

N00109.AR.002730
NWS YORKTOWN
5090.3a

FINAL PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 10 DECEMBER 2013 NWS YORKTOWN VA

12/10/2013
PARTNERING TEAM

FINAL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE 10th, 11th & 12th OF DECEMBER 2013 MEETING (No. 118) OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM

LOCATION: CH2M HILL Office
5701 Cleveland Street, Suite 200
Virginia, VA
757-518-9666

MEETING MANAGER: Mr. Jim Gravette
MEETING HOST: Mr. Bill Friedmann
TIMEKEEPER: Mr. Moshood Oduwole
FACILITATOR: Ms. Nancy Rouse
TIER II: Mr. Doug Dronfield
RECORDER: Mr. Brian Wachter
GUESTS: Mr. Wade Smith

INTRODUCTION

The Weapons Station (WPNSTA) Yorktown Partnering Team (Team) held a partnering meeting on December 10th, 11th and 12th, 2013. The Final Agenda for this meeting is included on pages 10-12 of these minutes.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

The following people also participated in the meeting:

Donna Caldwell/Navy, Dave Barclift/Navy, Stephanie Sawyer/CH2M HILL, Adam Forshey/CH2M HILL, Kim-Lee Yarberrry/CH2M HILL, Laura Cook/CH2M HILL, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL, Kyle Newman/VDEQ, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA

CONFERENCE CALLS:

January 6, 2014 (Status Call): 1000 – 1030 EST

Chorus Call: 866-203-7023
Pass Code: 9226075075

UPCOMING EVENTS:

FUTURE PARTNERING MEETING: March 4-6, 2014 (No. 119) – half day, full day, half day format
LOCATION: Richmond, Virginia
AGENDA CALL: February 3, 2014; 1000 – 1100 EST

MEETING MANAGER: Bill Friedmann
MEETING HOST: Wade Smith
FACILITATOR: Nancy Rouse
TIMEKEEPER: Jim Gravette
RECORDER: Brian Wachter

GUESTS: TBD

NEXT RAB MEETING: May 15, 2014
TIME: 1300-1500
LOCATION: York County Library – Yorktown

FUTURE PARTNERING MEETING: May 13-15, 2014 (No. 120)
LOCATION: Virginia Beach, VA
AGENDA CALL: TBD

MEETING MANAGER: TBD
MEETING HOST: TBD
FACILITATOR: Nancy Rouse
TIMEKEEPER: TBD
RECORDER: Brian Wachter

GUESTS: TBD

TUESDAY DECEMBER 10th DISCUSSION

Agenda Item: Site 22 pre-RD UFP-SAP Comment Discussion

Discussion Leader: Laura Cook/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Comment Discussion

Additional Conference Call Participants: None

Discussion: Laura led the presentation. *Comment 3* – Laura notes that 1,4 dioxane was not sampled during the RI, and sampling for it in this investigation is just to determine presence/absence; 1,4 dioxane was used as a stabilizer with 1,1,1-TCA so our approach is to sample the three wells with the highest concentrations of 1,1,1-TCA. Moshood asks why GW06 was not picked because based on Figure 5 it is the closest well to “Former Explosives Burning Facility”. Laura clarified that the “Former Explosives Burning Facility” label on this figure was only intended to point out what was done at this site, and not a specific area it was done. Laura further clarified that the burning at this site was done in a ring around the perimeter as shown on Figure 2. *Other 2 comments* – Laura notes

Final December 2013 Meeting Minutes Revised Final December 2013 Meeting Minutes.docx

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

that we thought we were drafting the SAP for predesign investigation to close in gaps of delineation to better design groundwater treatment. Laura notes that we have NFA/ROD for SW/SD at Site 22. Moshood notes that he has had conversations with Bruce Pluta, and BTAG's concern is with the groundwater/SW interface. Jim requests EPA holds off sending these comments until after predesign investigation since the results from this investigation may put these concerns to rest. Moshood notes that comment 3 will probably be only official comment right now. Bill notes that no pore water sampling done at time of RI when no risk to SW/SD determined. Moshood says that if there is evidence of a compound migrating to the creek, then we need to come up with plan to address that. Jim notes that interface sampling was not part of sampling at time of RI, but receiving media (SW/SD) show that it was not migrating, and source is no longer there. Laura does not think this pre-RD SAP is the right place to address this comment, since it is focused on groundwater remedy. Moshood thinks the five year review might be a better place to address this if groundwater data shows reason to reopen NFA/ROD. Jim suggests instead of making it a comment in the comment letter, make it a statement. Bill says it could even be a comment to address it in the five year review. Moshood asks planned schedule. Jim says planning to be in field in March 2014.

Three comments submitted as draft. 1st one will be submitted, and Moshood still working on response. Moshood will have comments back sometime next week. Wade will have comments in this week.

Wrap-Up/Action Item: None

Agenda Item: Site 34 UFP-SAP Update

Discussion Leader: Kim-Lee Yarberry/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Outstanding comment resolution and update on decontamination

Additional Participants: None

Discussion: Kim-Lee led the presentation. Bill adds that GW07 screen will be more in line with top of the confining unit, not the middle of aquifer as it is shown on the conceptualized cross section. Wade asks if we are looking for clay layer. Bill mentions that we do not have much lithologic information, and goal is to better understand the thickness and extent of the clay layer. Kim-Lee points out that MIP response really dropped off when you get out of the clay layer. Moshood mentions worry if something is found in soil samples. Bill mentions that if something is found, we would have to take a look. Bill mentions that metals are more likely to have issue here than VOCs. Moshood asks why we are resampling sediment location. Bill mentions that goal has always been to confirm results of the sample that started this investigation. Bill mentions that we will look for cracks within the building trenches (worst possible case). Jim mentions that the building was decontaminated (free of explosive residue) through pressure washing and/or scraping and removing impacted flooring. Building historically had two drains before the trench system was installed. Jim talks about uncertainties in schedule. Decon has not been completed at adjacent Site 8; base safety is looking into whether we can be in the area if there are still lots of explosives residue in the Site 8 area. Bill also mentions access issues with getting rig to proposed well location. Comment resolution is completed; redline document still needs to be sent out. Wade asks how schedule changes will be communicated; Jim says he will e-mail within the next two weeks.

Wrap-Up/Action Item: None

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 11th DISCUSSION

Agenda Item: Tier II Update

Discussion Leader: Doug Dronfield/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: None

Desired Outcome: Standard Meeting Format

Additional Participants: None

Discussion: According to Doug, Tier II meets later today so there are not many new updates. Goals are due in the next couple days for first quarter next year. Bill mentions that those are already posted to the Tier I/Tier II site. Doug says to get the success stories in this month as well. Bill asks what deadline is for those. Doug says it is on agenda, but early January is good. White paper put out about landfill long term monitoring. State under solid waste regulations is willing to shut down sites that have had no groundwater issues for a number of years. EPA is saying that if you get a site with waste in place during the five year review, then you have to do monitoring during that five year review. It may not be a requirement for the state, but some kind of monitoring data will be required for the EPA.

Bill asks about where we are allowed to meet. Doug says Navy discourages meeting outside of offices. Doug will check, but he thinks it is okay to meet in hotels if the meeting room there is free. Depends on travel policies of individual agencies. Mentions new personnel representing Tier II for this meeting from EPA and DEQ, manager from Quantico will be there for meeting today. Bill asks about any guidance for dealing with issues from funding or work stoppage, including if things might be handled differently for future potential shutdowns. Jim asks about Tier II priorities as a group for FY14. Wade says Tier II usually asks if there are any special training needs, and if there is anything recommended or anything other teams have had that was useful. Doug says it is specific to each team, so expectation is that Tier II will not roll anything out. For example, some teams have asked for help understanding munitions range work. Other teams use NIRIS system a lot to evaluate data, and they wanted more detailed information about how to use the system. Jim responds that the NIRIS training could be a good topic. Doug mentions that someone doing a review of what upgraded NIRIS can do could help determine how this could be useful. Moshood asks how Tier II uses team goals. Doug replies that new goals often do not match what management thinks you will do. It is also used to see how projects are going and what is out there to help allocate resources. For example, Little Creek wanted to expedite project completions a year ago in order to achieve construction complete for the base. Sometimes they look at goals to see if there is something to push for accomplishing (e.g. closing out a site a year early). Might be used to see why multiple deadlines are not being met (e.g. not meeting enough, contractor not getting work done, EPA does not have enough reviewers, etc). Jim mentions that as part of last partnering meeting, to be proactive, a topic was added to address eco topic when there was no issue to see if it could be worked through. In that case it had to do with mean vs max concentrations in risk assessments. After the discussion, it was determined that the resolution should be shared across teams. During that meeting, the BTAG representatives also brought up how uncertainty in risk assessments is displayed in reports, how depth of sampling effects ecological risks. These broader topics will not be discussed at Yorktown meetings due to time constraints, but it could be helpful for Tier II to discuss. Doug mentions that these are discussed, but only when brought up by individual teams. The landfill long term monitoring guidance was brought up recently, as well as how to deal with sediments in water bodies. Doug suggests talking to RPMs at sites that are close to closure to see how they dealt with these issues. Moshood adds that something BTAG mentioned was that they had seen this problem before, but that it was not resolved. Jim adds that it could be useful for EPA Tier II representative to ask BTAG what their priorities are, or what they feel has not been addressed in the past. Bill asks about traditional classification for clean fill vs what some areas now consider clean with ecological issues considered too. Doug says that topic is on the agenda.

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

Bill/Jim: Send Tier II list of items questions to Doug today.

Agenda Item: Site 3 FS RAO Discussion

Discussion Leader: Jim Gravette/Navy

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

Document/Prep Work: None

Desired Outcome: Discussion

Additional Participants: Dave Barclift/Navy, Donna Caldwell/Navy, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL, Kim-Lee Yarberry/CH2M HILL, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA, Katherine Will/Navy

Discussion: Jim led the discussion. Moshood mentions that even though there were no risks identified in SW/SD during the RI, because contaminants in groundwater still exceed screening levels, EPA is concerned with the groundwater/SW interface.

Katherine says she is not opposed to adding an ecological Remedial Action Objective (RAO), but is unclear of EPA's concern since COCs were not even detected in SW/SD. John responds that the RI is snapshot in time, this is not meant to address what is in RI since that is separate issue; this is to make sure that groundwater which we know is above risk levels does not get to surface water. Katherine says we need to be careful if RAO is added that it only focuses on groundwater potentially going to the creek. Donna asks if existing RAOs for groundwater address this concern. John says that all the RAOs are human health based, they do not deal with ecological receptors. Katherine says she would be okay with language that says risk to ecological receptors would be minimized. Bruce says that you could add ecological receptors to the second bullet. Jim says that Navy expects groundwater concentrations to decrease since source is gone. Donna says that cleanup goals for groundwater are the MCLs. John says that RI assumes plume is stable and the active remedy could change that. Moshood says his main concern is that putting something in as an RAO will help ensure this concern is not forgotten. Bruce says RAO means it is going to happen; putting it elsewhere in the document does not make this guarantee. John says it would easily be lost in the future if not documented in RAO. Katherine's concern is to say you will ensure no discharge to the surface water. Bruce says it needs to include something about dealing with unacceptable risk. Katherine will work with Jim and Donna to write new RAO or revise existing one, and send to EPA. Bruce is good with this approach.

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

Jim/Donna/Katherine: Propose new language for Site 3 FS RAO.

Agenda Item: Site 24 RI Groundwater Data Discussion

Discussion Leader: Stephanie Sawyer/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: None

Desired Outcome: Path forward for RI Report

Additional Participants: Dave Barclift/Navy, Donna Caldwell/Navy, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA

Discussion: Stephanie led the discussion. Moshood notes he had potential path forward developed with John, but Peter and Bruce were not involved in those discussions. John says that Bruce looked at the data last week, and they talked and agreed with Navy conclusions in the first page that it does not look like there is risk from the new well and there should not be need to recalculate the risk assessment in the revised RI report. John says that PCBs were listed in soil and asks about their concentrations in groundwater. Stephanie says that PCBs were not detected in groundwater. Stephanie says that constituents on table were those that were detected in at least one sample. Bill proposes putting this information in the RI. Stephanie says she wanted to put this in the nature and extent section and description of why risk assessment does not need to be rerun.

Wrap-Up/Action Item: None

Agenda Item: Site 6 RI UFP-SAP RTC Discussion

Discussion Leader: Kim-Lee Yarberry/CH2M HILL

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

Document/Prep Work: Review Comments and RTCs

Desired Outcome: Comment Discussion

Additional Participants: Dave Barclift/Navy, Donna Caldwell/Navy, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA

Discussion: Kim-Lee led the discussion. John clarifies comment #2 that he wants to figure out what trigger would need to be reached to re-run the risk assessment. Kim-Lee clarified that re-running risk only applies to excavated area where soil is the concern and the impoundment area where groundwater and sediment, and surface water are concerns. Kim-Lee indicated we can compare the upcoming data collected in these two areas with previous maximum detections to determine if we need to re-evaluate risk. Kim-Lee says that in areas that have not been investigated before, we will do full risk assessment. Bruce asks what areas have been removed in the impoundment. Kim-Lee summarized the flume and impoundment area removals. Bill K. reiterates that full risk assessment will be done in new areas; in previously investigated areas they will be compared to cleanup numbers already identified. John expressed concern over how an order of magnitude comparison will apply as to whether to re-run risk or not. Kim-Lee says we are trying to be overly conservative when determining whether to rerun risk assessment. Bruce expressed that it does not need to be that complicated for areas that have existing cleanup levels. Bill K. says that one other concern is that some of previous risk assessments were pretty old. Bill K. indicated that similar to how Five Year Review is done, old assessments would be evaluated. Bill proposes putting changes into draft redline version, and then comment can be sent if it is not adequately addressed there. Kim-Lee will work with Bill K. to update document. Bill K. says text is already written for Five Year Review, it just needs to be incorporated.

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

Kim-Lee/Jim: Navy to provide Site 6 DGI redline to regulators incorporating discussion from call.

Agenda Item: Site 31 RI UFP-SAP & SW Update

Discussion Leader: Jim Gravette/Navy

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Comment Discussion

Additional Participants: Dave Barclift/Navy, Donna Caldwell/Navy, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL, Kyle Newman/VDEQ, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA

Discussion: Jim led the discussion. Donna talks about human health risk assessment for occasional trespasser, and there is no concern from outfall to security fence line. Peter asks if some samples were collected in Ballard Creek in relation to another site. John says it is Site 12. Donna says that TCE was not detected in Ballard Creek. Peter asks if groundwater from our site is discharging directly to Ballard Creek. Bill and Donna answered no. Bill said we are only concerned with one tributary coming off of Site 31. Bruce asks if there is any issue with potential vapor buildup in any nearby buildings or piping. Donna says that all buildings were evaluated and only two (Sheds 3 and 6) were identified as problems, and these buildings have been evacuated. Donna also mentioned that inhalation was looked at in risk assessment, but probably did not include exposure from vapors in piping. Kyle says that pipe probably is conveying some soil gas. Bruce asks about habitat and what receptors are associated with that part of the stream. Bill K. says no fish observed. Bruce says to consider amphibians. John says fish could use area, at least seasonally. Bruce says as long as it is protective of various life stages of either fish or amphibians, then that should be protective. John raises concern about whether it is feasible to take sample one time, and the effect the loss of VOCs would have in a lab static renewal test. John thinks mobile lab would be more realistic. Bill K. answers that doing mobile lab sampling would be logistically very difficult. Bill K. says there are two options for the test – 3 separate samples from 7 day period in the field or collect one set for all 7 days. Bill K. says you can fill containers with no headspace so VOCs should not be an issue, the question would just be how to renew water in the test. John says concern is material will start off gassing as soon as test starts, whereas in the field they are exposed to a constant temperature; the temperature in the lab would decrease. Bruce said need to check if another, more applicable approach to doing this sampling. Multiple renewal scenario may end up being most feasible, but needs to be checked. Bill K., Bruce, and John not aware of any other toxicity testing methods. Bill K. suggests also using different species in the tests. May have to delay work until warmer weather due to water temperature

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

concerns for species you are checking. Bruce suggests turning this portion into a SAP Addendum to allow finalization of the SAP. John asks how flow and concentrations change seasonally. Bill notes that he has seen it flowing throughout the past year. Peter asks if any variability based on time of year. Bill notes that these locations were sampled twice, but both during cooler months (November and February). John asks if there is a short stretch of habitat between the sewer easement and the outfall, and if there could be higher concentrations there than at SW09. John asks if this will be phased sampling, in case SW20/21/22 come back with higher concentrations and they have habitat, would there be toxicity testing there. Jim suggests getting John out for a site walkthrough.

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

BTAG/Navy: Consider alternative eco toxicity testing methods for Site 31 and discuss in mid-January.

John, Kyle: Provide possible dates for Site 31 site visit.

Jim: Set up site visit.

Agenda Item: UXO-3 SI Fieldwork Update

Discussion Leader: Adam Forshey/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Discuss results & upcoming DGM survey

Additional Participants: Kyle Newman/VDEQ

Discussion: Adam led the discussion and summarized the recent side-scan sonar investigation. Moshood asks how Navy knows that when pier R-3 is no longer in use it will trigger this investigation in that area. Moshood says that right now CERCIS is not tracking individual piers, just UXO-3 as a whole. Bill says that SMP is where that is captured. Jim says that in base's database system, this is marked. The DGM (Phase 1b) investigation will happen around the Christmas holiday.

Wrap-Up/Action Item: None

Agenda Item: Site 23 RI Scoping Update

Discussion Leader: Laura Cook/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Update on progress

Additional Participants: None

Discussion: Laura led the discussion on the modification to the sampling approach since last discussed during the August partnering meeting. Moshood asks what we are proposing for 2003-2009 soil removal action area soils. Laura says we are proposing to use existing samples for this, although eventually the soil will also have to be removed. Moshood asks about samples to the east of the 2009 removal area. Bill mentions that topography is limiting in that area. Wade asks about large sample gap we aren't addressing. Jim mentions that samples were collected in this area during previous investigations. Wade mentions to just explain this in the SAP if there is a reason for not collecting in these areas. Laura shows figure of what type of waste was located where, and Jim mentions that this would be good to show the samples locations on in the SAP. Wade asks how groundwater approach changed since August. Bill notes that MW08 was moved so that it is more directly downgradient of the disposal area. Moshood asks if full suite analysis for soil includes dioxin. Laura says that if we are sampling for it in groundwater, it is because we are also sampling for it in soil. Laura notes that dioxin can occur anyway where burning occurs in the presence of chlorine. Bill notes that this might not apply in removal areas where we are just sampling the backfill. Bill notes that the burning did not occur in this area, it was brought here. Jim asks if you would expect to see dioxins in groundwater. Laura says that you would not expect to see it in groundwater, but we do not have the data to say it is definitely absent. Laura asks how team feels about reviewing worksheets 10, 11, and 18 before SAP is submitted. Jim suggests also setting up a call to walk through those worksheets once they are ready. Wade suggests sending information a week or two ahead of time to review before the call.

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

Jim: Set up site visit for Site 23 (Moshood working on travel orders).

Moshood: Verify BTAG lead for Site 23.

Agenda Item: Site 26 RI Fieldwork Update

Discussion Leader: Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Document/Prep Work: Review Presentation

Desired Outcome: Update on field work

Additional Participants: None

Discussion: Laura led the discussion. Jim is okay stepping further out from DW21. Moshood asks about flow direction. Laura says existing wells show water going north-northeast, but contamination seems to be going more to the north, although we are missing data to the north. Moshood has question about continuing with DPT instead of putting in groundwater monitoring well. Jim suggests installing monitoring well to the north instead of collecting groundwater grab sample. Putting well near 1801 leave large gap between wells. Laura notes that there is funding for two wells outside the fence line, although we only had one outside the fence in the final SAP. Wade suggests adding DPT location at mouth of the gulley leading north. Laura suggests permanent well at 1801 and permanent well at south end of the gulley.

Wrap-Up/Action Item:

Jim: Look into Site 26 former buildings: 1347, 1810, 1443, 1640, 1350, and 1348.

THURSDAY DECEMBER 12th DISCUSSION

Agenda Item: Partnering Team Exercise

Discussion Leader: Nancy Rouse/Management Edge

Document/Prep Work: None

Desired Outcome: Team Building

Additional Participants: None

Discussion: The team building exercise included a recognition of Moshood's birthday, an appreciation exercise for Bill, and an initial discussion of the self-assessment of their progress towards self-facilitation (as a first step towards building a "Roadmap to Self-Facilitation" specific for the WPNSTA Yorktown team).

Wrap-Up/Action Item: The team will continue discussion at the next partnering meeting.

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

Agenda Item: Agenda Building/Roundtable

Roundtable: Wade mentions that he lost his NIRIS certification, and wonders if it should be renewed. Bill mentions that it is basically used to upload large documents. Jim will have Navy employee give presentation on NIRIS, Wade will hold off on making a decision until after presentation at next partnering. Wade asks about flexibility on date for next RAB meeting. Wade asks about possibility for meeting more often, whether in person or on conference calls. Jim suggests monthly status call.

Next Partnering Meeting: March 4-6, 2014 – Richmond, VA - DEQ office (half day / full day / half day)
Agenda call: TBD

Next RAB Meeting: May 15, 2014 – Newport News, VA

Possible Agenda Topics for March meeting:

1. NIRIS training

Possible site visits:

1. Site 26 (potentially active fieldwork in progress)
2. Site 31 (potentially active fieldwork in progress)

Plus	Delta
Increased trust among internal team and technical subgroups	Communication with technical support during meetings
Jim's introduction and wrap up of Site 3 RAO discussion	Long commute for local meeting
Location and meeting format (½, full/ ½; comfortable spot; face-to-face), improved energy and cohesion	GSA vehicle issue
Well prepared within and outside of team – moved topics along	
Communication with technical support during meetings	
Good discussion with Tier 2	
Balanced participation	
Time to debrief after each topic	

Parking Lot Items

1. Look at future RAB dates including May 2014
2. NIRIS usefulness
3. Regulatory review scheduling challenges when multiple documents submitted in close timeframe

Listing of Action Items

1. **Moshood:** Check with supervisor for site visit availability
2. **Bill/Jim:** Send Tier II list of items/questions to Doug today
3. **Jim/Donna/Katherine:** Propose new language for Site 3 FS RAO.
4. **Kim-Lee/Jim:** Provide Site 6 DGI redline to regulators incorporating discussion from call.
5. **BTAG/Navy:** Consider alternative eco toxicity testing methods for Site 31 and discuss in mid-January.
6. **John, Kyle:** Provide possible dates for Site 31 site visit.
7. **Jim:** Set up site visit for Site 31 surface water (EPA/VDEQ schedule for John and Kyle) and all of Site 23 (Moshood working on travel orders).
8. **Moshood:** Verify BTAG lead for Site 23.
9. **Jim:** Look into Site 26 former buildings: 1347, 1810, 1443, 1640, 1350, and 1348.
10. **Jim/Bill:** Propose schedule to expedite Site 3 ROD.

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

- 11. Jim:** *Speak with Jason about NIRIS training.*
- 12. Bill:** *Schedule monthly 30-minute status call*

PARTNERING LOCATION: CH2MHILL Office
 5701 Cleveland St. Suite 200
 Office Phone (757)-518-9666
 CALL IN: (866) 203-7023
 Passcode: 9226075075

Next Partnering Meeting
 March 4-6, 2014
 Richmond, VA

MEETING MANAGER: Mr. Jim Gravette/Navy
TIMEKEEPER: Mr. Moshood Oduwole/EPA
RECORDER: Mr. Brian Wachter / CH2M HILL

MEETING HOST: Mr. Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL
FACILITATOR: Ms. Nancy Rouse/Management Edge
TIER II Link: Mr. Doug Dronfield/CH2M HILL
GUESTS: Wade Smith/VDEQ, Donna Caldwell/Navy, Stephanie Sawyer/CH2M HILL, Adam Forshey/CH2M HILL, Kim-Lee Yarberry/CH2M HILL, Laura Cook/CH2M HILL, Dave Barclift/Navy, Kyle Newman/VDEQ, John McCloskey/USFWS, Peter Knight/NOAA, Bruce Pluta/EPA, Bill Kappleman/CH2M HILL

WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING MEETING DRAFT AGENDA Tuesday December 10th, 2013						
Start Time	Agenda Item	Leader	Support	Prep Work	Desired Outcome	Duration
1100	Welcome & Check-in	Team	None	None	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
1130	Welcome Brian & Review Ground Rules	Nancy	Brian	None	Welcome	30 min
1200	Break					10 min
1210	Site 22 pre-RD UFP-SAP Comments	Laura	None	Review Presentation	Comment Discussion	60 min
1310	Team Success Stories for 2013	Bill	None	Consider what we've done	List out items to go into story	30 min
1340	Break					10 min
1350	Site 34 UFP-SAP Update	Kim-Lee	None	Review Presentation	Outstanding comment resolution and update on decontamination	60 min
1450	Break					10 min
1500	Wrap Up, Check-in, Prep for Tier II Discussion	Team	None	None	Review	30 min
1530	Conclude First Day					

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING MEETING DRAFT AGENDA Wednesday December 11th, 2013						
Start Time	Agenda Item	Leader	Support	Prep Work	Desired Outcome	Duration
0800	Welcome & Check-in	Team	None	None	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
0830	Tier II Update	Doug	None	None	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
0930	Site 24 RI Groundwater Data Discussion	Stephanie	Dave B., BTAG, Bill K., Donna	None	Path forward for RI Report	60 min
1030	Break					10 min
1040	Site 6 RI UFP-SAP RTC Discussion	Kim-Lee	Dave B., BTAG, Bill K., Donna	Review Comments and RTCs	Comment Discussion	60 min
1140	Lunch					60 min
1240	Site 31 RI UFP-SAP & SW Update	Jim	Dave B., BTAG, Kyle, Bill K., Donna	Review Presentation	Comment Discussion	60 min
1340	Break					10 min
1350	UXO-3 SI Fieldwork Update (Bathymetry and Side Scan Sonar)	Adam	Kyle	Review Presentation	Discuss Results & upcoming DGM survey	60 min
1450	Site 23 RI Scoping Update	Laura	None	Review Presentation	Update on Progress	30 min
1520	Site 26 RI Fieldwork Update	Bill	None	Review Presentation	Update on Field Work	30 min
1550	Break					10 min
1600	Wrap Up, Check-in	Team	None	None	Review	30 min
1630	Conclude Second Day					

**DRAFT DECEMBER 10th, 11th, and 12th PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM**

WPNSTA YORKTOWN PARTNERING MEETING DRAFT AGENDA Thursday December 12th, 2013						
Start Time	Agenda Item	Leader	Support	Prep Work	Desired Outcome	Duration
0800	Welcome & Check-in	Team	None	None	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
0830	Partnering Team Exercise	Nancy	None	None		60 min
0930	Break					10 min
0940	Review Outstanding Actions	Team	None	Review Action Items and Team Goals	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
1010	Roundtable/Agenda Building/Next Meetings	Team	None	None	Next Meeting	30 min
1040	Facilitator Feedback/ Plus-Delta	Nancy	None	Review Presentation	Standard Meeting Format	30 min
1110	Wrap Up					30 min
1140	Conclude Third Day					

Other Possible Topics:

Site 3 Update – FS, and expected timeframe for PRAP, public meeting, and ROD?