

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**CH2MHILL**

# Final Minutes from February 2003 Partnering Meeting - St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team

February 4 & 5, 2003

**Attendees:**

Dawn Hayes/LANTDIV  
Valerie Walker /NAVY  
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL  
Donna Caldwell/CH2M HILL  
Debbie Miller/ VDEQ  
Devlin Harris/VDEQ  
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL

**Guests:**

Bob Schirmer/LANTDIV/Tier II

From: Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Date: February 7, 2003

**LOCATION**

Renaissance Hotel, Portsmouth, VA

**MINUTES**

## Tuesday, February 4, 2003

**Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:**

Meeting Manager – Donna Caldwell  
Timekeeper/gatekeeper – Valerie Walker  
Host – Donna Caldwell  
Goalkeeper – Dawn Hayes  
Facilitator – Devlin Harris  
Recorder – Kim Henderson

**9:00 Check In.**

**Reading of the Ground Rules.**

**Review/Revise Agenda.** The BERA response to comments conference call with BTAG has been changed to a team discussion only.

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

The team reviewed action items from the November meeting and any carry-over items. The team agreed that the action items will be added to a separate spreadsheet and tracked at each meeting.

**Action Donna** – Follow up with Ann West regarding lab letter for the upcoming BERA sampling.

**Action Bill** – Check with Todd to see if he has completed any action items from the November 2002 meeting.

**Action Bill** – Discuss with Doug Dronfield, Kim's participation in the partnering training to be held in February.

The team reviewed the Draft November 2002 Partnering Meeting Minutes.

**Consensus:** November 2002 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final. The minutes will be finalized and placed on the Joint VA/MD Partnering Team web site.

### **Review Parking Lot items from the November meeting (Results in *italics*):**

- Discuss findings of proposed demo of Site 17 and implications for the demolition crew and follow up confirmation sampling for Site 17. Khoa Nguyen (Navy demo) notes the buildings are not scheduled for demo until FY03, we will sample before demo. When demo, they will cut piers to grade, and will slope sides with no fill on top. Demo crew will be OSHA certified. *Site 17 will be handled under Site 2 (See Consensus item). No additional sampling is scheduled to take place since the area will be covered.*

**Consensus:** The team agrees that following the demolition of Buildings 278 and 279 (Site 17) an addendum to the SSA will be prepared for NFA for Site 17. Land Use Controls (LUCs) will be handled under Site 2.

**Action Dawn** - Look into the Site 17 Demolition schedule and try to acquire a photo log of the demolition activities.

- Phragmites EIS within Navy Region, removal of invasive species. Does not affect SJCA. The treatment will include plane drop of herbicide on phragmites followed by burning. Information will be provided on the chemical that will be used for this. Navy will contract out the control of phragmites and kudzu. *No removal of invasive species will be done at SJCA.*
- Scoping Site 5 sampling to incorporate Site 6 soil and data. *February 2003 Meeting Presentation.*
- Ask Tier II when the next date will be for Partnering Training. *Will occur on February 26 and 27, 2003.*

## II. Summary of Site 3 Supplemental Investigation

Bill presented a summary of the *Draft Technical Memorandum: Site Delineation/Supplemental Remedial Investigation for Site 3* submitted on January 8<sup>th</sup>. Bill provided a presentation handout. The objectives of the presentation were to update the team on the schedule, reconfirm the acceptance of the approach, and discuss how additional data will be evaluated. The team had no comments (via email) on the Tech Memo, so the field mobilization began on Monday, February 3, 2003. It is anticipated that sampling will be completed by the end of this week. The sample distribution and methodology was reviewed by the team.

Team discussion on upland ditches: Samples along the drainage ditches will be collected below the anticipated depth of removal (12" bgs). If the results come back elevated against BTAG values, removal or lining will be necessary and Simeon will need to be involved. Regardless, removal design will be based upon results of what's left in ditches or what will be left in the ditches after removal. Bill instructed the field crew to look at how deep the "sediment" in the ditches was and take the sample right afterwards and take detailed field notes. The team agreed to consider the ditch "sediment" as soil.

All samples will be analyzed for TAL metals with quick turn around time. The invalidated data should be available by February 10, 2003. Data evaluation will consist of a risk driver comparison to the dredge fill 95% background UTLs and results will be mapped. Tables and maps will be distributed to the team for discussion at the March partnering meeting.

Team Discussion on data evaluation approach: The approach was agreed upon during a conference call and there was some confusion on the comparison of the mean background UCLs to mean site UCLs. A recollection of the discussion ended in the clarification of using background UTLs for a removal guide but for close-out, a population-to-population statistical comparison of UCLs would be necessary. This would allow us to have a location that may exceed the UTL but not be an issue because of the population-to-population comparison. Clarification from Todd may be needed because the method for close-out is not spelled out in the Tech Memo, though the approach was agreed upon in early 2002 by the team. Bill will amend the final tech memo to include the site closure method including the reference to the conference call, and how we plan to evaluate the data.

**Action Bill** - Include statistical approach which the team (and Alvaro) agreed upon previously in the Final Tech Memo for Site 3 additional sampling.

**Consensus:** Team agrees to go final with Site 3 Tech Memo with the inclusion of site background statistics as agreed upon in the Site 3 Phase I work plan.

The Final Remedial Action Construction Closeout report from SHAW will be sent to Dawn next week. Bill will send the Final Site 6 Closeout Report and Site 3 Removal

Summary with SHAW's final closeout report as an appendix (their appendices will be included on CD).

Devlin stated that we needed to incorporate standard language to the closeout signature page "In the event of contamination....under CERCLA" before VDEQ signing. However, later in the meeting it was determined that a signature page was not necessary because a NFA ROD will be signed by the team.

### **III. Site 5 Boundary**

The Site 5 boundary discussion was led by Bill, who provided a presentation handout. He presented the team with the idea of collecting additional soil samples at Site 5 to better define the Site 5 boundary. The area for potential remedial action will be based on risk driver compounds exceeding the background UTLs.

In surface soil, there were no human health risks identified. Arsenic and iron were the only risks in subsurface soil. Because there was no statistical difference between subsurface soil sample results and the background UTLs, a risk management decision for no further subsurface soil sampling was reached.

**Consensus**—The team agrees that no subsurface soil samples are needed for the Phase II RI at Site 5 based on risk management of arsenic and iron in subsurface soil.

Further delineation based on the Draft Final Remedial Investigation results and the new extent of Site 5 (towards Site 6) may be necessary to fill in data gaps and incorporate former Site 6. Areas to the south and west of the current Site 5 boundary appear to be impacted. In the historical aerial photographs, the area south of the current boundary indicates disturbed ground. Surface soil samples will be distributed based on further desktop review of aerial photos and data. The proposed sample distribution will be presented to the team at the March partnering meeting and in a technical memorandum similar to Site 3. Any lessons learned at Site 3 will be taken into account for Site 5.

Donna reviewed the MCL exceedances in Site 5 shallow groundwater from the RI. Beryllium, cadmium, and lead were only slightly above MCLs at MW03S. RDX was also detected at one of the deep monitoring wells. A question was posed to the team regarding resampling. Devlin brought up the future requirement for perchlorates analysis and indicated that we should incorporate perchlorates analysis now. It was decided that we will add a round of groundwater sampling to confirm or deny the MCL exceedances in shallow groundwater and the RDX in deep groundwater, and add analysis for perchlorates (Method EPA 314).

**Action Bill** – During development of Site 5 delineation, include an additional round of groundwater to confirm the MCL exceedances and explosives and add perchlorate analysis. (3/5/03 – Perchlorate sampling not agreed upon yet – further discussion necessary)

#### IV. Discussion of Site 2 RI

Bill presented the findings of the Site 2 RI/HHRA/ERA. Bill provided a presentation handout. The objective of the presentation was to present the Site 2 RI data to the team and summarize potential remedial alternatives.

The presentation included the following:

- Site history and background
- Surface features and surrounding area (including nearby buildings, Site 17, former locations of ASTs- known diesel release, and the incinerator)
- Hydrogeologic framework
- Extent of Waste found during 2001 trenching activities
- Sample Summary/Nature and Extent of Contamination (based on samples collected during RI)
- Human Health and Ecological Risk Drivers
- Remedial Alternatives to be considered

Team discussion regarding groundwater data: There appears to be a groundwater data gap. There is not a true upgradient well and there does not seem to be enough groundwater data for an accurate potentiometric surface. It was decided that additional investigation is needed. A review of current data will be required to determine the locations of additional monitoring wells. It is anticipated that one or two new wells will be installed. These wells will also help verify the vertical gradient at the site, which current data indicates is upward, towards the Columbia Aquifer. The Draft RI will be submitted with the recommendation for additional groundwater investigation.

**Parking Lot:** Discuss additional groundwater samples and wells at Site 2. Samples will include perchlorate. (3/5/03 – Perchlorate sampling not agreed upon yet – further discussion necessary)

**Action Bill** – Include figures which depict only risk drivers which exceed screening criteria in the Conclusion/Summary section of the RI report (separate from the Eco/HH sections).

Team discussion regarding dioxin in sediment and VOCs in surface water: The dioxin pattern does not appear to be caused by the incinerator. It is not certain where the dioxin (normal sources: incineration or incomplete combustion of chlorinated compounds) is coming from. Maps of the stormwater lines, in hardcopy only, were reviewed during the conversation. It appears that the Site 2 culvert is taking on a larger stormwater load than anticipated. There's also a newly paved road from the north leading to Site 17 that could conceal a drain/pipe leading to Building 279. Therefore, we will need to consider recontamination from the offsite ditches in the remediation of Site 2.

The team was concerned with the potential source of the surface water VOCs, specifically TCE. It is unknown as to what is under the parking lot, but Bill has reported

previously that waste (brick, wood, concrete) was identified in test pits adjacent to the parking lot during the 2001 trenching investigation. The collection of samples around the storm water outfalls using geoprobe is being considered to possibly determine where the VOCs and dioxins are coming from. It is anticipated that the source is from historical use of the area. Sites 10 and 21, located north of Site 2, has known TCE in groundwater and will be considered when attempting to determine the source and extent at Site 2.

In addition to the further investigation of the hydrologic conditions at the site, the use of piezometers and/or monitoring wells will be considered near the northwest parking lot to address the groundwater data gap and help delineate the TCE source.

The question was raised, if there are elevated levels at the outfall, what would we do? Is this a point of compliance?

**Action Dawn** – Check on monitored outfalls relative to St. Juliens Creek Site 2.

Team discussion on alternatives to be considered for Site 2: How do we see this site in the future? Possibly something similar to New Gosport - enlarging the area, some removal, and clean-up to maintain the area. If a cover is considered, the slow tidal movement will be beneficial. The option of scooping contamination from the land to the sediment and then covering with impermeable cover was discussed (similar to a RCRA C cap), but the levels of contamination must be similar. It may be necessary to reroute the storm drains and cut off the flow to St. Juliens Creek during remediation. Remediation costs may be \$5-10 million and will need to occur in a phased approach. It was decided that we will need to focus on the investigation over clean-up because SJCA is likely going BRAC. Therefore, we will need as much data as possible.

It is important that we are aware of the communication between the Site 2 inlet and St. Juliens Creek. The RAB wants to know if SJCA contaminated St. Juliens Creek. Therefore, if possible, we must clarify the fact that Site 2 sediment is similar to the upstream samples and that Site 2 is not thought to have contributed significantly to St. Juliens Creek.

The RI for Site 2 will include the data gaps identified in this meeting and incorporate recommendations from this meeting.

## **V. Site 6 PRAP**

There was not a discussion on the Site 6 PRAP because it has not been completed. Bill will send the Draft Site 6 PRAP out as soon as possible, possibly to the Navy by February 14th.

## **VI. BERA Discussion**

Originally, this discussion was to include a conference call with BTAG. It has been changed to a team discussion only. Bill led the discussion and provided a presentation

handout. The objective was to provide the team with the EPA comments to the Draft BERA Work Plan and the Response to Comments formulated to this point. The goal of the conversation was to reach consensus on the comments in order to proceed with the field sampling. VDEQ had not seen the comments. Bill went over each comment and the response.

**Action Todd** – Mobilize BTAG to review RTC.

It was determined that CH2M HILL will remove the mention of Site 6 from the BERA Work Plan. CH2M HILL will update text, tables, and figures before going final with the work plan.

VDEQ agreed to the approach included in the response to comment 2 (site conceptual model) but added that we may need to add perchlorate analysis to Site 19 associated sediment and/or surface water sampling.

VDEQ also indicated that there appeared to be too many samples, particularly those for bioassay. A concern was also raised regarding the number of reference samples (2 to 3), which appears too low. Bill and Dawn will discuss the justification of the bioassay samples with Ed Corl, Steve Petron, and Mike Elias. The lack of bioassay samples around AOC 1 was also questioned, considering the potential impact to Blows Creek from PAHs at the site.

**Action Dawn/Bill** – Check with Ed/Steve on the number of bioassay samples, the number of reference samples and bioassay analysis, the EPIC AOC-1 samples not being analyzed for bioassay, and Sample #35 not being analyzed for bioassay in the BERA for Blows Creek. Can we reduce the number of samples? Find out rationale and the pros/cons.

Bill will also check with Ed and Steve regarding what environmental conditions will impact the mobilization (i.e., low tide, extreme cold, precipitation).

Comment resolution will occur after Dawn and Bill talk to Ed and Steve. Concurrence from VDEQ and Valerie to mobilize after EPA/Todd agrees with RTC.

**Meeting Adjourned.**

**Wednesday February 5, 2003**

**9:00 Check In.**

#### **VII. Exit Exercise and Award**

Dawn initiated a exit exercise for Devlin Harris and presented him an award for his efforts for the SJCA team.

### VIII. Photo Review

Bill led the review of historical SJCA photos obtained from the early 1980's. The team reviewed and discussed the photos and the review will continue at the next partnering meeting.

**Action Bill** – Send Randy Sawyer a copy of the historic SJCA photo CD.

Special notice was taken to photos relative to Site 2 activities and a drum of “Pen-Strip-G” near an open shed on a pad was noticed in the northwestern vicinity of Site 2.

**Action Bill** – Search for “Pen-Strip-G” re: photo SJCA\_2, look for MSDS.

The photo details generated from this discussion will be incorporated into a separate photo log and provided to the team once the review is complete.

### IX. Tier II Update

Bob Schirmer of LANTDIV presented the Tier II update to the Team.

- Goals were due by January 15, 2003.
- Carryover Goals – If goals are carried over from one year to the next (i.e., from FY02 to FY03), assign a new date but note that the goal was an FY02 goal that didn't get completed and state a reason.
- Virginia groundwater training course in Richmond on March 24 and 25, 2003. Devlin is the POC and needs a count of attendees. They are looking for topics/case studies and presenters due by the end of February.
- Doug Dronfield is developing a technology matrix and incorporating ideas from LANTDIV.

The TEARS group for addressing ecological issues has been renewed for another year and will continue through December 2003. Their schedule was provided:

March	Soil Sampling and Removal Action final, Watershed and PRG discussion with FAQ/guidance generated
April	Composite Sampling, Work Plans, and Success Stories
June	Failure stories and Uncertainties
July/Sept	Risk Assessor Forum to discuss/train on papers and establish path forward
Nov/Dec	Train Tier I teams

**Action Dawn**- Check with Todd about changing the location of the March meeting from Philadelphia to Richmond.

## X. SASR

Bill presented the SASR and the team discussed deliverable schedules. The objective was to review the document submittal/review dates for SJCA. Several documents and action dates were changed based upon the discussion. The updated Final SASR with revised dates will be distributed to the team to reflect these changes.

## XI. FY03 Goal Update

This discussion was led by Dawn. The objective was to provide an update on the team's progress to meet the FY03 goals. The team agreed that the goals will be added to a separate spreadsheet and updated at each meeting.

## XII. Meeting Evaluation

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

## XIII. Agenda Building

Topic	Lead	Time
- Site 6 PRAP/ROD	Bill	1 hr
- Site 3 Sample Results	Bill	1 hr
- BERA Comment Resolution	Bill	½ hr
- Photo Review	Team	1 hr+
- Final Concurrence on Closeout Report	Bill	½ hr
- Site 5 proposed sampling layout	Bill	1 hr
- SSA Sites sample approach	Bill	1 hr
- RAB Agenda Building	Team	½ hr
- Future Meetings Schedule	Team	½ hr

### Next meeting:

Date: March 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup>, 2003

Location: Richmond, VA Crowne Plaza

Start time: 9:30 AM March 5<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 AM March 6<sup>th</sup>

End time: 3:30 PM March 6<sup>th</sup>

Chair: Bill Friedmann

Host: Debbie Miller

Timekeeper: Todd Richardson

Goal Keeper: Dawn Hayes

Recorder: Kim Henderson

Facilitator: Dawn Hayes

Tier II: Durwood Willis

Guests: NA

**Pre-meeting Conference Call: February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2003 10:00 AM**

**Future Meetings:**

Will be updated at the March 2003 meeting. Tentative dates:

April 8 – 9, 2003, Portsmouth, VA w/RAB

June 25 – 26, 2003, Richmond, VA

August 20 – 21, Chincoteague, VA

October 15 – 16, 2003, Portsmouth, VA w/RAB

**Meeting Adjourned.**

**Parking Lot**

Discuss additional groundwater samples and wells at Site 2. Samples will include perchlorate analysis. (3/5/03 – Perchlorate sampling not agreed upon yet – further discussion necessary)

**March 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>, 2003**  
**Richmond, VA**

<b>Day 1 03/05/ 03</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Time</b>
0900 hrs	Welcome/Check In	Team	Standard Meeting Format	Welcome and introduction of guests (if applicable). See how everyone's is doing, greetings	30 min
0930 hrs	Guests/R&R/Review GRs	Bill	Standard Meeting Format	Reading of the ground rules, discuss participation of guests for the day.	15 min
0945 hrs	Review Agenda Previous Meeting Minutes	Team	Standard Meeting Format	Revise the agenda if needed for the day for a more efficient meeting	15 min
1000 hrs	Review St Juliens Parking Lot Items	Bill	Standard Meeting Format	Review Parking lot items from previous meeting and see if they can be addressed during current meeting.	15 min
1015 hrs	Review St Juliens Action Items	Bill	Standard Meeting Format	Review what was accomplished and what needs to be completed or placed in parking lot and carried to the next meeting	30 min
1045 hrs	<b>Break</b>	Team	Renewal, Recharge, Wake up	Allow for focused discussions.	15 min
1100 hrs	Site 3 Sampling Results	Donna	Present the Site 3 Investigation Results.	Review the Site 3 Investigation results and determine path forward. Potential request for consensus.	1 hr
1230 hrs	<b>Lunch</b>	Team	Refuel	Eat, converse, and enjoy!	1 hr 15 min
1335 hrs	Site 6 Closeout Report	Bill	Discuss Site 6 Closeout.	<b>Team Consensus</b> on the Closeout of Site 6.	30 min
1400 hrs	Site 5 Supplemental Investigation	Donna	Review Site 5 additional sampling approach.	<b>Team Consensus</b> on the sample locations for additional delineation at Site 5.	1 hr
1500 hrs	<b>Break</b>	Team	Renewal, Recharge, Wake up	Allow for focused discussions.	15 min
1515 hrs	BERA	Bill	Status Update	Inform team of progress regarding BERA issues and response to comments.	30 min
1545 hrs	Roundtable	Team	Introduce topics to team that may need addressing.	Provide members time for members to bring up new issues or concerns. (Construction of fiber optics/AOC 1, Demo of building 278/279 & 187, MIP investigation at Site 21)	1 hr
1645 hrs	End of Day 1			Have a good dinner!	

<b>Day 2 03/06/ 03</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Time</b>
0900 hrs	Welcome & Check in	Team	Standard Meeting Format	Welcome and settle in for new day.	30 min
0930 hrs	Guests/R&R/Review GRs	Bill	Standard Meeting Format	Remind ourselves of the ground rules, discuss participation of guests for the day, see where we may have gone off course from previous day.	10 min
0940 hrs	Review Current Agenda	Bill	Focus the meeting and make necessary adjustments	Have a set agenda for the day and see if any dropped items from the previous day can be included.	20 min
1000 hrs	<b>Break</b>	Team	Renewal, Recharge, Wake up		15 min
1015 hrs	Photo Review	Bill	Continue review of historical photos for new information.	Add any relevant information to St. Juliens Creek Annex documents, including future reports.	1 hr 15 min
1115 hrs	<b>Break</b>	Team	Renewal, Recharge, Wake up		15 min
1130 hrs	Tier II Update	Durwood	Discuss Tier II, remind Team of deadlines	Inform Team of upcoming issues	30 min
1200 hrs	<b>Lunch</b>	Team	Refuel	Eat, converse, and enjoy!	1 hr
1300 hrs	RAB Agenda	Team	Develop RAB Agenda	Have agenda items for the next RAB in April.	30 min
1330 hrs	Team Goals and SASR Update	Bill/ Dawn	Review current goals and review schedules for various projects	Inform Team members of upcoming deadlines for deliverables and discuss the Team goals for the fiscal year	30 min
1400 hrs	Future Meetings Schedule	Team	Identify schedule for future meetings.	Have schedules for FY03 meetings.	30 min
1430 hrs	Agenda Building (Arrange Conference Call for Next Mtg.) Any Parking lot Items?	Bill	Identify agenda items for next meeting	Have agenda items set for next meeting. Address parking lot items.	30 min
1500	Facilitator/Tier II Feedback and Day 2 +/-▲	Facilitator / Tier II / Team	Critical analysis of meeting progress.	Understand how the Team performed during the meeting and how to improve next time.	30 min
1530 hrs	End of Day 2			Safe trip!	