

MEETING SUMMARY

CH2MHILL

## Final Minutes from October 2001 Partnering Meeting - St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team

October 17 & 18, 2001

**Attendees:**

Dawn Hayes/LANTDIV  
Todd Richardson/USEPA  
Jeff Harlow/NAVY  
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL  
Donna Caldwell /CH2M HILL  
Devlin Harris/DEQ

**Guests:** Durwood Willis/Tier II  
Ed Corl/LANTDIV (ECO)

From: Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Date: November 30, 2001

**LOCATION**

Crowne Plaza, Richmond, VA

**MINUTES**

**Wednesday, October 17, 2001**

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager – Devlin Harris  
Timekeeper/gatekeeper – Donna Caldwell  
Host – Navy  
Goalkeeper - Dawn Hayes  
Facilitator – Devlin Harris  
Recorder – Bill Friedmann  
Guest – Ed Corl

Review Agenda Items

Reading of Ground Rules

## Parking Lot

- Have discussion with Simeon to discuss big picture plans for ERA at St. Juliens.
- Sites 3, 4, 5, & 6 RI/HHRA/ERA/FS/EECA deliverable plans.
- Have Archie Pinkerton download historical site information (Site 19)
- Do we need a May meeting.
- Site 5 wetland.

### **I. Tier III Presentation**

The partnering team meets with the Tier III team to discuss the status of St. Juliens Creek Annex and issues which may affect all bases, such as ecological issues and signing of RODs.

### **II. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes**

Review of the August 2001 draft minutes. The minutes will be sent out in red line form and final form for the team to review.

### **III. Review of Agenda Items**

Todd discusses the process for the ROD/Close Out. If a site is in RI and then goes through EE/CA which will undergo removal, is a PRAP needed? What considerations should be made about public comment or a No Further Action ROD? Can the site simply be closed out via an EE/CA? The response is if the site has a hazard ranking, then you must follow through the RI/FS, PRAP and ROD, even if the FS is very scaled down and focused.

With regards to samples collected in the Elizabeth River. It is thought that samples were collected by Tetra Tech. If there is data, then this data should be included in the Appendix of the Background report and the ERA report.

**Action Mike Elias** - speak with Simeon about Elizabeth River data which could be included as an Appendix in the ERA.

### **IV. Dioxin Presentation**

Ed Corl (LANTDIV environmental chemist) distributes a handout and discusses dioxins. The presentation provides an overview of what dioxins are, why they are a concern to the environment, how dioxin data is viewed, and the methods used for detecting dioxin.

A point made regarding the analysis of dioxins is that even though Method 8290 is more expensive than 8280, if dioxins are suspected, since it analyzes for more dioxin compounds it would be more cost affective to use Method 8290. If any dioxins are detected and Method 8280 was used, it is likely that regulators would request additional sampling using 8290.

Ed reviewed the procedures for calculating TEQ (toxicity equivalency) and using TEQ (toxicity equivalency factor)

## **V. Ecological Risk Assessment - First Interim Deliverable**

A conference call is held to discuss the findings of the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) First Interim Deliverable for Sites 3, 4, 5, & 6. The discussion is led by Mike Elias of CH2M HILL and includes Simeon Hahn of EPA.

Simeon expressed that the first interim deliverable was fine and that he did not believe that generating a new deliverable would be necessary. Simeon did point out that there didn't seem to be adequate TOC or grain size data.

The team along with Mike and Simeon discuss a potential scoping meeting at St. Juliens Creek which will also serve as a site visit to address comments or questions. Prior to the meeting, the goals of the meeting will be defined.

**Action Mike/Bill** – Define goals of November ecological meeting and send to the Partnering team, Simeon Hahn, and Bruce Pluta.

There is a general discussion regarding the difference between a Screening ERA and a Baseline ERA. It was determined that the ERA through step 3 would no longer be a stand alone deliverable and will be included in the RI for Sites 3, 4, 5, & 6. The discussion then changed to sediment samples collected in the Elizabeth River. There are apparently two sets of data, one produced by the EPA which was sampled at the outfall of Blows Creek with the Elizabeth River. The second set of data was collected by the Elizabeth River Project with samples being collected both upgradient and downgradient of St. Juliens Creek Annex. It would be beneficial to review this data to see if there are any impacts to Blows and St. Juliens Creek from the Elizabeth River.

## **VI. SASR**

The team discusses the SASR. For the Site Screening Assessment (SSA) Site 7, John Ballinger is looking at the removal of material. We will hold off on finalizing the SSA until debris at Site 7 is removed. The concrete at Site 7 may be recycled. A proposal for costs for the removal will be sent out in the next few weeks to see if there is funding available for removal.

Background report – the final report has been submitted but CH2M HILL will look into adding data from Elizabeth River into an appendix.

**Action – Donna/Bill** – Elizabeth River Regional sediment . Data found will be placed in the appendix of the Background Investigation Report.

**Consensus – Team accepts the Final Technical Memorandum for Trenching Activities for Sites 2, 3, 5, & 6.**

**VII. Schedule**

The team discusses future partnering meeting dates and locations.

November 27-28, 2001 – Cacapon, WV  
January 9-10, 2002 w/RAB– Portsmouth, VA  
February 26-27, 2002 – Philadelphia, PA  
April 10-11, 2002 w/RAB – Portsmouth, VA  
June 11-12, 2002 – Richmond, VA  
July 23-24, 2002 – Portsmouth, VA  
September 10-11, 2002 - Cacapon, WV  
October 10, 2002 RAB only – Portsmouth, VA  
November 19-20, 2002 - TBD

**VIII. Roundtable**

The team discusses preliminary remedial goals (PRGs). PRGs are usually discussed in the feasibility study (FS), but may also be discussed in the RI for St. Juliens Creek sites, the PRGs will be determined as part of the FS.

For PRGs as it applies to ERAs, there is a triad approach. After samples are pulled, they are split into three samples. One third of the sample has full suite analysis done on it. Another third has a toxicity tests done (chronic) and the final third part has a benthic diversity evaluation. When results are complete, a table is developed to look at all three tests to determine the PRG. The approach can be enhanced by conducting fish tissue sampling or a bivalve bioaccumulation study.

Background soil concentrations can be used as PRGs. PRGs are typically used to clean up to a level which is higher than the actual screening values. There is a question of whether we can determine hot spots prior to developing PRGs.

**Thursday, October 18, 2001**

**IX. Joint Scoping for SSA Sites requiring further action**

The team discusses joint scoping of the SSA sites which require further action: Sites 1, 8, 11/21, 7, 19 and AOC1. The team comes to a consensus that the workplan for the additional SSA sampling will be in the form of Tech Memo.

**Site 1 (Landfill A)**

The exact extent of Site 1 is not known and no historical aerial photographs date back to the 1920's time frame. The 1937 aerial photograph gives some indication of ground scarring east of Site 1. Delineation of the site is needed through the use of trenching

similar to Sites 2, 3, 5, and 6 with UXO support. There is currently no need to sample groundwater here at this point, however, if any groundwater is sampled in the future at SJCA then explosives should be analyzed for. Limited soil sampling based on field observations for metals, SVOCs, explosives, dioxins and pesticides. The investigation area will also include areas east of the railroad line. No sampling of surface water or sediment at Blows Creek will occur unless there is evidence that it is warranted.

#### **Site 8 (Cross and Mine)**

It is requested that three surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater samples be collected and analyzed for metals and pesticides/PCBs. The team agrees that it would be better to install permanent groundwater wells for sampling as opposed to sampling using a geoprobe device. A geoprobe device can be used with an on-site lab for screening of pesticides to determine presence/absence and help determine the final monitoring well locations. Since groundwater flow direction is suspected to be towards Blows Creek, but is not certain, it will be necessary to install temporary wells which will be surveyed and gauged.

**Action Donna**- contact CH2M HILL chemist to see if on-site labs can analyze for pesticides.

#### **Site 19**

The team discussed the need to investigate two outfalls from Site 19 leading east to the Elizabeth River. There is reportedly an outfall from Site 19 leading north to Blows Creek. Jeff informed the team that there may have been releases of yellow substance in these culverts, possibly ammonium pickrate. The team discussed the possibility of collecting co-located surface water and sediment samples at the terminus of culverts for full suite. It is recommended that the team consult with Archie Pinkerton (site personnel with site history). The team also discusses installing groundwater monitoring wells on the north side of Blows Creek to be sampled for pesticides/PCBs, explosives, and ammonium pickrate.

**Action Donna** - check with chemist for parameter analysis of ammonium pickrate.

**Action Jeff** - identify the actual generic name of ammonium pickrate.

There is a discussion on collecting surface soil and subsurface soil around the former building for full suite analysis plus explosives. Install additional wells near the building for groundwater analysis.

**Action Jeff**- set up meeting with Archie Pinkerton. Consider video taping the interview with Mr. Pinkerton.

The partnering team will finalize the scoping of Site 19 during a site visit.

## **Site 11/21**

Previous investigations indicated presence of TCE in groundwater at both Site 11 and 21. In conjunction with the investigation of Site 8, the approach would be to use temporary piezometers to determine groundwater flow direction, an on-site mobile lab for screening of groundwater for VOCs and final placement of permanent groundwater monitoring wells. Since the location is in an area where there could be considerable utility lines, the investigation should be mindful of utility lines as conduits for contaminants.

## **AOC 1**

Further review of the historical aerial photographs during the completion of the draft SSA report indicated that samples which had elevated levels of PAHs were located within the ground scarred area identified in the photo. Additional samples were recommended to be taken based on risk. Up to 4 or 5 additional surface soil and subsurface soil samples will be collected and analyzed for full suite (plus explosives). Additionally, four surface water and four sediment sample locations will be collected at site related locations and downstream location for full suite and explosives, which may be collected during future sampling in Blows Creek. There is also the suggestion that additional surface soil and subsurface soil samples be collected for PAHs only. The team may discuss the additional sampling approach during a site visit.

## **X. Tier II Update**

Durwood Willis of Tier II gave an update to the team. There is no feedback yet from the from Tier III regarding the presentation given the previous morning.

Two items which are now on the agenda for the next Tier III meeting is teleconferencing and large water bodies. The meeting is set for May 16-17<sup>th</sup>, 2002. The full agenda is not set.

Joint Tier I/II meeting will be held at the Bolger Training and Conference Center in Potomac, MD on May 16-17, 2002. Tier I presentations will be on May 16<sup>th</sup>. Durwood suggested considering topics which we can feed into legal or ecological issues.

The VA/MD Partnering Team web site should be up and running.

Ecological sub group update – the team is made up of administrative managers and technical people. The administrative managers believe that the technical people are working well together and that the administrative side job is done. The administrative people have proposed to Tier II that the subgroup should be just technical people. No decision has been made on that yet. Concern is expressed to Durwood about just having technical people on the sub group. It is suggested that a compromise would be for Bruce Pluta to sit in on the teams which are having problems with ecological issues. It was noted that Bruce is participating more with calls and with some teams.

The next Tier II meeting will be held on December 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, 2001 followed by a meeting on March 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>, 2002.

Tier II Large water body issue – Draft sediment management protocol will not be released until a pending Navy study is completed. The Navy study is currently addressing comments at this time. There was a question on what should be done to address the differences in permitted outfall discharge levels which are above CERCLA ERA criteria.

**Action Dawn** – follow up on NPDES outfalls vs. CERCLA ERA criteria.

## XI. RI/FS/HHRA/ERA

The objective of the discussion is to determine what path the team wants to pursue for the RI sites taking into account that we are looking into removal/consolidation of the landfills and that RODs with ICs are not being signed. One possibility is to consider an EE/CA for Sites 3, 5, and 6.

**Action Devlin/Todd** – Check on the possibility of consolidation of Sites 3, 5, and 6 into Site 4 landfill.

The problem with consolidation into another landfill is that the landfill which is having the material transferred to must meet the current regulatory requirements.

Should the team pursue EE/CA for 3/6 (based on FS) and a no further action (NFA) ROD?

**Action Dawn** – discuss with Navy wetlands at sites 2 and 5.

**Action Bill** – e-mail Devlin volume estimates of wastes at 3, 5, 6 and waste within 2 weeks. The survey for Site 4 is expected in November.

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

### Agenda Items for November 2001 Meeting

Agenda Item	Leader	Purpose/Goal	Time
Day 1			
Welcome	Team	New Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	15 min.
Check-In	Team	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	10 min
Guests/R&R/Review GRs	Todd	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	10 min
Review Agenda Previous Meeting Minutes	Team	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	15 min
Review Facility Meeting Logistics	Jeff	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	5 min

Review St Juliens Parking Lot Items	Todd	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	15 min
Review St Juliens Action Items	Todd	Review what was accomplished and what needs to be completed or placed in parking lot and carried to the next meeting	20 min
Sites 3,4,5,and 6 RI/FS and engineering perspectives for consideration in the feasibility study report.	Dawn	Discuss engineering considerations for remedial alternatives	2 hr
Site 17	Bill	Scoping additional sampling/next steps	1 hr 30 min
SASR and Execution Update		Review/adjust SASR with team input	30 min
Review FY 02 Goals	Dawn	Status Update/Make applicable modification for Tier II posting	1 hr
Break	Team	Prep for Pre Final Charge	15 min
Partnering Exercises	Wandy	Work on deliverables/???	1 hr
<b>Day 2</b>			
Welcome	Team	New Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	15 min
Check in	Team	Warm up, settle in	15 min
Guests/R&R/Review GRs	Dawn	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	10 min
Review Facility Meeting Logistics	Jeff	Standard Meeting Format - <b>More Efficient Meeting</b>	5 min
Review Current Agenda	Dawn	Focus the meeting and make necessary adjustments	10 min
Partnering Exercise	Wandy	Continue deliverables/exercises??	1 hr
Break	Team	Renewal, Recharge, Wake up	15 min
Tier II Update	Bob	Update Tier I on Tier II issues	30 min
Agenda Building (Arrange Conference Call for Next Mtg.)	(Next Meeting Manager)	Identify agenda items for next meeting	30 min.
Parking Lot Items	Team	Address any unresolved issues	30 min.
Facilitator/Tier II Feedback and Day 2 +/▲	Wandy / Tier II / Team	Critical analysis of meeting progress	30 min.

Next meeting – November 27th & 28th, Cacapon State Park, WV

Start time: 8:00 AM, November 27

End time: 3:30 PM, November 28

Pre-meeting Conference Call: November 15<sup>th</sup>, 12 PM

Chair: Todd Richardson

Timekeeper: Dawn Hayes

Goal Keeper: Dawn Hayes

Recorder: Bill Friedmann

Facilitator – Wandy Brown

Tier II: Bob Schirmer

Guests: None

**St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team  
October 2001 Meeting Action Items and Carry Over Action Items**

<b>Date</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
8/29/01	1	Bill/Donna	Check on unresolved sites for the SSA/SMP. The unresolved locations will be in the SMP.	10/01
8/29/01	2	Bill/Donna	Talk to Holly Rosnick about presentation/explanation of PRGs. Look at COPCs and see if they work, then if we have to, look at SSLs.	10/01
8/30/01	3	Bill	Post trenching activity presentation for Sites 2, 3, 5, & 6 for the SJCA team, as well as Eco	10/01
8/30/01	4	Todd	Onboard review of SSA with Simeon on September 15 <sup>th</sup> .	9/01
8/30/01	5	Bill	Check with Howard Simmons (CH2M HILL) on .pdf1 CD of SSA and Background reports.	10/01
8/30/01	6	Donna	Get regional sediment information to include in the Background Report	10/01
10/17/01	7	CH2M HILL	Mike Elias speak with Simeon about Elizabeth River data which could be included as an Appendix in the ERA.	11/01
10/17/01	8	Jeff	Arrange space at SPAWAR on November 8 <sup>th</sup> /9 <sup>th</sup> for ECO scoping.	Early Nov.
10/17/01	9	Bill/Mike	Define goals of November ecological meeting and send to the Partnering team, Simeon Hahn, and Bruce Pluta	Early Nov.
10/17/01	10	Team	Comments on the draft SSA to CH2M by October 26.	10/26
10/17/01	11	Donna	Check on Elizabeth River Regional Sediment data to be included in the Background Report appendix.	11/01
10/17/01	12	Jeff/Donna	Check on Yorktown dioxin data information.	11/01
10/18/01	13	Donna	Contact CH2M Hill chemist to see if on-site labs are capable of analyzing pesticides. Also discuss ammonium	11/01

			pichorate and what constituents are of a concern.	
10/18/01	14	Jeff	Find "Explosive D" chemical composition.	11/01
10/18/01	15	Jeff	Check with Archie Pinkerton regarding Site 19 and his availability for a site visit on November 8 <sup>th</sup> .	Early Nov.
10/18/01	16	Dawn	Follow up on NPDES outfalls vs. CERCLA ERA criteria and follow up with Durwood on this.	11/01
10/18/01	17	Team	Check with each agencies/company regarding consolidation of landfills	11/01
10/18/01	18	Dawn	Discuss with Navy wetlands at Sites 2 and 5.	11/01
10/18/01	19	Bill	E-mail volume estimates of waste and descriptions at Sites 3, 5, & 6. Will also need topographic survey of Site 4.	Nov. 1
10/18/01	20	Hill/Dawn	Have meeting to discuss costs/goals for Sites 3, 5, & 6 remedial actions.	11/01
10/18/01	21	Devlin	Investigate requirements for waiver for consolidation of landfills 3, 5, & 6 to Site 4.	11/01
10/18/01	22	Bill	Post information to web (goals/meetings)	11/01

### St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Goals

No.	Goal	Date
1	<b>Develop Ecological Risk Approach Matrix for Sites 2- 6</b> Draft SERA for Sites 3-6 combined with RI/HHRA due on 12/14/01 Draft SERA Site 2 - to be determined based on funding	1 <sup>st</sup> FY02
2	<b>Final RI/HHRA Site 2</b> Draft RI/HHRA Site 2 due on 3/15/02	3 <sup>rd</sup> FY02
3	<b>Final RI/FS Sites 3 &amp; 6</b> Draft RI/HHRA/SERA due 12/14/01 Draft Focused FS for Sites 3 & 6 due 2/04/02	3 <sup>rd</sup> FY02
4	<b>Final RI/FS Sites 4 &amp; 5</b> Draft RI/HHRA/SERA due 12/14/01 Draft FS for Sites 4 & 5 – to be determined	4 <sup>th</sup> FY02
5	<b>Finalize SSA Report &amp; Closeouts of NFA Sites</b> Draft SSA submitted 8/13/01, comments due on 1/10/02	2 <sup>nd</sup> FY02
6	<b>Finalize Removal Action Work Plan for Sites 3 &amp; 6</b> EE/CA 3 <sup>rd</sup> FY02 currently scheduled for 3/11/02	3 <sup>rd</sup> FY02
7	<b>ROD for Sites 3 &amp; 6</b>	4 <sup>th</sup> FY02
8	<b>Complete Team Deliverables</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> FY02

	Consensus received on partnering team member roles 10/17/01 Graduation expected in May 2002	
9	Draft FFA – review sites for inclusion into FFA at Jan. 2002 meeting	4 <sup>th</sup> FY02
10	Final Background Report – Complete 11/28/02	1 <sup>st</sup> FY02
11	Work Plan for SI for Various Sites – to be determined based on funding	3 <sup>rd</sup> FY02
12	Draft PRAP and Draft ROD for Site 2	FY03

