fact Sheets and updates to interested parties
- Distribute Fact Sheets and updates to local public buildings, such as libraries
- Provide information to News Media
- Other suggestion(s): _____

LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

1. Have you ever attended a meeting in which the Navy presented information about programs or actions at the Base that affect on the community? _____

If Yes, what was the meeting(s) regarding? _____

Was the information helpful? _____ Why, or why not? _____

2. Would you be interested in attending public meetings in the future regarding actions or programs at the Base? _____

How would you prefer to have your questions answered?

- In a large open discussion
- One-on-one
- By written response
- Other _____
