

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**CH2MHILL**

## **St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: May 18, 2006**

**Attendees:** Agnes Sullivan/NAVFAC MID LANT  
Todd Richardson/EPA (Region III)  
Karen Doran/VDEQ  
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL  
Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

**Tier II Link:** Bob Schirmer/NAVFAC MID LANT

**Guests:** Josh Barber/EPA (Region III)

**From:** Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

**Date:** June 14, 2006

**Location:** Virginia Beach Resort Hotel & Conference Center, Virginia Beach, VA

---

### **Thursday, May 18, 2006**

#### **0830 Welcome/Check In**

#### **Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:**

**Meeting Manager:** Karen Doran  
**Timekeeper/Gatekeeper:** Kim Henderson  
**Host:** Janna Staszak  
**Goalkeeper:** Agnes Sullivan  
**Facilitator:** Todd Richardson  
**Recorder:** Janna Staszak

#### **Ground Rules**

#### **I. Review Agenda, Meeting Minutes, Action Items, and Parking Lot from the Previous Meeting**

##### **Review Agenda:**

Revisions were made throughout the meeting as needed.

The March meeting minutes were added to the parking lot.

##### **Review Parking Lot:**

- Indoor air vapor intrusion - pending guidance, removed from parking lot

##### **Review Action Items:**

The action items from the March meeting were reviewed. As a result, the following action items were created:

**Action Kim** – Email Linda Baxter ([Baxter.Linda@epa.gov](mailto:Baxter.Linda@epa.gov)) St. Juliens Creek sediment data.

**Action Karen** – Send Linda Baxter and the team Virginia shellfish/fish advisory information.

## II. Blows Creek eBERA

Objective: Present the electronically-enhanced baseline ecological risk assessment (eBERA) success story write-up and review comments. Review feedback on eBERA.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the draft eBERA success story write-up were provided. Agnes then reviewed the content of the document. Todd expressed concerns regarding identification of the eBERA as a success story since it has not been fully accepted by Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG). Agnes said that it's only a draft write-up, but she feels that the eBERA is still a success to the team. Kim indicated that the team should still pull together a write-up, but maybe direct it more toward a "lessons learned". Agnes said that she feels the team successfully pulled together the first eBERA; whether or not the same format is used for future BERAs. Karen indicated that she really likes the format of the document because it makes it easier for the remedial project manager (RPM) to review it.

Todd called Bruce to solicit feedback on the format. Over speaker phone, Bruce provided feedback and indicated that overall, the presentation was good. He found it easy to navigate from one area to another. However, he feels there is an accessibility problem because people using different computers and from different agencies have been unable to open the document, which is bad from a public review factor. From a technical presentation standpoint, Bruce felt that the level of information presented to support the risk assessment process doesn't go through the assessment in a logical sequence so that you can follow from start to finish what is going on. Kim indicated that she feels the content is the same as a typical BERA. Bruce said the headings are the same, but the same information isn't presented (both from narrative and information standpoints). Bruce indicated that the document was very snap-shot/visually oriented, but lacks the information of going from point A to point B (the thought process). Bruce has submitted comments on content to Todd and feels that we can move forward on Blows Creek with the document as-is. He will also submit separate comments on concept, but does not recommend proceeding with this approach on other documents (as a stand-alone document). Aside from the technical issues, of which Bruce indicated he did not see many, Bruce recommends salvaging some concepts for a future document. His concept comments are geared toward path forward (for other sites/projects). Bruce agrees that there are benefits to the electronic format, but more for briefings or public meetings. Bruce has seen this type of format in site reviews for other sites, but that as a stand alone BERA document, content needs to be laid out in more of a comprehensive format.

Kim suggested that at the next meeting, ecological people are involved to talk about the path forward for Blows Creek, in spite of the issues with the document format.

Todd suggested spinning the success story to indicate that it is an effective tool for partnering teams. Agnes indicated that if possible, she would like to revise the electronic document into a format that would be accepted as a stand alone document, but needs more specific comments from EPA before making that decision. Kim suggested inviting BTAG to

a workgroup to revise and finalize the eBERA. She suggested that if they have more involvement they may be more supportive of it.

Karen has provided comments. She indicated that the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) risk assessor feels that the detail regarding equations should be increased. VDEQ also recommended table format changes.

Path Forward: Kim reviewed the path forward, once comments are received from EPA, BTAG may need to be involved to discuss the path forward for the site. Regarding the success story, the team will revise it to present the success of trying an innovative approach, and proceed with submission to Tier II. Once conceptual comments are received Ed Corl/NAVFAC and Agnes will determine path forward for the eBERA format.

**Action Team** – Arrange for eco consultants to attend Richmond partnering meeting on July 19 or 20.

**Action Agnes** – Revise eBERA success story and email to team for review by May 31.

### III. Tier II Update

Bob Schirmer/NAVFAC provided the Tier II update:

- Tier II Meeting: Scheduled for June 20 and 21. Goals and proposed meetings need to be updated before the meeting.
- Basics of Partnering Training: Karen, Josh, and Agnes need to attend the training, which is tentatively scheduled for July 27 and 28 in Virginia (location to be determined).
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Goals: Bob suggested that EPA talk about GPRA goals at the next meeting.
- Uniform Federal Policy - Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for Federal Facilities: EPA and Department of Defense (DoD) have approved the Uniform QAP for Federal Facilities. Bob recommended that the team start thinking about how to incorporate the QAPP and that Josh provide addition information on the QAPP at the next partnering meeting into SJCA. The Little Creek Master Project Plans (MPPs) are being revised to incorporate the Uniform QAP for Federal Facilities.
- eBERA success story: Bob indicated that although the EPA has not accepted the current format of the eBERA, it is still a success story because it shortened up a long document and has paved the way for EPA to revise the BERA format.

### IV. Site 19 Removal Action Update

Objective: Update the team on the status of the removal action and prepare for post-removal action submittals.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Janna reviewed the site background and removal action then discussed the upcoming Site 19 submittals.

Based on results of the Site Investigation (SI) (2002) and Supplemental Site Investigation (SSI) (2004) and the recommendation of the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) (2005) and Action Memorandum (2006), a removal action was conducted at Site 19 to

remediate elevated metals in surface soil and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in subsurface soil at Site 19. The scope of the removal action consisted of excavation of 1.5 feet of soil from the Metallic Slag Area and excavation of 4 feet of soil from the Elevated Subsurface Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) Area, backfill, and site restoration. Preliminary work, including a site survey, utility search, waste characterization sampling, and borrow sampling, was conducted in February. The removal action occurred the week of May 8, 2006.

Path Forward: Upcoming post-removal submittals and tentative dates include:

- Draft Construction Closeout Report (June 12)
- Final Construction Closeout Report (July 31)
- Draft Site Closeout Report (August 31)
- Final Site Closeout Report (November 15)

#### **V. Site 5 EE/CA, Site Remediation Goals, and Groundwater Monitoring**

Objective: Review the site background, review the Draft EE/CA recommendation and comments, develop cleanup goals for confirmation samples, discuss groundwater monitoring and preliminary comments on work plan, and review the path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the site background and status. Janna presented the EE/CA recommendation, which is for excavation to visible limits, collection of confirmation samples, and restoration/wetlands creation. Karen asked why excavation to seasonal mean low groundwater level followed by creation of wetlands was not evaluated. Janna responded that the alternative had been considered, but it was not fully evaluated because it became apparent that it would be cost-prohibitive due to the estimated depth of the seasonal mean low groundwater level at the site. Additionally, considerable technical evaluation would have been necessary in order to evaluate the feasibility of the wetland.

Kim reviewed the VDEQ comments. The first VDEQ comment recommends replacing the shallow and deep monitoring wells at the same location rather than upgradient of the waste/burnt soil area as is indicated in the work plan. Kim indicated that the deep groundwater well will not be replaced because there is no risk in the deep groundwater and no plan to collect future deep groundwater data. Kim indicated that the logic in replacing the shallow well upgradient was similar to what is used in landfills, where you have an upgradient well to serve as a baseline of what is coming from off-site. Karen said she prefers to install the shallow well at its existing location for consistency of data for future trend analysis. Kim indicated that the location could be moved in the EE/CA, and the exact location could be determined during the work plan phase for the removal action.

The second VDEQ comment regarded wetland monitoring: VDEQ recommend three to five years of monitoring for the constructed wetland. Janna explained that the EE/CA recommended alternative is based on achieving the remedial action objectives (RAOs), and that the success of the wetland will not have any impact on the achievement of the RAOs. Therefore, the wetland success is not tied to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) risk mitigation. The Navy prefers a successful wetland, but there is some risk as to the success due to limited data during the growing season. Because the Navy will not be pursuing wetland credit, the actual acreage of wetland

created will not be tied to a requirement. Agnes recently attended a meeting with Navy and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on wetland banking. Debbie Miller from VDEQ also attended. Agnes explained that the Navy had been looking into banking in order to track their wetland credits in the tidewater area/watershed. Because requirements for wetland banking include deed restrictions to restrict property use, lifetime maintenance of the wetlands, and no wetland losses are planned on tidewater bases, the Navy determined it would not be pursued. Karen indicated that she still felt that the site should be monitored for success. She recalled similar project at other facilities where monitoring was a requirement.

**Action Karen** – Check on wetland monitoring requirements at other facilities (regarding applicability to Site 5).

Janna reviewed the overall schedule for the EE/CA. Comments on the draft are due May 31. A 30 day public comment period will follow receipt of the comments. Submission of the Final EE/CA is planned for July 21. In the meantime, a draft Action Memorandum will be submitted by June 30. Comments will be due on the Draft Action Memorandum by July 30, and the Final Action Memorandum will be submitted August 15.

Kim then discussed Site Remediation Goals (SRGs). She indicated that cleanup goals had never been developed for the site because the presumed plan was always excavation to seasonal mean low groundwater level with no confirmation samples. However, since it has been realized that excavation to that depth would be cost prohibitive, SRGs are now necessary. Kim reviewed the process for developing the goals, which was based on human health risk and background upper tolerance limits (UTLs). The team indicated that the logic makes sense and after review of the SRG Technical Memorandum, consensus can be created.

**Action Janna** – Send Site 5 SRG Technical Memorandum to the team and Linda Watson (watson.linda@epa.gov) by May 19.

The team then discussed groundwater monitoring at Site 5. The draft Expanded Remedial Investigation (ERI) Addendum Work Plan (WP) is currently out for review. It calls for the collection of two additional rounds of data from the shallow wells. Minor typographical comments had been received from VDEQ. No comments were received from the Navy or EPA. The team decided to accept the work plan and begin planning the first sampling event. Change pages will be sent to address the VDEQ comments.

**Consensus:** The team accepts the Draft ERI Addendum WP as final with grammatical revisions and agrees to conduct Site 5 groundwater monitoring based on the Draft submittal.

**Path Forward:** The ERI report will be finalized upon the receipt of EPA comments. The EE/CA will be finalized after comments are received from the Navy and EPA, and the public comment period is held. The first round of groundwater samples will be collected in June.

## **VI. Site 21 Status Update**

**Objective:** Review the site status, review the draft SSI findings and recommendations, and review the schedule.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the site history and status then reviewed the data from the SSI. Karen indicated that she is concerned with the deep groundwater because of the arsenic detection. Kim replied that arsenic was only detected in the initial sample (August 2003), and has not been detected since (in December 2004 or November 2005). Agnes asked if the deep groundwater well could be abandoned. Kim will look into it.

Karen asked about Site 2 surface water data, looking for whether or not the trichloroethene (TCE) at Site 2 seemed to be from Site 21. Kim reviewed the Site 2 surface water data, and indicated that because the TCE levels at Site 2 are significantly higher than Site 21, Site 21 is not the likely source of contamination to Site 2.

Kim reviewed the Conceptual Site Model (CSM). Karen questioned the petroleum release depiction because it appears as though the benzene flows down all the way to the confining unit. Kim will review and revise for the final submittal.

The team then discussed the storm sewer video survey. The survey has not yet been conducted because it appears that the storm line is not functioning. A contractor working at Site 21 had previously indicated they were making repairs to the line; however, the extent of their planned repairs is unknown.

**Action Agnes** - Check on repair of storm sewers with standing water at Site 21 by June 15.

Agnes indicated that she does not want to survey the entire line within the plume if it isn't necessary. She noted that the TCE detections in the eastern portion of the line were much lower than the western portion (adjacent to Building 1556) and asked if it was necessary to survey that portion. Janna indicated that the lower levels may be a result of the lower concentrations in that portion of the plume, and that because TCE volatilizes rapidly, the low levels in the storm line may still represent a problem. Agnes asked if there was any way to determine what the concentration may have been before the TCE volatilized. Kim responded that she would discuss the extent of the survey and what effect leakage may have on the treatability study with the technical consultant.

Kim discussed the path forward for Site 21. A treatability study is planned for 2006. Prior to the treatability study, additional data collection is recommended. A work plan is being prepared to plan the collection of additional data, which will include additional groundwater sampling (temporary and permanent wells), soil sample collection, and *Dehalococcoides* analysis. Karen recommended collection of a groundwater sample between Building 1556 and Site 2, south of the 500 ppm TCE detection at TW106. The team agreed to collect the recommended sample.

Path Forward: Kim indicated that the work plan for additional data collection should be submitted by the end of June. Additionally, the SSI report will be finalized in July, pending comments. The work plan for the treatability study is anticipated to meet the team goal of September 30 for submission, pending results of the additional data collection.

## **VII. Roundtable**

### Oversight Contractors:

EPA is considering adding oversight contractors as an additional level of review. If the plan is implemented, the contractor would attend all of the Tier I meetings. However, Todd has recommended to Josh and his management that SJCA does not need one.

#### Partnering Training:

Todd doesn't think we need to go to facilitation, but strongly recommends implementing the principles of facilitation.

### VIII. Schedule and FY 2006 Team Goals Update

**Schedule:** The Schedule was updated and is included as a separate file.

The following document review deadlines were discussed:

Document	Comments due
Draft Final Site 5 ERI (HHRA Revision)	Over due <del>(Now 5/19)</del>
Draft eBERA Concept	Overdue
Site 4 LUC RD	6/30
Draft SSI for Site 21	7/5
Draft SMP	7/15
Draft Construction Closeout Report for Site 19	7/16
Tech Memo on SRG for Site 5	7/19
Work Plan for Site 21 Data Gaps	7/30
Draft Site Closeout Report for Site 19	10/31

**FY 2006 Team Goals:** The FY 2006 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

### IX. Agenda Building – July Meeting Agenda

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
GPRA and UFP QAPP	I, C - To inform the team of policies and discuss impact on site plans.	Josh	0.5 hr
eBERA	I, D, C - Determine path forward for Blows Creek; <del>refine eBERA concept.</del>	Mike/Ed	2 hrs
Site 5 Confirmation Sampling & Wetland Monitoring	D, C - SRG development (HHRA, eco risk mitigated) and sample frequency; wetland monitoring	Kim	1.5 hrs
Site 2 Path Forward and RTC	C, D - Data gap work plan, ERI	Kim	1 hr

	comments		
Site 4 Groundwater Monitoring & RACR	I, C, D - Review comments on work plan and RACR	Janna	0.75 hr
FY 2007 Goals & SMP	I, C, D - Determine paths forward for sites and develop FY2007 goals	Agnes/Kim	1 hr
Partnering Activity/Josh Entrance	I - Welcome Josh and develop good team working skills	Team/Facilitator	0.5 hr
Roundtable	I - open	Team	0.5 hr

**Next meeting:** July 19 and 20, 2006

**Location:** VDEQ 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, Richmond, Virginia

**Lodging:** Crowne Plaza, Richmond, Virginia

**Start time:** 9:30 AM

**Finish time:** 5:00 PM

**Chair:** Kim Henderson

**Host:** Karen Doran

**Timekeeper:** Josh Barber

**Goal Keeper:** Agnes Sullivan

**Recorder:** Janna Staszak

**Facilitator:** Agnes Sullivan

**Tier II:** Bruce Frizzell

**Guests:** Ed Corl, Mike Elias, BTAG, VDEQ eco (Pat)

**Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call:** 10:00 AM on July 11, 2006

**Call-in number:** 1-888-232-0362 (Host Code: 100890 Participant Code: 191819)

~~**Action Karen** - Check with Durwood for Tier II tie in.~~

*Note: Bruce Frizzell will serve as the Tier II link. Janna will coordinate.*

## **X. Future Meetings Schedule**

August 30 - 31, 2006

Chincoteague, VA

October 18 - 19, 2006

Norfolk, Virginia with RAB Meeting

December 6 - 7, 2006

Washington, DC (Marriott Residence Inn? Hilton Alexandria?)

## **XI. Meeting Evaluation**

Todd provided facilitator feedback. During the Partnering Session, the Team filled in "+" and "Δ" to list the positives and negatives of the meeting.

**Action Janna** - Email Todd's gift to team by May 31.

## **XII. Parking Lot**

Indoor air vapor intrusion was removed from the Parking Lot. The team will be notified when the guidance is finalized.

To remain in parking lot:

- March draft meeting minutes