

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Conference Center
U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center
November 17, 2005
DRAFT Meeting Minutes**

I. Attendance

RAB Members Present

Robert Campbell	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP)
Marco Kaltofen	Co-Chair, Community Member
Steven Lubic	Representative of Natick Board of Selectman
Joel McCassie	Co-Chair, Environmental, Safety, and Health Office (ESHO), U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center (SSC)
John McHugh	Restoration Officer, ESHO SSC
A. Richard Miller	Community Member
Dr. Kannan Vembu	Representative of Natick Board of Selectmen
Christine Williams	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

RAB Members Absent

Dr. Charles Czeisler	Community Member, Lakewood Association
Tony Doheny Jr.	Community Member
James Fitzgerald	Community Member
Sid Gantman	Community Member
Elizabeth McCoy	Employee Member, SSC
James Straub	Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Dr. Harlee Strauss	Community Representative

Others in Attendance

Diane Anderson	Recorder, ICF Consulting
Michelle Bonanca	ESHO, SSC
Wolfgang Calicchio	Environmental Consultant, Mactec
James Connolly	ESHO, SSC
Anne Marie Desmarais	Environmental Insight
Darren Gainer	Environmental Consultant, ECC
Stacey Greendlinger	U.S. EPA
Kevin Palaia	Environmental Consultant, ICF Consulting
Jeffrey Pickett	Environmental Consultant, Mactec

II. Handouts

1. Buildings 62 and 68 Removal Action Update, Soldiers Systems Center – MACTEC Engineering and Consulting
2. Draft Community Relations Plan Update
3. *Draft Community Relations Plan for Soldier Systems Center, Natick, Massachusetts*, prepared by EA Engineering Science and Technology, Inc. (dated November 2005)

III. Meeting Minutes

Mr. McCassie called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm and asked if there were any comments, changes, or revisions to the October 6, 2005 RAB meeting minutes.

The minutes were accepted without amendment.

General Comments

Mr. Kaltofen thanked the RAB members that attended the recent town of Natick open house.

Mr. Miller stated that the Lake Cochituate State Park and various groups in town (including the Natick Conservation Commission) are looking at possibly treating the Eurasian water-milfoil problem in the lake with milfoil weevils. He stated that there were a couple of presentations available on the subject. He wanted the RAB to be aware of this in the event it became the treatment in the coming year, and if there may be any implications to the cleanup efforts being done at SSC.

Ms. Williams asked what the weevils do.

Mr. Miller replied that weevils are native to the northern U.S.; they feed on the Eurasian water-milfoil, and kill it by eating from the inside out. He stated that they are introduced to the lake by the thousands. He stated that there is some debate whether the sunfish will go after the weevils, and there is also a question about whether removing the Eurasian water-milfoil would introduce a different invasive species. He stated that there are studies at a number of lakes in the area, and the weevils are a new approved technique.

Dr. Vembu stated that the main issue from the presentations he had seen on the weevils is their cost.

Mr. Miller responded that cost was an issue, but they are not overly expensive compared to the other alternatives on Lake Cochituate. He stated that the State Park is ready to go forward with the weevils if it appears to be a good idea.

Buildings 62 and 68 Removal Action Update, Soldiers Systems Center

Mr. Jeff Pickett introduced Mr. Wolf Calicchio, a chemist from Mactec who was on-site during the Building 62 and 68 soil removal action.

Mr. Pickett stated that in the spring of 2005 (March) Mactec provided the soil removal action work plan. Mr. Pickett then pointed out the location of the buildings on a map and indicated that Building 62 was constructed between 1974 and 1975 and Building 68 was constructed between 1980 and 1981. He stated that each building is a 20x20 foot metal-skinned structure on a concrete slab, and the area around the buildings is either grass or paved with an asphalt drainage swale

between the buildings. He stated that the adjacent parking lot had recently been re-graded, and there was an elevated access road behind the buildings and numerous buried electrical utilities around the buildings.

Mr. Pickett then showed a number of photographs of the Building 62 and 68 area, pointing out the drainage swale, the storm sewer headwall, and the approximate area proposed for soil excavation. He stated that only the areas with exposed soil were proposed for excavation, and not any of the existing asphalt areas.

Mr. Pickett stated that the buildings were used to store hazardous materials and chemicals until 1991, and the Master Environmental Plan (MEP) also identified some pallets with waste oil near Building 62. He stated that presently, no hazardous materials are stored in the buildings and there have been no documented spills or releases at the buildings.

Mr. Pickett stated that a soil gas survey was done in the area of Buildings 62 and 68 in 1989 and 1990, but the results of the survey were inconclusive. Two surface soil samples were collected near Buildings 62 and 68 (RA-8 and RA-9) in 1993 as part of the U.S. Army Environmental Center investigation – some polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's) were found, but no volatile organics were detected. In 2004, Mactec performed a Site Investigation (SI) at Buildings 62 and 68, and the following activities were performed:

- Concrete chip samples were collected from inside of each building (four/building)
- Subslab soil samples were collected from each building (two borings/building)
- Soil samples at nine locations were collected in the grass area around each building at two depths (0-1 and 2-3 feet).
- Samples were analyzed for VOC, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, inorganics, VPH, and EPH
- Floor integrity was in good shape and there was no staining or sign of spillage.
- Sample results were compared to EPA Region 9 PRGs.

Mr. Pickett stated that no chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) were found in the concrete chip samples and no PCBs were detected in the samples. He noted that the COPCs in most surface soil locations were petroleum-related PAHs and EPH. Mr. Pickett then presented a map indicating where the samples were collected.

Mr. Pickett stated that a removal action was proposed in March 2005 to cleanup the soils to levels based on MCP Method 1 (S-1/GW-1) standards. He explained that the cleanup was based on the EPH-contaminated soils, and there were no exceedances of VOCs, inorganics, or VPH.

Mr. Pickett stated that the removal action would consist of removing soil from the ground surface down to approximately 2 feet deep around the buildings, an equivalent of approximately 150 cubic yards. Additional excavation would be performed, as needed, if confirmatory samples exceeded cleanup standards in certain areas. The material would then be transported for asphalt recycling to Aggregate Industries in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts. The site would then be restored to pre-removal conditions including the drainage swale.

Mr. Calicchio then discussed the chronology of the removal action. He stated that from September 26th to 29th, five (5) roll offs of soil were excavated and transported to Aggregate Industries for recycling. The excavation stopped on September 29th due to damaging an electrical conduit on the north side of Building 68. Seven post-excavation confirmation samples were collected, and two of the samples exceeded target cleanup levels prompting further excavation.

Mr. Calicchio stated that from October 5th to October 7th, three (3) roll offs of additional soil were excavated and transported to Aggregate Industries for recycling. Three additional confirmation

samples were collected, one of which exceeded the target cleanup levels. On October 21st, four more confirmatory samples were collected, all of which had results below the target cleanup levels.

Mr. Calicchio stated that from October 31st to November 1st the excavation was backfilled, and on November 2nd the area was loamed and re-seeded and the drainage ditch was re-installed with asphalt paving.

Mr. Calicchio then presented a map showing the two sample locations (SS-091 and SS-092) that initially exceeded the cleanup levels. He then stated that of the nine final confirmation samples, only one sample (SS-097) had detected concentrations of PAHs slightly higher than the current MCP S-1/GW-1 cleanup standards.

Mr. Calicchio noted that the average concentration of the confirmatory samples was below the current MCP S-1/GW-1 standards. He also noted that the maximum detected concentrations of PAHs in the confirmatory samples are below the proposed MCP Method 1 S-1/GW-1 standards, which are set to be promulgated in January 2006. The new standards will be:

- Benzo(a)anthracene – 7 mg/kg
- benzo(b)fluoranthene – 7 mg/kg
- benzo(a)pyrene – 2 mg/kg

Mr. Calicchio stated that it was difficult to remove more soil due to multiple conduits west of Buildings 62 and 68, and further excavation posed a risk to the footings of Building 62.

Mr. Miller asked if the confirmatory sample concentrations were slightly in excess of what was hoped.

Mr. Calicchio answered that one sample location was slightly in excess of the targeted clean-up levels.

Mr. Miller asked if the state and federal guidelines were forgiving about the exceedance.

Ms. Williams responded that they were.

Mr. Miller asked about the method of recycling the contaminated soil into asphalt and if there were any risks associated with it or if it was a safe way of disposing it.

Mr. Calicchio stated that asphalt typically contains most of the PAH components found in the soil. The concentrations that were found in the soils at the Building 62 and 68 are far lower than what is typically found in asphalt.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if petroleum grade compounds have ever been found in wells in the Building 62 and 68 area.

Mr. Pickett answered that he was not aware of any.

Mr. Palaia stated that he also did not think any were found in wells in the Building 62 and 68 area.

Draft Community Relations Plan Update

Mr. McHugh stated that he wanted to preface the presentation by saying that the Army wanted to develop a cooperative Community Relations Plan among the Army, the regulators, the RAB, and the Natick community. He noted that previous discussions produced good ideas and the Army wanted to evolve the draft plan into a document that would work for all stakeholders.

Mr. James Connolly stated that the original Community Relations Plan development began in 1993-1994 with a comprehensive survey, which included questionnaires distributed to over 1,000 employees and telephone surveys of over 950 Natick residents. The original plan was developed in July 1996 and was based on the results of the 1993-1994 survey. He noted that environmental newsletters have been distributed since that time, environmental open houses were held in 1995 (two) and 2000, and public notifications and press releases have been distributed.

The U.S. Army Environmental Center awarded a contract in the spring of 2005 to update a number of different aspects of the plan. After a series of meetings and interview letters sent to the community, RAB members, and regulators, a draft Community Relations Plan (updating the July 1996 plan) was provided in October 2005.

Mr. Connolly indicated that one of the first steps in revising the plan was to generate a list of people to interview to identify potential concerns of the stakeholders, and how to respond to those concerns. Initially members included RAB members, elected officials, regulators, and the entire mailing list from the 1996 newsletter. Town boundaries were defined by Route 9 to the north, Route 135 to the south, Main Street to the east, and Lake Cochituate to the west. One-hundred and twenty nine (129) people were sent letters inviting them to be interviewed, and 34 people agreed to be interviewed between June 27^h and July 28th at participants' places of business, the local library, or over the phone.

Mr. Connolly stated that the purpose of the interviews were to identify issues and concerns that the community might have, to see if the Army was communicating effectively with the public, and determine how the Army could better communicate with the public via its community outreach and involvement efforts. He noted that the interviewers asked each participant a series of 22 questions, and he said that not all participants answered every question. Mr. Connolly indicated that the 22 questions were included in the Draft Community Relations Plan that was handed out.

Dr. Vembu asked if the draft was based on the 34 interviews.

Mr. Connolly responded that it was.

Mr. Connolly stated that the 22 questions were divided into four subsections, including: Community Perceptions, Installation Environmental Program Knowledge, Community Involvement Activities, and Community Comments.

Mr. Connolly then discussed the significant findings from the questionnaire, including:

- 27 participants indicated that they were aware of environmental concerns at SSC; 26 of which identified health issues as the primary concern
- The most prevalent concern expressed was the water quality of Natick's drinking water supply and Lake Cochituate.
- Several participants expressed concern about the location of the installation in a residential neighborhood and possibility of it being a "terrorist target".
- 19 participants thought they were adequately informed. In particular, one group including

RAB members, regulatory agency representatives, and several town officials were extremely well informed. Four people said they were not well informed, but thought it might be due to their own fault for not utilizing available resources.

Mr. Connolly then presented a breakdown of how participants thought they could be best informed concerning restoration activities at the installation. In general, public meetings, open houses, tours, newsletters, fact sheet mailings, newspaper/press releases, and the internet were preferred methods.

Mr. Connolly stated that a number of concerns resulting from the questionnaire have been incorporated into the updated Community Relations Plan. He also noted that a number of comments and recommendations identified opportunities that should be taken to improve communications, including:

- Status updates regarding cleanup activities are important to share with the community
- Newspapers and newsletters are the most important sources of community information
- RAB meetings were identified as an important source of information
- The newsletter was also a good source of information with limitations. The newsletter initially was sent out to several thousand people with a return postcard if you wanted to continue receiving the newsletter. Over the years, the number of people receiving the newsletter has dropped to about 1,200 people.

Mr. Connolly stated that the Army felt that it was doing a good job of informing some of the community and hoped that they were doing a good job of informing the RAB, the regulators, and town officials. The majority of the participants felt they were being adequately briefed. However, the Army was not reaching all of the community.

Dr. Vembu asked about how the list of 1,200 was arrived at. He asked that if people moved away, are they dropped from the list or is there some indicator to determine who is or is not interested?

Mr. Connolly responded that he did not have the list sorted by address, but it could be done.

Ms. Greendlinger asked how many of the 1,200 are employees?

Mr. Connolly responded that the list of 1,200 does not include any employees; it is only residents. All SSC employees originally received the questionnaire as a separate mailing.

Mr. McHugh stated that the original mailing went to a very wide distribution list, and that people could be dropped from the list in two ways: 1) if they returned the response card indicating they wanted to be dropped, or 2) they moved away.

Mr. Miller asked what the initial number was.

Mr. McHugh responded that he would check, but thought that it consisted of a large number of households in Natick.

Mr. Miller asked if the 1,200 was 50-percent less than the original mailing.

Mr. Connolly responded that it was less than 50-percent of the original mailing.

Mr. Miller asked if everyone from the original list was being kept on the list if they did not ask to be dropped.

Mr. McHugh stated that he thought that a person was dropped from the list if the newsletter came back as undeliverable or if they asked to be dropped from the list (via the returned response card). Mr. McHugh said that the first mailing went out in 1995, and that the original records should be available. He stated that he would check with the first mailing and see if the response card may have said that if you do not respond then you will not be put on the mailing list.

Mr. Miller asked if he could check that, because he was interested if it dropped 50-percent from the first round.

Mr. McHugh said that the initial mailing was very significant and was extremely costly (around \$20,000) due to printing and mailing.

Mr. Miller stated that he would like to know who may want to receive the newsletter that may have been dropped from the initial list.

Mr. Kaltofen noted that a large number of people downloaded the newsletter from his website.

Mr. McHugh asked if he could track the number.

Mr. Kaltofen said he could and thought the number was in the hundreds.

Mr. Connolly continued with the presentation and stated that more than half of the participants were unaware of the existence or contents of the information repositories or how to use them. He also stated that some were unaware that a RAB was already in place, but agreed that there should be an organization like the RAB in place.

Mr. Connolly stated that 24 of 32 people who answered the question were not sure if their concerns were being adequately represented.

Mr. Miller asked if this was an accurate description.

Mr. Connolly responded that of the 32 participants that responded to the specific question, 24 participants did not feel they are being adequately informed and that concrete steps need to be taken to enhance public involvement and ensure people are reached and informed. He stated again that some people were unaware there was a RAB, three people expressed interest in joining the RAB, and three people expressed interest in attending meetings, but not joining.

Mr. Miller asked if just six people expressed interest in the RAB.

Mr. Connolly responded that, yes, only six people expressed interest in the RAB.

Mr. Connolly stated that although the current RAB members preferred to hold the meetings at SSC, perhaps attendance might be improved if some target meetings were held in other areas, such as the town library.

Mr. Kaltofen said the Public Safety auditorium has been used for meetings in the past.

A discussion followed regarding the Selectman's meeting room as a possible venue, if available.

Mr. McHugh asked if the public would go to the Public Safety auditorium.

Mr. Kaltofen responded that he felt the Selectman's meeting room was the one where most people would likely attend.

Mr. Miller agreed, but said the Selectman's meeting room is usually tied up and the library availability is about the same. He also stated that the police and fire station rooms are not generally opened to the public and felt the library would be a better place for meetings because it wasn't as formidable as trying to enter the SSC installation.

Mr. McHugh stated that a meeting in the fall or spring in the town library could be looked into; however, arrangements needed to be made to stay later than 9:00 pm, if that is allowable.

Mr. Miller responded that arrangements could probably be made, but a custodian may be needed.

Mr. McHugh asked what the cost of the custodian might be.

Mr. Miller thought it was minimal, possibly \$50.

Ms. Greendlinger responded that fees were generally waived for government-related public meetings.

Mr. Kaltofen responded that another reason for having the RAB meetings at the SSC installation is to help educate the public about SSC and what happens here.

Mr. Connolly stated that it is possible that some people do not want to subject themselves to searches by attending RAB meetings at SSC, and perhaps one or two meetings could be held off post providing an overview or target topics to increase public participation.

Ms. Greendlinger noted that she felt that a mixture of RAB meetings should be held on- and off-post, but also suggested holding general public update/informational meetings. She stated that regular meetings should be held to present updates on the cleanup successes and the challenges that remain. She stated that they could be done in many different ways (presentations, newsletters, posters, a walk-through where people could ask questions at their own pace), but should be different than the RAB meeting format to encourage people to respond and be more involved.

Dr. Vembu asked how the 24 of 32 who answered the question that they felt their concerns were not being represented was determined. He noted that the questionnaire responses in the draft Community Relations Plan, were 8 for "yes", and 24 for "no response". He asked if "no response" means that they did not comment on it, or if they felt that their concerns were not being represented.

Mr. Connolly clarified that eight of the 32 responded that they thought their concerns were being well represented.

Dr. Vembu asked for further clarification of these numbers.

Mr. Connolly stated that the majority of the participants were not sure, but the bottom line was that communications need to improve and the Army would like the RAB's input on how to do that.

Mr. Miller added that he felt the participants were responding to whether they were being "adequately represented", and unless people can participate enough to understand, one cannot assume that they are being "adequately represented".

Mr. Kaltofen stated that he received a strong vote of no confidence from the chairman of the

Natick Board of Selectmen, who said that what bothered him was that the RAB meetings were not publicized as well as other meetings, even though the meetings are open to the public. Mr. Kaltofen noted that what he thought was missing was that the town clerk hadn't made a standard operating procedure of posting the RAB meetings like the other public meetings are posted. He said that some people depend on the system of looking on the bulletin board at the town hall, the local cable station, or at the Natick town website. He stated that he felt that the town clerk (Jane Hladick) should get the information to post with a proposed agenda for each RAB meeting.

Mr. Connolly said that he felt that this issue was corrected in July, and that the newspaper advertisement announcing each RAB meeting and the associated agenda are being sent to the town clerk for posting. He stated that this procedure is not in the draft Community Relations Plan, but it should be.

Ms Greendlinger asked if the town clerk was posting this information.

Mr. Connolly responded that he did not know, but would find out. He commented that the town clerk is now being directed by the selectman to publish when the RAB meetings are happening and would continue to do so.

Mr. Miller commented that the town has a website, but felt that it was deficient in many ways. He stated that a private group started an unofficial town website called www.natick.info, and felt that the Army should look into it as somewhere to post meeting announcements.

Mr. McHugh stated that they would look into it.

Mr. McHugh asked if the Conservation Commission or Open Space Committee meeting minutes were posted on the official town website.

Mr. Miller said that he thought they were posted on the www.natick.com website.

Mr. Kaltofen said that he thought the minutes were posted somewhere on the server and were searchable.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that he thought that a newspaper advertisement or a press release may possibly interest cable news to cover the meetings.

Ms. Greendlinger commented that the local cable stations normally run community activity lists and that as a general rule, any press releases should be sent to a media distribution list.

Dr. Vembu asked if it would be easier to have the town selectmen or town clerk come to the RAB meetings.

Mr. McHugh said the Army has a duty to notify the town clerk.

Ms. Greendlinger commented that the town clerk should be added to the e-mail distribution list.

Mr. McHugh responded that she already was.

Mr. Campbell felt that a major problem is that the regular RAB members don't show up at every meeting. However, if the cable media were going to be involved, there may be greater participation.

Ms. Greendlinger responded that media coverage may generate interest in people who may want

to become RAB members, and suggested that the Army check with the current RAB members to see why they are not coming on a regular basis (e.g., is it personal, business, or something else not compelling them to attend; is it something that can be controlled by the RAB members). She stated that by getting out to the community, you get other people's interest, whether it be as a RAB member or being in the audience, giving people the opportunity to participate.

Mr. Connolly commented that the Army would have to look into the additional expense of running commercial advertising or other forms of advertising if they became methods of communicating with the public.

Ms. Greendlinger asked if the town of Natick had talk radio, and if so, was it a major force in the town. She stated that in some of the communities she has dealt with, many people listened to talk radio.

Mr. Kaltofen responded that Natick does not have local talk radio.

A discussion followed about press releases and their effectiveness.

Ms. Williams thought that the soil cleanup at the Buildings 62 and 68 site would provide a great success story for a press release and might stimulate interest from the community. She asked how many tons of soil were cleaned up.

Dr. Vembu stated 150 cubic yards.

Mr. McHugh said eight roll offs.

Ms. Williams said that would be a great story to tell.

Mr. Connolly stated that the RAB missed an opportunity to participate in the recent Natick Days, and asked if anybody knew of a similar type of activity in the spring. He noted that it might be good to go out and talk to people, possibly at the Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, Lions Club, or any other organization to get people involved and provide a status update, possibly once or twice a year.

Dr. Vembu stated that he was still concerned about the number of non-responses on the questionnaire – only 34 of 129 agreed to be interviewed. He asked what the target approach of selecting the 129 was?

Mr. Connolly responded that some people did not know as much as they would like, but it was the Army's responsibility to inform people, even if just a few people wish to be involved.

Mr. Miller commented that he didn't have confidence that advertising would help, but felt that reporters could make more of a difference, especially if you can get a reporter interested in a particular activity – the resulting article is likely to be better received by the community. He stated that the RAB could give materials to reporters. He stated that if there is a panic, it will be reported, but the reporters need to be involved in other aspects. Mr. Miller said that he did not feel Natick Days was very effective since this was its first year and it had little publicity. He felt that it would have a better response next year.

Mr. McHugh stated that the press releases going out are for RAB meetings, and he felt that the RAB meetings were pretty technical in nature. He noted that these press releases may not interest the general public and felt it was an area to focus on.

Mr. Kaltofen said that using the library for meetings could create some issues, because you have to be let in by a librarian and sign into a locked room.

Ms. Greendlinger felt that press releases regarding soil removal activities were a good opportunity and that there should be a press release when a removal starts and another one when it ends. She stated that a photo opportunity or press event around different activities could generate a reporter's interest. She stated that some of the work at the installation could possibly make good photo opportunities, or perhaps just a picture with a caption.

A discussion followed about reporters and how long they usually last (less than one year), and turnover is high within the industry.

Mr. Campbell responded that getting new reporters involved is difficult because they usually want to know everything that has been done over the past 10 to 15 years in a 5-10 minute phone interview.

Ms. Greendlinger responded that that is why the Army has a public affairs person. She said that the job of regulators is to provide information to people – it is an opportunity to educate the reporters so they can help pass the word to the public.

Mr. Connolly commented that the newsletters are sent to people expressing interest in them, but the Army is also looking at sending copies to the libraries, town offices, and websites.

Mr. Connolly asked the RAB members to make written comments and suggestions on the draft Community Relations Plan within 30 days, because the U.S. Army Environmental Center wanted to have the plan finalized by January 2006 since their contract is about to run out.

Ms. Greendlinger commented that it would be beneficial for the plan to reflect a range of opportunities. She said that it didn't have to be prescriptive, but should allow for a range of flexibility depending on what makes sense for that year and the type of work going on and length of activity.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if the RAB is mentioned on the Natick Labs website

Mr. Connolly responded that press releases for the RAB meetings are usually on the Natick Labs website.

Ms. Greendlinger asked if there was a link to the newsletters on the Natick Labs website.

Mr. McHugh stated that after 9/11, with the heightened national security, maps and other information were eliminated from the site. He stated that they could look into whether the newsletter could be posted on the Natick Labs website.

Ms. Williams asked if the newsletter could be posted on the EPA Superfund website dedicated to the Natick site.

Ms. Greendlinger said that it could be.

Dr. Vembu asked if it would be possible to conduct the RAB meetings at the town hall or a more accessible place, instead of going through all the security checks at the installation.

Mr. Kaltofen responded that it would be useful, but it might be difficult to reserve the room.

Mr. McHugh stated that he thought the town library might work the best for some meetings.

Mr. McHugh commented that they would try to have minutes available earlier than usual. He stated that the upcoming schedule is busy, especially in the spring, with more activity than the past few years.

Mr. Kaltofen commented that by distributing the agenda, more members would be interested in attending the meetings.

Mr. Kaltofen asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Mr. McHugh asked about when to schedule the next RAB meeting. January 19, 2006 was agreed as a tentative date for the next RAB meeting.

Mr. McHugh said that a draft agenda would be made available for comment prior to the next RAB meeting.

Dr. Vembu stated that the comments on the draft Community Relations Plan are due in a month's time and he was putting it as December 15, 2005 for a due date.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that comments should go directly to Jim Connolly in a month.

Ms. Greendlinger asked if there were any other days like Arbor Day, Earth Day, or somewhere similar where the material could be presented.

Mr. Kaltofen responded that there were similar events, but they are usually limited to park cleanup and trail cleanup days.

Mr. Miller said that there was a bio-diversity week possibly in June, but normally it consisted of nature activities. He stated that other groups like the Cochituate State Park have more planned events and there may be opportunities to get involved with them. He also stated that the health fair at the Leonard Morse Hospital is well received and may be another event to look at getting more involved with.

Mr. Miller wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving, Happy Holidays, and a Happy New Year.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Action Items:

1. Mr. McHugh stated that the original mailing went to a very wide distribution list, and that people could be dropped from the list in two ways: 1) if they returned the response card indicating they wanted to be dropped, or 2) they moved away.

Mr. Miller asked what the initial number was.

Mr. McHugh responded that he would check, but thought that it consisted of a large number of households in Natick.

2. Mr. McHugh stated that he thought that a person was dropped from the list if the newsletter came back as undeliverable or if they asked to be dropped from the list (via the returned response card). Mr. McHugh said that the first mailing went out in 1995, and that the original records should be available. He stated that he would check with the first

mailing and see if the response card may have said that if you do not respond then you will not be put on the mailing list.

Mr. Miller asked if he could check that, because he was interested if it dropped 50-percent from the first round.

3. Mr. Kaltofen stated that he received a strong vote of no confidence from the chairman of the Natick Board of Selectmen, who said that what bothered him was that the RAB meetings were not publicized as well as other meetings, even though the meetings are open to the public. Mr. Kaltofen stated that what he thought was missing was the town clerk hadn't made a standard operating procedure of posting the RAB meetings like the other public meetings are posted. He said that some people depend on the system of looking on the bulletin board at the town hall, the local cable station, or at the Natick town website. He stated that he felt that the town clerk (Jane Hladick) should get the information to post with a proposed agenda for each RAB meeting.

Mr. Connolly said that he felt that this issue was corrected in July, and that the newspaper advertisement announcing each RAB meeting and the associated agenda are being sent to the town clerk for posting. He stated that this procedure is not in the draft Community Relations Plan, but it should be.

Ms Greendlinger asked if the town clerk was posting this information.

Mr. Connolly responded that he did not know, but would find out. He commented that the town clerk is now being directed by the selectman to publish when the RAB meetings are happening and would continue to do so.

4. Mr. Miller commented that the town has a website, but felt that it was deficient in many ways. He stated that a private group started an unofficial town website called www.natick.info, and felt that the Army should look into it as somewhere to post meeting announcements.

Mr. McHugh stated that they would look into it.

5. Mr. Connolly commented that the newsletters are sent to people expressing interest in them, but the Army is also looking at sending copies to the libraries, town offices, and websites.
6. Mr. Connolly asked the RAB members to make written comments and suggestions on the draft Community Relations Plan within 30 days, because the U.S. Army Environmental Center wanted to have the plan finalized by January 2006 since their contract is about to run out.

7. Ms. Greendlinger asked if there was a link to the newsletters on the Natick Labs website.

Mr. McHugh stated that after 9/11, with the heightened national security, maps and other information were eliminated from the site. He stated that they could look into whether the newsletter could be posted on the Natick Labs website.

8. Ms. Williams asked if the newsletter could be posted on the EPA Superfund website dedicated to the Natick site.

Ms. Greendlinger said that it could be.

9. Mr. McHugh said that a draft agenda would be made available for comment prior to the next RAB meeting.
10. Dr. Vembu stated that the comments on the draft Community Relations Plan are due in a month's time and he was putting it as December 15, 2005 for a due date.

Mr. Kaltofen stated that comments should go directly to Jim Connolly in a month.