

N61414.AR.001885
NAB LITTLE CREEK
5090.3a

MEETING MINUTES FROM INSTALLATION RESTORATION PARTNERING TEAM MEETING
DATED 17 MAY 2000 NAB LITTLE CREEK VA
5/17/2000
CH2MHILL

Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek IR Partnering Group Meeting Minutes:

Partnering Meeting – May 17 - 18, 2000

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

Scott MacEwen/CH2M HILL
Bruce Frizzel/Tier II

COPIES:

FROM: Donna Caldwell/CH2M HILL

DATE: May 17-18 2000

LOCATION

CH2M HILL Chincoteague, Virginia

MINUTES

May 17, 2000

8:30 Check In,
Introductions

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

I. Parking Lot:

Parking Lot

- LANTDIV position on outfalls/water body sampling
- ARAR applicability for 2 ft soil cover at closed landfills prior to Solid Waste Regulations

- Onboard review of FFA "strawman" of Site History
- Rifle Range
- Dioxin at Site 9
- SWMU 2 discuss results
- SWMU 17/1
- PRAP Site 9 & 10
- Desktop GIS
- Former Incinerator Site near the northern part of Site 10

II Partnering Deliverables

Wandy provided an update of the Tier II conference call.

III. Background Statistics

Donna presented a summary of background statistics. **Action Donna** -confirm with Alta the sequence of statistical steps; - identify outliers to establish data sets prior to developing box plots. Bruce would like to see the data before statistics are preformed. **Action Donna**- provide Bruce with validated rank ordered data set for background. Robert would like to see the final summary table with surface and subsurface separate even if the background upper tolerance limit (UTL) values are the same when statistics warrant pooling data. Hill will submit an interim deliverable with recommendation on how the data will be pooled for combinations of background data sets for review by regulators before proceeding. Scott asked how BTAG would use the background data and would they need to approve of the technical approach. **Action Bruce** - talk to Peter about BTAG consensus on background statistics.

IV. SASR Review

Scott provided an update of the SASR and schedules. **Action Donna** - coordinate schedule to load validated background data into data base and generate rank order file for Bruce. Establish interim deliverable for background (6/20) and set up a conference call by 6/30 for review of comments. **Consensus** - send out draft FS and HHRA for Site 9 & 10 without background analysis and incorporate into the final.

V. Ecological Update

Bruce presented an update of the Eco Subgroup meeting. Status of the ERA screening documents is that the response to comments have been accepted by BTAG. Draft screening ERA (Steps 1 & 2) is due by the end of the month. It was noted that Site 9 & 10 needed to be expedited to meet ROD goals and that they would be separated out. An issue with Site 9 &

10 risk for soil is that the concern was noted for possible historic surface runoff to a "receiving area". It was suggested that runoff source area ("receiving area") could be considered a separate area of concern of SWMU to look at a later date so as not to delay Site 9 & 10 RODs. For Site 9, the receiving area is thought to be Pond 3 and a small drainage leading to the pond. Bob noted that the Navy is not prepared to chase historical releases if the limits of contamination at a site are defined. Bruce commented that we need to either include the receiving area in Site 9 PRAP/ROD or define the receiving area as separate source. The issue of Navy policy of investigation of historical releases would be violated if we define a receiving area as its own site. The Team discussed positive and negative aspects of separating out such a receiving area to create a new site.

Negative Aspects-

- Would require more information on possible former pathways
- Would have to define how far out it would be necessary to chase a possible historical release
- It is difficult to sort other potential contributions
- Decisions are made in the absence of background data

Positive Aspects

- Site 9 & 10 ROD could proceed
- Define the extent of the pathway and the extent of contamination
- The receiving area site would be defined as an Appendix B site

Bruce Frizzel recommended that the team review all previous data to estimate the severity of potential contamination and consider that in the decision process. **Action Team** review all available information and pursue other sources such as photos. Bob noted there is a June 6 Little Creek Eco subgroup meeting and suggested a conference call on Monday June 5 10:00 am to discuss this issue. **Action Bruce Beach** will initiate the call.

VI. Tier II Update

Bruce Frizzel presented an update of Tier II. Deliverables for partnering are due and he recommended a loose-leaf binder to be able to replace pages as appropriate. A MOA LUCIP and LUCAP was distributed as a model for the Tier I Teams. Technical Issue papers were also distributed. Bruce noted that draft RODs should be reviewed closely before it goes to legal review. Navy legal should look at the document first before going to EPA legal. Reminder that 2nd quarter goals are due June 30. **Action Robert** prepare 2nd quarter goals for delivery to Tier II. **Action Bob** notify legal about upcoming EE/CA for review.

VII. SWMU 2 Relative Risk Ranking (RRR) and Dioxin

Bob presented a summary of SWMU 2 historical data. Goal of the discussion is to inform the team of SWMU 2 available data and provide supporting information to classify the site

in Appendix B. The Site is now Appendix B in the FFA and any investigation will be deferred since the site is not considered high risk or of critical concern. The Site may be demolished as part of replacement of the new power facilities at NAB Little Creek.

It was noted that the Navy might collect a dioxin sample when other sites are sampled for dioxin. **Action Robert** review information on Dioxin test analysis.

VIII. FFA Review

Bruce presented a summary of the draft FFA and identified a schedule for review. June 14 was noted for an on board review page by page. Robert noted that DEQ VA Attorney General recommends that DEQ will not participate in FFA process. **Action Bob** get Susan Hulbert (LANTDIV legal) involved in the FFA issues. **Action Team** review the FFA for the next meeting to provide changes, specifically dates for RCRA permit and withdrawal of permit request. **Action Donna** add language that will summarize the SWMU Report and SSA process. **Action Bruce/Robert** check with lawyers about how the absence of a RCRA permit at Little Creek will influence FFA language. **Action Bob** -Update the Community Relations Plan (Part 37). **Action Robert** identify any NOV's for Little Creek.

IX. Site 16 PCBs

The Eco subgroup reached consensus that Site 16 does not need to go to Step 3 in the ERA process. That recommendation will be addressed in the Screening ERA. No PCB sampling is necessary. The goal of the discussion is to reach consensus for NFA or no NFA. Bruce asked about current risk and discussed the issue with Alvero. Alvero was comfortable with a transient receptor scenario with > 100ppm PCB in soil. Robert noted his discussion with DEQ toxicologist did not agree noting that without conducting a risk assessment DEQ is not comfortable with > 1 ppb left in place in the absence of institutional controls. Robert suggested four samples be collected outside the excavated area at depth of 0-6". Bruce suggested that if we go out to sample Site 16 we should also grab a few samples at Site 15 AOC A for limited sampling to look at areas (surface soil) outside of previous excavations. **Action HILL**- Prepare a "one page" memo / work plan for sample of PCBs. Schedule for the memo is not a high priority.

Day 2 May 18, 2000

Check In

Review / Revise Agenda

X. FY01 Scope of Work

Bob presented a summary of FY01 work. The SMP was updated in June. Bob distributed a handout of funding. He noted that PMO is a LANTDIV overhead budget. Bob reviewed funding availability for each task. Bob noted there is funding available for SWMU 2 that we will consider reallocation for other efforts at the activity. **Action Bob** review SMP / FY01 budget.

XI. Site 12 RI Comments

Discussed the Draft RI for Site 12. The FS is waiting for the final RI and BTAG resolution of Step 3, and VA Tech's work on microcosm tests and modeling. Scott noted a meeting with VA Tech is scheduled for early June. The schedule for the FS is Nov. 2000 and for the Final RI is Sept. 2000. Scott summarized the status of the RI. Scott suggested we hold off on any pilot study until after completion of the FS, scheduled for Feb. 2001. Bruce summarized BTAG comments on the RI, noting a concern with flow into the storm drain and outfall. Bob asked how dredging of the ditch affects the ERA screening for the site. Because there have been no detected constituents in most recent sampling, there should be no effect unless the dredging exposed deeper sediments that may be contaminated. Robert sees no adverse affect from this since the sediments were sampled to a depth of 2 ft. **Action Bob** contact Jeff Waller for an update of the dredging activity which we will then forward info to the Eco subgroup. Team reviewed the sewer system path from the site.

XII. Master Project Plans MPP

Goal of the discussion is informational to provide an update of the status of the MPP and address any comments from Bruce and Robert. EPA comment addressed a requirement that the labs be CLP certified. **Action Bruce** -follow up with EPA policy on the required use of CLP labs. Bruce will call Scott with his follow up in early June.

XIII. Site 8 EE/CA

Site 8 is a construction debris (CD) landfill adjacent to a wildlife area and wetland area. The SI recommends an RI be conducted at Site 8. The Navy originally considered an EE/CA and/or hotspot removal for the site. Goal of the discussion is to determine long range plans for the site. Bob noted there is some waste at ground surface and an EE/CA was considered for housekeeping (removal of surface debris) purpose and to evaluate the remaining soil cover thickness. Robert expressed concern with waste at the surface and noted that to avoid any identification of the site as open dump under DEQ solid waste regulations the Navy should address it. **Action Robert** provide an example of a streamlined EE/CA. Bob proposed that the \$50 – \$60 K funding for FY00 be applied to a Site 8 characterization followed by a focused EE/CA for surface waste, with funding for FY01 as part of the RI. **Action Bob** –prepare scope of work for inventory of surface waste and EE/CA. **Consensus** to prepare an EE/CA to remove surface debris in FY00. Discussed development of a streamlined RI/FS to delineate waste and soil cover thickness, in addition to a second round of groundwater samples to address Eco subgroup data needs, address natural resource issues, HHRA, and FS Eco issues, and natural resources damage estimates.

XIV. ORC (Oxygen Release Compounds)

Goal of the discussion is for general feedback for applying the use of ORC at Little Creek sites in the near future. It was noted for consideration of bench scale tests on soil and water from PCP Site 13 and perhaps solvents at Site 11. Scott noted that for Site 13 ORC and HRC tests were conducted and the Implementation Plan for Site 13 comments from EPA are in and they have requested a discussion of the uncertainties. He noted that for TCE at Site 11, the HRC process showed some degradation but not to any great degree and that it may be premature to implement this process at Site 11. At Site 13, he noted that to implement a Pilot Study we need to install a monitoring system and that perhaps it could be considered with funding from extra money from CTO 47. LTM of bioremediation should consist of an initial frequency monitoring that is extending with time to less frequent monitoring intervals (4 rounds of sampling was suggested), followed by a report. Bruce noted with

injection of ORC it would be valuable to also inject a non-reactive tracer. **Action Bob** - verify funding available for ORC at Site 13 and prepare scope of work (sampling- baseline + 4 rounds).

XV. Rifle Ranges

Goal of the discussion is to identify agency positions on active rifle ranges. DEQ noted that they only deal with closed ranges. DEQ defers to BMPs to address active ranges. Bruce presented DOD/EPA management principals for closed ranges to address sites prior to promulgation of the Range Rule. Bruce distributed a handout on DOD policy for ranges. From a CERCLA perspective, in the FFA Findings of Fact (FoF) we identify this directive noting ranges are handled under a DoD policy. Team will address this issue in the FFA through a reference in the FoF. Bob noted this issue is also being addressed at higher levels in the Navy as they define roles and responsibilities. Team agrees that this is not a CERCLA responsibility but will nonetheless be address in FoF, similar to the UST program sites. **Action Bruce** – provide language for FFA to address the rifle range. **Action Robert** provide copy of DoD/EPA memo Management Principals for Ranges.

XVI. Pesticides at Sites 9 & 10

Goal of the discussion is to reach consensus on the need to sample pesticides in the May/June sampling at Site 9 & 10. PCBs have not been detected at either site. For Round 8 sampling a few pesticide hits were noted below tap water RBCs. Robert spoke with DEQ risk assessor and requested one more round of pesticide data before eliminating them as constituents of concern. Bruce suggested for Site 10 that we sample the three downgradient wells (MW01, MW02, & MW03), and one upgradient (MW08), and for Site 9 sample wells MW05, MW06, and UST 3 for pesticides. **Consensus** to sample these wells for pesticides. Dioxin sampling was suggested for wells MW04, MW05, and MW06. **Consensus** for sampling as discussed. **Action Scott** review data for cyanide and if non-detected in historical data drop from the sampling list of parameters.

XVII.

FY00 Goals

1. Submit Draft RODs for Sites 9 & 10 (9/00) (Draft ROD does not include legal review)
 - 12/99 - schedule reviewed during meeting - on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- work funded
 - 3/00- additional sampling required, on schedule pending results
 - 4/00- behind schedule by 20 days for final ROD by 9/30/00; schedule may slip further due to ecological issues and dioxin
 - 5/00 on schedule for 9/00, but in jeopardy due to "receiving area" discussions and background and BTAG review
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
 - 4/00- behind schedule awaiting EPA review comments of interim submittal II
 - 5/00 goal delayed for final HHRA in July 00 due to additional sampling at site 10 and review of interim deliverables

3. Final 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
 - 4/00- on schedule
 - 5/00 on schedule**

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
 - 4/00 on schedule
 - 5/00 on schedule**
 - Final Site 11 SRI (9/00):
 - 3/00 on schedule
 - 4/00 on schedule
 - 5/00 on schedule**

 - Draft Site 12 SRI (1/00):
 - submitted 1/00,**

 - Final Site 12 SRI (5/00):
 - 3/00 on schedule
 - 4/00 on schedule
 - 5/00 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 categorized all sites for FFA draft slip to 3/15/00
 - 4/00 on schedule revise to June 00
 - 5/00 on schedule for submittal June 00**

 - Final FFA (9/00)-
 - on schedule
 - 4/00 on schedule
 - 5/00 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
 - 4/00- 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, completed
 - 4/00- **Completed**

8. Scoping of FY 01 Work (8/00)
 - 12/99 – on schedule;
 - 2/1/00- on schedule
 - 3/00 on schedule
 - 4/00 on schedule
 - 5/00 on schedule preliminary completed 5/00, will update 6/14/00

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

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
 - 4/00- behind schedule, ERA problems with comments; meeting to resolve issues
 - 4/21; goal cannot be met
 - 5/00 **Step 2 to be completed 6/00 Step 3 on hold** *Work*

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
 - 4/00- behind schedule, ERA problems with Step 1 & 2 comments; meeting to resolve issues 4/21; on schedule
 - 5/00 on schedule **Note: Step 2 to be completed 6/00, Step 3 on hold pending tech approach issues, overall on schedule.** *Work*

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
 - 4/00 did not meet goal, to be completed by 5/00
 - 5/00 **comments discussed in May, final June 00**

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 OHM for SWMU 8, based on sample results.

3/00- work plan submitted,

4/00- on board review of comments; on schedule

5/00 on schedule note: SWMU 2 has been reprioritized to Appendix B site

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**

XVIII. Partnering

Roles and Responsibilities of process facilitator

NEXT MEETING

June 14 & 15 Philadelphia, PA

Start: 8:30

End: 4:30

Guests: Stacie Tier II

Roles

Chair: Robert

Timekeeper: Scott

Host: Bruce

Recorder: Donna

Goal Keeper: Bob

Conference Call: June, 11 Thursday 10:00

Proposed Agenda:

- RI/FS for site 9 & 10 1 hr
- Site 12 1 hr
- FFA Review 4 hr
- SMPGoal/funding update 1 hr
- Eco Update 0.5 hr
- RAB meeting Aug 1-2 timeframe 1 hr
- Site 8 EE/CA 2' cover and \$ 1 hr

- 2nd Quarter report 0.5 hr
- SWMU 8 RA confirm sampling 1 hr

Next meeting August 1, & 2, Virginia Beach

September 12, 13 Richmond

October 24 & 25 Herndon

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- 5/00-1 **Action Scott/Donna** - Prepare partnering deliverable; Donna provide deliverable to Scott
- 5/00-2 **Action Donna** -confirm with Alta the sequence of statistical steps for background data analysis.
- 5/00-3 **Action Donna**- provide Bruce with validated rank ordered data set for background.
- 5/00-4 **Action Bruce** - talk to Peter about BTAG consensus on background statistics.
- 5/00-5 **Action Donna** - coordinate schedule to load validated background data into data base and generate rank order file for Bruce, and coordinate conference call between June 20 - 30 for interim deliverable of background. ✓
- 5/00-6 **Action Team** - review all available information on Site 9 & 10 for consideration of "receiving area" as new site, and pursue other sources of available data such as air photos.
- 5/00-7 - **Action Bruce** initiate conference call to discuss Site 9 & 10 for consideration of "receiving area" as new site following Eco subgroup call June 5. *PARK CO*
- 5/00-8 - **Action Robert** prepare 2nd quarter goals for delivery to Tier II. *ON GOING*
- 5/00-9 - **Action Bob** notify legal about upcoming EE/CA for review. -
- 5/00-10 - **Action Robert** review information on Dioxin test analysis. ✓ *SITE 9+10*
- 5/00-11 - **Action Bob** get Susan Hulbert (LANTDIV legal) involved in the FFA issues. ✓
- 5/00-12 - **Action Team** review the FFA for the next meeting to provide changes, specifically dates for RCRA permit and withdrawal of permit request. ✓
- 5/00-13 - **Action Donna** add language that will summarize the SWMU Report and SSA ✓ process in the FFA.
- 5/00-14 - **Action Bruce/Robert** check with lawyers about how the absence of a RCRA permit at Little Creek will influence FFA language. *CARRYOVER*
- 5/00-15 - **Action Bob** -Update the Community Relations Plan (Part 37). ✓
- 5/00-16 - **Action Robert** identify any NOV's for Little Creek. *ON GOING*
- 5/00-17 - **Action HILL**- Prepare a "one page" memo / work plan for sample of PCBs at Site 16. *CARRYOVER*
- 5/00-18 - **Action Bob** review SMP/FY01 budget.
- 5/00-19 - **Action Bob** contact Jeff Waller for an update of the dredging activity for Site 12.
- 5/00-20 - **Action Bruce** -follow up with EPA policy on the required use of CLP labs. ✓
- 5/00-29 - **Action Robert** provide an example of a streamlined EE/CA *CAR PM*

- 5/00-21 - Action Bob –prepare scope of work for inventory of surface waste and EE/CA at Site 8. *Done*
- 5/00-22 - Action Bob -verify funding available for ORC at Site 13 and prepare scope of work *Done*
- 5/00-23 - Action Bruce – provide language for FFA to address the rifle range. *approved*
- 5/00-24 - Action Robert provide copy of DoD/EPA memo Management Principals for Ranges.
- 5/00-25 - Action Scott review data for cyanide and if non-detected in historical data drop from the sampling list of parameters for Site 9 & 10 *Done*
- 5/00-26 - Action All any new ECO sites?? *Completed*
- 5/00-27 - Action All review dioxin paper for SWMU 2 *ongoing*
- 5/00-28 - Action Robert send email about dioxin sampling at SWMU 2/Site 9 *completed*

UPDATED PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS

4/00-1 Action Scott-follow up with Tier II for pull down menu on Web page for goal updates

Completed

4/00-2 – Action Scott – update Partnering Team member list on Web Site

Completed

4/00-3 Action Donna – prepare deliverable of background statistics and statistical approach for interim review by EPA to be submitted one week before next meeting.

Completed

4/00-4 Action Donna – Send Bruce electronic copy of Draft SMP 4/12/00

Completed

4/00-5 Action Bob, BMP for Rifle Ranges

Completed

4/00-6 Action Bruce- discuss Site 16 risk issue with Alvero.

Completed

4/00-7 Action Scott -- discuss Site 16 risk issue with Bill

Completed

4/00-8 Action Robert – discuss Site 16 risk issue with Pat

Completed

4/00-9 Action Scott/ Ann West- send pesticide data to Team from rounds 7 & 8 by 4/25

Completed

4/00-10 Bruce Robert- look at pesticide data for Sites 9 & 10, hold conference call to discuss need to analyze for at Site 9.

Completed

4/00-11 Action Bob- investigate if historical dredge data is available in Desert Cove adjacent to SWMU 7.

Completed

4/00-12 Action Bruce- Set up conference call April 20 to finalize sediment sampling issue in the SWMU 7 & 8 work plan and May sampling parameters at Sites 9 & 10

Completed

4/00-13 Action Robert- check on DEQ requirements for soil as fill material.

Completed

3/00-2 Action Scott (4/18)- respond to EPA comments on ORC Pilot Test.
Carryover In progress on going (4/25) (5/00)

3/00-8 Action Donna - SWMU Report Update to include FFA sorting
Completed FFA Carryover SWMU Report in Progress (6/15/00) (5/00)

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

Carryover (5/17/00)

Completed (5/00)

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

Carryover

Completed (5/00)

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

Completed/Carryover, Bob was told all drains go to sanitary sewer. Bob will still inquire with another individual

Completed (5/00)

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

Carryover- put on hold to clarify parameters. Bob noted recent sewer line break which released sewage into ditch west of Site 7. **Consensus** to delay fifth round of sampling at site 7 for six months to allow for revision of sampling program to address ECO concerns.

Completed 5/00

3/00-16 Action Rick/Bob- Check with Francine Blend about sanitary permit for exceedences at SWMU 2. Bob checked with John VanName, John Camberlin, and Brian Lee. At region, Francine deals with Norfolk, Wilke Din has responsibility for Little Creek. If SWMU 2 is under permit then will actions be addressed in the permit

Carryover

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

Carryover

Completed 5/00

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

Carryover ✓

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

Carryover ✓

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

Carryover

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

Carry over in progress

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 **Bob** to further discuss with attorneys. Bob noted all land has been transferred to Chief Mid-Atlantic Region; LANTDIV still responsible for environmental.

Carryover 5/00