

# St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team Meeting Minutes:

## Partnering meeting – April 26 & 27, 2001

### Attendees:

Dawn Hayes/LANTDIV  
Ed Corl/LANTDIV ECO  
Todd Richardson/USEPA  
Devlin Harris/VDEQ  
Jeff Harlow/NAVY  
Wandy Browne/The Management Edge  
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL  
Andy Hopton/CDM Federal  
Lynne France/CDM Federal  
Bruce Frizzell/Tier II

Guests: Simeon Hahn/BTAG

From: Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Date: April 30, 2001

### LOCATION

Founder's Inn, Virginia Beach, Virginia

### MINUTES

Thursday, April 26, 2001

9:15 Check in

### Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager – Todd Richardson  
Timekeeper/gatekeeper – Lynne France  
Host – Lynne France  
Goalkeeper - Dawn Hayes  
Facilitator - Wandy Browne  
Recorder – Bill Friedmann  
New People – Bill Friedmann/CH2M Hill

### Parking Lot

– Enter/Exit- Bill

- NFA Section Meeting Minutes
- Site 17; discuss next steps
- Site 2; discussion on possible design and risk assessments
- Dioxin samples in sediment near Site 5
- Helo flight

#### Reading of Partnering Team Ground Rules

The Meeting Agenda was reviewed and revised to indicate that the partnering items include presentation of Soil Cover Survey after SSA Findings on Day 1.

Lynne requested a discussion on how to address duplicate samples. Team members indicated that duplicates are typically treated by taking the higher of the two values. No additional time was needed to be added to the agenda to discuss.

#### **I. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes and Action Items**

Dawn review her general comments. Spell check the document and follow consistent formats. Make sure using ETAGs and BTAGs correctly. Page three space between

Todd Richardson asked for some clarity on the Action item he was responsible for; the review time between Response to comments on PRAP and acceptance of PRAP. Todd did check on review time for redlines which will take one to two weeks.

Bottom of page 3 – delete “Navy and EPA are having trouble getting Ecological RAs approved at Little Creek, so the Little Creek Team came up with process and gave to ETAG for review.

Page 4, NFA Discussion – Dawn would like the paragraph to be rewritten somewhat. Dawn will supply Bill with her comments for the NFA discussion paragraph.

There was a general question on how partnering minutes should be presented on the web site. Dawn believes that these documents are FOIA documents, they should be accurate and understandable.

Page 5 (Site 17) Change the last sentence to read “the team decided to wait until validated data to run against RBCs and Background results”.

Page 5 (Background) Change “Bill Friedmann is concerned” to “Bill Friedmann indicated”.

Page 5 Last paragraph 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, “EPA will be getting a memo from Navy outlining what is expected from them concerning how RPMs handle BTAG”. There was a general comment that this does not mean the Navy is dictating BTAG issues to the EPA. Dawn commented that the EPA is coming out with a document on how to handle BTAG comments. Bruce pointed out that the Tier II team believes that the decision on Eco

issues still resides with each base Partnering Team and that any problems are to be brought to the Eco Team.

Page 6 – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, last sentence “BTAG will not be part of the risk management portion” is not accurate. There is was a general discussion on the role of BTAG and that should be that BTAG should have input but no official comments. Ed envisioned that opinions would be heard, but that the RPM would be allowed to make their decision. Simeon pointed out that there many places for Risk Management input. Bruce indicated that there have been other sites where these lessons have been learned. Dawn is concerned about the type of input.

Simeon asked how review dates were chosen. Todd explains that the dates are to help streamline the process, but the dates are situational and are not set in stone. Dawn discussed that the dates where chosen as goals.

**CONCENSUS: Accepted meeting minutes from February 27-28, 2001 meeting as revised.**

Logistics

Reviewed Parking Lot Items from previous meeting.

- None

Review Action Items from previous meeting:

**St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team  
Previous Meeting Action Items**

<b>Date</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
2/27/01 Complete	1	Dave	E-mail team list to Doug Dronfield	3/23/01
2/27/01 Complete	2	Dave	Post Goals/Minutes/Calendar on Tier II web site	3/23/01
1/23/01	3	Dawn	Check on CH2M Hill making and holding hotel reservations	4/5/01
1/23/01 Complete	5	Jeff	Forward a copy of closeout report for SSA sites to Todd/Dawn/Lynne and Dave. He will forward a copy of Weapons Station AOC report.	3/30/01
3/20/01 Complete	6	Dawn	Will Send Dave a copy of the PDF Format for response to comments. She will send NABLC as an Example	4/401

3/20/01 Complete within 1- 2 weeks	7	Todd	Will check on review time between Response to comments on PRAP and acceptance of PRAP	4/26/01
3/20/01 Complete on 4/27	8	Dawn	Will send out a revised SASR and ROD schedule	4/6/01
3/20/01	9	Todd	Will check on the time requirement for finalization of FFA ( <b>180 days</b> )	4/26/01
3/20/01 Complete	10	Dave	Provide an explanation as to why the statisticians want to wait for validated data before running background investigation statistics	3/22/01
3/20/01 Complete	11	Team	There will be a conference call to discuss Site 17(after validated data has been screened against RBCs). The Team will decide the next steps for the site.	4/9/01
3/21/01 Complete	12	Team	Review partnering Roles and Responsibilities example documents to prepare to develop our own for SJCA. Bring Partnering Notebook.	4/26/01

Dawn informed the team that the Navy will not be awarding FFA this year and asked if this would have an impact on the EPAs schedule. According to Todd, not awarding the FFA this year will affect the EPAs schedule.

## II. Site 17 SI Report

Lynne presents the findings related to the SI Report. Building 279 was built on piers and a drainage features runs under the building and leads to the pond of Site 2. The samples collected targeted sampling under Building 279, used for lead battery storage and maintenance. During the 1989 RCRA Facility Assessment (RFA), two 55-gallons drums of PD860 were noted on a concrete pad outside of the building and some staining of the pad was noted. The drums are no longer present.

Soil and groundwater samples were collected during the Relative Risk Ranking (RRR). Analysis detected pesticides in soil, but nothing related to batteries. The question is whether more work needs to be done, such as additional sampling. Originally, a larger soil sampling event was scheduled, but was reduced to 4 samples to be analyzed for TCL VOCs, TCL SVOCs, low concentration PAHs, TCL Pest/PCBs, and TAL inorganics.

Samples collected from locations SS-03 and SS-04 had a higher number of detects. The data has been validated. For HHRA evaluation the data was compared to RBCs. For Eco Risk Assessment, arsenic and lead are a concern as well as benzo(a)pyrene. There were many inorganics which exceeded the residential RBCs. There were seven organic compounds which exceeded the residential RBCs.

Site 2 (Landfill B) is a 2-acre site with shallow saltwater pond in the center which is tidally influenced by St. Juliens Creek. Conceptual model looked at all exposure media; surface water, sediment, surface soil, and biota. There were five terrestrial and seven aquatic receptors. The results of the screening indicated that 12-groundwater, 14-surface

Site 2 (Landfill B) is a 2-acre site with shallow saltwater pond in the center which is tidally influenced by St. Juliens Creek. Conceptual model looked at all exposure media; surface water, sediment, surface soil, and biota. There were five terrestrial and seven aquatic receptors. The results of the screening indicated that 12-groundwater, 14-surface

### III. Ecological Risk Approach

Dawn informed the team that Navy may be interested in selling a portion of St. Juliens. Dawn informed the team that Navy may be interested in selling a portion of St. Juliens. Dawn informed the team that Navy may be interested in selling a portion of St. Juliens.

Consensus – the Team will delay issuing Site 17 draft SI report based on potential modifications to Plan of Actions for Site 17 and Site 2. New delivery date to be determined during next partnering meeting.

The team discusses the schedule for Site 17. At this point, once the background data is available, a conference call will be scheduled to discuss the next step for Site 17. The draft SI will be delayed until the team agrees on an action.

#### Action Item – Dawn will check on Site 17 building demolition time frame. (5/4/01)

Jeff suggested that since we are dealing with two sites with similar problems, that it may be worth discussing moving the problems with Site 17 to Site 2 so that we can close out Site 17. There was a general discussion on how the team can move problem related to site 17 under the Site 2. The report was due in April. Devlin suggested submitting the draft SI, distribute site photos to the team and schedule a conference call to discuss. At this point Site 17 can not be closed out with compounds which exceed the residential RBCs and if there were to be any institutional controls, the site would require a ROD. Dawn questioned whether additional samples could be taken after the demolition took place. That is a possibility.

Action Item – Dawn will check on Site 17 building demolition time frame. (5/4/01)

The team discusses the schedule for Site 17. At this point, once the background data is available, a conference call will be scheduled to discuss the next step for Site 17. The draft SI will be delayed until the team agrees on an action.

Consensus – the Team will delay issuing Site 17 draft SI report based on potential modifications to Plan of Actions for Site 17 and Site 2. New delivery date to be determined during next partnering meeting.

Dawn informed the team that Navy may be interested in selling a portion of St. Juliens.

water, 39-sediment, 35-soil, and 40-food web COPCs were identified as exceeded screening values. Most of these exceedences came from samples collected near Site 17 in the northern reaches of Site 2. According to Andy, it appears that the pond in the middle of Site 2 is trapping and holding contaminants. Since one or more COPCs were identified in each of the media, additional evaluation in Step 3 is recommended; realistic refinement.

The realistic refinement (Step 3a) used average chemical concentration, body weights and ingestion as well realistic exposure assumptions. The conclusions of Step 3a indicated that one or more COPCs were identified in surface water and sediment and that risk via the food chain was indicated for the raccoon and muskrat. Further evaluation of these risks will be evaluated under Step 3b including the identification of data gaps and the studies required to fill the data gaps.

After the presentation of Site 2, the team discussed details of the site layout and history. The presumptive remedy for Site 2 at this time is a cap. There is concern whether a cap will be stable so close to a wetland and the potential impact the cap could have on the wetland. The wetland was not made due to activities of the landfill since historical information indicates that the site was a wetland first. Devlin and Simeon discuss with the team the benefit of restoration/enhancement of the wetlands. The ecological risk will be carried through for soils since there now seems to be more presumptive remedies available. Options discussed for Landfill B: cover/capping, surficial debris removal, revegetate, ponds contaminated with sediments, wetland filled or catch basin, sediment removal, and sediment cap.

There was a question regarding the comparison of CDM sample results with previous samples collected by Tetra Tech. Andy indicated that the sample results varied slightly. Most metals, PAHs and DDT detected were from the site, not St. Juliens Creek. The PAHs are not a food chain issue. Simeon questioned whether there were any identifiable signals associated with the landfill.

Summary for Site 2 – in the absence of a clear presumptive remedy, the team will follow through the risk for the soils. The team will take a site visit today to Site 2 and discuss again.

**Action - CDM/Hill will look into regional influences of sedimentation along the Elizabeth River which may impact St. Juliens Creek.**

#### **Site 4**

Andy continued his presentation. Site 4 (Landfill D) is 8.5-acre site which ends in a wetland at Blow's Creek. There is a fresh water drainage ditch which runs on the western side of the landfill. There were both terrestrial and aquatic receptors and both freshwater and marine environments. There were one or more COPCs identified for marine and fresh surfacewater, marine and freshwater sediment, soils, and food web. The Realistic Refinement Steps (Step 3a) indicated that one or more COPCs were identified in each media. Risk via the food chain was indicated for the raccoon and muskrat. Further

evaluation of these risks will be evaluated under Step 3b including the identification of data gaps and the studies required to fill the data gaps.

Devlin raised the question as whether or not UXO sampling was conducted at the sites and that UXO should be included with routine sampling. Lynne indicated that UXO samples were collected for Sites 2 and 5. Jeff informed the team that historically, the base was very good at burning UXO and minimizing their inclusion in the landfills. Sampling should be minimized. Devlin agrees to minimizing the number of samples, but restates the need to address the UXO data gap.

### **Sites 3, 5, & 6**

Site 3 (Landfill C), Site 5 (Burning Grounds), and Site 6 (Caged Pit). For Landfill C, just looked soil and groundwater for media and looked at terrestrial receptors. One or more COPCs identified; 10 in groundwater, 40 in soil, and 17 in food web. Additional evaluation in Step 3 would be recommended, however, the selected presumptive remedy of capping the landfill will remove soil as a media of concern and prevent contamination transport to groundwater.

Lynne indicated to the team that the extent of Landfill C are not known and questioned if it really was a landfill. The area was used for disposing dredge fill. Devlin questioned what is the reason behind capping and suggested that the upcoming soil cover be delayed until there is better documentation on the history (including aerial photos) of Landfill C. Dawn pointed out that it has been documented in some work plans that there were chemicals reportedly disposed of at Landfill C and her main concern with mobilization for the soil cover for Landfill C was to be able to include the information in RI. Jeff believes that these chemicals which Dawn had mentioned were burned.

Andy continued his presentation by discussing Sites 5/6, which has a small intermittent stream between them. Looked at all transport pathways and same receptors as other sites (except Site 3). Soil was not looked at soil because of potential cap as the presumptive remedy. The screening looked at freshwater and saltwater habitats. One or more COPCs identified; 20 in surface water (both marine and freshwater), 15 in groundwater, 50 sediment (both marine and freshwater), and 44 in soil. Higher concentrations detected near the sites and lower detections near Blow's Creek. Due to the COPCs the screening moved to Step 3a. The conclusion indicated that the muskrat and raccoon are at risk. The next step will be complete step 3b; identify data gaps and identify the studies to fill the data gaps.

Andy discussed uncertainties with the ERA:

- detection limits
- no screening values for some chemicals
- total vs. dissolved metals in water
- no site-specific bioavailability
- lack of species-specific toxicities, life history parameters, bioaccumulation factors
- chemical mixture were not considered
- did not consider reptiles and amphibians.

Devlin pointed out to the team that there appears to be a data gap for dioxins at Site 5. Lynne confirmed that there were five subsurface soil samples collected for dioxins using Method 8290. Four of five samples detected dioxin. There was no samples collected for surface soil because of the degradation of dioxins due to exposure to sunlight.

Simeon expressed the need to start moving on the risk assessments for the sites and asked Dawn if there was budget to do so. Dawn replied that there is budget, but not for this year.

**Action – CDM/HILL – compile available historical data on site 3.**

**Action – Dawn to get Simeon/Team info on the BERA approach/schedule.**

**Action – Bill check with Holly Rosnick (CH2M HILL) regarding dioxins considerations for HHRA.**

Simeon suggested that the best way to check for dioxins would be to collect tissue samples. Dawn questioned if there was a cover, would we need to worry about the dioxins. Simeon responded that if there was a cover, there would no longer be a pathway and therefore it would not be necessary to collect samples for dioxin.

Dawn asked Simeon if he would like sampling of dioxins in Blow's Creek. Simeon responded that sampling for dioxins would not be necessary in Blow's Creek at this time, but maybe at a later date.

Simeon asked if there is a priority to completing sites. Dawn expressed her desire to keep Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5/6 on similar tracks. The budgets for the sites are flexible, but doesn't mean the money has to be used for the original intent.

The team thanks Andy for his presentation and the meeting adjourns to go to St. Juliens Creek to view Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5/6.

#### **IV. St. Juliens Creek and New Gosport Site Visits**

The Partnering Team reconvenes at St. Juliens Creek. The team visits Site 17 (Building 279). The team members were able to look at some of the sample locations under the building and view the how water under the building would flow towards Site 2.

The team then visits Site 2 at which time there are many small discussions regarding the site layout and remedies. It is noticed that portions of the site are covered with abrasive blast media (ABM). Devlin expressed to Dawn the positive aspects of removing the ABM and enhancing the wetlands. This would be similar to the New Gosport project at Norfolk Naval Shipyard. The team decides that it will visit New Gosport today, if time permits. If we were to proposed trenching activities to determine limits of waste or ABM, Devlin cautioned that we would need have a contingency in the work plan that explains what action would be taken in the event that drums or cans are unearthed. Devlin expressed that immediate removal would not be necessary, but there needs to be a

plan. Devlin also expressed the need to have a DEQ representative on site to view the trenching activities.

The team visits the remaining sites adjourns and reconvenes at New Gosport. New Gosport is a former housing area that was used to dispose of ABM. The ABM was spread over the ground and was pushed into Paradise Creek. The current removal of ABM is complete and work has begun on restoring wetlands.

Meeting adjourned for the day.

### **Friday, April 27, 2001**

Second Day Attendees – Lynne, Ed, Wandy, Bruce, Dawn, Jeff, Bill, Todd

#### **Check-In**

Review Agenda – The agenda is modified

Finalize Ground Rules

Break

Soil Survey

Tier II

Agenda Building

Facilitator Feedback

End

## **V. Ground Rules/ Roles and Responsibilities**

The team reviews the ground rules presented in the March 2001 Partnering Meeting. The team has an open discussion on proposed changes.

### **St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team Ground Rules**

- The meeting Agenda will be prepared and distributed one week ahead of the meeting (in time for the conference call).
- We will come to the meetings prepared.
- Meeting Roles will be rotated alphabetically by last name.
- We will try to be on time.
- We will make decisions by consensus.
- Each member will support the Team decisions.
- Discussion Leaders will check for input from all members during discussions.

- Be flexible.
- If new data comes in after a decision has been made, we will bring the data to the group for discussion.
- If a member is unable to make the meeting, the Team will attempt to conference in the member and/or we will use a proxy. If the proxy waives or passes on the consensus, the item will be placed on the Parking Lot.
- We will be open and candid with each other and the Team.
- There will be no non-productive sidebars. Be respectful of other team members.
- Maintain open lines of communication and keep everyone informed.
- Team members will discuss and work to resolve conflicts and differences of opinions before going outside of the Team.
- Team members will call "time outs" when necessary.
- Casual dress is encouraged.

There was general discussion regarding the role of the proxy and the limitations of a proxy. Wandy expressed to the team that the purpose of the ground rules is to help the team move forward and support team decisions.

**Consensus (except for Devlin)– accept ground rules**

Wandy begins a discussion and an exercise on Roles and Responsibilities. The purpose of the exercise is better clarify where each team member's responsibilities begin and end. The team will revise their roles and responsibilities and provide a draft to Bill for inclusion into the partnering minutes.

**Action – Jeff will get Roles and Responsibilities to Devlin.**

**Action – Todd will reserve meeting room at Region III by May 2<sup>nd</sup>.**

**Action – the team will e-mail their roles and responsibilities to Bill by May 2<sup>nd</sup>.**

Devlin Harris (DEQ) Roles & Responsibilities

1. Coordinate and prepare comments on documents
2. Advise team members of changes in regulations
3. Review documents in a timely manner
4. Provide technical regulatory oversight and support so that remediation is consistent with NCP.

5. Resolve issues within agency w regards to my facilities.
6. Provide criteria for cleanup and ARAR's
7. Meet DSMOA commitments
8. Attend RAB meetings
9. Work in partnership

Jeff Harlow and Dawn Hayes (Navy)

1. Execute community relations
2. Conduct field oversight and assist contractor when they are on-site
3. Co-chair the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
4. Maintain local administrative records in repository
5. Sign decision documents, including permits
6. Identify probable land uses
7. Prevent or control new sources of contamination
8. Ensure budgetary requests are properly submitted
9. Protect natural resources
10. Be responsible for emergency response
11. Provide oversight and coordination of base mission and projects
12. Ensure that contract submittals are timely & complete and schedules are met
13. Provide long-term maintenance
14. Identify ERN salary support
15. Keep chain of command informed
16. Create and distribute administrative record
17. Manage ERN program (budgeting)
18. Solicit and respond to comments
19. Implement team's decision
20. Provide support (lead the effort where assigned) for regulatory agreements
21. Develop and maintain Site Management Plan/ Management Action Plan
22. Determine ERN eligibility
23. Ensure compliance with NCP and ARARs
24. Author decision documents
25. Maintain execution plan
26. Respond to regulatory inquiries on hazardous waste sites
27. Ensure decision are implemented
28. Ensure site close-out
29. Provide information to appropriate database
30. Review hazwaste docket
31. Maintain consistency in overall program execution and quality of products
32. Coordinate with other Service Centers

Bill Friedmann (CH2M HILL) & Lynne France (CDM Federal)

1. Keep partnering team members informed of the status of all activities
2. Maintain a professional attitude towards all partnering team members; be responsive to each team member's individual needs
3. Fully coordinate work tasks with the appropriate partnering team member, coordinate field work with base RPM prior to mobilization

4. Maintain flexibility; respond to changes rapidly and effectively
5. Be knowledgeable of pertinent regulations/guidance
6. Be knowledgeable of, and willing to use, innovative technologies
7. Advise partnering team of ways to do work better/faster/cheaper
8. Advise partnering team of technical impacts of their recommendations
9. Suggest technical ways to meet all partnering team member requirements
10. Assist SJCA with community relations activities
11. Conduct work tasks and prepare deliverables as directed by the partnering team in a cost-effective, timely manner
12. Assist in planning and executing environmental activities at the base
13. Advise partnering team of economic impacts of their recommendations
14. Advise partnering team members of schedule adjustments with recommendations to get back on schedule, or adjust the baseline. Also notify partnering team of 'unexpected conditions' or when assigned tasks will not meet goals
15. Ensure qualified people work on SJCA IRP work tasks (field/office work)
16. Ensure proper health & safety issues are addressed prior to field activities
17. Provide adequate quantity/quality of field equipment
18. Ensure quality control/quality assurance on all deliverables
19. Coordinate and monitor work tasks performed by subcontractors.

## **VI. Soil Cover Survey**

Bill presented to the team the technical approach to the soil cover surveys to be conducted at Sites 3, 4, and 5/6. Based on new information and potential changes to the presumptive remedies at these sites, the team discusses trenching as an alternative to 24" hand auger holes. It was agreed that there is generally better information collected during trenching and since the activity will be looking at specific areas within the site boundaries, conducting a soil survey using hand auger would be of very little use.

An important issue brought to the team's attention was the concern over unexploded ordnance (UXO). Previous field work has had UXO support at specific sampling points. For the proposed trenching, a UXO surveyor would be brought on-site to clear locations prior to trenching and remain on-site. The work plan would be required to have health and safety issues addressed with respect to the potential UXO.

Ed brought up the issue of additional sampling to help delineate the sites, but according to Lynne and Dawn it is not necessary at this point, though there is still consideration of collecting samples for dioxins at Site 5.

The delineation of the sites will be important in determining future budgeting. It is likely that projects will have to be re-prioritized based on the findings of the trenching activities. A schedule for mobilization for the trenching will have to be determined.

**Action – Dawn will check on a HASP for OE**

## VII. Tier II Update

Bruce updates the team on Tier II activities

- Have team contacts on web site.
- Check on Tier II schedule to schedule the Tier I meetings dates so we can have a tier II representative at the meetings
- How to conduct meeting – deliverables could be put in 3 ring binder.
- Meeting management – as we address more sites, we need to manage the meetings better.

**Action Item – Bill/Lynne will update the SJCA web site with a members list. Bill's name will be added.**

**Action – Bruce will check on schedule for the May meeting conference call.**

## VIII. Agenda Building for Next Meeting/Scheduling of Meetings

### Agenda Items for May 30 & 31 2001 Meeting

Item	Lead	Goal	Time
Site 17 Presentation of SI Report	Lynne/Bill	Present findings of Site 17 and decide on fate.	1 hour
SSA Findings	Lynne/Bill	Presenting Findings and get feedback	1 hour
Background Investigation	Bill/Alta	Informational - Presentation of Report of Findings solicit up-front comments Including how it will be used in the ecological report.	1.5 hours
Tier II Link	Bruce	Informational	0.5 hour
Entrance Time	Wandy	Entrance for Bill	0.5 hour
Partnering	Wandy	Finalize Roles and Responsibilities, meeting management	1.5 hours
RI (Sites 2,3,4,5/6)	Lynne	Findings	2 hours
Soil Survey/Site Delineation	Bill/Dawn	Approach	1 hour
SASR	Bill/Dave	Review Status	0.5
Goals	Dawn	Review Status	0.25
Standard Stuff	Lynne		3.0

**Action – Wandy will bring partnering videos to next partnering.**

**Action – Bill will edit NFA Section in March meeting minutes**

**Action – CDM/HILL will take over SASR**

**Action – Bill/Lynne will provide 3-ring binder w/ up-to-date Team Deliverables at next partnering meeting (5/30/01)**

**Next meeting – May 30 & 31 at Philadelphia (Embassy Suites)**

First Day: May 30th  
Start time: 9:00 AM  
End time: 5:00 PM

Second Day: May 31st  
Start time: 9:00 AM  
End time: 5:00 PM

Pre-meeting Conference Call: May 23, 2001 10:00 – 12:00 (Dawn will let us know of her availability). Agenda for the next meeting will be discussed first followed by a discussion on Site 17.

Alternate Call: May 24, 2001 same time.

Chair: Lynne France  
Host: Todd Richardson  
Timekeeper: Dawn Hayes  
Goal Keeper: Dawn Hayes  
Recorder: Bill Friedmann/Lynne France  
Tier II: Bruce Frizzell  
Guests: Andy Hopton (CDM Federal Ecological Risk Assessor), Alta Turner (CH2M HILL – conference call), Alvaro Alvarado (EPA)

May 30 & 31 Philadelphia, PA  
July 11 & 12 Portsmouth, VA  
August 28 & 29 Charlottesville, VA  
October 10 & 11 Portsmouth, VA  
November 27 & 28 Cacapon State Park, WV

**X April 01 Meeting Check-out**

+	Δ
<b>General</b>	
Good meeting place	Friday Meetings
Meetballs	Need site pictures
Close to meatballs	Cold at first
Simeon's time	Simeon's time
Good having Devlin back	Laptop Death
Having Ed at meeting	Large group
Lessons Learned from other sites	Not enough money this year
Gosport visit	Large group
<b>Meeting Management</b>	
Meeting was fragmented at first, but got it back together	Meeting was fragmented at first
Flexible about site visit prioritized	Need to use flipcharts
Effective meeting considering changes with documents	Multiple conversations hard to record minutes and volume was high
Interaction – Brainstorming	Planning and Timing
Content changing, meeting management will change	
No non-productive sidebars	

**St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team  
April 2001 Meeting Action Items**

<b>Date</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
4/26/01	1	Dawn	Check on Site 17 building demolition time frame	5/4/01
4/26/01	2	Bill/ Lynne	Look into regional influences of sedimentation along the Elizabeth River which may impact St. Juliens Creek	
4/26/01	3	Bill/ Lynne	Compile available historical data on Site 3	
4/26/01	5	Dawn	Get Simeon and Team information on the BERA approach and schedule	
4/26/01	6	Bill	Check with Holly Rosnick (CH2M HILL) on dioxin considerations for the HHRA	
4/27/01	7	Jeff	Provide roles and responsibilities to Devlin	
4/27/01	8	Todd	Reserve room with a TV & VCR at Region III for next partnering meeting	5/2/01
4/27/01	9	Team	E-mail roles and responsibilities to Bill	5/2/01
4/27/01	10	Dawn	Will check on a HASP for UXO	

<b>Date</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
4/27/01	11	Bill/ Lynne	Update the SJCA web site with a members list. Bill's name will be added	
4/27/01	12	Wandy	Bring partnering videos to the May partnering meeting.	5/30/01
4/27/01	13	Bill	Edit the NFA Section in the March meeting minutes	5/30/01
4/27/01	14	Bill/ Lynne	Take over SASR	
4/27/01	15	Bill/ Lynne	Provide team with 3-ring binder with up-to-date Team Deliverables.	5/30/01
4/27/01	12	Bruce	Check his schedule to participate in the May meeting conference call	