

St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: October 12 and 13, 2005

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

Tier II Link: Bob Schirmer/NAVFAC MID LANT

Guests: Becky Jackson/CH2M HILL

From: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

Date: November 7, 2005

Location: Virginia Beach Resort Hotel and Conference Center, Virginia Beach, VA

Wednesday, October 12, 2005

0830 Welcome/Check In

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager: Jim Cutler
Timekeeper/Gatekeeper: Todd Richardson
Host: Kim Henderson
Goalkeeper: Agnes Sullivan
Facilitator: Kim Henderson
Recorder: Janna Staszak

Ground Rules

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

Review Agenda:

No changes were made to the agenda. Revisions were made throughout the meeting as needed.

Review Previous Meeting Minutes:

No changes were made to the minutes.

Consensus: August 2005 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final with no revisions. The final minutes will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint Installation Restoration (IR) Teams web site.

Review Previous Action Items:

The team reviewed Action Items and carryover items from the August 2005 meeting. The Action Items were added to a separate spreadsheet and tracked at the meeting.

Agnes told the team about a meeting held with Norfolk Naval Shipyard (NNSY) regarding the May 2005 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. She explained that the meeting focused on the land use across St. Juliens Creek from SJCA where Mr. Grant reported that "hot material" was dumped while NNSY contractors were using the land. She explained that a contractor had leased the property to fabricate enclosures for work on submarines, but that the Navy had no involvement with the land selection and that no submarines or hazardous material were ever brought to the property. Real estate records were reviewed and neither the property across the creek nor the sunken bridge was ever owned by the Navy. Todd asked if a formal response will be prepared. Agnes said yes; Navy Public Affairs Officers (PAOs) have prepared a response, which has been sent to Washington, DC for review and concurrence prior to submittal.

As a result of the responses to the previous Action Items, the following new Action Items were created:

Action Kim – Find facilitator roles and add to deliverables – send to the team.

Action Agnes – Forward final Port Authority letter for Site 5 wetlands.

Action Agnes – Determine if the Community Involvement Plan (CIP) should be posted on the public website.

Action Team – Bring Meyers Briggs results to the December meeting.

Review Parking Lot:

- Indoor air vapor guidance – will remain in parking lot pending guidance

II. Restoration Advisory Board Review

Objective: Review of the October 11, 2005 RAB meeting.

Overview of Discussion: The team discussed the RAB meeting. The RAB meeting went well. Bob Mann was the only attendee (aside from the Partnering Team). Bob Mann requested a site visit; the site visit will be scheduled for the May 2006 meeting. The following actions resulted from the meeting:

Action Kim – Send the historical society presentation to the RAB.

Todd indicated that Jim McCaery/EPA Site Assessment Branch Chief will also work to address the community concerns raised in May 2005 regarding St. Juliens Creek. If a site assessment is conducted, Todd wasn't sure if the RAB was the appropriate forum for addressing the findings. Kim suggested that Todd talk to the Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) to determine if the RAB is the proper forum for voicing the EPA's findings and response actions.

Action Todd – Talk to Jim McCaery regarding EPA Site Assessment involvement in conjunction with community concerns in St. Juliens Creek and discuss participation in October 2006 RAB Meeting.

III. Site 19 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA)

Objective: Discuss the Draft EE/CA, any comments, the Action Memorandum, and schedule.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed. Kim presented an update on the Site 19 EE/CA to the team, including the site background, the EE/CA content and schedule, the Action Memorandum, and the overall schedule.

The Draft EE/CA was submitted on August 31, 2005. The preferred remedy (Non-Time-Critical Removal Action [NTCRA]) is excavation, off-site disposal, and backfill/restoration of the Metallic Slag Area and Elevated Subsurface Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) Area. Kim reviewed the status of the comments on the EE/CA. VDEQ previously submitted minor comments and they will be incorporated in the Final EE/CA. Todd indicated that EPA has minor comments regarding pre-confirmation samples (add a more detailed explanation about why they are being used instead of post excavation confirmation samples) and including the data from the previous samples (it is referenced and the locations are shown, but the actual data are not included). Agnes indicated that she will review the EE/CA during the public review period.

The public comment period was scheduled for October 17 through November 16, 2005. The public notice for the EE/CA appeared in the Virginia Pilot on October 16, 2005. At the end of the public comment period, if comments are received, a Responsiveness Summary will be prepared to address the comments. The EE/CA will then be finalized by December 10, 2005.

The draft Action Memorandum will be submitted in October for review by the team. Kim explained that the Action Memorandum is the decision document for the Navy to approve the proposed remedy. The Action Memorandum will need to be signed before the removal action can take place. The team goal is to complete the removal action by June 30, 2006, so the Action Memorandum will need to be submitted as soon as possible in order to allow time for signature.

Action Agnes – Get PAO approval for the Draft Site 19 EE/CA public notice.

IV. Site 21 Field Investigation

Objective: Update the team on the status of the Site 21 field work.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the site history, the current plume and site status, and discussed the upcoming field activities.

Trichloroethene (TCE) concentrations are present at 120 to 1,800 parts per billion (ppb). TCE breakdown products have been identified, including vinyl chloride concentrations ranging from 2.3 to 7.3 ppb and cis-1,2-dichloroethene (DCE) concentrations ranging from 12 to 710 ppb. Benzene is present at 75 ppb at MW09S. All of the elevated concentrations are limited to the surficial aquifer (5 to 19 feet below ground surface) and the groundwater flows to the southwest.

Kim reminded the team that the Final Work Plan for the field investigation was submitted on August 26, 2005 to further delineate the volatile organic compound (VOC) plume and determine the potential for transport and release of VOCs through the storm sewer system.

Field work for additional groundwater delineation is scheduled for October 31 through November 11, 2005. Field work will include the following:

- Delineation of the eastern boundary of the VOC plume
 - 5 temporary wells east of MW07S, sample for VOCs
 - 1 to 2 permanent shallow monitoring wells based on the results
- Determination of the extent of VOCs under building 1556
 - 4 or 5 temporary wells within the building, sample for VOCs
 - 1 permanent shall monitoring well based on the results
- Refinement of the boundaries of the VOC plume in preparation for treatment
 - 12 temporary wells within and around the current estimated plume boundaries, sample for VOCs
- Establishment of the complete data set for the VOC plume
 - Samples from existing shallow monitoring wells for VOC analysis
- Confirmation of previous MCL exceedances of the arsenic at MW01D
 - Collect samples for arsenic by Inductively Coupled Plasma - Mass Spectrometry (ICPMS)

A video survey will be conducted to locate any existing leaks in approximately 1,075 linear feet of the storm water system and if leaks are found, they may need to be repaired prior to remediation activities.

Kim indicated that she met with the Building 1556 personnel to begin coordination. Work inside of the building will be allowed and will take place in the evenings to prevent disruption to the building operations.

Action Agnes - Check with Lt. Segalla on dig permit requirement for Site 21 field work (October 31 through November 11).

The overall schedule for Site 21 is to conduct the field investigation (October 31 through November 11, 2005), conduct the storm sewer survey in FY2006, prepare a draft Supplemental SI report (January 2006), and prepare a Draft Treatability Study Work Plan (September 2006). Kim asked the team to plan on reviewing data from the temporary wells quickly so that the permanent well locations can be selected. The team agreed. She will provide a figure depicting the data and proposed permanent well locations.

V. Site 4

Objective: Review construction status, determine plan for voluntary performance monitoring, and verify that an Interim Remedial Action Completion Report (IRACR) is appropriate for Site 4 instead of a RACR.

Overview of Discussion: Janna provided an update on the construction status and reviewed the Construction Closeout Report. Janna indicated that construction is substantially

complete. Since the last meeting, the pre-final inspection was conducted, the curb and fence were installed, and hydroseeding and asphalt repairs were complete. The only items remaining were investigative-derived waste (IDW) removal (scheduled for October 17, 2005), sign installation (scheduled for the week of October 17, 2005), removal of the erosion and sediment controls (after site stabilization), and the final inspection (to be scheduled by Resident Officer In Charge of Construction [ROICC] office). Janna showed the team recent photographs of the site, including the western slope and the fence, the new downgradient monitoring well, the southern slope, and the eastern side of the site/ditch/fence. Because there is no turn-around at the end of the road (near the bridge south of the site), Agnes has requested to Lt. Segalla (Navy PWC) that a sign be placed on the road north of Site 4 to indicate the road is a dead end without a turn-around. The Construction Closeout Report, which will summarize the construction effort, will be submitted on October 31, 2005.

Action Agnes - Ask Lt. Segalla about sign installation at Site 4.

Kim discussed the difference between an IRACR and a RACR based on the Navy's perspective. IRACRs are written if a remedial action is implemented (construction complete) and all cleanup goals for all media are not met (Response in Place [RIP]). The RACR is written when remedial action is implemented (construction complete) and all clean-up goals for all media are met (Response Complete [RC]). Therefore, because waste is being left in place, from the Navy's perspective an IRACR would be appropriate for Site 4. The EPA guidance is written from a delisting perspective, in which a RACR would not be written until all of the sites are closed. Todd agreed that an IRACR should be appropriate for Site 4.

The IRACR documents the Remedial Action and RIP, and that the remedy is operational and functional in accordance with Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). It should be submitted when all the components of the Record of Decision (ROD) have been implemented. Funding is anticipated in April 2006 and the team goal for completion is June 2006, so the IRACR will begin when funding is received. Kim showed the team the format of the IRACR, using the Little Creek Sites 9 and 10 as an example.

Kim presented the purpose of the voluntary performance monitoring; to monitor the effectiveness of the soil cover because there is waste still in place and to evaluate the site's impact on groundwater quality to ensure no potential future releases will pose unacceptable risk. "Voluntary" monitoring was proposed at Site 4 because the regulatory requirements are "relevant and appropriate" but not "applicable". Therefore, the site is not bound by the Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations (VSWMR) and the team can select the constituents to monitor for and the frequency and duration for monitoring.

The proposed monitoring included 4 monitoring wells (1 upgradient and 3 downgradient) for the MCL exceedances and human health risk drivers in soil (arsenic, iron, cadmium, lead, thallium). The duration was quarterly for one year, review data, and reevaluate monitoring frequency. Data evaluation would be conducted by statistical trends analysis.

Todd asked if 4 rounds will be enough for a statistical evaluation. Kim responded that 4 rounds from 4 wells should be sufficient. Jim asked what the statistical analysis would

accomplish. Agnes asked Jim if he foresees the ability to stop monitoring in the future; Jim said that he does.

Action Kim – Check with stats people on data requirements for Site 4 groundwater monitoring.

Todd expressed concern is on the overall objective of the monitoring; i.e, since there were no permeability requirements for the cover it's not really assessing the effectiveness. Jim responded that there is always potential for release since there is waste left in place. Then Todd asked why not do full suite analysis since the contents that may leach out are unknown. Jim asked what the other detects were, other than the chemicals of potential concern (COPCs). VOCs were detected, but the detections were common lab constituents. One pesticide was also detected but not repeated in subsequent monitoring.

Jim requested that the data be related to risk, and the objectives kept general.

Action Todd/Jim – Research requirements for waste-in-place monitoring requirements (Site 4).

The team agreed that a consensus statement needs to be created to ensure that there is no confusion on the monitoring frequency, analytical parameters, data evaluation, and decision points. A consensus statement was drafted but placed in the parking lot to discuss further and make a decision at the next meeting.

Draft consensus statement: The team agrees to conduct voluntary post-ROD groundwater monitoring at Site 4 to monitor the effectiveness of the soil cover and evaluate the site's impact on groundwater quality to ensure no potential future releases will pose unacceptable risk. Three downgradient and one upgradient monitoring wells will be monitored for arsenic, iron, cadmium, lead, and thallium based on previous maximum contaminant level (MCL) exceedances. Monitoring will be conducted quarterly for one year and the monitoring frequency will be re-evaluated after one year based on statistical analysis and comparison to MCLs, background upper tolerance limits (UTLs), and site-specific 1999 data.

VI. Entrance/Partnering Activity

Objective: Team-building exercise to welcome Agnes to the team.

Overview: The team "geocached" in Virginia Beach.

Thursday, October 13, 2005

0830 Check In.

Review Agenda:

No revisions were made to the agenda.

VII. Site 2

Objective: Present the Expanded Remedial Investigation (ERI) results, conclusions, and recommendations; update the team on the status of the Tiger Team; discuss activities associated with the Feasibility Study (FS); and discuss the path forward for the site.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the status of the Site 2 ERI, explaining the content, objectives, delays, and format of the document. She displayed a site photo that showed the various contamination locations at the site, then began reviewing the results by media.

Waste and Soil: Waste (ABM, burnt soil, construction debris, spent ordnance, petroleum odor) extends to 7 ft bgs over approximately 3.3 acres. Localized hot spots in the soil, including lead in subsurface soil (8,850 mg/kg), 4,4-DDT in subsurface soil (290,000 ug/kg), and Aroclor-1260 in surface soil (2,700 ug/kg). Potential human health risks for future construction workers (hazard index [HI] = 1.3) and future child residents (HI = 8.3) were identified based on the more conservative reasonable maximum exposure (RME) evaluation, but no risks were identified based on the more realistic central tendency (CT) exposure evaluation. Potential ecological risks were identified to lower-level receptors, avian vermivores, and reptiles due to metals, PAHs, and pesticides. The recommendation for soil is for risk management of potential human health risks based on results of CT exposure and to develop an FS to evaluate alternatives for mitigation of ecological risks.

Action Todd, Jim, Kim – Check on subsurface soil sampling depths for Sites 2 and 5 from the Remedial Investigation.

Shallow groundwater: AVOC plume with TCE (330,000 ug/L) and degradation products (cis/trans 1,2-DCE and vinyl chloride) is present at the site. Potential unacceptable risks were identified for all receptors. The chemicals of concern (COCs) are VOCs, heptachlor epoxide, carbazole, naphthalene, 2,6-dinitrotoluene, RDX, and several inorganics (arsenic, iron, manganese, thallium, vanadium). There is a potential for risk management of the inorganics. Although RME hazards were identified for the inorganics (HI > 1), there was no CT exposure risk for arsenic and vanadium and the concentrations of the other inorganics were below background UTLs. MCL exceedances include several VOCs, arsenic, and heptachlor epoxide. The recommendation for shallow groundwater is to consider risk management for the inorganic COCs and to develop a treatability study/pilot study and FS to evaluate potential remedial alternatives.

The Tiger Team meeting is scheduled at the CH2M HILL Virginia Beach office October 25 through October 27 to discuss potential remedial alternatives for shallow groundwater. Kim and Agnes reviewed the meeting agenda: the first day will consist of a statement of objectives and presentation of the site background. Then the Tiger Team plans to discuss the site independently and prepare a report of data gaps and options. The team discussed the most appropriate time for VDEQ and EPA to participate in the meeting, if warranted. Todd asked if he should be sending an EPA technical expert to the meeting instead of himself. Agnes said that it would probably not be necessary because most of the discussions will be the Tiger Team members.

Action Agnes – Send Tiger Team agenda to Ruth Owens and ask when the best time for EPA and VDEQ to participate and let Jim and Todd know.

Deep groundwater: There were no MCL or RBC exceedances during the RI. One deep groundwater well was installed in the VOC plume during the ERI, and TCE was detected above the MCL. Some possibilities for the presence of TCE include carry down with the well installation, a leaking Yorktown Confining Unit, or that a conduit was created during well installation. The potential human health risks were not reevaluated in the ERI because the team agreed to further investigate the cause of TCE detected in deep groundwater. A tech memo will be prepared for a deep groundwater investigation (pump the well dry as possible, recharge, and resample). Todd asked if the confining unit was thin there; Kim responded that it was thick. Agnes asked how long the carry down would linger if carry-down was the cause. Jim responded that he wouldn't expect it to be that long, and he is more worried about the potential conduit. The ERI recommends additional investigation for the deep groundwater.

Sediment: VOCs were detected in sediment adjacent to the VOC plume. The potential human health risks were not reevaluated as part of the ERI. The RI indicated that there were potential human health risks associated with dermal contact for future adult and child residents for chromium based on the RME evaluation. The CT exposure risks for all scenarios were less than 1. To further evaluate potential risks to ecological receptors, toxicity testing was performed during the ERI. Four of the five samples collected in the inlet indicated 0 to 58% survival and that these locations correlated with elevated PAH and metal concentrations. Potential adverse effects to piscivorous wildlife and reptiles were also identified based on mercury concentrations. However, the mercury concentrations are similar to reference soil/sediment in urbanized areas. The recommendation for sediment is to develop the FS to evaluate alternatives for mitigation of ecological risks. Additional sampling may be required because the data does not indicate measurable trends. Todd suggested that an ecological subgroup be involved in the FS planning.

Surface water: Both the storm water system passing through the Site 21 VOC plume and the Site 2 shallow groundwater discharge were identified as sources to the inlet surface water. No human health risks were identified for surface water based on the transient nature. The ERA concluded that several inorganics and carbon disulfide may adversely affect aquatic life, but the risks are minimal based on the transient nature of surface water. Recommendations for surface water include the consideration of risk management, completion of the video survey and repair of the upgradient storm sewer system, and remediation of the other media to eliminate potential sources of contamination to surface water. Jim asked if the surface water data have been compared to the Virginia Water Quality Standards for surface water. Kim indicated that they had and the data and comparison is included in the RI.

Kim reviewed the steps currently being taken in association with the FS. Wetlands analysis activities have been started; including a wetland delineation and report, a tidal benchmark survey, a conceptual wetlands design, and a Net Environmental Benefits Analysis (NEBA). In addition, the team will consider performing waste characterization sampling of the soil and groundwater to determine if it would require hazardous or nonhazardous disposal. The disposal cost would have a huge impact on the cost of the alternative during the FS.

The path forward for Site 2 includes submission of the Draft ERI by October 21, 2005, the Tiger Team meeting on October 25 through 27, 2005, submission of the deep groundwater

tech memo by the end of October 2005, and development of the FS by March 15, 2006. A Phase I remedial action or pilot study is planned by September 30, 2006 (FY 2006 goal).

VIII. Site 5 EE/CA

Objective: Finalize the options for evaluation, review the steps for the EE/CA and discuss the schedule for Site 5.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Janna presented the EE/CA options being evaluated, discussed the ongoing activities supporting the EE/CA, and reviewed the schedule.

Janna presented the options being considered in the EE/CA:

1. No action
2. Excavation of waste, backfill, and restoration
 - a. Excavate to visible limits and take confirmation samples
 - b. Excavate to seasonal mean low groundwater level with no confirmation samples
3. Excavation of waste and creation of a wetland
 - a. Excavate to visible limits and take confirmation samples
 - b. Excavate to seasonal mean low groundwater level with no confirmation samples

Janna reviewed the activities that are ongoing in support of the EE/CA preparation. Wetlands delineation was conducted on September 30, 2005. The delineation report will be submitted by the end of October 2005. Once the remedy is selected, the impact on the wetland will be evaluated. Follow-up steps will include a conceptual wetlands mitigation plan, approval by BTAG, and notification to the USACE. Potential ecological risks are being evaluated to determine impacts associated with groundwater becoming surface water. Water balance and hydrogeology evaluations are being conducted to determine if a wetland can be supported. Groundwater level and rain monitoring are being conducted weekly to help determine the seasonal mean low groundwater level and the appropriate elevation/type of wetland.

The proposed schedule for Site 5 is submission of the Draft EE/CA by November 30, 2005, team comments by January 31, 2006, public comment period from February 15 through March 14, 2006, and submission of the Final EE/CA by March 31, 2006.

Action Jim/Todd – Provide comments on Draft Site 5 ERI by October 21, 2005.

IX. Roundtable

Blows Creek BERA – Kim showed the team a preliminary outline for the electronically enhanced BERA, explaining that there would be summaries linked to different levels of information. The outline has been submitted to Ed, but has not yet been released to the whole team. The tentative submittal date is December 2005.

EPA Remedial Oversight Contract (ROC) – The EPA has an internal push right now to procure a ROC. This may delay review times, because after the ROC reviews documents, EPA technical staff would review.

Indoor Air Vapor Intrusion – Kim indicated that the Navy has issued a draft white paper on indoor air vapor intrusion.

Action Agnes – Is draft Navy white paper on indoor air vapor intrusion available for distribution?

Action Agnes – Talk to Bob about indoor air vapor intrusion (Parking Lot).

NAVFAC Reorganization – Agnes indicated that MID LANT (EV-3) may be reorganized. They are currently centralized at the Naval Station Norfolk. MID LANT personnel may be separated to reside at each base. The reorganization is still being negotiated, but Bob expects that if it's going to happen it will happen by the end of the year.

X. Tier II Update

Jim indicated that Durwood/Navy/Tier II is looking for perchlorate questions to discuss at their next meeting.

Agnes provided Bob's update: Tier II has not met since our last meeting and there is no update. Tier II will be meeting next week.

XI. SASR, FY 2005, and FY 2006 Team Goals Update

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

FY 2005 and FY 2006 Team Goals: The FY 2005 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site. The FY 2006 Team goals were finalized and will be posted on the Joint web site.

XII. Enterprise Training

Objective: Introduce Enterprise to the team.

Overview of Discussion: Becky Jackson provided a demonstration of the web sites (both the public and secure sites). She reviewed the site content and capabilities of both sites. Becky also showed the team how to perform online document review and presented the calendar function of the web site. Custom alerts can be set up to send emails when portions of the site are updated (i.e., document review folder or calendar).

Action Agnes – Check if Administrative Record files are stored electronically in the library for public review.

Action Agnes – Look into activity points of contact (POCs) for SJCA web site.

XIII. Agenda Building

December Meeting Agenda

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
SJCA Deliverables	C, D - Finalize SJCA Deliverables	Team	1 hr
Team Building Exercise (MBTI)	I - Exchange our MBTIs and learn to work better together	Todd	0.5 hr
Site 4 - Groundwater Monitoring,	C, D - Consensus on voluntary	Kim/Janna	1 hr

ROD Amendment Tech Memo, and Construction Closeout Report	monitoring, Discuss comments		
Site 2 Eco Subgroup	I, C - Plan for the FS/Get subgroup recommendation on sediment remediation	Mike/Subgrp	1 hr
BERA	I - TBD, based on status	Mike/Kim	0.5 hr
Site 2 ERI Comments	C - Discuss team comments on ERI	Kim	0.5 hr
Site 21	I, C - Discuss field investigation results and plan path forward	Kim	0.5 hr
Site 2 Tiger Team	C - Discuss Tiger Team report	Agnes	0.5 hr
Roundtable (Site 19, CIP, RAB response/update)		Team	0.5 hr
Site 5 - Selected Remedy	I - Present the selected remedy/prepare for review of EE/CA	Janna	0.5 hr

Next meeting: December 20 -21, 2005

Location: Hospitality House, Williamsburg, Virginia

Lodging: Hospitality House, Williamsburg, Virginia

Start time: 9:00 AM

Finish time: 4:00 PM

Chair: Kim Henderson

Host: Janna Staszak

Timekeeper: Jim Cutler

Goal Keeper: Agnes Sullivan

Recorder: Janna Staszak

Facilitator: Todd Richardson

Tier II: Bob Schirmer

Guests: Mike Elias, Ed Corl, BTAG

Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call: 10:00 AM on November 29, 2005

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

XIV. Future Meetings Schedule

February 1-2, 2006 Richmond, VA

March 15-16, 2006 Philadelphia, PA

XV. Meeting Evaluation

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

Kim provided facilitator feedback, the team assessed the meeting via a facilitator checklist and determined that the meeting was well-focused and the team stayed on schedule.

XVI. Parking Lot

To remain in parking lot:

- Indoor air vapor intrusion – pending guidance
- Consensus for the Site 4 Voluntary Groundwater Performance Monitoring

0.5 hr	Miles/Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments
0.5 hr	Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments
0.5 hr	Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments
0.5 hr	Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments
0.5 hr	Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments
0.5 hr	Year	1 - TBD based on status	Site 4 - BHI Comments