Starting points.....
For the July 17, 2002 RAB discussion of OFFTA cleanup options

Aim of this session
To help the Navy, EPA and RIDEM anticipate community members' concerns, questions and preferences, when zeroing in on a proposed cleanup plan and explaining it to the public in coming months. If the RAB reaches clear consensus now, fine. If not, we can at least highlight key issues.

What we've been told, based on technical studies
- On/off-shore contamination mainly from oils, tars and metals (arsenic, antimony, beryllium, lead, manganese). Also buried debris. Mainly from 1940-70s petrol burning in pits for fire-fighting practice. Some arsenic and pesticide derivatives may come from native geology and earlier farming practices.
- Apparently nothing now going into the air or water except for pipe drainage from a nearby parking lot.
- No extreme human health risk from surface contact or occasionally eating nearby seafood. But worrisome if people start digging down, drink site's ground water, or eat a lot of seafood from nearby.
- If leave as is, shouldn't build on or use the surface/shoreline areas for human activity, or allow swimming, boating or fishing in adjacent waters.
- One near-shore area has eelgrass, a valuable Bay ecological resource. To remove it and then replant with eelgrass would complete the cleanup, but would be expensive and not have sure-fire success.

The action options identified by Navy consultants, in communication with EPA & RIDEM

Location	Option*	Est. cost**	Reactions/justifications thus far
On-shore soil	Alt 1: No action now; monitor long-term	70,000	Fenced off; no current human use
	Alt 2: Remove, treat nearby & backfill; monitor	11,957,000	EPA prefers, permanent solution; less material dumped elsewhere; acceptable to RIDEM if can review methods
	Alt 3: Remove & dispose contaminants elsewhere; monitor	8,105,000	Navy prefers because it would protect site as much as Alt 2, at lower cost; acceptable to EPA and RIDEM
Groundwater	Alt 1: No action now	70,000	No anticipated need to use this water for drinking
	Alt 2: Monitor/control land use & drainage	500,000	Navy prefers, soil cleanup and microbial action may solve the problem; acceptable to RIDEM
	Alt 3: Remediate by pumping & treating	5 to10,000,000	If groundwater found to pollute, RIDEM would explore less costly passive ways, like a wall or deep-rooted trees
Off-shore sediment	Alt 1: No action now; monitor long-term	70,000	Some (but not EPA) feel that on-shore cleanup and natural microbial action might reduce offshore contamination
	Alt 2: Restrict access to land & off-shore areas; monitor all	517,000	Navy prefers as interim step that doesn't disrupt shore habitat or waste funds, until on-shore soils cleaned and contaminant causes known; EPA says already clear
	Alt 3: Remove beach contaminants only; monitor off-shore	3,372,000	Same off-shore concerns as for Alts 1 and 2
	Alt 4: Remove beach & off-shore contaminants, except eelgrass area	3,826,000	Acceptable to RIDEM and EPA, assuming the Navy does a good cleanup job elsewhere off-shore and on-shore
	Alt 5: Remove beach & off-shore contaminants, including eelgrass area	3,772,000	Preferred by EPA; acceptable to RIDEM; some feel eelgrass removal/replacement may be very costly and risky

* Each alternative includes reviews every 5 years, costing $21,500 (non-discounted) each time.

** Present worth; i.e. capital outlays, later monitoring, etc, discounted @ 3.9% from 30 years back to the present.

Enclosure (1)

Possible questions for focused discussion

1. What considerations (criteria) do we think community members and leaders will have most in mind when reacting to an OFFTA cleanup plan? *Could ask RAB members to take 5 minutes to fill out the following checklist, then compile right away and discuss.*

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not so important
Prevent/reduce human exposure to health risks?			
Prevent/reduce sea food contamination?			
Not jeopardize eelgrass or other nearby marine life?			
Clean up permanently, for all possible future uses?			
Not spend more than needed for most likely needs?			
Not ship our contaminants to other "backyards"?			
Minimize cleanup dust, truck traffic, noise, etc.?			
Not jeopardize Navy base security during the cleanup?			
Other considerations?			

2. What is the rationale for wanting to clean up groundwater separately? Wouldn't the soil cleanup and improving the parking lot drainage do the trick? Would that be a separate cleanup operation, or integrated with the others?

3. There has been email discussion since June of treating the on-shore and off-shore cleanups as separate operations, rather than as one. It apparently would cost more to split permanent cleanup into two phases. EPA and RIDEM don't seem to want this. But the Navy feels that off-shore cleanup may not prove to be needed. What are other pros and cons from citizens' standpoints?

4. What would happen to funding if low-cost, interim OFFTA actions are chosen? The Navy (Jim Shafer) assures us that budget savings would be applied to other high-priority NSN study/cleanup needs, such as at Gould Island or Derecktor Off-shore. And that the Navy is obligated to do more if OFFTA contamination continues or gets worse. But how do we know that military needs or something else won't take the cleanup money away? Isn't a bird in hand worth two in the bush?

5. Re the eelgrass, is there Navy-EPA-RIDEM consensus that it's ok not to tear up the beds and clean underneath ...that the risk of messing up this valuable habitat isn't worth it...that the cost savings could better be applied to other OFFTA cleanup needs, and that the Navy in fact will do this?

6. What's next? We understand that the Navy team (Shafer, Griffin, technical managers, consultants) will make a decision recommendation about OFFTA, and that the final Record of Decision will be signed by the NAVSTA Newport Commanding Officer. How do EPA and RIDEM endorsements, and the public hearing and comment period, fit into the picture? How can we RAB citizen members be most helpful? What time frame is in mind?

As prepared/refined by Dave Brown, NSN-RAB Public Information Committee Chair, July 11-17, 2002
Based on the 6/02 Tetra Tech, EPA & RIDEM briefings; the 3/02 OFFTA Draft Final FS; & earlier OFFTA reports
And additional help from Jim Shafer, Paul Kulpa, Kymberlee Keckler & Tom McGrath