



# Meeting Minutes

Draft Minutes May 2009

## Partnering Team Meeting

Havelock, NC

May 20, 2009

1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

May 21, 2009

8:00 AM – 3:00 PM

OU14 PRAP Public Meeting, May 21, 2009

6:00 PM – 8:00 PM

### In Attendance:

Jeff Christopher, MCAS Cherry Point

Erica DeLattre, Rhēa

George Lane, NCDENR

Jan Nielsen, NAVFAC MIDLANT

Gena Townsend, USEPA

Doug Bitterman, CH2M HILL

Tim Wenk, CH2M HILL

### Guests:

Chris Berner, FRC East

Renee Clore, CH2M HILL

Bill Hannah, CH2M HILL

John Myers, MCAS Cherry Point

Barry Valicek, FRC East

### Roles:

Chair: Jan

Recorder: Tim

Timekeeper: Gena

Facilitator: Erica

Goalie: George

### Next meeting:

June 30-July 1, 2009;

Greensboro, NC

### Roles:

Chair: Erica

Recorder: Tim

Timekeeper: Jeff

Facilitator: George

Goalie: Gena

## FY09: Team Goals

- Draft OU1 Central Groundwater Plume FS
- OU1 Vapor Intrusion SAP
- OU1, Site 83 SAP
- Draft OU1, Site 16/83 FFS
- OU1, Site 17 Supplemental Investigation Report
- OU1, Sites 14, 15, 17, 18, and 40 ROD
- OU1 Groundwater Additional Investigation Report
- OU1, Site 16 AS/SVE System Removal Work Plan
- OU1, Tributary 2 Removal Action Close Out Report
- OU2, Site 10 FFS
- OU14 FS
- OU14 PRAP
- OU14 ROD

## FY09: Team Successes

- OU5 IRACR
- OU1 RI Addendum
- OU14 FS
- OU14 PRAP

# DECISIONS AND CONSENSUS ITEMS

- Decision Remove sample location adjacent to Building 1877 from the vapor intrusion SAP; building is not an enclosed structure
- Decision For Site 17:
- The presence of dieldrin is attributed to wide-spread use of pesticides at MCAS Cherry Point based on the low concentrations observed at the site and no known releases at the site. Dieldrin will not require any further action.
  - PCBs (Aroclor-1260) will be investigated further if the sample from the new permanent well at the site has detections above the MCLs. If the PCB results are non-detect or below the MCLs, there will be no further action for PCBs.

## ACTION ITEMS

### NEW ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description
0509-01	Bill	Send CD with OU1 RI Addendum appendices to Jeff
0509-02	Tim	Finalize minutes from January, February, and March 2009
0509-03	Bill	Re-send the correspondence from the state of North Carolina confirming that well records are not required for temporary wells to Jeff.

### ONGOING ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description
None		

### RESOLVED ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description
0309-01	Erica	Send Site 83 UFP-SAP to partnering team when it goes to the Navy chemist for review.
0309-02	Jan	Send new ROD guidance and presentation to the team (get from Donna Caldwell).
0309-03	Bill	Send vapor intrusion UFP-SAP to George and Gena when it goes to the Navy chemist for review.
0309-04	Doug	Send the OU14 PRAP presentation to Gena.
0309-05	Erica	OU3 look into specific data for groundwater monitoring well OU3-7GW08. The well is currently only sampled for cadmium, which may be the result of sediment in the sample. Specifically, the

		turbidity readings taken during the well sampling event should be reviewed.
0309-06	Bill	Send 2 hard copies of the OU1 RI Addendum to Jeff when it is complete.

**DAY 1: Tuesday, May 20, 2009**

**Meeting Check-In**

**Start Time 1300**

**Check-in and Meeting Administration**

*Check In*

The team checked in and discussed work and personal activities.

*Agenda Review*

The team reviewed the agenda for the meeting. There were no additions or requested changes.

*Ground Rules*

The ground rules were not covered this meeting.

*Meeting Minutes*

The meeting minutes for the January, February, and March 2009 meetings are not finalized. The receipt of remaining comments on the minutes was completed during the meeting and the minutes can be finalized.

**Improved ROD Format**

**Start - 1349**

Jan had discussions with Kirk and other Navy folks about what the Navy and EPA require for Improved RODs. Kirk attended a Camp Lejeune partnering meeting where a consensus was reached. This meeting was attended by USEPA lawyer for Camp Lejeune. Gena informed the team that EPA headquarters has not approved the new format yet. She believes EPA headquarters has not come to a consensus on how they want it to be handled and will not do so for a while.

Gena said she has Navy's draft guidance and has provided it to her attorney handling Camp Lejeune for review. She believes hyperlinks in the text will be an issue for headquarters and could be the deciding factor on the format being approved. If there is linked text and other things as a bonus it might be okay. However, we don't know where we will have pushback until we publish a document. Jan said the Navy standpoint is to not have hyperlinks and to make the document easy to follow; the goal is to make it clear and easy to read and understand. Gena said her internal attorneys should be fine with the Improved ROD as long as everything required is in the document and the guidance is followed.

Jeff said that, based on this discussion, he understands the problem to be the use of hyperlinks. Since the Navy said there should not be any hyperlinks, the problem should go away. He said he feels that the links were good because they pointed the reader to the additional information and took the reader straight to the document being referenced. Jeff asked if the extensive references would be necessary since the links are removed. Doug and Gena replied the reader

just has to go find it themselves in the administrative record. Bill added that there are some items that need to be pulled into the document, such as risk assessment numbers.

Jan said she discussed with her management the possibility of EPA not approving the Improved ROD format. If there is a risk of not getting approval Jan will provide management updates but for now we are on track.

### **OU1 Vapor Intrusion SAP**

**Start - 1405**

**Guests - Barry Valicek / FRC East  
Chris Berner / FRC East**

Jeff introduced the guests to the team. He invited them to the meeting to have the FRC East represented at the meetings when OU1 is discussed since they are involved with and work at the site.

Bill informed the team that he has received comments from everyone but Gena on the OU1 vapor intrusion SAP. George said he reviewed the SAP and did not have any comments. Bill said Jan had a few comments on the wording of a few items but they were not significant and did not result in changes in the investigation or approach.

Jan said the Navy likes this SAP and wants to use this as an example for other teams working on projects with vapor intrusion, so if there are any changes the team wants to see in the plan they should be mentioned.

Gena said she believes we have sufficient soil and groundwater data in the areas identified for investigation so there should not be any surprises when the work is completed. Jan agreed and stated that where we have the groundwater issue we have our vapor intrusion issue.

Bill indicated that Jeff provided comments on the SAP and also asked the FRC East group to review the SAP. He said that FRC East provided updates about the building status and occupancy for the buildings targeted for investigation (i.e. Table 1). As a result, Building 1877 has been identified as an outdoor fenced switching station and it was noted that the structure is not enclosed or occupied. Bill said there was a sample at this location and proposed that this building and sample be removed for the study. Gena replied that this study needs to take future occupancy into consideration along with current occupancy so we should keep it in the investigation. Bill and Jan replied that it is for current risk only and that future risks will be handled by LUCs for future construction in the area impacted by the plume and if occupancy of the buildings in these areas changes. Bill mentioned that the OU1 plume is large and the entire area would need to be investigated for future risk. Jan and Bill stated that any new buildings in the area will need to have an indoor air assessment completed prior to construction and a vapor barrier or other vapor mitigation strategy will need to be employed as part of the construction where required. For clarification, Gena confirmed that we are looking at current buildings and we are not looking at areas where there are buildings without occupants and areas where there are no plans for buildings. She added there LUCs will be necessary to address future construction in areas where we have concerns. Bill, Jan, and Jeff said she was correct; the LUCs

will establish what will have to happen in this area with regards to vapor intrusion prior to construction or occupancy changes.

Jeff brought up the topic of the process for getting approval to do subsurface work in the OU1 plume area once the LUCs are established. As an example, he said there are LUCs at OU2 Site 10 that say the area can only be used for industrial purposes. He said he could build a garage for industrial use out there as long as he did not excavate but added that if he wanted to break the ground surface to do the construction he would have to get EPA approval prior to starting the work.

At OU1, however, Jeff said the LUC will say that any new building or major modifications will require a vapor intrusion investigation at the site prior to the start of construction. He said he wants the LUCs to be able to limit the work out there to a certain degree but would like to be able to do some things without repeatedly contacting the state or EPA for approval. For instance, he wants to be able to install fire hydrants or other items out there without having to contact the state or EPA for each item. He says we should be able to agree to a set procedure for how to handle intrusive activities in these areas without requiring repeated EPA and state approval. Gena said it is more difficult to agree to that than just talking about it at these meetings because approval for work in these areas is based on an EPA-DOD agreement. She said she does not think it is going to be as difficult as Jeff believes it will be to get approval for working at the site.

Gena said that if the land use changes, the LUCs would be followed and the land use change has to be approved. Jan asked if the EPA had to be informed only or if approval is required from the EPA. Gena replied that it will ultimately require approval. Jeff said he wants it to be worded such that the EPA does not have to be contacted every time they want to do something at OU1, including excavation and building. Gena said we are going to have areas with soil contamination that will be highlighted and other areas highlighted with groundwater contamination. There LUCs will state that there will not be intrusive activities into the soil or groundwater in these areas. Bill mentioned that the soil exceedances are beneath Building 133.

Bill asked the group what happens now before construction starts at the site. Gena said they should go through Jeff but there are no LUCs in place yet. Jan said that construction on IR sites is not new or unique to Cherry Point. The base will have to understand that this problem exists and they will have to do certain things before starting work on various projects. There are standard forms out there that summarize what must be taken into consideration prior to starting work on a project. She said the public utility folks will have to be trained as to what to do when it comes to repairs, based on agreements with the state and EPA, and that new construction will have another step in the process before it begins.

Before continuing on, Bill asked for team approval to remove Building 1877 from the vapor intrusion SAP. The team agreed that it can be removed from the vapor intrusion investigation. This change will also be highlighted in the draft-final UFP-SAP.

Jeff said there are a couple other buildings that should be evaluated. One of them is an extension of Building 133 that will be soon or has already been occupied. The other building is to the east of Building 137 and is already in operation; this building is upgradient of the plume

but is likely within 100 ft of the plume. Bill said we will have to revise the sampling locations in these areas and can move the sample that was going to be collected near Building 1877 to one of these areas. The draft-final UFP SAP will be in a redline strikeout mode to highlight any changes.

Jeff added that there are a couple of buildings that are not included in this investigation because they are not currently occupied. However, they may become occupied so we need to evaluate if they are within 100 ft of the plume or an area of concern. That way, if they do change the occupancy in the future, he will know whether or not they will require an evaluation for vapor intrusion. Bill said that he will help Jeff determine which buildings fall into this category and will be labeled in the Building identification table in the UFP SAP.

### **OU1 Additional Investigation Results**

**Start - 1510**

**Guests - Barry Valicek / FRC East**

**Chris Berner / FRC East**

Bill presented the results of the OU1 additional investigation. The investigation was conducted based on the recommendation of the OU1 RI Addendum:

- Collection of groundwater level measurements and samples (cVOCs and natural attenuation parameters) from a significant portion of the OU1 monitoring well network
- Installation and sampling of additional upper and lower surficial aquifer monitoring wells
- Presented the proposed plan to the team at the Atlanta Partnering Meeting (Jan 2009)

During the investigation, 14 new monitoring wells were installed. The original plan was to install 15 new monitoring wells, but the one proposed at Site 16 could not be installed due to weather and ground conditions; the well will be installed as part of a future investigation. All of the wells were installed using the sonic method with standard well construction materials. The 14 new wells were developed, sampled, and surveyed.

He said the sampling event consisted of collecting samples from 160 of the 170 wells originally proposed. The wells that were not sampled were either abandoned, not found, or dry. Samples were analyzed for VOCs, natural attenuation parameters (nitrite, nitrate, sulfide, chloride, methane, ethane, ethene, and TOC), and field parameters. In addition to these analyses, the new well at Site 83 was sampled for PAHs and pesticides. The new well at Site 17 was only sampled for PCBs and dieldrin.

Bill also told the team that groundwater levels were taken and the water level contours generated are roughly the same as what was found in the OU1 RI Addendum. There was a mound in SW OU1 identified in the RI but these wells there were not measured during this event.

The following preliminary results were presented:

- Dissolved Oxygen - Only 12 of 160 wells had DO over 5 mg/L, indicating that there are very few locations where reductive dechlorination may not occur (reductive dechlorination can occur when DO is less than 5 mg/L); 109 of the 160 wells had DO below 0.5 mg/L, which is ideal for reductive dechlorination.

- Preliminary TCE, 1,2-DCE, and vinyl chloride plumes appear to be generally similar to the maps presented in the OU1 RI Addendum. Preliminary plume maps have been generated and were presented to the team.

Once all of the data have been received and validated they will be presented in a technical memorandum that will include:

- A summary of the field and laboratory methodology
- Lithologic logs and well construction diagrams for soil borings and monitoring wells
- Analytical results of groundwater sampling activities
- A summary of findings and potential recommendations

Gena said, in summary, everything is pretty much where we thought it was but the higher levels extend a little further from where we thought near the buildings. Bill agreed with Gena's statement.

George confirmed that the UST folks have a SVE system near Building 133 because he believed it may impact the level of contamination that we see. Jeff said the UST program had the SVE system near the building and it was an active system. Gena said even with the concentrations detected in the area it does not take much TCE to generate our concentrations. She added that in a DNAPL zone even when you remove the source you still have a leading edge to the plume because it is coming out of the capillary fringes.

Jan noticed an area under Building 133 where concentration went down and said it did not seem to make sense. Bill showed the figure of the wells in southwestern Building 133 that showed the most recent results and stated that there was only one previous round of samples at this well. The team discussed that since the data from the well was limited, more samples would be necessary to accurately determine the concentrations in that area.

### **OU1 Site 17**

**Start - 1510**

**Guests - Barry Valicek / FRC East**

**Chris Berner / FRC East**

Jan said this presentation is designed to summarize what has been reviewed, what decisions were made, and why we are currently at this point.

### **Timeline**

- Completed SAP for Supplemental Investigation (SI)
- Conducted SI and presented results to the team during the November 2008 partnering meeting
  - Team consensus on moving forward with LUCs and LTM and decision to install an additional monitoring well
- Presented the proposed well locations during the January 2009 meeting
- Team decided to include NFA Sites 14, 15, 18, and 40 in the Site 17 FFS during the March 2009 meeting
- Draft SI report submitted in April 2008

- Monitoring well installed and sampled in May 2009

#### **FFS for Sites 14, 15, 17, 18, and 40**

Bill provided a brief summary of the previous investigations at the site. The results of the investigations were discussed and the connection between the investigations was established.

The team reviewed the RAOs for the site:

- Prevent groundwater impacts from soil that could potentially result in unacceptable risks to human receptors. *This language is revised from what was in the presentation.*
- Prevent unacceptable risks to human receptors from use of shallow groundwater driven by Aroclor-1260 and dieldrin.

Bill summarized the remedial alternatives for the site:

- Alternative 1 - no action
- Alternative 2 - LUCs with LTM
- No active remedy was further evaluated beyond the preliminary screening because:
  - Locations of detected soil and groundwater concentrations do not appear to correlate and are distributed sporadically
  - Unclear if residual soil concentrations act as a continuing source of groundwater contamination or if the source was from normal, base-wide pesticide applications
  - With the latter case, an active soil remedy would not be a cost-effective solution to prevent future groundwater contamination
  - PCBs and dieldrin adsorb to soil and not highly mobile in groundwater
  - Aroclor-1260 was observed above the MCL in two small localized areas, and dieldrin was above the NC2L within one small localized area; costs for implementation of an active extraction/treatment groundwater system would be enormous given the small areal extent of contamination
  - Natural attenuation processes are expected to decrease concentrations
  - Groundwater concentration trends have not been established at the site

Gena said she did not agree with the alternatives presented because there is not an active remedy that would be evaluated in the FS. She said some active remedy needs to be considered and, while it may be screened out, it should be initially evaluated. Given the contamination at the site, she said the third alternative that she would consider is to remove the soil.

The team reviewed the data from the site. Gena said the biggest concern is there are PCBs in groundwater. She suggested if the well that was recently installed and sampled comes up clean for PCBs, then the PCB issue at the site is gone. She also said that based on the low level of contamination, we can write off dieldrin as base-wide application of pesticides. Jan verified what Gena said by stating all we have before the permanent well sample is direct push groundwater samples and we now have a permanent well that has been sampled. She asked if Gena will agree to only take one sample from the permanent well and be able to close out the site. Gena said yes because the other samples allowed the team to locate the permanent well in the location that was expected to have the highest contamination. If that well is clean, then we can close out the site. George stated he preferred to see what the results are from the most recent sampling before making a judgment on what to do at the site.

The group reviewed the sample results again to see if there were any noticeable data trends. During the review, Gena stated if the sample from the permanent monitoring well comes up with a non-detection, then she believes that no active remedy or monitoring plan would be necessary because the site could be closed out under a NFA ROD. She said if the groundwater sample from the new well shows we have a PCB hit above the MCL, then the FS needs to propose an area for removal or another active remedy and show that it is not reasonable based on the NCP criteria. Gena reiterated her point and said if the PCBs in the groundwater sample are below the MCL then we can close out the site because dieldrin can be written off as a base-wide application and the PCBs will be at an acceptable level.

George said he believes that the dieldrin at the site can be attributed to base-wide application of pesticides based on the levels we have detected at the site. He said if the FS can document the level of contamination and make a solid argument why it is due to general pesticide use, he will be comfortable with handling it as such. However, he was concerned about the documentation history for this site. He said to suddenly drop dieldrin as a concern could be difficult. Jeff agreed but noted that the RI identified it as a potential spill (based on anecdotic evidence) and the levels we see are not indicative of a spill. Gena added that a removal action was already conducted this area and the concentrations we see are indicative of base-wide application. She pointed out that the highest concentration of dieldrin detected at the site is the discharge point for the drainage area and that location would be the point of concentration for any contamination in the runoff.

Bill asked George and Gena to confirm that it was acceptable to remove dieldrin as a COC in the FS. George and Gena replied it was acceptable but said there has to be an explanation as to why it is removed. Doug suggested that removing dieldrin as a COC should be documented in the Site 17 Supplemental Investigation report as well.

Gena summarized the discussion and said the current path forward is to look at the data from the new well:

- If the PCB results are below MCLs, PCBs are not considered a COC and the site can be closed in a decision document.
- If the PCB results are above the MCLs, we will develop a FS that evaluates an active remedy for PCBs at the site. Jan added that the FS will also discuss the attenuation of the contaminant.

#### **OU14 - ROD Status and PRAP presentation**

##### **Start - 1642**

Doug told the team the pre-draft of the ROD is almost complete and the goal is to have the ROD to the team by early July.

Gena said she used the OU14 PRAP presentation Doug pulled together in a presentation to her upper management. The EPA approved of the presentation and she only received a couple comments:

- They asked how the institutional controls will be handled and if there will be training associated with them. Gena said she replied that institutional controls will be established as usual and the Base would be responsible for training.

- They asked if MNA would feasibly continue for 100 years. Gena explained that the RD will have performance criteria for the MNA that will be reviewed in the 5-year reviews and, if it slows, the remedy will be re-evaluated. The EPA agreed to MNA at the site.

**DAY 2: Thursday, May 21, 2009**

**Start Time 0815**

**OU2 LTM Review and Optimization Approach**

**Start - 0815**

Jan provided the team with a brief summary of a recent discussion about the OU2 LTM sampling. In May 2009 NAVFAC, Rhēa, and CH2M HILL discussed what need to be evaluated with respect to the LTM monitoring at OU2. The group reviewed the purpose of the samples and wells (internal wells vs. perimeter wells), monitoring within waste for MNA, and other pertinent information. The group discussed the frequency of the monitoring and the chemical parameters that are in the current analysis suite.

The group decided that the following actions would be necessary:

- Data evaluation report will be developed – trend analysis/statistical analysis
- Define or confirm boundary of waste with existing data: boring logs, test pits, aerial photos
- Develop LTM plan with purpose, location, and parameters of each well
- Produce a SAP that will outline the current sampling approach as well as that for responding to high hits in perimeter wells and present an exit strategy

Jan is developing a scope of work for the trend analysis, data evaluation, revised LTM plan, and SAP. Work will be ready for potential end of year funds (July-September 2009).

**MRP Update**

**Start - 0828**

**Guests - John Myers/MCAS Cherry Point**

**Renee Clore/CH2M HILL**

Jan provided a brief update on the MRP projects at Skeet Range #1 and Cat Island.

**Aerial DGM Survey**

- Mobilized on March 4, 2009
- Began DGM on March 6, 2009
- Project delays due to weather and mechanical problems
- Finished DGM survey on April 21, 2009
- Demobilized April 22, 2009
- Have preliminary results. The data show a heavy cluster of anomalies around Cat Island.
- Battelle is currently evaluating the raw data to screen out non-MEC items. There are strings of crab pots that were detected.

**March 2009 Cat Island sampling event**

- Collected samples March 3-4

- 6 composite surface soil samples
- 2 surface water samples collected from water-filled depressions
- Received preliminary data on April 13
- Expect validated data on May 22

The team reviewed the preliminary data from the Cat Island sampling event. Although the samples were analyzed for metals, explosives, and perchlorate, the only detections above the residential RSLs were arsenic in 4 of the 6 samples, with concentrations ranging between 1.0 and 3.1 mg/kg. Also, there were no explosives detected in soil.

Gena suggested that when we go out there and remove the bombs we need to take a sample from under a few bombs to see if there is localized contamination. Jan said the clearance work is being done to support a larger investigation in the RI phase, so we will be sampling out there again. Gena said if we don't find any environmental contamination once the bombs are removed, there will not be a risk and the EPA may not have any authority at the site.

The surface water samples collected from the craters on the island had metals and slight explosive detections. One sample, CI-SW04-0309, had a cadmium concentration that was above the NC 2B standard. The team discussed whether the detection of the explosives could be from munitions in the surrounding water and not the island itself, since they weren't detected in the soil. John Myers suggested it was due to the tidal changes and the island getting sporadically flooded.

#### **Cat Island and Skeet & Trap Range #1 sampling event**

- Cat Island
  - May 27-30, 2009
  - 12 sediment samples, including 2 proposed background samples
  - 4 surface water samples, including 1 proposed background sample
- Skeet and trap range #1
  - May 18-22, 2009
  - 12 sediment samples, collected with vibrocore method
  - 3 surface water samples, collected within 1 foot of the bottom of the river
  - 5 surface soil samples

#### **Site Investigation report schedule**

- July 14, 2009 - Battelle's final DGM report
- July 20, 2009 - May 2009 sample data
- August 17, 2009 - Pre-draft report to NAVFAC/MCAS
- September 11, 2009 - NAVFAC/MCAS comments
- September 25, 2009 - RTC
- October 9, 2009 - Draft Report to NCDENR/EPA
- November 6, 2009 - NCDENR/EPA comments on Draft Report
- November 20, 2009 - RTC
- December 18, 2009 - Final Report
- Q1 2010 - Present results via Public Meeting/Fact Sheet

#### **Wood Island Surface Clearance**

- Anticipated schedule
  - ESS draft is in progress, targeting draft to NAVFAC/MCAS in June 2009
  - Work plan is currently in planning stages but requires ESS finalized, will revise stakeholder list
  - Targeting field work in the winter of 2009/2010, no birds or hurricanes
- Funding for surface clearance has been received
- Transporting/treating waste will require NCDENR approvals
  - John Myers stated that moving items from the range makes them hazardous waste. Destroying them on the island could impact the community. It may be better to transport the items to Bogue Field.
- Anticipated problems and concerns are being worked through
- Anticipated public involvement
  - Discussing fact sheet and public meeting
  - Additional communications prior to detonations

## **OU2 Focused FS**

### **Start - 0918**

Erica presented changes to the FFS based on comments from Jan to make the language stronger. The group discussed the FFS and what language should be included in the document. The discussion was relatively superficial because Gena and George had not seen the FFS yet. Jan said the goal of the discussion was to make the group comfortable with the general content of the FFS. The major discussions included:

- The preference to not to dig it up and haul the waste elsewhere.
- The previous human health risk assessment for the site should be summarized and the remainder of the discussion about the risk assessment should talk about hot spot 2, the failed attempt to remediate it, and what we currently have out there.
- Avoid words like “significant” and other subjective words.
- Erica said they used the designation “soil/waste” to indicate that there is both soil and waste involved in the hotspot. Gena said it should not be used because it will make things confusing since you can treat soil but you can’t treat waste. She added it just needs to be explained that when you dig into the soil you will encounter waste at 3-5 feet. She said not to use the term “soil/waste,” rather “soil mixed with waste” or something similar should be used. She added that the FFS should describe what the waste is because that will dictate how the waste is handled. Bill noted that soil and waste are two different media.
- Gena said that if the original LUCs for OU2 do not provide for someone to inspect the landfill to make sure the cover is still in place, it needs to be added to the FFS. She said that since the original ROD included treatment for the contamination there may not be anything in there about inspections. Therefore, we need to make sure that we have a LUC to maintain the cover because that is the remedy. Jan and Jeff said they did not think the current OU2 LUCs would cover the inspection and maintenance of the soil cover.

In thinking about the establishment of the LUCs, Gena said she didn't think that the plat for OU2 would have to be amended to include the new LUCs. Jeff said he thinks the plat should be amended so that the new LUC is officially documented. The team discussed amending the plat and all agreed in the end that it should be amended to include the LUC for maintaining the Hot Spot 2 cover and to show where the hotspot is located. Gena added that the plat amendment needs to be included as a cost in the FFS.

### **OU1 Site 83 SAP**

#### **Start - 1020**

The team discussed the SAP worksheets and the comments that came from the Navy chemist, John Tucker, about the SAP for Site 83. Erica said she had ongoing discussions throughout the chemist review with the chemist and was able to work through a few of his questions. Erica currently has comments from Jan and Gena on the SAP.

The chemist suggested that they collect more samples to send to a fixed lab to confirm the results of the mobile lab. However, Erica and Jan worked with the chemist to bring the extra number of split samples down because it seemed excessive; the chemist originally wanted to have 25 split samples but was talked into only 5. The team discussed variability inherent with soil samples and the factors that could lead to differences between the mobile lab and the fixed lab, including sample packing and shipping and the mobile lab setup. The chemist's reason for adding the additional samples was due to a Navy regulation about mobile laboratories.

Erica said that additional language is being added to the SAP for including Navy approval for bringing a radiological source on site because the lab will have a radiological source. Jeff said he was working with the appropriate Navy and Air Station entities to ensure they have all of the necessary permits and permissions to bring radiological-containing devices aboard the Station.

Erica said that one of the Navy chemist's comments led to the creation of a flow chart that showed how the data will be evaluated following the investigation. Gena said the flowchart created need to be changed because it stated a RSL exceedance meant "PAHs and/or pesticides pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment." She said the RSLs just indicate a potential risk and we should compare the results to cleanup goals that are generated from a risk evaluation. In response, team worked on the wording so that the chart indicated that RSL exceedances may "pose a potential unacceptable risk..." and the final step in the decision tree was to "reassess risks and determine potential remedial action." Gena said the EPA will not agree to any active remedy if there is not a risk. Jeff added that the revised risk numbers can then be used to determine the size and shape of the removal area.

Jeff asked Erica why the 1-2 ft sample interval was not being collected and analyzed. Erica replied that interval will not be collected in order to reduce the overall number of samples. Jeff suggested that the 1-2 ft sample be collected in the event the 0-1 ft sample is contaminated and the 2-3 ft sample is clean. He is concerned that skipping that interval may create more excavation than necessary because the 1-2 ft sample could be clean and not require removal. Gena said she does not mind missing that interval in the sampling because excavation will

likely get the first 2 feet regardless due to the type of equipment that will be used. Jan added that if we start seeing a trend of the 0-1 ft interval being dirty and the 2-3 ft interval being clean, the team can have a discussion to see if it will be worthwhile to analyze the 1-2 ft interval during the sampling activities.

### **Document Review Schedule**

#### **Start - 1110**

The team discussed the documents that are currently ready for review and the forecasted document and review schedules.

### **Partnering Round Table**

#### **Start - 1250**

*State travel restrictions* – NC state travel restrictions are in effect for the next year. Travel will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. George needs to know travel locations and logistics a minimum of one month in advance.

### **Meeting Closeout**

#### **Future Meeting Dates/Locations:**

#### **Next Meeting**

**June 30 – July 1, 2009; Greensboro, NC - downtown Marriott**

Pre-meeting teleconference: June 23, 2009; 1000

#### **Roles:**

Chair: Erica  
Recorder: Tim  
Timekeeper: Jeff  
Facilitator: George  
Goalie: Gena

#### **Meeting topics:**

- SMP
- OU2 FFS
- OU14 ROD
- MRP Update – final aerial DGM, sample results
- Site 17
- Well abandonment
- LTM

**August 25-26, 2009; Havelock, NC**

RAB meeting August 25

Pre-meeting teleconference: August 18, 2009; 1000

**October 14-15, 2009; Pittsburgh, PA - book George's room independent of group**

*Pre-meeting teleconference: October 6, 2009; 1000*

**December 1-2, 2009; Havelock, NC**

RAB meeting December 1

*Pre-meeting teleconference: November 24, 2009; 1000*

Meeting attendee contact information:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Doug Bitterman	CH2M HILL	757-671-6209	<a href="mailto:doug.bitterman@ch2m.com">doug.bitterman@ch2m.com</a>
Chris Berner	FRC East	not available	<a href="#">not available</a>
Renee Clore	CH2M HILL	312-873-9758	<a href="mailto:renee.clore@ch2m.com">renee.clore@ch2m.com</a>
Jeff Christopher	Cherry Point	252-466-4421	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.christopher@usmc.mil">jeffrey.christopher@usmc.mil</a>
Erica DeLattre	Rhēa	724-443-4111	<a href="mailto:erica@rhea.us">erica@rhea.us</a>
Bill Hanna	CH2M HILL	757-671-6277	<a href="mailto:bill.hannah@ch2m.com">bill.hannah@ch2m.com</a>
George Lane	NCDENR	919-508-8462	<a href="mailto:george.lane@ncmail.net">george.lane@ncmail.net</a>
John Myers	Cherry Point	252-466-4903	<a href="mailto:john.s.myers@usmc.mil">john.s.myers@usmc.mil</a>
Jan Nielsen	NAVFAC	757-322-8339	<a href="mailto:janice.nielsen@navy.mil">janice.nielsen@navy.mil</a>
Gena Townsend	EPA	404-562-8538	<a href="mailto:townsend.gena@epa.gov">townsend.gena@epa.gov</a>
Barry Valicek	FRC East	252-464-5315	<a href="mailto:barry.valicek@navy.mil">barry.valicek@navy.mil</a>
Tim Wenk	CH2M HILL	757-671-6265	<a href="mailto:tim.wenk@ch2m.com">tim.wenk@ch2m.com</a>