

N61414.AR.001883
NAB LITTLE CREEK
5090.3a

MEETING MINUTES FROM INSTALLATION RESTORATION PARTNERING TEAM MEETING
DATED 1 MARCH 2000 NAB LITTLE CREEK VA
3/1/2000
CH2MHILL

Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek IR Partnering Group Meeting Minutes:

Partnering Meeting – March 1 - 2, 2000

ATTENDEES: Bob Schirmer/LANTDIV
Robert Weld/VDEQ
Donna Caldwell/CH2M HILL
Bruce Beach/ USEPA
Wanda Browne/Facilitator
Scott MacEwen/CH2M HILL

Rick Hylton/NWS
Will Bullard/Tier II

COPIES:

FROM: Donna Caldwell/CH2M HILL/VBO

DATE: March 1-2, 2000

LOCATION

CH2M HILL Virginia Beach, Virginia

MINUTES

March 1, 2000

8:00 Check In,
Introductions

Review Groundrules.
Review assigned roles
Review previous meeting minutes
January Meeting Minutes accepted as edited

I. Parking Lot:

Parking Lot

- LANTDIV position on outfalls/water body sampling
- Onboard FFA discussion at next meeting,

- Discuss Site 9 & 10 3-Year LTM Report comments (3/31/00)
- Tier II Success Story
- Tier II training / technical guidance

II. SASR Review

Scott reviewed SASR. **Action Scott** – provide Bob with a list of Laboratories and Data Validators used by HILL. EPA would like to include this list in the Final Master Project Plans as an Appendix. It was noted the Lab data from the background study is delayed and the final report would slip a few weeks due to these laboratory delays. Draft FFA - revise submittal to mid March. FFA comments moved up to May 1. SMP will be moved to March 15. Site 9 & 10 3-Year LTM Report comments to be discussed. HHRA for those sites may be dependent on the discussion addressing the potential need for additional samples. **Action Scott (4/18)**- respond to EPA comments on ORC Pilot Test. **Action Scott (3/7)**- send SASR out Final to team.

III. Tier II

Goals- Tier II would like a progress report of achieving goals to be updated quarterly for submittal to Tier II. Team progress on goals would put updated and put on the Partnering Web Site quarterly. In addition to PRAPs /RODs etc, Tier II would like to include success stories. Robert noted the ECO Subgroup finalization of alternate screening values for Little Creek as a success for the Team. First due date for progress on Team Goals is March 31. Updates due the first of each succeeding quarter. **Action Robert** – prepare text for ERA alternate screening values as success story and goal progress update to Tier II. Consider Background Study as a success story for the future. Goals should include dates for PRAPs and RODs. **Action Scott**- discuss with web supervisor adding Goals and progress updates to web menus. Meeting minutes in Admin Record was discussed. Tier II and lawyers do not deem it appropriate to place meeting minutes in the Administrative Record, but is appropriate for minutes to be placed in the information repository. Team Consensus not to place minutes in Administrative Record. Scott noted that partnering issues in minutes would not be placed on the web site. Three technical issue papers were prepared by tier II to address topics applicable to teams: background soil sampling, groundwater field screening, and groundwater above MCLs. Other topics pending include dioxin, soil sampling, coordinating for issues related to HHRA and ERA. Yorktown and Langley AFB MOU for land use controls (LUCIP/LUCAP)- in final stages but not yet signed.

IV. Sites 9 & 10

Discussed soil cover survey results and delineation of waste- Consensus that based on preliminary data presented on the cover survey, there is sufficient cover at these sites. The results will be compiled in a tech memo that will include a description of field activities, description of waste material encountered in the borings, survey topographic map showing boring locations, and recommendations for revised site boundaries. The tech memo will be submitted for review and included in appendix of the FFS.

For defining delineation of waste the team reviewed EPIC and references (IAS and Round II Verification Study (RVS)). Based on a review of available data the limits of waste are not conclusive. Reviewed RI data (1994 by Foster Wheeler), some pesticides detected, no PCBs detected. Discussed the need to collect additional surface soil samples for analysis of TAL and pesticides. Discussed implication of using the data if the ERA/HHRA is already complete. Bruce suggested statistical comparison of the data, and if results are within the range used for ERA/HHRA, then there would be no need to revise risk assessment. If there is a statistical difference then that warrants incorporation into a revised risk assessment, and risks will be updated. Data will be included in Appendix of FFS report. Data will fill data gaps in risk sampling data and could also be use to support re-defining the limits of the landfill. Robert noted other lines of evidence would be needed to re-define limits of waste. Discussed value of redefining the limits of waste. Given the cost to better define the limits of waste it was agree to leave the boundary as it is currently defined, with the exception of the southern lobe of site 10 where waste was noted outside current line defined on maps. Consensus to submit the nine samples collected at Site 10 during the soil cover survey for analysis of TAL and pesticides. Will obtain 7- day turn-around on analysis.

EPA Comments on HHRA

1. Comment regarding not evaluating risk for groundwater. If there is no drinking water risk analysis then we may have problems defining institutional controls. Robert noted all groundwater is potentially drinking water. Risk analysis on groundwater need to be conducted, and if groundwater has significant risk other alternatives may have to be considered. Consensus to address groundwater risk in the HHRA and FFS.
2. DNAPL: is not an issue based on past investigation, metals only concern. A confining clay layer (Yorktown confining unit) is present. No information on how thick the clay is at the site. Bruce noted it would be necessary to monitor the first confined aquifer. If groundwater is contaminated may need to assess groundwater quality of the Yorktown aquifer. If groundwater at the site is not much different than background, the issue of the confined aquifer is not as critical. Consensus to finalize the background study and HHRA before investigating the Yorktown aquifer.
3. Public well supplies: Nearest wells used are on the golf course. Boring logs and locations and will be reviewed and risk assessment on the groundwater will provide additional information to further evaluate this issue. **Action Roni Warren to call EPA risk assessor (Alvaro) to discuss comments.**

Discussed impacts of the soil cover survey to the schedule for FFS/PRAP/ROD.

Alternatives to evaluate:

1. No action
2. Institutional controls with long-term monitoring
3. Institutional controls with a clay cap

Discussed if the 2-foot cover rule is an ARAR. EPA and DEQ considers it an ARAR. Bob proposed we discuss this at the next meeting.

V. Partnering Entrance and Exit Procedures

Attached to end of minutes

VI. Site Numbering System and Review of FFA Table Sort

Team reviewed Sites Table and discussed where each site should be identified in the FFA. Consensus to use RFA site names as primary name with the exception of SWMUs 1 through 8 which have been renamed. Those sites will be identified as "New" SWMU 1-8 and "Old" SWMU 1-8. All IR sites will be referred to by their IR Site # with the exception of IR 2 which is all sandblast SWMUs which will be referred to by their SWMU name.

Review of Sites

IR Site 4- Appendix B

IR Site 5- WTBD

IR Site 6- Appendix A

New SWMU 6 (131-133)- SI process for site screening assessment (SSA) Appendix A

New SWMUs 2, 7, & 8 – Appendix A

IR Site 14- desktop audit Appendix B, may change to findings of fact (FoF) based on a review by Bruce and Robert

IR Site 15- Appendix B, team discussed value of removal of the soil, if done, removal will be documented and the site re-evaluated

IR Site 16- Appendix B **Action Donna** - compare AOC-B confirmation data with risk criteria, **Action Scott** - provide close out report- if PCB levels >1 then consider removal for a no action PRAP/ROD

IR Site 17- Appendix B consensus for limited sampling

SWMU 13- Appendix A, existing info suggests potential contamination

Day 2 March 2, 2000

Check In

Finalize FFA Site Table Continued

SWMU 18 – Appendix B

SWMU 30 – Appendix B

SWMU 81 – Appendix B

SWMU 96 – Appendix B

SWMU 97 – Appendix B

SWMU 98 – Appendix B

SWMU 114 – Appendix B

SWMU 115 – Appendix B, awaiting DEQ TRO approval – close out report DEQ TRO

SWMU 116 – Appendix B, **Action Bruce-** address weather SVOC analysis is needed for this site

SWMU 18 – Appendix B

SWMU 119– Appendix B, obtain groundwater samples because previous sample locations uncertain

SWMU 122– Appendix B

SWMU 128– Appendix B

SWMU 129– Appendix B

New SWMU 5 (130)- Appendix A, **Action Scott** SWMU 5- check with Dan Feinburg if GIS mapping will meet the need for recording historic building locations

SWMU 138– Appendix B, based on rationale for outfalls and pending Navy approach to addressing outfalls

SWMU 141– Appendix B, based on rationale for outfalls and pending Navy approach to addressing outfalls

SWMU 146 – Appendix B, based on rationale for outfalls and pending Navy approach to addressing outfalls

AOC D- Appendix B

AOC H- Appendix B, limited sampling for pesticides

ALL REMAINING SITES NFA FOR INCLUSION IN FFA FINDINGS OF FACT with the following notes:

SWMU 23 – TBD pending **Action Bob** check on status of rifle range, is the site active? plans for closure? Navy approach is to take no action on active ranges until closure. **Action Team-** team to research rifle ranges in FFAs. Action- pictures of rifle range team research rifle ranges in FFAs

SWMU 63- FoF, all tanks over 660 gallons are registered with DEQ

SWMU 109 TBD/FoF pending **Action Bob** - check that floor drains have been taken off line, drains in the back have been confirmed sealed. Closure of drains in front of building uncertain, Bob will investigate further

VII. Funding Update

Bob presented an update of funding issues. Money has been made available for removal of blast grit at SWMU 8. Any money left over can be used for other investigations at Little Creek. Bruce noted removal and sampling of SWMU 8 through an EE/CA is appropriate. Bob will obligate dollars for removal as soon as possible.

VIII SMP Review

Scott presented brief outline of progress on the SMP deliverable and distributed an outline of the report. Bruce noted an appropriate format would include a breakdown of the types of sites as in the FFA. He noted a brief description of each site with the schedule should be included. Scott suggested that in other SMPs, a description of removal actions was included. It was decided a narrative is appropriate for each SWMU/Site in Appendix A (WTBD) and Appendix B, but should not include figures showing detailed sampling. Details of Appendix B sites with additional limited proposed sampling should not be included in the text. NFA sites should not be included in the SMP. Robert noted the SMP is attachment to the FFA and that the SMP should only address plans for scheduled activities. For Appendix B sites do not need to provide a schedule of that work unless it is just a brief statement that a certain number of sites would be done each year. Discussed if FFA table should be in SMP. **Action Team**-clarify if FFA Table should be included in the SMP.

IX. SWMU 2, 7, & 8 Work Plan

Reviewed the work plan for SWMUs 2, 7,& 8. **Action Donna**- contact area landfills (e.g.Trashmore, SPSA) to see if they would accept blast grit as cover material. It was noted that the firm Agglite (make aggregate) may be able to use the material. **Action Donna** – delineate grit at SWMU 8 and discuss options with OHM (Taylor Sword).

X. Goal Update MARCH 00

FY00

1. Submit Draft RODs for Sites 9 & 10 (9/00)
 - 12/99 - schedule reviewed during meeting - on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- work funded
 - 3/00- **additional sampling required, on schedule pending results**
2. Final Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment for Sites 9 & 10 (5/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule pending funding ;
 - 2/1/00- work funded
 - 3/00- **on schedule pending results of site 9 and 10 sampling**
3. Final Draft Background Study (9/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/00- sampling completed Jan 2000.
 - 3/00- **on schedule, may slip due to laboratory deliverable delay**
4. Complete Final RI for Site 11 (draft), Site 12 (final), & Site 13 (final) (9/00)
 - 12/99 - on schedule, may slip pending re-prioritization of sites.
 - 2/1/00
 - Draft Site 11 SRI (6/00):
 - 3/00 **on schedule**
 - Final Site 11 SRI (9/00):
 - 3/00 **on schedule**
 - Draft Site 12 SRI (1/00):
 - submitted 1/00,**

Final Site 12 SRI (5/00):
3/00 on schedule

5. Draft FFA (12/99) Submit Final FFA (9/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/1/00-
 Draft FFA (12/99) –
 1/00 slips to 2/00
3/00 catagorized all sites for FFA draft slip to 3/15/00
 - Final FFA (9/00)-
 on schedule

6. Partnering Deliverables (4/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule, completed roles and responsibilities by entity;
 - 2/1/00- Conflict resolution completed, two partnering deliverable remains
 - 3/00- On schedule member entrance/exit procedures completed**

7. Complete Site Management Plan (4/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule, reviewed during 12/99 meeting;
 - 2/1/00-On board review of draft SMP scheduled for 2/29/00
 - 3/00- On board review, draft submittal slip to 3/15,**

8. Scoping of FY 01 Work (8/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- on schedule
 - 3/00 on schedule**

9. Set up Eco Subgroup (11/99)
 - Goal Completed 10/99;
 - 3/00 on schedule**

10. Complete Ecological Risk Assessment through Step 3 for Sites 9, 10, 11, 12, & 13 (5/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- Work funded, Eco-sub group conference call scheduled for 2/2/00 to
 finalize screening values
 - 3/00 – on schedule, steps 1 & 2 drafts submitted 1/28**

11. Complete Ecological Risk Assessment through Step 3 for Sites 5, 7, 8, & SWMU 3 (9/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- Work funded, Eco-sub group conference call scheduled for 2/2/00 to
 finalize screening values
 - 3/00 – on schedule, steps 1 & 2 drafts submitted 1/28**

12. Finalize Master Project Plans (3/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule, comments due December 31, 1999

2/1/00 – VDEQ submitted comments; EPA comments due 2/00
3/00 - behind schedule

13. Complete Draft Site Investigation for SWMUs 7, 8, & 2 (9/00)

12/99 – on schedule, may slip due to re-prioritization of sites

2/1/00-

SWMU 2, 7 & 8 Project Plans (5/14/00): on schedule

SWMU 2, 7 & 8 Final Report (9/29/00): on schedule

Note: SWMU2- Possible problems with ERN funding of an active site- will discuss at next mtg. SWMU 8- disposal/initial characterization samples taken 1/00. Bob will get ready to obligate \$\$ to OIIM for SWMU 8, based on sample results.

3/00- work plan submitted

14. Evaluate and prioritize site rankings by a risk using Navy Model (2/00)

12/99 - on schedule, NORM model submitted to Team 11/99

2/1/00 – Site ranking list reviewed 1/00. Goal completed

NEXT MEETING

April 10 & 11 Radison Annapolis, MD

Start: 9:00

End: 4:00

Guests:

Roles

Chair: Scott

Timekeeper: Robert

Host: Scott

Recorder: Donna

Goal Keeper: Bob

Guests: Tier II Stacy Driscoll

Conference Call: February 24 Thursday 10:00

Proposed Agenda:

- SMP On-board review 1 hr
- Finalize Site Sorting for FFA in Sites table 2 hr
- Team Roles 1 hr
- Partnering preception/reality 0.5 hr
- Budget update 0.75 hr
- Discuss Role of "FIT" 0.5 hr
- Landfill Cover Issues 0.5 hr

- Check in/Check out 4
- SWMU 2, 7, & 8 1 hr
- ECO Update 0.25

Next meeting May 17, & 18, Chinoteague

June 14 & 15 Philadelphia

NEW ACTION ITEMS

3/00-1 Action Scott – provide Bob list of Laboratories and Data Validators

3/00-2 Action Scott (4/18)- respond to EPA comments on ORC Pilot Test.

3/00-3 Action Scott (3/7)- send SASR out Final to team

3/00-4 Action Robert - prepare text for ECO alternate screening values as a success story and goal update to Tier II.

3/00-5 Action Scott- discuss with web supervisor adding Goals to web menus.

3/00-6 Action Donna – IR 16 compare AOC-B confirmation data with risk criteria,

3/00-7 Action Scott – IR 16 provide close out report- if PCB levels >1 then consider removal for a no action PRAP/ROD

3/00-8 Action Donna - SWMU Report Update to include FFA sorting

3/00-9 Action Bruce- SWMU 116- address weather SVOC analysis is needed for this site

3/00-10 Action Scott- SWMU 5- check with Dan Feinburg if GIS mapping will meet the need for recording historic building locations

3/00-11 Action Bob -SWMU 23 - check on status of rifle range, is the site active? plans for closure?

3/00-12 Action Team- SWMU 23 team to research rifle ranges in FFAs

3/00-13 Action Bob -SWMU 109 TBD/FoF pending - check that floor drains have been taken off line, drains in the back have been confirmed sealed. Closure of drains in front of building uncertain

3/00-14 Action Team-clarify if FFA Table should be included in the SMP.

3/00-15 Action Bob – Check status of site 7 for LTM ECO concerns

3/00-16 Action Rick/Bob- Check with Francine Blend about permit for SWMU 2

3/00-17 Action Bob- Check SWMU 2 status with respect to fuunding as an active site

3/00-18 Action Donna – test results of soil cover survey (letter report) to DEQ

3/00-19 Action Robert- Notify Stacy of change in Partnering meeting

3/00-20 Bob- locate boring logs for golf course wells for use at Sites 9 and 10

3/00-21 Action Donna- email updated list of member info

3/00-22 Action Scott – check on Annapolis hotel reservations

3/00-23 Action Robert/Bruce- look at SWMU 17/1 data to assess possible FoF status vs appendix B

3/00-24 Action Bob- Contact Bruce for action for Bruce to provide comments on Master Project Plans

3/00-25 Action Team- review roles and responsibilities of team members

3/00-26 Action Bob find out about new Kelly/Rick replacement

UPDATED PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS

1/00-1 Action Bob, contact Jeff Waller to update on the Virginia Beach Dredging issues for the next RAB

Completed

1/00-2 Action Scott, get landfill ARARS from Stewart

Completed

1/00-3 Bill Kappleman will send out eco screening criteria that have been approved

Completed.

1/00-4 Bill Kappleman to ask eco subgroup if LTM at site 7 could wait until ERA to step 4 is Complete to better identify sampling requirements

Completed no response yet

1/00-5 Bob task eco subgroup to finalize meeting minutes

Completed

1/00-6 Bob to review numbering system

Completed

1/00-7 Donna to sort site table for FFA

Completed

1/00-6 Robert address issue of use of "Commonwealth of VA" "VDEQ" in the FFA

Carryover

1/00-7 Rick RAB meeting notification

Completed

1/00-8 Rick prepare RAB handouts Action Team send RAB presentations to Rick by 2/27/00

Completed

1/00-9 Bruce inquire how EPA would handle an active unit (SWMU 2 fly ash unit)

8/99 – 4 Robert and Bruce- review SWMU 16 and 17 more closely to assess possible NFA.
Carryover Completed March mtg

8/99 – 7 Bruce/Bob Review Marine Reserve Center status as part of NPL. Investigate if Site 4 can be excluded from the NPL.

Completed/carryover (3/30/ 00), yes can be taken out, carryover to further discuss with attorneys. Bob noted all land has been transferred to Chief Mid-Atlantic Region; LANTDIV still responsible for environmental.

8/99 – 8 Bruce – Check with toxicologist on an appropriate number of samples for analysis of the full suite of compounds verses partial list for Site Investigations at SWMUs 7, 8, and 2. Can only a % of total samples get full site.

Carryover (3/30)

4/99-7 - Bruce: Try to obtain 4 copies of EPIC report for IR Group Members

Carry over (6/00) in progress

5/99-18 - Bob: Check with LANTDIV regarding experience with SWMUs and outfalls and update team at September meeting

Carry-over (3/31).