



**COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN**  
**Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study**  
**Penobscot River, Maine**

*Prepared for:*

**United States District Court  
District of Maine**

*Prepared by:*

**Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.**  
511 Congress Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Maine 04101

Project No. 3616166052

**Final  
Revision 0**

**July 27, 2018**



**COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN**  
**Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study**  
**Penobscot River, Maine**

*Prepared for:*

**United States District Court**  
**District of Maine**

*Prepared by:*

**Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.**  
511 Congress Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Maine 04101

Project No. 3616166052

**Final**  
**Revision 1**

**July 27, 2018**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Nelson Walter".

---

Nelson Walter, PE  
Principal Engineer

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mary Kelly".

---

Mary Kelly  
Community Involvement Specialist

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 BACKGROUND.....	2
3.0 CCIP STAGES.....	2
3.1 STAGE ONE – PRE-PLANNING AND RELATIONSHIP BUILDING.....	3
3.2 STAGE TWO – ISSUE SCOPING, KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND TRANSPARENCY.....	4
3.3 STAGE THREE –PHASE III REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS REVIEW BY COURT.....	5
3.4 STAGE FOUR – COURT DECISION.....	7
3.5 STAGE FIVE – IMPLEMENTATION OF COURT DECISION.....	8
4.0 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF ENGAGEMENT.....	10
5.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	12
6.0 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION.....	12
7.0 PARTICIPATION ACTIVITY TRACKING AND MANAGEMENT.....	13
8.0 MANAGEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS.....	13
9.0 EVALUATION FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT.....	15
10.0 REFERENCES.....	15

## TABLES

Table 1	Public Participation Levels of Engagement
Table 2	Management of Expectations Framework

## APPENDICES

Appendix A	Stakeholder Directory
------------	-----------------------



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (Amec Foster Wheeler) was retained by the United States District Court for the District of Maine (the Court) to complete an Evaluation of Potential Active Remedies, the Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study (Phase III Engineering Study). The Phase III Engineering Study requires a thorough and independent identification and evaluation of potential active remedial measures to speed the recovery of the Penobscot River and Estuary from mercury contamination.

The Phase III Engineering Study is currently underway, and a final report will be submitted to the Court by September 14, 2018. The evaluation of potential remedial alternatives will be designed to identify feasible, effective, cost-effective remedial alternatives to achieve the objectives set forth by the Court and the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act* (RCRA). Once the Phase III Engineering Study is complete, the Court will assess the recommended options set forth and will determine an appropriate path forward.

As part of the Phase III Engineering Study, this Communication and Community Involvement Plan (CCIP) has been prepared to:

- Build awareness and educate stakeholders about the Phase III Engineering Study, challenges, proposed alternatives and selected evaluation criteria;
- Solicit feedback on stakeholders' interest in the project; and
- Solicit feedback about the Phase III Engineering Study, proposed alternatives, and potential implementation of these alternatives.

The CCIP was not part of direction provided by the Court; however, Amec Foster Wheeler identified the need and value of an involvement process in the consideration of remedial alternatives and future implementation of selected remedial alternatives. A defined stakeholder involvement process supports projects through the sharing of relevant, accessible information, providing opportunities for input and establishing clear expectations on how that input will be considered, therefore enabling stakeholders to see their voice in the process while avoiding stakeholder fatigue. The CCIP has been designed as a living document to support the Court through deliberations, decisions, and implementation of those decisions that may affect stakeholders. The CCIP is designed to be updated as new information arises and feedback is received. This document has been developed based on our current knowledge of the project and engagement with various stakeholder groups along the Penobscot River and Estuary.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

Beginning in 1967, a chlor-alkali plant located in Orrington, Maine, released mercury into the Penobscot River. The amount of mercury released annually decreased between 1970 and 1982 and decreased further when the plant was closed in 2000. Measured elevated levels of methylmercury in sediments and biota led to legal action by the Maine People's Alliance in 2000. This group joined with the Natural Resources Defense Council to bring a lawsuit, pursuant to the imminent and substantial endangerment provision of RCRA, against HoltraChem Manufacturing Company, LLC, which owned the plant at the time the suit was filed, and against Mallinckrodt Inc., who, with its affiliates and predecessor, owned the plant from 1967 until 1982. After a trial in July 2002, the Court ruled in the plaintiffs' favor, ordered an independent scientific study, later named the Penobscot River Mercury Study (PRMS), and appointed a Study Panel to complete the PRMS.

Two phases of the PRMS were previously completed. After the Study Panel presented the Court with the Phase II report, the Court held a bench trial in June 2014. The Court issued an opinion on September 2, 2015, and a follow-up order issued on October 16, 2015, in which the Court mandated *"an immediate, thorough, open, and independent identification and evaluation of potential active remedies to speed the recovery of the Penobscot River estuary from its present state of mercury contamination."* The study area includes land from the former Veazie Dam south to Upper Penobscot Bay, including Mendall Marsh and the Orland River (Penobscot River and Estuary).

The Court selected Amec Foster Wheeler to conduct the Phase III Engineering Study. The intent of the Phase III Engineering Study is to identify remedial alternatives for the Court to deliberate and ultimately decide which alternative, or combination of alternatives to implement, if any. As part of the scope of work for the Phase III Engineering Study, Amec Foster Wheeler completed the community research required to prepare a draft CCIP. The intent of the CCIP is to guide engagement activities from the initiation of the Phase III Engineering Study (Stage One of the CCIP) to implementation of the Court decision (Stage Five of the CCIP). The five stages of the CCIP are described in detail in Section 3.0.

## 3.0 CCIP STAGES

Amec Foster Wheeler has recommended five distinct stages to help guide and give structure to engagement activities as they relate to each of the predicted milestones of the project. These stages consist of:

- Stage One – Pre-Planning and Relationship Building
- Stage Two – Information Sharing and Transparency

- Stage Three – Alternatives Information, Transparency and Court Deliberation
- Stage Four – Court Decision
- Stage Five – Implementation of Court Decision

Amec Foster Wheeler committed to specific engagement activities in the scope of work, which were initiated in early 2017. The activities undertaken to date are considered to be part of Stage One and Stage Two.

### 3.1 STAGE ONE – PRE-PLANNING AND RELATIONSHIP BUILDING

CCIP Stage One was initiated at the launch of the Phase III Engineering Study. The intent of Stage One was to determine communication guidelines and messaging, identify potentially interested community groups, map stakeholder relationships and interactions, and make initial contact with key stakeholders.

Several tools and activities were employed during Stage One for the purpose of introducing and sharing information about the project to potential stakeholders:

- **Stakeholder Directory and Mailing List:** A stakeholder directory that includes stakeholder names and contact information was developed. From the stakeholder directory, a mailing list was developed to help ensure that information about the Phase III Engineering Study reaches the target audience (interested stakeholders) in a timely and transparent manner.
- **Stakeholder Mapping:** While detailed stakeholder mapping is not recommended until relationships have been further developed with community groups, it is beneficial to develop a framework to guide the mapping process. The framework has been populated with baseline information during this stage but should be revisited and updated as connections are made, and more is learned about the interests, priorities and interactions of the stakeholders.
- **Website:** A project website specific to the Phase III Engineering Study (<http://www.penobscotmercurystudy.com/home>) was developed to share information with stakeholders, and should continue to be used to facilitate the sharing of information in a timely and effective manner. The information on the website should mirror content / language presented in fact sheets, presentations, or other publicly-facing information avenues. Current information shared on the website includes:
  - A description of past and current studies including background, challenges, regulatory regime, next steps, and schedule;
  - A description of the environment including study area, a mercury overview, impacts of mercury on the Penobscot River and Estuary, and closures and advisories;

- A document repository to house key documents, fact sheets, presentations, maps and information shared by others; and
- Contact information, including a project contact email address and phone number.
- **Online Survey:** An online survey was developed to gather feedback from stakeholders regarding how they want to be engaged, their level of interest in the Phase III Engineering Study, and their knowledge of the project.
- **Emails:** Following development of the website, survey, and related messaging, several emails were sent to potentially interested stakeholders to introduce the Phase III Engineering Study, share the website, solicit input through the online survey, and offer the opportunity to meet and discuss the project.
- **Meetings:** Meetings were organized with interested community groups to share information and solicit feedback on the project.

One theme that emerged from the feedback received from interested community groups through emails and meetings was that stakeholders and the public are largely unaware of the project but are interested in becoming more informed. Amec Foster Wheeler recognizes that stakeholders need to be informed in order to participate meaningfully in an engagement program. Continuing to inform and share knowledge about the project and Phase III Engineering Study with the stakeholders is important to support successful planning and implementation of remedial alternatives and opportunities to share information have been identified as part of each stage.

### **3.2 STAGE TWO – ISSUE SCOPING, KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND TRANSPARENCY**

CCIP Stage Two is currently underway and will continue until the projected completion of the final Phase III Engineering Study report in September 2018. Until that time, Amec Foster Wheeler will continue to inform stakeholders about the project. Several other reports and studies will also be completed during this time and will be shared with stakeholders. The intent of this stage is to:

- Continue efforts to develop relationships with stakeholders;
- Respond to inquiries and maintain open lines of communication with stakeholders; and
- Educate stakeholders on technical aspects of the Phase III Engineering Study and other relevant studies to keep them informed and engaged with the project using a variety of tools for maximum outreach.

Several tools and activities may be used to advance these goals:

- **Fact Sheets:** A plain-language fact sheet will be prepared that will summarize the recommendations of the Phase III Engineering Study. Its release will coincide with the public release of the Phase III Engineering Study to share with and inform the community about the recommendations before the Court, the proposed technologies and locations, the benefits and challenges, the process and next steps. Regarding process, information should be provided to identify and explain the differences between this process and the typical process at other site clean-ups conducted by United States Environmental Protection Agency or state agencies under *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act* (CERCLA) or state laws. This will assist with transparency and managing stakeholder expectations regarding the recommendations, process and schedule. This tool was also requested by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection to assist the agency in responding to questions about the recommended remedial alternatives.
- **Website:** The website will be maintained and will be updated as information becomes available. The following information has been identified and will be added to the website or considered during this stage:
  - Final copies of supporting reports that are scheduled to be completed during this stage will be posted to the website.
  - The Phase III Engineering Study final report will be posted to the website once released by the Court.
- **Emails:** Information bulletins will be emailed to stakeholders to inform them of new information / reports / schedule adjustments that have been posted to the website. An email message will be used to inform stakeholders when the final Phase III Engineering Study report is available. A link to the fact sheet summarizing the recommendations will be included in this email.
- **CCIP Transition Planning:** Amec Foster Wheeler's currently contracted involvement will end with completion of this stage. If another group is engaged by the Court to continue the communication and community involvement process, a transition plan should be developed with the Future Consulting Team to guide the transfer of information, management of the website, and responsibility and ownership of the goals of the CCIP.

### **3.3 STAGE THREE –PHASE III REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS REVIEW BY COURT**

Amec Foster Wheeler is recommending that CCIP Stage Three would be initiated when the final Phase III Engineering Study is released to the public (tentatively July 2018), the Parties review and present to the Court their views on the recommendations, and the Court begins its deliberations. The Phase III Engineering Study will include recommended remedial alternatives

for the Court's consideration. If selected, these recommended remedial alternatives have the potential to affect stakeholders. The intent of this stage is to:

- Provide information in plain-language to stakeholders about each of the remedial alternatives;
- Provide opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on the remedial alternatives so that the feedback can be considered in the selection and planning for implementation of alternatives, as appropriate; and
- Set clear expectations for stakeholder involvement during Court deliberations (e.g., stakeholders may not have an opportunity to provide direct feedback to the Court).

During this stage, it would be important to continue to provide and deliver information to stakeholders in ways that maximize understanding and accessibility. With this in mind, some or all of the following tools and activities can be used to help advance the goals of this stage:

- **Public Presentations:** Sharing project information through various types of media can help to foster more thorough understanding and interest in the project. If there is interest, it may be beneficial to prepare and deliver a presentation, or series of presentations about the remedial alternatives to stakeholder groups. The presentation should be highly visual, use plain language, and be delivered in-person with ample time allotted to answer questions and further discuss the information presented with attendees.
- **Fact Sheets:** Share fact sheets on different aspects of the remedial alternatives over the course of the Court's review. Each fact sheet can focus on a technology or area. They should communicate the benefits and challenges as well as the next steps that would be required. The fact sheets should be posted on the website and emailed to the stakeholder list on a regular basis (i.e., every 3, 4, 6 months) for the duration of deliberations. This would assist with keeping lines of communication open, provide transparency and continue to set expectations. This process also builds knowledge within the community that contributes towards individuals being able to develop an informed opinion and provide informed input and sets the stage for a better understanding when the Court releases its decision. Recommended fact sheets include:
  - Mendall Marsh,
  - Orland River,
  - Orrington,
  - Thin layer capping, including associated long-term management and adaptive management,
  - Dredging, including associated long-term management and adaptive management, and

- Monitored Natural Recovering (including Enhanced), including associated long-term management and adaptive management.
- **Website:** The fact sheets series should be posted on the website as they are released. The website should also be updated with links to additional information related to the project and remedial alternatives as they become available. It is also recommended that a frequently asked questions page be developed to support addresses known and reoccurring inquiries about the project.
- **Emails Update:** Regular email updates should be sent out sharing information as it becomes available, such as links to the fact sheet, event announcements, a list frequently asked questions page and introduction of the interactive public kiosk.

### 3.4 STAGE FOUR – COURT DECISION

It is recommended that CCIP Stage Four would begin when the Court reaches a decision on the recommended remedial alternatives. The intent of this stage is to maintain transparency and inform stakeholders about the Court's decision in a timely and effective manner. The Future Consulting Team would be responsible to select tools and activities that advance the goals and principles of the CCIP. Suggested tools and activities include the following.

- **Finalize Stakeholder Mapping:** During this stage and in preparation for Stage Five, the stakeholder mapping should be updated and finalized. Understanding stakeholder needs, concerns, and interactions would help when it comes time to determine how specific stakeholders would be engaged as part of Stage Five.
- **Court Decision Summary Fact Sheet:** A plain language fact sheet that summarizes the Court's decision should be prepared and available to stakeholders as soon as possible after the Court decision is released.
- **Website:** The website should be updated as soon as possible following the Court's decision with a copy of the decision, the fact sheet summarizing the Court's decision, and an update of the frequently asked questions page. Regarding the frequently asked questions page, stakeholders are likely to have several questions regarding the Court decision and how it might affect them as stakeholders. Where possible, the team should try to predict questions that may arise with the announcement of the Court decision. These questions can be prepared in advance, vetted and shared along with the announcement of the Court decision.
- **Interactive Public Kiosk:** As part of this stage of the project an interactive public information kiosk may provide a valuable way to engage the public and introduce the remedial alternatives to river users who are not already engaged as part of the stakeholder groups identified. Once the kiosk is in place, the information shared at this venue can be adjusted to reflect important knowledge and shared as part of subsequent stages of the CCIP. The kiosk could take many forms (such as a refurbished boat, beachside information booth, travelling open house etc. but should be designed in a way that it can go to where the people are to maximize visibility and reach as large of a population of river users as possible).

- **Email Update:** An email update should be prepared including links to the Court decision, the fact sheet and frequently asked questions. As always, stakeholders should be invited to ask question and provide feedback.
- **Public Presentations or Meetings:** Presentation or public meetings should be considered to share information about the Court decision. These meetings should reflect the remedial alternatives selected and locations of the proposed work and known interested stakeholders, such as:
  - Mendall Marsh: with the municipalities that surround Mendall Marsh, general public around Mendall Marsh and those who have expressed specific interests in the marsh.
  - Frankfort Flats, Verona East, and Orland River: with the municipalities that surround the proposed work sites, general public, those who would be directly affected / interested by in-water works, and those who have expressed specific interests in these areas.
  - Orrington: with the municipalities that surround the proposed work sites, general public, those who would be directly affected / interested by in-water works, and those who have expressed specific interests in these areas. There should be a consideration of communication regarding the proposed work in relation to the extensive efforts that have occurred historically in this area to support an informed understanding as to the need for additional work.
  - Regulatory agencies that may have a direct interest and role in the management and/or approvals.
  - Penobscot Indian Nation Council and its representatives.
  - Lobster and crab fishermen associations, members and their representatives.

### 3.5 STAGE FIVE – IMPLEMENTATION OF COURT DECISION

Amec Foster Wheeler is recommending that CCIP Stage Five would coincide with the implementation of the Court decision regarding remedial action(s) to address the mercury impacts to the Penobscot River and Estuary. Regardless of the remedial action(s) the Court chooses to apply, some degree of communication and community involvement is warranted throughout implementation stage. There are significant opportunities during this stage to include stakeholders as participants and advocates in the implementation of the Court decision. However, the level of stakeholder involvement that is feasible and appropriate during this stage cannot be determined until:

- The determined remedial action(s) have been selected and released to the public;
- Information is available about how and when the remedial actions would be implemented;

- Stakeholder groups most likely to be affected and the degree of impact are identified; and
- A decision is made about who would be implementing the remedial action activities.

Based on the recommended remedial alternatives in the Phase III Engineering Study and Amec Foster Wheeler's understanding of the current stakeholder environment, the following tools and activities are suggested for consideration in the detailed planning of Stage Five. These recommendations should be further refined (detailed planning) so that they are of appropriate scope and activity to the selected remedial alternatives.

- **Website:** The website should be maintained and updated as appropriate.
- **Meetings:** Meetings should be conducted with individuals or groups as appropriate. It is recommended that the following meetings be considered:
  - Local municipalities to discuss and share remedial plans.
  - Penobscot Indian Nation Tribal Council and representatives,
  - Lobstermen and crab fishermen,
  - River users (such as river captains), and
  - Local school boards / education institutes.
- **Youth Outreach:** Consider opportunities to involve local youth through collaboration with local schools. Opportunities may exist to use remedial activities as in-class projects associated with curriculum for various age groups. This activity develops capacity among local Youth and also provides a mechanism to further inform communities.
- **Community Liaison Panels:** These mixed stakeholder groups would support informing the implementation of the selected alternatives and further information sharing within stakeholder groups. It is recommended that three to four panels be established for:
  - Mendall Marsh,
  - Orland River, East Verona, and
  - Orrington.

## 4.0 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF ENGAGEMENT

This CCIP has been prepared according to internationally-recognized principles for public participation, such as the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), which are as follows:

- **Early notification.** Information about the project will be provided to stakeholders and Indigenous communities in a comprehensive and timely manner to facilitate early and meaningful engagement.
- **Honest, open and transparent communication.** All pertinent information about the project will be shared with stakeholders and indigenous communities. Input from these groups will be sought, documented, and addressed. If input is not addressed, justification will be provided.
- **Accessible.** A variety of public participation techniques and methods will be used to distribute information about the project and to gather feedback. If requested, information will be provided in a language that facilitates understanding.
- **Inclusive.** The process will be inclusive and strive to include all known or self-identified stakeholders and welcome input received from those individuals and groups with a stake or interest in the project.
- **Flexible.** Feedback on the engagement process will be sought from interested parties to ensure that sufficient opportunities for meaningful input are provided.
- **Mutual Respect.** Respect will be given to the differing cultures, values and constraints of each party and to specific project timelines. There will be follow-through on commitments.
- **Efficiency.** The engagement process will be designed to make the most effective use of existing processes and resources while optimizing the contributions of all participants.
- **Timely.** Engagement is most effective if initiated as early as possible before decisions are made. Clear and reasonable timelines should be established for input and comments and these timelines need to be communicated clearly.

The implementation of this CCIP on the basis of the above principles is envisaged to generate the following overall benefits:

- The provision of first-hand information to all interested parties;
- Recognition and integration of stakeholder issues and concerns;
- Better understanding of shared interests;
- Better-informed, environmentally-sound decisions;

- Positive working relationships that could lead to long-term opportunities and benefits; and
- Compliance with potential Court and regulatory requirements and guidelines.

Effective communication and consultation connects options (such as key messaging and activities) to the needs of specific stakeholder groups. Amec Foster Wheeler chose to follow CERCLA’s community involvement process, which is based on IAP2, as a foundation for the development of the CCIP. The public participation spectrum outlined by IAP2 provides a guide to understanding and selection of tools to address stakeholder needs. The following graphic describes the relevant IAP2 levels of engagement as they apply to the Project. There are five levels of public participation/community engagement, ranging from "inform" (lowest level) to "empower" (highest level). The higher the level, the more influence the community has over the process and decisions. Due to the context of the situation (i.e., a litigation-driven, judicially-ordered study and remedial evaluation) and the complexity of the PRMS, activities selected as part of the CCIP are categorized within the Inform to Involve levels.

**TABLE 1**  
**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF ENGAGEMENT**  
**Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study**  
**Penobscot River Estuary, Maine**

<b>Level of Engagement</b>	<b>Public Participation Goal</b>	<b>Promise to the Public</b>
Inform	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, and/or solutions.	We will keep you informed.
Consult	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
Involve	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternative developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.

Source: IAP2 (2015)

The application of the levels of engagement and how they would be used to set and manage stakeholder expectations is discussed in detail in Section 8.0. Amec Foster Wheeler

recommends the following best practices on which to base potential involvement activities to further inform and involve the community during the project:

- Proactively reach out to the stakeholders by setting up information kiosks at locations such as community centres, parks, arenas, or libraries;
- Make it easier for the public to provide input through the use of online surveys communicated through post cards, information sheets, and website content;
- Build awareness of the project by considering alternative modes of communication (such as street signs and social media) and modifying standard modes (such as diversifying newspaper notice placement and appearance);
- Keep interested parties up to date about the project through website and newsletters;
- Partner with local municipalities and community associations to build awareness and further inform the public;
- Consider alternative methods to communicate complex aspects of the project (such as visualizations); and
- Build collaborative relationships that better inform the project through workshops with technical staff and agencies or stakeholder groups (such as advisory groups).

These principles, benefits, and best practices create the foundation of engagement planning and are considered and infused where possible into every component of this CCIP.

## **5.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Amec Foster Wheeler is responsible for the development of the CCIP and facilitating Stage One and Stage Two engagement activities (see Section 3.0) until the submission of the final Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study.

Following submission and acceptance of the final Phase III Engineering Study Report, the Court would be responsible for deciding if and how to implement the CCIP and carry engagement activities forward. Amec Foster Wheeler recommends that the mechanism to advance the CCIP through Stages Three to Five should be determined in advance of the end of Amec Foster Wheeler's scope of work, to ensure there is some overlap and a smooth transition of responsibilities to the Future Consulting Team.

## **6.0 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION**

Amec Foster Wheeler has developed and currently manages a stakeholder directory that includes community groups with the potential to be affected by the implementation of

recommended remedial options (Appendix A). The directory includes the name of each organization, individual, and/or community group; the stakeholder category that best represents their interests given information available; contact information; and links to organization websites.

Each stakeholder group has the potential to be affected by the project in different ways and to different degrees. It is important to recognize and make efforts to accommodate the needs of each stakeholder where possible, so they feel as though they have been meaningfully engaged and involved in the project. As relationships with each stakeholder are further developed, the level at which they want / need to be engaged about the project (Section 4.0) should be recorded in the directory along with their preferred communication methods (i.e., phone, email, newsletter) to ensure that stakeholders are receiving relevant, important information in a timely and effective manner.

The stakeholder directory is meant to be a living document that would be updated as information, preferences, and motivations change throughout all stages of the project.

## **7.0 PARTICIPATION ACTIVITY TRACKING AND MANAGEMENT**

Participation activities to date have been tracked using an excel tracking database. Records of contact (ROCs) between stakeholders and Amec Foster Wheeler have been collected since the Phase III Engineering Study was initiated and are maintained in a tracking database. ROCs should continue to be recorded and tracked using this system to ensure that a continuous, thorough record of engagement is available for the life of the project.

The information tracked includes the ROC number, date of contact, method of contact, event summary, and event participants. Each ROC entry is coded according to the topics discussed. By implementing a coding system for ROC topics, reports focused on specific topics can be generated if requests for information are required by the Court or regulators.

## **8.0 MANAGEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**

An introduction to the IAP2 levels of engagement was provided in Section 4.0. Not all levels of engagement are appropriate for every stakeholder at every stage of the project. In order to determine the level of engagement (or combination) needed, the potential expectations of each stakeholder must be evaluated. This evaluation was initiated as part of Stage One through the collection of stakeholder information and continued into Stage Two. As previously noted, any such further evaluation would depend upon decisions of the Court following the delivery of the Phase III Report. Information would be gathered from ongoing face-to-face meetings and

discussions with stakeholders, as well as through a review of available secondary sources and professional experience.

The evaluation should be revisited at each stage of the project, as stakeholder interests have the potential to change as the project progresses.

An effective and transparent engagement program requires clear guidelines for, and management of, the expectations of all parties involved in the project. Providing a framework to guide the way each stakeholder should be engaged and clearly communicating that framework in the early stages of relationship building will help to set clear expectations for levels of engagement for both the stakeholder and Amec Foster Wheeler or the Future Consulting Team. The IAP2 levels of engagement were used as a basis for the design of this framework. The process of setting expectations is interactive and is based on how the stakeholder rates their level of concern about the project. Each level of concern is paired with an appropriate level of engagement. Table 2 provides the level of engagement and types of activities that go towards addressing various levels of concern.

**TABLE 2  
 MANAGEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS FRAMEWORK**

**Penobscot River Phase III Engineering Study  
 Penobscot River Estuary, Maine**

<b>Level of Concern</b>	<b>Level of Engagement</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Tools</b>
Very low to low	Inform	Community stakeholders are kept informed through well balanced and objective information that assists in their understanding of the project.	Fact sheets, newsletters, websites, meetings and open houses.
Low to moderate	Consult	Community stakeholders are provided opportunities to have their concerns heard and the study team (Amec Foster Wheeler or Future Consulting Team) identifies how the public input would influence decisions.	Comment forms, surveys, focus groups, and public meetings.
Moderate to high	Involve	The study team works directly with its community stakeholders to understand their priorities and interests and incorporate them into the planning for the implementation of remedial alternatives selected by the Court.	Community liaison panels and workshops.

As new information becomes available following the release of the Phase III Engineering Study, Court deliberations, the Court decision, and implementation of remedial actions, the level of concern of stakeholders has the potential to change. Amec Foster Wheeler recommends engaging regularly with stakeholders and seeking feedback after new information is released to determine if their level of interest about the project or activity has changed. This may be

accomplished using a brief survey questionnaire attached to an email, discussed over the phone or as a link on the website.

## 9.0 EVALUATION FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT

Regular, meaningful engagement with stakeholders is valuable because it creates open lines of communication, develops trust, and maintains transparency. Regular contact and information-sharing can help to keep stakeholders interested and engaged and can also help the study team (Amec Foster Wheeler or the Future Consulting Team) to gauge the effectiveness of how the information was shared. The recommended evaluation process includes the following steps:

- **Create opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback:** Feedback tools such as surveys or questionnaires should be designed in a way that invites stakeholders to provide suggestions to improve communication about the project.
- **Review and track feedback regularly:** Feedback should be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and where feasible, the program should be adjusted to meet the needs of the stakeholders. Records of contact regarding communication activities and feedback received should be entered in the Tracking Database and adjustments to the CCIP in response to that feedback should be noted.
- **Follow up:** In some cases, the study team should make changes to the CCIP to accommodate the needs of the stakeholder, as appropriate. Regardless of the outcome, decisions made in response to feedback should be relayed back to the stakeholder to close the loop.

## 10.0 REFERENCES

International Association of Public Participation (IAP2). 2015. Public Participation Spectrum. Accessed November 2017 at:

[https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations\\_course/IAP2\\_P2\\_Spectrum\\_FINAL.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf).

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. Superfund Community Involvement Tools and Resources. Accessed May 2016 at:

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-community-involvement-tools-and-resources>.

---

**APPENDIX A**

Stakeholder Directory

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization	Organization Type
Mike	Belliveau		Environmental Health Strategy Center	Advocacy group
Nick	Battista	Policy Officer	Island Institute	Advocacy group
Kim	Burns	Chief Talent Officer	Island Institute	Advocacy group
Rob	Snyder	President	Island Institute	Advocacy group
			Action Committee of 50	Citizens' group
			AIM Bucksport (former Verso Mill property owners)	Citizens' group
Tom	King	President	Belfast Bay Watershed Coalition (also runs Penobscot Bay Stewards program)	Citizens' group
Hans	Carlson	Executive Director	Blue Hill Heritage Trust	Citizens' group
Ian	Stewart	Executive Director	Coastal Mountains Land Trust	Citizens' group
			Eddington Salmon Club	Citizens' group
Alan	Hutchinson	Executive Director	Forest Society of Maine	Citizens' group
			Friends of Fort Knox	Citizens' group
			Friends of Penobscot Bay	Citizens' group
			Friends of Sears Island	Citizens' group
Cheri	Domina	Executive Director	Great Pond Mountain Conservation Trust	Citizens' group
Barney	Hallowell	Executive Director	Hurricane Island Foundation	Citizens' group
Stephen	Miller	Executive Director	Islesboro Islands Trust	Citizens' group
Tony	DeFeo	President	Landmark Heritage Trust	Citizens' group
Gordon	Russell	Steering Committee Chair	Lower Penobscot Watershed Coalition	Citizens' group
Tim	Glidden	President	Maine Coast Heritage Trust	Citizens' group
Doug	Welch	Executive Director	Maine Island Trail Association	Citizens' group
Cheryl	Daigle	Executive Director	Maine Lakes Society	Citizens' group
Jesse	Graham	Executive Director	Maine People's Alliance	Citizens' group
Jody	Jones	Executive Director	Midcoast Conservancy	Citizens' group
Lisa	Pohlmann	Executive Director	Natural Resources Council of Maine	Citizens' group
Nancy	Galland		Penobscot Alliance for Mercury Elimination	Citizens' group
Robin	Alden	Executive Director	Penobscot East Resource Center (Maine Center for Coastal Fisheries)	Citizens' group
Andy	Goode		Penobscot River Restoration Trust	Citizens' group
Glendon	Brand	Chapter Director	Sierra Club (Maine Chapter)	Citizens' group
Kate	Dempsey	State Director	The Nature Conservancy (Maine)	Citizens' group
Jimmy	Matarazzo	Board Member	Veazie Salmon Club	Citizens' group
Linnell	Mather	Executive Director	Vinalhaven Land Trust	Citizens' group
M	Aube		Eastern Maine Development Corporation (EMDC)	Economic Development
Jen	Brooks	Director of Strategic Initiatives	Eastern Maine Development Corporation (EMDC)	Economic Development
			National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	Federal agency
			United States Coast Guard	Government - Federal (Agency)
			US Army Corps of Engineers, New England District	Government - Federal (Agency)
Alexandra	Dapolito Dunn	Regional Administrator	US EPA, Region 1	Government - Federal (Agency)
Anna	Harris	Project Lead	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Government - Federal (Agency)
Susan	Collins	US Senator	United States	Government - Federal (Elected)
Angus	King	US Senator	United States	Government - Federal (Elected)
Chellie	Pingree	US Representative	United States	Government - Federal (Elected)
Bruce	Poliquin	US Representative	United States	Government - Federal (Elected)
Catherine	Conlow	City Manager	City of Bangor	Government - Municipal
Lisa	Goodwin	City Clerk	City of Bangor	Government - Municipal
		Council	City of Bangor	Government - Municipal
Walter	Ash	Mayor	City of Belfast	Government - Municipal

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization	Organization Type
Amy	Flood	Clerk	City of Belfast	Government - Municipal
Joseph	Slocum	Manager	City of Belfast	Government - Municipal
Peter	Baldacci	Commissioner - District 1	County of Penobscot	Government - Municipal
Thomas	Davis	Commissioner - District 2	County of Penobscot	Government - Municipal
Laura	Sanborn	Commissioner - District 3	County of Penobscot	Government - Municipal
Barbara	Arseneau	Commissioner - District 4	County of Waldo	Government - Municipal
Amy	Fowler	Commissioner - District 3	County of Waldo	Government - Municipal
Betty	Johnson	Commissioner - District 1	County of Waldo	Government - Municipal
William	Shorey	Commissioner - District 2	County of Waldo	Government - Municipal
Antonio	Blasi	Commissioner - District 3	Hancock County	Government - Municipal
Percy	Brown	Commissioner - District 2	Hancock County	Government - Municipal
William	Clark	Commissioner - District 1	Hancock County	Government - Municipal
Debpraj	Plourde	Town Clerk	Searsport Maine	Government - Municipal
Kathy	Downes	Town Clerk	Town of Bucksport	Government - Municipal
Susan	Lessard	Town Manager	Town of Bucksport	Government - Municipal
David	Keene	Mayor / Council Chair	Town of Bucksport	Government - Municipal
Constantino	Basile	Selectmen, 1	Town of Castine	Government - Municipal
David	Unger	Chairman	Town of Castine	Government - Municipal
Peter	Vogell	Selectmen, 2	Town of Castine	Government - Municipal
Angus	Jennings	Town Manager	Town of Hampden	Government - Municipal
David	Ryder	Mayor	Town of Hampden	Government - Municipal
Paula	Scott	Town Clerk	Town of Hampden	Government - Municipal
Gary	Hunt	Chairman	Town of Hancock - Selectboard	Government - Municipal
Richard	Merchant	Vice-Chairman	Town of Hancock - Selectboard	Government - Municipal
Janet	Anderson	Town Manager	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Shey	Conover	School Committee Member	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Archibald	Gillies	Chair	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Hanna	Kerr	Selectmen	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Sandra	Oliver	Vice-Chair	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Gabriel	Pendleton	Selectmen	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Jay	Zlotkowski	Selectmen	Town of Islesboro	Government - Municipal
Connie	Brown	Town Clerk	Town of Orland	Government - Municipal
Ed	Rankin	Sr. Chair	Town of Orland	Government - Municipal
Paul	White	Town Manager	Town of Orrington	Government - Municipal
Sally	Bridges	Town Clerk	Town of Penobscot	Government - Municipal
Jill	Riley	Town Clerk	Town of Prospect	Government - Municipal
James	Gillway	Town Manager	Town of Searsport	Government - Municipal
James	Gillway	Town Manager	Town of Searsport	Government - Municipal
Loren	Cole	Town Manager (Interim)	Town of Stockton Springs	Government - Municipal
Marlene	Smith	Town Clerk	Town of Verona Island	Government - Municipal
Phillip G.	Pitula	Town Manager	Town of Winterport	Government - Municipal
Ralph	Gonzales	Selectmen	Town of Orland selectmen	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Les	Stackpole	Selectmen	Town of Orland selectmen	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Lesley	Cosmano	Selectmen	Town of Stockton Springs - Select Board	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Peter	Curley	Selectmen	Town of Stockton Springs - Select Board	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Sara	Skolfield	Selectmen	Town of Stockton Springs - Select Board	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Russell	Ames	2nd Selectmen	Town of Verona Island - Board of Selectmen	Government - Municipal (Elected)

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization	Organization Type
Glendon	Bevan	1st Selectmen	Town of Verona Island - Board of Selectmen	Government - Municipal (Elected)
Charles	Grindle	3rd Selectmen	Town of Verona Island - Board of Selectmen	Government - Municipal (Elected)
			Maine Board of Environmental Protection	Government - State
			Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)	Government - State
			Maine Department of Marine Resources (DMR)	Government - State
			Maine Department of Transportation (DOT)	Government - State
Owen	Casas	Representative (I-Rockport)	Maine Legislature	Government - State
			Maine Port Authority	Government - State
Anne (Pinny)	Beebe-Centre	Representative (D-Rockland)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Christine	Burstein	Representative (D-Lincolntonville)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Richard	Campbell	Representative (R-Orrington)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Ralph	Chapman	Representative (D-Brooksville)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Jim	Davitt	Representative(D-Hampden)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Mick	Devin	Representative (D-Newcastle)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Jeff	Evangelos	Representative (I-Friendship)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
James	Gillway	Representative(R-Searsport)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Adam	Goode	Representative (D-Bangor)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Erin	Herbig	Representative (D-Belfast)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Chuck	Kruger	Representative(D-Thomaston)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Walter	Kumiega	Representative (D-Deer Isle)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Karleton	Ward	Representative (R-Dedham)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Joan	Welsh	Representative (D-Rockport)	Maine House of Representatives	Government - State (Elected)
Chris	Johnson	Senator (D-Lincoln)	Maine Senate	Government - State (Elected)
Dave	Miramant	Senator (D-Camden)	Maine Senate	Government - State (Elected)
Kimberly	Rosen	Senator (R-Hancock)	Maine Senate	Government - State (Elected)
Michael	Thibodeau	Senator (R-Waldo)	Maine Senate	Government - State (Elected)
Paul	LePage	Governor	State of Maine	Government - State (Elected)
Wayne	Canning	Lobsterman	Maine Lobster Council, Zone D	Government - State (Industry Council)
			Maine Lobster Council, Zones C and D	Government - State (Industry Council)
		Town Clerk	Town of Orrington	Government - Municipal
John	Banks	Director, Natural Resources	Penobscot Indian Nation	Indigenous
Kirk	Francis	Chief	Penobscot Indian Nation	Indigenous
Dan	Kusnierz	Manager, Water Resources Program	Penobscot Indian Nation	Indigenous
Butch	Phillips	Elder	Penobscot Indian Nation	Indigenous
David	Black	Lobsterman		Individual
Mike	Hutchings	Lobsterman		Individual
Colette	Jardis			Individual
Drew	Laughland			Individual
Stacy	Leafsong			Individual
George	Whitridge			Individual
Skeet	Wyman			Individual
			Alewife Harvesters of Maine	Industry/workers' group
			Downeast Lobstermen's Association	Industry/workers' group
Brian	Downey	Forum Coordinator	Maine & New Hampshire Port Safety Forum	Industry/workers' group
			Maine Coast Fishermen's Association	Industry/workers' group
Ben	Martens	Executive Director	Maine Coastal Fishermen	Industry/workers' group
Rock	Alley	President	Maine Lobstering Union (Local 207)	Industry/workers' group

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization	Organization Type
Joel	Pitcher	Organizer	Maine Lobstering Union (Local 207)	Industry/workers' group
Patrice	McCarron	Executive Director	Maine Lobstermen's Association	Industry/workers' group
Kim	Ervin Tucker		Maine Lobstermen's Union	Industry/workers' group
Jen	Brooks	Director of Strategic Initiatives	Mobilize Eastern Maine	Industry/workers' group
Gelinas	David	Captain	Penobscot Bay & River Pilots Association	Industry/workers' group
			Bucksport Harbormaster	Land / Resource User
Douglas	Fournier	Captain	Penobscot Bay Tractor Tug Company	Land / Resource User
David	Thanhauser		Penobscot River Canoe and Kayak Trail	Recreation
Darron	Collins	President	College of the Atlantic	Research / Academic
Paul	Anderson	Director	Maine Sea Grant	Research / Academic
		Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Conservation Biology	University of Maine	Research / Academic