

**Meeting Minutes Restoration
Advisory Board (RAB)
Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport,
Rhode Island**

**May 15, 2024, 6:30 PM – 8:30 PM
Sonesta Select, Middletown, Rhode
Island And Virtual Webinar**

Call to Order and Approval of Previous Minutes

Lisa Shanahan (Host, Resolution Consultants) and **Henry Stueber** (Community RAB Co-Chair) called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed attendees to the meeting of the NAVSTA Newport RAB, noting that this meeting was also being held with a webinar format. Lisa discussed the instructions for participating in the virtual meeting and presented the meeting agenda, which is provided (Enclosure 1).

Panelists	Attendees
Deb Moore (NAVSTA Newport)	David Brown (via phone)
Joe McCloud (NAVFAC)	Steve Johnson, EDC Portsmouth
Jess Welkey (NAVFAC)	Andy Long, Newport This Week (via phone)
Paul Young (NAVFAC)	Commander Ian Underwood, NS Public Works
Henry Stueber, Community RAB Co-Chair	Jim Freess, Newport
Dave Dorocz (NAVSTA Newport)	Tim Sheehan (via phone)
Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) (via phone)	Tom Grieb, Portsmouth
Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants)	Michael Wilson, Newport
Tyler Winkler (Resolution Consultants)	Cornelia Muller NAVSTA Newport Community Planning Liaison (via phone)
Jane Dolan (EPA)	
Lisa Shanahan, Host, Resolution Consultants (via phone)	

Henry Stueber called for any comments on or revisions to the draft minutes for the March 20, 2024 RAB Meeting. Minutes were accepted.

Part 1: Site Progress Milestones

Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) presented the Site Progress Milestones Update as a bulleted list by Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites (Enclosure 2). The usual Site Progress Milestones Table has been updated and was provided as a handout at the meeting (attached as Enclosure 3).

Naomi Ouellette reviewed each ERP site’s stage in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. Please refer to Enclosure 2 for notable milestones that were highlighted.

Q&A:

Site 1

Q: Henry Stueber – Has the Navy reviewed the thermal imaging data, and who did it?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) and Ian Underwood (NAVSTA Newport) – NAVFAC has not yet reviewed this work, but it was completed by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and Rutgers University in collaboration with NAVFAC Engineering and Expeditionary Warfare Center (EXWC), which is the branch of NAVFAC that specializes in research and development.

Site 8 Naval Undersea Systems Command (NUSC):

Q: Henry Stueber – What is the hydraulic testing for?

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – It is to determine the groundwater flow paths and the structure/fracturing of the subsurface geology to better understand how injections should be carried out. This is being developed by Tetra Tech.

Site 10 and 11 – Tank Farm 2 (OU 14) and Tank Farm 3 (OU 15):

Q: Henry Stueber – When will the soil removal start?

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – The Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis (EECAs) must be finalized, and the action memos must be produced and reviewed by the Navy. The goal is to do this work by fall, but these other documents must be finalized first.

Q: Tom Grieb – These two sites are relatively small, will there be a lot of trucks like with Site 13?

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – No, this will be a much smaller operation.

Site 19 Derecktor Shipyard:

Q: Henry Stueber – Is it still unclear where the chlorinated volatile organic compounds in groundwater are coming from?

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – Yes, but new wells and soil borings that are planned for the Study Area Screening Evaluation should help identify the source area.

MRP Site 1:

Q: Henry Stueber – When will the MRP Site 1 soil removal remedial action start?

A: Jane Dolan (EPA) – This will not likely begin until 2026 due to the changes in the order of the work plan by Severson.

Q: Tom Grieb – The CRMC does not allow dredging of sediment within certain times of the year, so has this been considered?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Yes, team is aware that a waiver would be requested, as needed, to allow dredging at this time.

Site 25, 26, 27:

Q: Henry Stueber – Is the Relative Risk Ranking Evaluation (RRRE) global or

nationwide?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – The RRRE applies nationwide.

Q: Tom Grieb – Can you explain how the RRRE works to prioritize sites?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – The Technical Presentation will cover this.

Milestone Chart

Q: Henry Stueber – Why has Site 11 been shifted, as indicated by it being all red on the chart?

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – It is a combination of the RRRE and impacts related to planned Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) infrastructure removal activity.

Q: Henry Stueber – Can we separate Sites 10 and 11 when discussing milestones going forward?

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – Yes, we will do this.

Part 2: Technical Presentation

Navy environmental Restoration Program (ERP) Annual Summary Brief, Joe McCloud (NAVFAC), See Enclosure 4

Q&A:

Q: Jane Dolan (EPA) – What is the definition of a Site?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – An Installation Restoration (IR) site is an Operable Unit (OU) that is at or beyond the Remedial Investigation (RI) phase. When an area of interest or Area of Concern is identified, it is placed under investigation. When it is determined that a site needs additional remedial investigations like the various PFAS sites, it becomes an IR Site # and the EPA assigns an OU #.

Q: Henry Stueber – Is there something that the community/RAB can do to reach out to obtain more funding/help?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Not directly at this time.

A: Jane Dolan (EPA) – We discussed this during the RPM meeting, and Joe will discuss it more when going over the RRRE.

Q: Henry Stueber – So the RRRE is based on an algorithm, why did Sites 25 and 27 have a different ranking than Site 26 if they are all similar?

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – It is either due to higher concentrations of PFAS at Site 26, or a higher risk factor for receptors or migration pathway. (See Enclosure 7 for the inputs that are used for the RSSE)

Q: Henry Stueber – The community would like to see the inputs for each Site to be reexamined to advance the timeline of the consideration.

A: Ian Underwood (NAVSTA Newport) – We have to consider the broader context when determining site risk, wherein sites like Red Hill in Hawaii has diesel leaking directly into the aquifer that makes it an immediate priority. That affects the funding that is available for lower priority sites.

Q: Henry Stueber – So why are Newport sites not being considered high risk since

there are active migrating plumes.

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – There are no drinking water wells from these areas, which is considered a “high” risk factors, so there is not a direct human receptor path.

Q: Tom Grieb – What about Site 1, where we have to consider aquaculture in the bay that becomes a food source.

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – Site 1 is already classified as high priority because of the receptors identified at the Site.

Q: Henry Stueber – Are aquaculture and marine food sources that go on to act as food a receptor pathway that is being considered.

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – Yes, the model considers these receptor paths.

Q: Steve Johnson – How is the Navy considering migration pathways into the ponds that are water sources?

A: Dave Dorocz (NAVSTA Newport) – These ponds are tested regularly for water quality.

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – Additionally, most of the water beneath the installation flows to the west and out to the Bay; this would not impact the ponds that are a part of the Newport drinking water supply.

Q: Henry Stueber – Could we create an action item to share the inputs into the model for the community to evaluate the inputs.

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – This will be discussed with the agencies in subsequent meetings.

Q: Henry Stueber – Is RIDEM involved in this process as it impacts broader Rhode Island food sources?

A: Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) – Yes, RIDEM is involved in this process and will provide input.

Q: Michael Wilson – Has the Navy evaluated the potential for mycelium enhanced remediation?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Not that I am aware of, but EXWC would be the ones doing this. Some of their research and findings can be seen at <https://serdp-estcp.mil/>.

Q: Henry Stueber – What can be done to advance some of these projects that are on pause due to the RRSE?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – MIDLANT has been effective at advocating for additional funding that is leftover at the end of the fiscal year, and that is how Site 9 got funded. The Navy RPMs will keep working to advocate for these sites.

Q: Henry Stueber – At the Roger’s High School, if they find munitions during excavation, does this become a part of the FUDS program?

A: Dave Dorocz (NAVSTA Newport) – The base would destroy or remove the munitions but would not investigate the site under Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Program.

Q: Jane Dolan (EPA) – Is Building 86 at Fort Adams going to be involved in the

Basewide remedial activities?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – It is not clear if this will be included because it is not in the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA), but we can discuss this as a team.

Q: Henry Stueber – Is it only the landfills that will be monitored in perpetuity on 30-year cycles.

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Any site where Contaminants of Concern (COCs) or waste are left in place will continue to be monitored.

Q: Henry Stueber – Will annual costs for certain sites ever go down below estimated numbers?

A: Jess Welkey (NAVFAC) – Yes, eventually the annual cost will go down for sites like Site 7 after certain remedial actions, like demolition and removal actions, are complete.

Q: Tom Grieb – Are the numbers shown for the 2024 Cost to Completion on slide 34 indicative of the total cost to completion?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Yes.

Q: Jane Dolan (EPA) – So what do the values for Sites 25, 26, 27 include.

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Scoping and remedial investigation activities. Until the RI is complete, it is unknown what the Cost to Completion will be.

Q: Steve Johnson – Are we discussing the government fiscal year in the table on slide 34?

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – Yes this presentation is for FY2024 (which is 1 October 2023 through 30 September 2024). In the past, the funding presentation was done in January, but this presentation was delayed due to the desire to include more timely technical presentations this year.

Q: Henry Stueber – To be clear, these are not the annual budgets on slide 34?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – Correct, these are the estimated cost to completion. The FY 2023 budget was \$22.3 million for IRP (installation restoration program), 14.4 for MRP (munitions response program) which is \$36.7 million total for FY 2023.

Q: Henry Stueber – What is this year's budget?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – I attempted to think about how to share this, but it is still not clear to convey as this gets updated.

Q: Henry Stueber – If the project you own is evaluated on the expenses and progress made, why can't we get a budget for the individual sites?

A: Paul Young (NAVFAC) – These are estimates because a lot of these projects and tasks are not contracted yet.

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – We have numbers that are estimated and requested, but this is not necessarily budgeted for. RPMs tell the Navy how much money we need, and this will then be funded.

Q: Jane Dolan (EPA) – If \$37 million was spent in FY 23, how is the \$110 million estimated cost to completion still accurate?

A: Joe McCloud (NAVFAC) – The estimated cost to completion will likely continue to increase.

Q: Henry Stueber – The RAB formally requests the budget for FY 25 as an ACTION ITEM, to the highest level possible.

A: Ian Underwood (NAVSTA Newport) – We will work to obtain this estimate to the most accurate level possible.

Q: Dave Brown – Does the traditional funding authorization, obligation, budgeting distinction still exist?

A: Ian Underwood (NAVSTA Newport) – Yes, this does still exist.

Part 3 Regulatory Updates

EPA Update:

Jane Dolan – No major updates.

Q: Henry – Who will attend in your stead Jane?

A: Jane – It will depend on the project, but either Laurie O'Connor (EPA), Kim White (EPA), or Tim Barbeau (EPA).

RIDEM Update:

Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) – The Rhode Island Department of Health will be updating drinking water standards by June 30th, and RIDEM will provide an update following this.

Q: Henry Stueber – Will these be going lower?

A: Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) – The numbers will be considered alongside new EPA standards to develop State drinking water standards.

Q: Steve Johnson – Will changing the standards potentially cause some municipal water supplies to go out of compliance?

A: Paul Kulpa (RIDEM) – If it were out of compliance, this would have to be addressed.

A: Tom Grieb – In the Town of Portsmouth, the new EPA standards are well below current levels but the Town is preemptively working to meet them.

Navy Co-Chair Update:

Dave Dorocz – The Phase 2 permitting is in progress and the Phase 1 construction of the bulkhead to the north of Pier 1 is currently underway. Phase 2 will be the section of the bulkhead in front of Pier 1 and section 366 to the south of Pier 1. Construction for the new NOAA Pier is also underway.

RAB Community Co-Chair Update:

Henry Stueber – Henry had new attendees introduce themselves.

Q: Michael Wilson – Has there been any investigation at Fort Adams?

A: Deb Moore (NAVSTA Newport) – No Navy investigations have happened or are planned since this is private property.

Q: Dave Brown – Is there a way to show those of us who are online who from the community is at the in-person meeting, like showing a name list or having the camera show the whole scene a few times? What you're doing now to introduce newcomers is very helpful.

A: Naomi Ouellette (Resolution Consultants) – We will continue to attempt to scan more of the room with the camera. Attendance for each meeting is also shared with the meeting minutes and other materials (sent by Dave following each meeting).

Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next meeting is July 17, 2024. Naomi Ouellette mentioned the following potential topics for upcoming technical presentations:

- Site 8: Naval Undersea Systems Center (NUSC) dredging update
- Site 9: PFAS RI Scoping

The RAB virtual meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Next Steps/Action Items

-NAVFAC RPMs to work to provide some form of a budget for FY 2025 to RAB members in the future.

Sincerely,

D. D. Dorocz

Enclosures:

- (1) Meeting Agenda
- (2) Site Progress Milestones Update
- (3) Site Progress Milestones Chart
- (4) Technical Presentation: Basewide Funding Update and Update on the PFAS Funding Prioritization
- (5) RAB Membership & Contact Information
- (6) RAB Instructions Tips and Tricks
- (7) Figure 1 RSSE Primer