



**Naval Air Station  
South Weymouth, MA  
Restoration Advisory Board  
Summary of RAB Meeting – June 12, 2008**



NAS South Weymouth Website: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>

## **1. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

Mary Skelton Roberts opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. She requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, introduce themselves. She noted that the meeting agenda, handouts, and the sign-in sheet were available on the back table. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A to this meeting summary. M. Skelton Roberts asked if everyone had time to read the minutes from the May 2008 RAB meeting and asked for comments. There were no comments on the minutes but M. Bromberg indicated that he had not yet reviewed them. If he has comments he will provide them.

M. Skelton Roberts then reviewed the ground rules for the meeting and reminded the meeting attendees that the focus of the meeting is cleanup issues; redevelopment issues will be placed on the 'parking lot.' She reviewed the guidelines for the meeting and reminded the participants when asking questions to wait to speak until they are acknowledged, to state their names and affiliations, and to speak into the microphone when they have questions. She also requested that all questions be held until the end of the presentation.

M. Skelton Roberts then reviewed the agenda and presentation scheduled for the meeting. The Agenda for the meeting and the Action Item Tracking List are provided as Attachment B to this meeting summary. In accordance with the agenda, the presentation would be followed by the Updates and Action Items portion of the meeting.

## **2. PRESENTATIONS**

M. Skelton Roberts introduced Dave Barney, Navy, to give a presentation on the Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL). The following paragraphs summarize the presentation and include references to selected presentation slides in Attachment C. The complete presentation is available on the NAS South Weymouth web site: <http://nas-southweymouth.navy-env.com>.

The FOSL is out for public comment until June 18, 2008. It is available at the libraries, can be provided electronically, and D. Barney has hard copies. Comments can be emailed to Dave Barney or sent through regular mail.

There are a few common acronyms that are used in the presentation. These include: Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST); Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (LIFOC); Review Item Area (RIA); Area of Concern (AOC); Installation Restoration (IR); and Operable Unit (OU). A FOST is prepared when the Navy has evaluated a property and determines it is suitable for transfer. A LIFOC is a lease document with the expectation that lessee is going to acquire the property in the future. RIA, AOC, IR, and OU are different types of environmental sites that are undergoing investigation, evaluation, and clean up.

D. Barney then reviewed two slides from the March RAB meeting presentation on tools for property reuse. One tool that the DOD and Navy use to get property back into the hands of the community for redevelopment and reuse, is leasing (Slide 2). The process begins with a request for a lease. Before proceeding with a lease, a determination is made whether the proposed lease will impact the ability to transfer the property and whether it will impact the clean-up process. In this case, the Navy determined that the lease process will improve their ability to transfer the property and it will not hinder the clean-up process. The lease can either be an interim master lease, which has an annual term for a period of time, or a LIFOC which is a long term lease (i.e. 50 years).

As shown on Slide 3, the Interim Master Lease allows little or no alterations to the property and the use must be consistent with prior uses (i.e. daycare facility on the Base). The LIFOC gives the lessee a real property interest. The LIFOC allows improvements and demolition with permission. The receiver of the property under the lease will be allowed to perform environmental investigations and remedial actions.

The Navy is choosing the LIFOC now, instead of a transfer as has been done in the past, because environmental clean-up is not complete (Slide 4). The future transfer of the remaining portions of the Base property is planned for two FOSTs: FOST 5 and FOST 6. The sites and areas to be included in FOST 5 and FOST 6 have been determined and both have sites which are still undergoing environmental investigation and clean-up. The LIFOC can occur because the conveyance plan has been agreed upon. The public benefit conveyance (PBC) and economic development conveyance (EDC) plans are in place, which allows the Navy to enter into the LIFOC; otherwise the Navy could only develop an Interim Master Lease. Another reason for the Navy to choose the LIFOC is that the re-development is moving forward and the structure of the LIFOC will allow the beneficial integration of clean-up and redevelopment.

A PBC is used when the receiver of the property works with a sponsoring federal agency to receive property, and receives the property for the general public benefit. For example, the national park service is a federal agency entity and can sponsor the transfer of property for the perpetual use as a park and

recreational facility. Generally under a PBC the land is conveyed at some reduced value. The EDC is a process by which revenue will be generated and jobs will be created through the use of the property.

The LIFOC will pertain to only FOST 5 and 6 acreage; the balance of the Base has either been previously transferred or will be transferred at the time the FOSL is signed. Slide 5 lists the sites in FOST 5 that still require investigation and/or clean-up. The Navy is retaining the lead in completing the clean-ups for these areas; when they are completed, the FOST 5 land will be transferred. Slides 6 and 7 list the sites in FOST 6 that still require investigation and/or clean-up. The Navy is retaining ownership of the FOST 6 land and has certain obligations and responsibilities as the continuing landowner. However, SSTTDC will be taking the lead on the environmental clean ups, but Navy will still be involved. The LIFOC process thus is a significant difference from the CDR and early transfer process.

The contents of the FOSL include the purpose, description of the property, summary of conditions, notifications, and restrictions, suitability determination, and enclosures. The enclosures are really the bulk of the document and have all the details and references to additional materials, supporting the FOSL. The purpose of the FOSL is to allow the combination of cleanup and development (Slide 8). The FOSL allows alterations and improvements, such as building demolition, utility system installation, and runway removal. The FOSL will allow SSTTDC to be in charge of the environmental investigations and environmental response actions, which will provide a better opportunity to integrate the clean-up and redevelopment.

The FOSL consists of 15 subparcels which are described in the description of property portion of the document. This portion of the FOSL has a narrative description of these areas, including the sites in each of the subparcels, buffer zones and physical features (e.g. waterways), buildings, as well as a table for quick reference about the parcels. There is also a table which indicates the proposed zoning for future use.

Another part of the document includes a summary of environmental conditions for each type of site, notifications, and restrictions. The environmental condition at each type of site (IR, AOC, RIA, and MCP) is described, along with information regarding the presence of lead, asbestos, PCBs, USTs, etc. Details are included in the References and Enclosures. The FOSL requires that certain notifications be made. Through the applicable environmental laws and regulations, notifications need to be made to the lessee: that hazardous substances have been stored for greater than a year, that the Navy has entered into a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) with the EPA, that RODs and land use controls are associated with some sites, and that there is a public comment/review process.

The restrictions also fall under this section of the FOSL (Slides 9 and 10). The primary concern is protection of human health and the environment. The FOSL is designed to retain maximum flexibility for the developer and still allow the Navy to have control over the work being done under the lease. The integration, which allows the remedial action to be performed by the developer, requires a right of access for the Navy, EPA, and DEP to provide oversight, supervision, and the right to collect samples. Examples of restrictions in the FOSL include: groundwater or soil cannot be accessed by the developer without prior approval; and demolition cannot be performed by the developer without prior approval. Approval can be requested as a blanket approval, or on a case-by-case basis. There are blanket restrictions in the FOSL, but the process allows the restrictions to get peeled away with the submittal and approval of the appropriate work plans or other necessary information required for the clean up and development.

Other examples of restrictions are presented in Slide 11. A site control and security plan must be provided and reviewed. There will be no cost to the Navy to perform the work under the lease. The developer must get permits and have approved work plans, and a layer of oversight and control exists. There are existing monitoring wells that either need to be protected or abandoned appropriately, if necessary.

The next steps (Slide 12) are the public comment period, which continues through June 18, 2008. As necessary, there will be amendments and changes to the document after review of comments. The FOSL will then be signed. When the FOSL is signed, the FOST 3 and FOST 4 land will be transferred to SSTTDC. The LIFOC will be entered into, which will cover the remaining base property in the FOST 5 and FOST 6 group of sites. At some point, as the remedial action and environmental clean-up at sites within FOST 5 and FOST 6 are complete, the land will also be transferred.

A question was asked about the extent that the Navy has administrative control over the lessee. D. Barney stated that since there is a process to review and approve work plans, if there is an approved work plan that is not being followed the Navy has the right and obligation to step in. A follow up question asked if the Navy had any administrative control over the property other than with regard to clean-up activities, does the Navy have a say in what the land will be used for? D. Barney stated that the Navy does not have a say in the use of transferred property but that they do have a say over usage of leased property. Some areas of the Base property are currently under the master lease which includes a number of operations. The majority of the property is not under the master lease. A question was asked if the lease can be on a website that is available for public review. D. Barney stated the FOSL is available publicly (at local libraries and the NAS South Weymouth web site); the language and the structure of the LIFOC may not be a public document.

M. Parsons asked if the Navy could be fined for not cleaning up the property. A. Malewicz stated that the MCP has penalties, or fines, for not meeting deadlines, but NAS South Weymouth is under CERCLA; there is a site management plan which has a schedule of criteria to meet. B. Olson stated that there are stipulated penalties in the agreement with the Navy, so if there is a violation of the Federal Facilities Agreement with the Navy the Navy is subject to stipulated penalties (fines) that have already been agreed upon. With the FOSL, there is no change to the Navy's responsibility, so they are responsible for making sure the work is performed, otherwise they can be fined. There are also other non-CERCLA laws that the Navy must follow, and that EPA could enforce outside of the Superfund program. But within Superfund, EPA would go through CERCLA/FFA to deal with any violations.

M. Bryam asked how the EPA knows about violations. B. Olson stated that possible violations come to the EPA's attention through a variety of ways, like through EPA oversight, DEP reports, employees report violations, and other awareness.

H. Welch asked if EPA could have a person onsite for oversight during development. B. Olson stated that there will be increased oversight during the FOST 6 site clean-up activities. EPA will need to determine the level of oversight.

M. Byram asked if there is a process in place that ensures that the rare species and habitat would be protected no matter who leases the property. S. Ivas stated that SSTTDC will follow the conservation and management plan from the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program that is already in place. Everything that is done on the Base has to be consistent with that plan. The state oversees activities that could be harmful to endangered species.

R. Kleiman stated that a joint permit, a conservation and management permit, is in the process of being finalized and will be issued by Natural Heritage to SSTTDC and LNR. It is applicable to land that is leased or owned, and oversees and ensures compliance based on the activities performed.

D. Galluzzo asked where the 550 acres of land are located that were transferred in May of 2003. Which portion of the property was transferred to LNR and what was transferred as public conveyance? D. Barney showed the general area on a figure of the Base, and stated that primarily the perimeter locations were transferred as PBC land.

D. Galluzzo asked if it was correct that buildings could be demolished under the lease. Wouldn't it be more difficult to contain the contaminants in these buildings when you already have residents onsite? D. Barney responded that the materials within a building have to be handled properly before the demolition

occurs. The developer would need to follow the regulations for proper demolition. Also demolition cannot occur without prior approval from the Navy and the regulatory agencies.

D. Galluzzo asked what happens if something unexpected is found and the available money has run out. P. McIntyre stated that there is insurance for that type of situation. The clean-up will be insured so that the cost of the clean-up is pre-funded, and if the anticipated cost of the clean-up is exceeded, the insurance will cover the remainder of the cost.

M. Skelton Roberts introduced Eric Kfoury, who as of July 1 will help manage SSTTDC until the new executive director is hired. E. Kfoury's presentation will outline the transition period.

E. Kfoury stated that shortly SSTTDC will be entering into agreements; property will be first transferred by deed or lease, then the work will begin. Nothing that is being put in place affects the level of involvement of the regulatory agencies and the Navy. Public participation remains vital to this process. Though SSTTDC and LNR are assuming a direct role in restoring the Base, the Navy is still ultimately responsible under the FFA that D. Barney referred to. SSTTDC is agreeing to do the work on behalf of the Navy. SSTTDC will subcontract to LNR to do the actual clean-up and to meet the monitoring requirements.

He stated that there are three important things to remember. One is that SSTTDC is performing the work for the Navy. Two is that EPA and DEP will have the same regulatory role as they do now and the same clean-up standards and regulations need to be met. And third, the cleanup will be pre-funded and fully insured and will thus go more quickly. This does not mean there will not be less care taken for the clean-up.

For SSTTDC to perform the work there must be some legal interest (title or leasehold) in the property. A firm property interest needs to be demonstrated to provide the developer the ability to finance the public infrastructure. Where restoration is not complete, the LIFO will be used to provide the leasehold interest. The formal agreement is expected to be signed sometime this fall, the exact date is unknown.

A handout, or Fact Sheet, was provided by E. Kfoury that showed the FOST 1 through 4 transferred land and which areas were transferred under PBCs. When the agreements are signed in the fall, the property in FOST 3 and FOST 4 will be transferred to SSTTDC since clean-up of these areas has been completed. SSTTDC hopes to have the majority of FOST 5 transferred in the fall, as well, due to the fact that the most of the clean-up work remaining is primarily administrative. Any remaining acreage and sites within FOST 5 and all of FOST 6 will be included under the LIFO. The lease is very important to SSTTDC because it allows them to perform the work on behalf of the Navy. As areas are determined to be suitable for transfer, they will be transferred. This approach has been used at other BRAC sites.

Any remaining investigation, clean-up, and monitoring will be totally pre-funded at the time the agreements are signed. This ensures that the work goes forward without delay. The insurance company will provide another layer of oversight, because they will not pay out if they do not feel the work is being done up to standard. The RAB will continue in its current form, there may be other public involvement opportunities, but the RAB will remain the primary public forum.

LNR will purchase an Environmental Protection Program (EPP) insurance policy. This type of policy assures that actions are completed and all associated costs are paid in full. LNR will obtain this policy from American International Specialty Lines Insurance Company, an affiliate of AIG. AIG will cover any cost overruns and will distribute payment as the work moves forward. The Navy must agree to the insurance policy terms and conditions. The Navy will be able to access and use the funds if they determine an action is necessary. There has been some uncertainty over when the clean-up will occur and E. Kfoury believes that this process will alleviate that uncertainty.

M. Parsons asked how will the sale of the property work with the lease. D. Barney stated that FOST 3 and FOST 4 will be transferred directly, and will not be part of the lease. As other land gets transferred, the lease on that specific property gets dissolved.

E. Kfoury stated that SSTITDC will receive the property upon completion of the clean-up work. The deal includes payments to Navy when property included in FOSTs 3, 4, and 5 are transferred. With respect to FOST 6, there is pre-funding (about \$33 million), and that money is there. The leasehold interest in this case will ultimately be transferred.

M. Parsons asked how they arrived at the \$33 million amount as being sufficient to finish the remaining environmental work on the Base. D. Barney stated that the estimate was from the Navy's budgeting process, and what was estimated was the cost to complete all the remaining sites. M. Parsons stated her concern with the thoroughness of the estimates. In response it was stated that if there is something found that is larger than anticipated, the insurance policy will cover it and the work will still be completed.

P. McIntyre stated that the cost to close, the amount of money it will cost to close out all the remaining sites consistent with federal and state standards, was estimated by the Navy. For the insurance estimate, the Navy estimate and available RI data was run through a cost estimate model by SSTITDC and LNR. That number is refined again after it is passed on to AIG, and analyzed by the insurance experts. If the insurance is surpassed then AIG will pay out of pocket for the additional expenses, so there is no reason for them to try and shortchange the environmental cleanup process. He stated that whatever number that AIG selects for the amount of insurance policy coverage, SSTITDC and LNR will prepay the insurance

company up front and AIG will then pay out as the work is completed. AIG will not pay if the work is not performed consistent with federal and state regulations. This removes the Navy, SSTITDC, and LNR from the need to pay the contractor. With this EPP there are two components. One is the pre-paid component. The second component is that there is an insurance layer that covers unknown situations.

The SSTITDC environmental consultant, LFR, is now preparing the underwriting of the package for AIG; it will be given to AIG in about a month. Negotiations will follow, and the insurance policy will be in place before closing of the LIFOC.

H. Welch asked when they will know the actual exclusions in the policy. P. McIntyre responded that the policy will be designed to cover what they know needs to be remediated and also what is unknown as of yet.

D. Galluzzo asked what the policy term is. P. McIntyre stated that it will be 15 years in length. D. Galluzzo asked what if something goes wrong in 20 years. P. McIntyre stated that the policy can be renewed if necessary. D. Galluzzo asked why a 15 year insurance policy, when SSTITDC has a 53 year estimate of the life of the project. P. McIntyre stated that this specific policy covers the cleanup and the experts say that cleanup should be finished well within 15 years. Other insurance policies could cover other issues in the future.

D. Galluzzo asked about protecting the towns. P. McIntyre stated that SSTITDC and LNR cannot purchase insurance for the property until the lease is in place and they have a real property interest. This policy again just covers the known and unknown cleanup costs, so the towns' liabilities are somewhat covered even though they are not named on the insurance policy.

D. Galluzzo stated his concern is that after 15 years the policy is complete and then someone gets sick due to environmental reasons that can be tied to the Base. Will the insurance still cover these future cases? D. Barney noted that if something is found and attributable to the Navy the Navy will still be responsible. This does not say people's health costs will be covered, but the Navy is still liable.

D. Galluzzo asked if the insurance policy can be made a public document. P. McIntyre stated that it is not typically done and that it is not his decision to make. It is a privileged document to some extent. E. Kfoury noted that LNR is purchasing the policy and it is an LNR document. P. McIntyre stated that typically the insurance company does not allow this, due to the fact that someone may try and take advantage of the insurance policy.

M. Bromberg stated that he does not see the value in “integrating of cleanup and development.” He can’t see how they can estimate the cost of the cleanup without the available information. The insurance company does not know exactly what is out there so how do they know how much it is going to cost to clean it up? M. Bromberg stated that he believes the LIFOC is too complex and believes that the Navy should continue as it has been. D. Barney stated that he does not agree that it is too complex and the LIFOC eliminates or reduces the uncertainty about redevelopment and cleanup.

R. Kleiman stated that the LIFOC should increase efficiency. For example, there are some areas where soil needs to be removed and disposed of off site. At the same time utilities can be put in, foundations can be dug, and grading can be done that is consistent with the redevelopment. During the capping of the WGL, the parking lot for the transit area can be constructed.

M. Bromberg stated that he would like to see a solid waste compliance schedule from SSTITDC before any more land is transferred to them. He also stated that he was still concerned about French Stream. D. Barney stated that French Stream and Old Swamp River are part of FOST 5 and they will be addressed.

M. Bromberg asked who is responsible for LTM. What if there is a problem in 20 years? D. Barney stated that if the remedy fails, the Navy may be responsible but it depends on the cause of the remedy failure. B. Olson stated that he would expect the EPA would go after the Navy if there is a problem with a remedy. The Navy would be held responsible and then the Navy could turn around and deal with SSTITDC.

H. Welch asked what happens if all the \$33 million (\$2 million/year) is used up. P. McIntyre responded that you shouldn’t assume the burn rate of \$2 million/year over 15 years. Most of the expenses will be up front to complete the cleanups quickly and this number isn’t settled upon yet. The remaining amount will be used for monitoring. The majority of the 15-year time period will hopefully allow a sufficient amount of time to cover the unexpected. The policy is typically for a minimum of two times the estimated cost of cleanup and that is paid in an up front amount. It was agreed with the Navy that the minimum estimate for cleanup had to be at least \$20 million. Once the lease is signed, LNR will wire AIG the agreed upon amount. The cleanup contractor will submit invoices directly to AIG, who will check their work before they will pay out. LNR will have a resident engineer and AIG will have oversight, as well. This process removes SSTITDC and LNR from the process and adds another entity to provide oversight.

A. Hilbert asked if SSTITDC had a copy of the DPH report [e.g. Massachusetts Department of Public Health ALS/MS Study]. If something comes out of the report that is detrimental how is that going to be addressed as part of the cleanup and redevelopment. B. Olson stated that if conclusions of the report are

tied to existing investigations at the Base they would need to be addressed under CERCLA. If there are general issues or historical issues identified in the report then it is not likely to impact the cleanup. He commented that the report is likely to recommend additional health studies. These types of studies are performed at other similar sites, and if it is related to the site then there will be a response.

A participant stated that after SSTTDC is gone he wants assurance that the towns will not be liable at any point in the future.

M. Parsons stated that she had asked for a cancer study in 1997; chronic non-cancerous diseases were asked to be studied, as well. The health study was started in 1997 with a specific purpose and she feels that by expanding it to the South Shore Area it dilutes the study. What is the status of the health study?

B. Olson stated that the DPH study is still under review and the EPA has no control over the progress of the study, it is part of the Department of Public Health.

M. Smart commented that the Navy funding constraints could have slowed things down and having this insurance pre-funded money should be a benefit. Is it a per site cleanup, or is it a lump sum? P. McIntyre said that under the policy each site does not have a monetary limit, but the initial insurance sum was based on the breakdown of what the clean up for each site was estimated to cost. The money is in a pool and is available for all the sites. There is a seamless transition between the prepaid money and insurance money.

### 3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

M. Skelton Roberts asked each of the Leads to provide updates to the list of Update Items.

RAB Administrative Actions: D. Barney stated that there were no updates.

MassDEP Update: D. Chaffin stated there was no update.

Coast Guard Update: D. Barney received no update.

IR Program Site Update: D. Barney stated that the Draft Remedial Investigation Report for Building 81 was released, the Navy has responded to comments on the Draft Remedial Investigation Report for Building 82, and the Draft Remedial Investigation Report for the SRA site is underway. The second quarter of the Year 2 long-term monitoring at RDA is underway.

MCP Update: The RAO for the FFTA will be submitted before July 8, 2008.

EBS Update: A decision document has been submitted for RIA 111 and technical memoranda have been submitted for AOCs 60 and 61.

FOST Update: Meeting topic.

SSTTDC Update: Meeting topic.

M. Skelton Roberts reviewed the action items listed on the Action Item Tracking List (see Attachment B) for this RAB meeting. There was one item: suggestions to improve the public participation process. M. Skelton Roberts is working with RAB members to collect and summarize the suggestions offered and written down during the discussion. A categorized list of suggested improvements to the public participation process will be compiled. The list may be presented at the next RAB meeting.

#### Conclusion/Next Meeting

The next RAB meeting will be on July 10, 2008.



**Naval Air Station South Weymouth  
Weymouth, MA  
Restoration Advisory Board  
RAB Meeting Agenda**



June 12, 2008

Conference Center on Shea Memorial Drive

7:00 PM

<i>Agenda Items</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Projected Time</i>
<b>1. Introduction, Review of Meeting Notes</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>7:00 - 7:15</b>
<b>2. Finding of Suitability to Lease</b>	<b>Navy</b>	<b>7:15 - 7:45</b>
<b>3. Transition to SSTTDC/LNR</b>	<b>SSTTDC/LNR</b>	<b>7:45 - 8:15</b>
<b>4. Updates and Action Items</b>	<b>Navy</b>	<b>8:15 - 8:30</b>
<b>5. Questions, Agenda Items, Next Meeting</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>8:30 - 8:45</b>

**Facilitator:** Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution: Mary Skelton-Roberts

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members:**

**Abington:** James Lavin, (Alternate: Steve Ivas); Phil Sortin (Alternate: Beth Sortin)

**Hingham:** no current representation

**Rockland:** no current representation

**Weymouth:** James Cunningham (Community Co-Chair); Ken Hayes; Dan McCormack; Steve White

**Navy:** Dave Barney (Navy Co-Chair)

**EPA:** Kymberlee Keckler (Alternate: Bryan Olson)

**MA DEP:** David Chaffin (Alternate: Ann Malewicz)

**BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Points of Contact:**

**Navy:** Dave Barney, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Base Realignment and Closure Office, Program Management Office, Northeast (617) 753-4656  
Email: [david.a.barney@navy.mil](mailto:david.a.barney@navy.mil)

Brian Helland, Remedial Project Manager, Base Realignment and Closure Office, Program Management Office, Northeast (215) 897-4912  
Email: [brian.helland@navy.mil](mailto:brian.helland@navy.mil)

**MA DEP:** David Chaffin, Environmental Engineer, Federal Facilities (617) 348-4005  
Email: [david.chaffin@state.ma.us](mailto:david.chaffin@state.ma.us)

**EPA:** Kymberlee Keckler, Remedial Project Manager, Federal Facilities Section (617) 918-1385 Email: [keckler.kymberlee@epa.gov](mailto:keckler.kymberlee@epa.gov)



## Naval Air Station South Weymouth Restoration Advisory Board Action Item Tracking List



### June 12, 2008 – Next RAB Meeting

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		
Provide suggestions to improve the public participation process.	A. Malewicz	Next RAB
<b>UPDATES</b>		
RAB Administrative Actions	D. Barney	Each RAB
MA DEP Update	D. Chaffin	Each RAB
Coast Guard Buoy Facility Update	R. Marino	Each RAB
IR Program Sites Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
MCP Release Areas Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
EBS Review Item Areas/ Various Removal Action Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
FOST/FOSL/CDR Update	D. Barney	Each RAB
SSTTDC Update	J. Lavin/ S. Ivas	Each RAB
<b>COMPLETED ITEMS</b>		
Check location/depth of peat moved to south end of runway. (5/08)		
Determine Navy's role in the Enabling Legislation. (5/08)		
Provide the AOC 55C HHRA to A. Hilbert, J. Rakers, H. Welch (3/08)		
Investigate issues with movement of peat during development (1/08)		
Provide copies of EPA health risk requested by M. Bromberg (1/08)		
Review routing of piping between STP Site and French Stream (11/07)		
Provide location of Basewide Assessment floc samples (10/07)		
Provide copies of parking lot response letter (10/07)		
Provide groundwater data for transferred land (10/07)		
MDPH MS Study update (8/07)		
List of AULs; what and where they are (4/07)		
Provide vernal pools map to J. Cunningham (4/07)		
Copies of figures from Old Swamp River Study by Beta Group, Inc (03/07)		
Provide Hydrogeologic Investigation Tech Memo to D. Galluzzo (03/07)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (03/07)		
Provide blueprint of old STP to H. Welch (01/07)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (01/07)		
Check status of NAS South Weymouth website (01/07)		
P. Scannell to provide the reference for the 1995 EPA study to D. Barney (11/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (11/06)		
Were runways in the transferred land tested for fuel oil and PCBs? (11/06)		
1997 DEP letter re: non-potable drinking water source areas on the Base (11/06)		
Map showing sampling locations on the Base (11/06)		
Old Swamp River additional sample collection; data available? (11/06)		
Status of release of MDPH ALS/MS study (11/06)		
Contact Dr. Knorr regarding access to NAS South Weymouth EGIS (7/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (7/06)		
Check availability of MDPH to give a presentation on MS/ALS data (5/06)		
Distribute monthly Navy program status/administrative items update (3/06; 4/06)		