



**Naval Air Station
South Weymouth, MA
Restoration Advisory Board
Summary of RAB Meeting – September 11, 2008**



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 July 2008 RAB meeting and asked for comments. There were no comments on the minutes. M. Skelton Roberts asked if there were any questions on the August 2008 clean-up update. There were no questions or comments. A RAB member (P. Sortin, Abington) filmed the entire meeting.

M. Skelton Roberts introduced Dave DeLorenzo (MassDEP), the Deputy Director of Municipal Services. Prior to this position he was the Deputy Director for the MassDEP Southeast Regional Office for water supply, wastewater, and wetlands; his technical training is in hydrogeology. He stated that his present job is with the state revolving fund, which provides low interest loans mostly to municipalities for development of water supplies (collection systems, wastewater treatment plants, etc.). Their office recently received an application for funding for Weymouth, for water supply improvements. This is a priority project in many areas and he is at the RAB to represent the non-waste site clean up issues. If there are any questions, D. DeLorenzo will try and get the answers.

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.

M. Skelton Roberts then reviewed the agenda 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 and discussion would be followed by the Updates and Action Items portion of the meeting.

2. PRESENTATIONS

M. Skelton Roberts introduced P. Scannell to begin a presentation related to the agenda topic, Suggestions to Enhance the Public Participation Process. A group of interested citizens has met with M. Skelton Roberts a number of times over the past few months to discuss their concerns, which were summarized in a memorandum addressed to EPA and MassDEP, dated September 11, 2008. The memorandum was handed out at the meeting and is included in Attachment C. The following paragraphs summarize the presentation and discussion of the concerns and issues related to the cleanup and development of the Base summarized in the memorandum.

A. Malewicz thanked LNR for bringing together their technical experts to this meeting. The hope is to improve communication and work together through this process.

P. Scannell thanked the Navy for giving the citizens a voice. He stated that the residents are looking for advocacy on their behalf. The previous enabling legislation has crumbled and changed. The citizens' advisory committee (CAC) did not make the residents feel welcome, so having this opportunity to voice their opinions is very important to the residents.

The presentation is titled, Establishing Trust in an Advocacy Relationship; P. Scannell stated that the community has needs and requirements they would like to see met to establish this trust. These needs include full disclosure of clean up standards and methodologies that will be utilized. Also they would like a representative from EPA or MassDEP to oversee the clean up and development activities conducted by LNR/SSTTDC. There should be a resource that allows the residents to voice concerns and questions as well as funds for residents to hire a technical expert. These two requests may be taken care of if the technical assistant grant (TAG) goes through. The residents would like EPA/MassDEP to provide them with a resource who has both legal and environmental expertise.

The residents also have the following specific clean up concerns (see Attachment 1 of the September 11, 2008 memorandum included as Attachment C):

- The residents want Whitman's Pond to be classified as an Area of Concern (AOC) due to the fact that the residents feel it has been impacted by the Base.
- The new sewage treatment plant needs to be located away from existing rivers and streams.
- The Navy's storm drains will continue to serve as a pathway migration for the iron floc.
- The floc needs to be studied further.
- The remaining runways need to be tested for contamination.
- The source of the plume at Building 81 (Site 9) and AOC 108 (Site 11) needs to be disclosed.

- They want to know when the runways will be tested for contamination and where the results for the runways already torn up are (some asbestos was found in caulking).
- They want to know why SSTDTC/LNR changed their mind from excavating the West Gate Landfill to capping the landfill. D. Galluzzo restated that the notion was first introduced by Terry Fancher, SSTDTC, that for environmental reasons the landfill had to be excavated even though the Navy preferred capping it. Now that LNR is doing the cleanup, the change to capping, after it was determined by SSTDTC to be unacceptable, is not acceptable to residents.
- M. Parsons stated that the open space land conveyed to the National Parks Service under the public benefit conveyance included terms, some of which have not been met, including posting signs (5 years late). The three towns voted to have 730 acres remain as open space (1998). She stated that for an economic development conveyance you have to prove job creation. A public benefit conveyance provides for recreation space or for municipal buildings for the town. She noted that without the residents' agreement, the acreage was changed to 381 +/- acres which are mostly wetlands. M. Parsons read from minutes of earlier discussions regarding how the acreage was dropped during negotiations.
- Institutional controls need to be designated for the contaminated areas (poor signage).
- The contaminated land should not be transferred until all the clean up is complete.
- A timeline and schedule of the clean up is needed.
- How are developers, businesses, and prospective residents being informed of the Superfund sites on this property and what are the legal requirements to disclose this information to potential owners?
- Additional questions in Attachment 2 of the September 11, 2008 memorandum include:
 - Request for a re-evaluation and estimate of the cost of clean-up to LNR.
 - What are the contingencies in place if a contaminated area is found during development?
 - Has an approved water source been identified, if so what is it and how will it be transported to the Base?
 - Does the Weymouth water department currently filter for contaminants listed in the groundwater on the Base?
 - Who is the independent observer for wetlands protection?
 - Where is the MDPH report? Can the MassDEP demand the release of the draft report if the final report is not available?

P. Scannell concluded his presentation and thanked the RAB again for this opportunity.

M. Skelton Roberts then moved to a discussion of the September 11th memorandum. The points included in the memorandum and the opinions expressed by those attending the meeting are presented below. The discussion was conducted in an open forum format.

Memorandum Item 1: Greater Understanding of the Cleanup and Allocation of Resources for the Site.

M. Skelton Roberts asked if anyone had any clarifying questions about the first point.

D. Galluzzo stated that they were basically addressing their concerns to the regulators. The residents can not get enough information about the clean up and development of this property and they want to make sure it is done properly and to the appropriate standards. The land will never be as clean as it was before the Navy was present. The residents want full disclosure because even after the clean-up process there will be remaining contaminants. He asked how is the money being allocated to remaining sites under the FOSL? M. Parsons would like a copy of the Feasibility Study (FS) for the FOSL. D. Barney stated that there is not a FS for the FOSL.

M. Skelton Roberts asked what is not sufficient about the RAB presentations that the residents do not feel like they are getting enough information? P. Scannell responded that the presentations at the RAB are distinctly different than the SSTD/LNR presentations. M. Skelton Roberts asked what is not happening now. P. Scannell responded that the developer's presentations leave too much ambiguity about whether or not the land is cleaned up. The residents have a problem with land that is not clean being transferred. They want to make sure someone takes responsibility for the land being cleaned up.

D. Galluzzo stated that they were told early on that clean up would be complete before construction. Now they are being told that construction will be starting before cleanup is finished. He noted that it is difficult to understand the change, it is confusing, and inconsistent at best. T. Pries stated that at one of the first meetings she had attended there was a discussion about parallel tracks to expedite development on the Base. If something is discovered will construction really stop? She stated that it seems to be going full tilt and it feels like the residents have been railroaded, and that construction will not really stop if contamination is discovered.

A. Malewicz stated that the government has tools that now allow transfer of property prior to cleanup. This did not originally fit NAS South Weymouth but it has now evolved into transfer prior to clean up. It has been confusing, but it has been an evolution of cleanup. The goal is to still have the clean up goals met during this process.

P. Scannell asked if we were cleaning up to fit a plan. What is the cleanup standard for the Site? D. Chaffin stated that these are open-ended questions and the answer is really site specific. It is easier to think of in terms in individual sites. Decisions are made site by site.

D. Galluzzo stated that early on the clean up was supposed to be to residential standards and now it is a site by site decision. K. Keckler said that it would be unusual to make a blanket statement about cleanup

standards. A. Malewicz stated that there has always been the option of cleanup to either commercial or residential standards. She noted that there is a reuse plan the residents voted on and as long as the commercial or residential standards meet the reuse plan the residents are satisfied. P. Scannell asked why it wasn't considered residential with so many homes slated. A. Malewicz responded that it was a blend of open space, residential, commercial, etc. P. Scannell stated that the residents would like it to be clearly stated and marked so that current and future residents will know exactly what areas are contaminated.

R. Daniels asked if the residents were looking for an explanation for the cleanup process and how it will be funded. M. Parsons stated she wanted documents. R. Daniels commented that she thinks the group is looking for a greater understanding of clean up and what resources are being allocated to each of the remaining contaminated sites under the FOSL (Finding of Suitability to Lease). K. Keckler stated that some of these documents have not been prepared yet, and once they are they will be made public as it has been done in the past.

D. Galluzzo stated that LNR has had chances, and that the residents are addressing their concerns and trust towards the agencies and not towards LNR. M. Skelton Roberts asked how can they not engage LNR in conversation if trust is in question. D. Galluzzo responded that if the agencies can get information out of LNR then that is all the residents really care about. A. Malewicz commented they want to move forward. There has not been an overarching person for Weymouth to provide a clear picture. She stated that we all need to work together to move forward.

P. Scannell stated that they were under the impression that MassDEP/EPA has the final say during the cleanup process. The residents want to know whether the agencies accept the developers' answers and approve their methodology so that if something goes wrong the residents have a course of action they can take. M. Parsons wants to be able to ask questions instead of having presentations, because presentations take up time that the residents want to use to ask questions.

R. Daniels stated that LNR had not begun the clean up so she is confused by residents stating that LNR had their chance. M. Parsons responded that it is about trust; LNR has changed the plans too many times. She feels that LNR has not been forthcoming to date so it is difficult to have any trust that the cleanup process will be different. M. Bromberg suggested that a RAB sub-committee meet with LNR and EPA/MassDEP representatives to work on issues and then go back to the residents. Others supported this suggestion. S. Greendlinger noted that to build trust a relationship has to start and the residents need to be willing to engage with people.

B. Olson stated he wanted to answer the question of who is making the final decisions. Ultimately the final decision is up to the EPA. The Navy proposes something, and MassDEP/EPA discuss and either

agree or make changes. LNR may have clean up plans, as may the Navy and EPA, so there will be discussions about the clean up plans. Navy will implement a collective decision, but discussion is needed by all parties first.

R. Daniels stated she is willing to provide information and have discussions to answer residents' questions for the next RAB meeting. R. Kleiman commented that they thought they did their best to present a lot of complicated data to a very large board of people during the CAC meetings. It did involve a lot of presentations but they followed the MEPA process. He noted that the cleanup issues were not meant to be addressed during the MEPA process.

P. Scannell stated that the residents consider the EPA/MassDEP an authoritative party. He appreciates hearing that there will be a discussion and feels that it is time for the residential group to get over the history with the entities involved. It is time for the facts to be heard. M. Parsons stated that she wants discussion and does not want to listen to any more presentations. T. Pries apologized if the residents do not welcome LNR but there are reasons for the mistrust. She feels that the Mayor sold out the citizens. She is concerned about Whitman's Pond becoming a hazardous waste site, and whether she needs to sell her house. She would like to use the regulators as a filter to learn what is important because she feels that the information from the developer has been misleading.

R. Daniels stated that she will provide information about what LNR intends to do. The conveyance by the Navy to SSTDTC of parcels that have been remediated and lease for those that have yet to undergo a remedy is planned for October. D. Galluzzo stated that he would be willing to listen to LNR one more time in the presence of MassDEP/EPA. The RAB attendees would appreciate that the presentation be in a similar format with an open discussion forum. P. Scannell stated that the residents are comfortable with the integrity of the RAB information and past RAB presentations. The residents are looking to the government to make sure information is accurate. A. Malewicz commented that she is hearing that the residents want a discussion by LNR in the format of a RAB meeting or something similar. M. Skelton Roberts stated that the information must be clearly presented, there will be time for questions, and there will be time for the regulators to comment, as well. A. Hilbert stated that she has given up on LNR and is not ready for them; she would rather listen to the regulators.

H. Welch wants to see maps with streets relative to the sites and an acronym sheet posted on the wall large enough to view. M. Skelton Roberts asked who can create these maps and when. R. Kleiman stated that LNR could do this. T. Pries wants Navy maps. D. Barney stated that they have posted maps with surrounding streets at prior RAB meetings. H. Welch wants a map that shows streets approximately 100 yards around the Base with Sites/FOSTs referenced. D. Barney said he would work on it. M. Skelton Roberts stated she will coordinate with Navy and LNR to make sure that maps will be provided.

Memorandum Item 2: Greater Oversight of LNR/SSTTDC Clean up and Development Activities.

K. Keckler stated that EPA has received additional funding from Navy and is hoping to have a (full time) person stationed on the Base within two months or so. They are working on finding someone to fill that position and trying to find an office on Base. P. Scannell stated that it was not acceptable if the developer is moving faster than the government, he wants a person from the government, now. M. Bromberg commented that he appreciates that the Navy is providing funding for the regulatory oversight.

Memorandum Item 3: Funds for Residents to Hire Technical Experts.

K. Keckler stated that there are limitations to the TAG, for example you cannot collect own groundwater data. M. Skelton Roberts asked about the status of the preparation of the TAG application. P. Scannell indicated that they are working on it but did not provide a schedule for its completion. B. Olson stated that EPA does collect split samples. The TAG expert would be welcome to oversee the split sampling.

Memorandum Item 4: MassDEP or EPA to Provide the Residents with a Resource With Both Legal and Environmental Expertise.

M. Skelton Roberts asked if this is the same person as the TAG expert. P. Scannell responded, not necessarily. The residents want a point person. M. Skelton Roberts said there are people available that are point people: K. Keckler is a technical expert; S. Greendlinger is the EPA Community Involvement Coordinator who ensures a meaningful exchange between all stakeholders. M. Skelton-Roberts requested feedback from the community if they feel that the point people are not providing enough information.

Memorandum Item 5: Continuation of RAB meetings.

The RABs will continue. Residents want others to be involved. A list of suggested groups and individuals is included in the memorandum (see Attachment C). It was noted that D. DeLorenzo is now the MassDEP/SERO contact.

Memorandum Attachment 1 – Points of Concern were briefly discussed as follows:

Point 1: D. DeLorenzo will check to see if there has been any testing at Whitman's Pond. M. Parsons gave a photo to D. Delorenzo. T. Pries is specifically concerned with South Cove. Also she is concerned where the development will get their water supply since Whitman's Pond was highly affected by recent activities. B. Olson stated that an EPA report indicated that there is no contamination in Whitman's Pond from the Base. M. Parsons stated that after 1964 Whitman's Pond became a secondary water supply, and it is now a primary supply. The group will provide D. DeLorenzo with additional information.

Point 4: D. DeLorenzo asked if the iron floc is a contentious issue. The group answered yes.

Point 7: D. DeLorenzo stated that the runways will be tested. P. Scannell stated that supposedly the permit was issued before testing was completed. R. Kleiman responded that he disagrees with that statement, and that the permit was issued only after the results were known. D. Galluzzo commented that scarifying of runways happened before the test results were known, if you look at the dates.

Memorandum Attachment 2 – Additional questions and points were briefly discussed as follows:

Point 3: D. DeLorenzo said he would be able to find this information.

Point 5: D. DeLorenzo group is working on a contract to get an independent observer.

Point 6: A. Malewicz stated that she sent a note to Susan Condon, MDPH, requesting the draft public health report. She was told that there was no access to the draft report and that it is still under peer review. P. Scannell asked if this study was funded by the DoD. A. Malewicz stated that she will try and put pressure on the MDPH to get the information.

3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

M. Skelton Roberts reviewed the action items listed on the Action Item Tracking List (see Attachment B) for this RAB meeting:

Review suggestions to enhance the public participation process: Discussed during the meeting.

Provide FOST 3 and 4 Responsiveness summaries to M. Bromberg: Completed.

Send email announcing availability of FOST 5A for review: Completed.

Discuss the parties involved in the cleanup and development of the Base: The parties involved include the Navy, EPA, and MASSDEP, and future involvement include SSTT, LNR, and their contractor LFR.

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 that the RAO submittal for the FFTA was approved early in August, which means that the MassDEP considers the Site complete. He also stated that the Navy sent a letter to the Southeast Region concerning the Small Landfill Site, explaining the closeout will be transitioning from the Navy to LNR, so the MassDEP knows the plans for the Small Landfill.

Coast Guard Update: D. Barney received no update.

IR Program Site Update: D. Barney stated that the third quarter of sampling occurred at RDA as part of the long term monitoring program. This round included collection of small mammals for testing. The pre-design investigation for the former Sewage Treatment Plant was completed in August. Comments were received from EPA and MassDEP on the Building 81 RI report. A pre-design sampling and analysis plan was submitted for the West Gate Landfill to assist in the development and design for that Site. Relative to the Basewide Assessment, the Navy met with a variety of regulators to discuss the comments on the risk assessment portion. The Navy is now in a position to revise and finalize that document.

MCP Update: All work at the FFTA has been completed.

EBS Update: D. Barney stated that the East Mat Ditch (AOC 60) and the AOC 61 TACAN Outfall will be the subject of the proposed plan meeting next month. At RIA 110, the Southeast Antenna Field, four transmitter poles and four light poles have been taken down and are awaiting disposal. Confirmatory soil samples were collected from the excavation around the base of two transmitter poles and submitted to the lab for analysis. Decision documents are being prepared for the remainder of the RIA sites.

FOST/FOSL Update: No update.

SSTTDC Update: The order of conditions for the slurry wall for the waste water treatment plant effluent beds has been completed.

D. Galluzzo offered concluding comments and stated that he hopes the future of NAS Weymouth is calamity free. He doesn't believe that the original plan for reuse of the Base laid out by the Navy is being followed. He then re-stated and summarized the residents concerns.

Conclusion/Next Meeting

M. Skelton-Roberts wrapped up the meeting. D. Barney suggested that the RAB for next month be postponed to November because a public hearing is scheduled for October on the Proposed Plan for the East Mat Ditch and TACCAN Outfall. An informal meeting can be held after the public hearing. The next RAB meeting will be the second Thursday in November and LNR will provide answers to questions/continue discussion.

To: Brian Olson, MassDEP; David Chaffin, Mass DEP; Anne Malewicz, MADEP; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA; Stacy Greendlinger, EPA

Fr: Dominic Galluzzo, Weymouth; Mary Parsons, Rockland; Mary Byram, Hingham; Anne Hilbert, Weymouth; Beth Sortin, Abington; Tricia Pries, Weymouth; Peter Scannell, Weymouth

Date: September 11, 2008

Re: Issues related to the clean up and development of the So. Weymouth Naval Airstation

At the May 2008 RAB meeting, Ann Malewicz and other representatives of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the EPA asked residents to identify tangible ideas of what would provide residents with a degree of advocacy and trust with respect to the clean-up of the Base. On June 4 and July 2, 2008, several residents met to outline specific recommendations to ensure meaningful resident participation in the clean-up process. Those attending the June 4th meeting were: Dominic Galluzzo, Mary Parsons, Mary Byram, Anne Hilbert, and Beth Sortin, Tricia Pries. Those attending the July 2nd meeting were: Dominic Galluzzo, Beth Sortin, Tricia Pries, Anne Hilbert, Mary Parsons and Kathleen McGovern. Mary Skelton Roberts facilitated and took notes during both meetings. A final meeting was held on August 20th with Peter Scannell, Mary Parsons, Dominic Galluzzo, Beth Sortin, Anne Hilbert, Tricia Pries and Mary Skelton-Roberts in attendance.

Below is a list of concerns and requests we have identified to date. In anticipation of setting a stage for informed and meaningful dialogue among the regulating agencies, residents, the Navy and LNR/SSTTDC, attached are two pages describing some of our concerns about the former So. Weymouth Naval Air Station.

Community Needs/Requirements:

1. Greater Understanding of the Clean up and Allocation of Resources for the Site. The residents need to better understand what type of cleanup is planned and what resources are to be allocated to each remaining contaminated sites under FOSL. Copies of all feasibility studies for all RIA's, AOC', and CERCLA, I.R. sites are requested, specifically the Feasibility Study for the Finding of Suitability to Lease.
2. Greater Oversight of LNR/SSTTDC clean up and development activities. From the onset of the initiative to clean up the base, residents have repeatedly requested greater and more consistent oversight of LNR in order to ensure that development and clean-up are done according to State and Federal requirements. We specifically would like more consistent supervision of any and all activity related to the excavation of the land. We request a legal document allowing EPA/DEP access to land transferred for the purpose of monitoring and reviewing cleanup and construction processes. Additionally, we request a point person assigned from both DEP/EPA to:
 - a. Handle anonymous complaints from citizens in a manner true to the original enabling legislation's intent of providing citizen's advocacy oversight.
 - b. Conduct site visits, on any cleaned or to be cleaned sites, anytime without prior notice or permission from LNR, or the environmental police or any other security

type organizations that are operating in the best interests of the developer exclusively.

- c. Interface within the different MADEP/EPA programs and other permitting agencies to ensure parking lot issues are not left appropriately addressed.
 - d. Provide consistent access and communication with the public.
3. Funds for residents to hire technical experts who can evaluate existing data and educate the community on some of the more technical elements related to clean up. We would also request funding so that residents can hire an independent consultant to work with the community. One area where the consultant would be utilized would be in doing its own ground water testing. We request that the Navy and LNR allocate some of the currently designated clean-up funds (\$32 million) to support this individual, who would be completely independent of LNR and SSTDC. We would also like that documentation or report developed by the technical expert be submitted to DEP, EPA and the public first and then sent to LNR after vetting by the agency. We want all reports and documentation to become available at future RAB meets.
 4. We would like either DEP or EPA to provide the residents with a resource who has both legal and environmental expertise.
 5. We request that the RAB be continued at least until all phases of construction are complete with the meetings to integrate development, leasing and clean-up issues. We request the RAB continue to be the vehicle for community involvement. In light of the Navy's Decision to convey a Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) for the remaining sites, we cordially invite the following groups to participate:
 - North River/South River Watershed. Samantha Woods,
 - Watershed Action Alliance. Jill Cowie,
 - Back River Watershed Association, Kathleen McGovern
 - DEP/SERO James McLaughlin
 - MEPA – Ashley Eglington
 - MWRA
 - Water Resource Commission
 - LNR: Kevin Chase
 - LFR. Company doing the actual clean-up must attend the meetings and engage in the discussions.

Attachment 1

Clean-up Concerns

The representative residents of Rockland Abington, Weymouth and Hingham are concerned that the cleanup process could readily be undermined by the sheer complexity of the project. Our clean up concerns are further exacerbated by several factors, including: i) That SSTTDC has become one with the developer and does not represent community interests. ii) The Enabling Legislation, which was originally intended to be the governing document for the redevelopment, is now in the process of being changed without any community discussion or vote. iii) LNR, who does not have a good track record of working collaboratively with residents as evidenced by the fact that the residents were neither allowed nor encouraged to actively participate in CAC meetings, is now coordinating the cleanup and to the development. iv) Local and state politicians have admitted to constituents that they are not up to speed on the project or that they lack of knowledge of cleanup issues and have not been forthcoming with information regarding public participation.

Given these and many other factors, the residents would like the following issues noted as concerns. Below are examples of our points of concern.

1. Whitman's Pond needs to be classified as an Area of Concern as it relates to any previous and subsequent contamination from activities on the Base and remediation efforts need to be brought forth appropriately.
2. By using the Navy storm drains, more iron floc will end up into Old Swamp River and French's Stream.
3. Move sewage treatment plant away from the water and tributaries that feed into French's Stream with strict maintenance and fail safe system in place to safeguard our watersheds.
4. Iron flocculation in French's Stream needs to be studied further. The feeder stream that feeds old Swamp River next to RDA does not demonstrate any excess iron floc, yet it is approximately 75' from the RDA site, which leaches excessive iron floc.
5. Find out the source of the plume under bldg. 81 and AOC 108 (CERCLA SITE # 9 and 11). Under no circumstances should any building be built on or near those sites.
6. Contaminated land should not be transferred to LNR until all the clean up is complete.
7. When will the runways be tested for contamination? And where are the test results for the runways that have already been torn up?
8. SSTTDC/LNR were adamant for environmental reasons, that the West Gate Landfill be excavated when the Navy proposed a capping resolution. We expect the excavation option to be executed to the fullest.

9. How are developers, businesses and prospective residents being informed of the Superfund Sites on the property?
10. Public Benefits Conveyance - National Parks Service Open Space Land needs to have the terms of the conveyance agreement met.
11. Institutional controls need to be put in place at the site immediately. For example, areas that have already been identified as contaminated should be fenced off, with proper signage identifying the hazard as a CERCLA site with the skull and crossbone logo. Existing signage is inadequate.
12. Where will the future onsite repository of the historical environmental documentation be for residents, developers and investors to review the conditions and cleanup on the Base? What are the legal requirements for disseminating this information with full disclosure?
13. We request a timeline and schedule of the clean up.

Attachment 2

Additional Questions – Concerns

1. We want a re-evaluation/estimate of how much it will cost for clean up under LNR.
2. What contingencies are in place should a contaminant and/or unknown contaminated site be found? We request occurrence based insurance for the site to ensure those who are affected by the activities on the base are covered should the need arise.
3. Does the Weymouth Water Department currently filter for the contaminants listed in the groundwater on the Base?
4. Has an approved water source been identified since the ground water cannot be used. What is the timeline?
5. Who is the independent observer for Wetlands Protection? (Within DEP)
6. Where is the MDPH report? Can DEP demand, insist, the release of a draft report if the final is not available? (Suzanne Condon, Teresa Cassidy, Dr. Robert Knorr.)

Distribution List:

North River/South River Watershed. Samantha Woods,
Watershed Action Alliance. Jill Cowie,
Back River Watershed Association, Kathleen McGovern
DEP/SERO James McLaughlin
MEPA – Ashley Eglington
MWRA
Water Resource Commission
LNR: Kevin Chase
LFR. Company doing the actual clean-up must attend the meetings and engage in the discussions.

Delahunt
Fish and Wildlife/Natural Heritage – Mary to send
DEP - Millie Garcia-Serrano, Davis Ellis, Bob Johnston,
EPA also
Wildlands Trust - Scott MacFadden
Audubon – Heidi Ricci
J Cowie
Natural Heritage – Jonathan Regosin
Lakeville DEP
Dave Barney
Brian



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



September 11, 2008

Conference Center on Shea Memorial Drive

7:00 PM

<i>Agenda Items</i>	<i>Item Lead</i>	<i>Projected Time</i>
1. Introduction, Review of Meeting Notes	Facilitator	7:00 - 7:15
2. Suggestions to Enhance the Public Participation Process	Facilitator	7:15 – 8:00
3. Updates and Action Items	Navy	8:00 – 8:30
4. Questions, Agenda Items, Next Meeting	Facilitator	8:30 - 9:00

Facilitator: Mary Skelton-Roberts, Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution & Public Collaboration

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

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

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

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

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