

St. Juliens Creek Annex Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary: November 12, 2002

RAB Members Present

Valerie Walker	CNRMA
Lyle Jackson	Community Rep
Dawn Hayes	LANTDIV
Devlin Harris	Virginia DEQ
Todd Richardson	USEPA Region III
Kevin Lew	SPAWAR
Bill Friedmann	CH2M HILL
John Ballinger	Navy Regional Env.

RAB Members Absent :

Bob Mann	Community Co-chair (Geneva Shores)
Marty Costello	Community Rep
Fred Foster	Community Rep
Frank Fender	SPAWAR

Robert Keys	Community Rep
Carl Fisher	Elizabeth River Project
Glen Manning	Community Rep
Jessy Overton, Jr.	Community Rep

RAB Participants

Donna Caldwell	CH2M HILL
Mike Newbill	CNRMA
Debbie Miller	Virginia DEQ
Alex Barron	Virginia DEQ
Scott Mohr	Naval Station Public Relations
Bob Schirmer	LANTDIV
Robert Carter	Community Rep
Dr. Morris Roberts	VIMS

FROM: William Friedmann/CH2M HILL

DATE: November 12, 2002

LOCATION

St Juliens Creek Annex Chesapeake, Virginia

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. John Ballinger presented opening remarks and introductions. Mr. Ballinger reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Removal Action Sites 3, 6, & 7

Mr. Bill Friedmann presented a summary of the removal activities conducted at Sites 3, 6, and 7 at SJCA. Handouts of the presentation were provided to the RAB. Mr. Friedmann.

presented a summary of the history of the sites the investigations conducted at the sites that lead to the removal activities. The investigations conducted at Sites 3 & 6 included a Remedial Investigation in which risk from contamination was identified and an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis that identified remedial action alternatives. The options considered for remedial actions included a soil cover, partial removal and soil cover, and complete removal of waste and contaminated soil.

Site 7 had been used as an outside storage area for old equipment and materials, including concrete counterweights and air compressor. Mr. Friedmann provided the point of contact information for these activities.

Removal activities began in August 2002 and included site preparation, removal, and site restoration. Mr. Ballinger noted the waste removal activities went very smooth with no problems with waste disposal and signing of manifests. Excavated material was disposed of in a Subtitle D Landfill. Mr. Friedmann described the site preparation activities and screening of excavated material for UXO. It was noted that no live UXO was found, only spent ordnance fragments. Mr. Friedmann described how the trucks were cleaned prior to leaving the site and erosion and sediment control features of the removal activities.

Mr. Friedmann described the screening sampling that was conducted during the removal activities and the confirmation sampling that was conducted following completion of removal. Samples were analyzed for metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

Ms. Dawn Hayes noted that in a photo of the removal activity at Site 6, groundwater entering the excavation was green as a result of sea dye packs. A sample of the groundwater was taken and there were no contaminants detected in the groundwater sample.

Ms. Hayes noted that removal of material at Site 7 focused on potential recycling as much as possible.

Mr. Friedmann described site restoration activities conducted at the sites, including backfill, grading, seed, mulch, and final removal of equipment. Site restoration was completed in early October. Mr. Friedmann noted the following the removal activities the team is currently reviewing confirmation sampling data to ensure the removal activities have mitigated risk identified in the Remedial Investigation. The sites will then be closed out with post removal documents including Close Out Report, Proposed Remedial Action Plan, and Record of Decision.

Ms. Hayes noted the cost for removal is 1.4 million, and due to funding limitations the removal of the remaining material at Site 3 will be completed with FY03 funding.

Questions:

Mr. Jackson asked how much burnt waste was identified at Site 3. Mr. Friedmann explained that based on trenching and excavation the material was generally less than 2 feet deep with minor amounts of debris (bolts, metal). Mr. Jackson asked what was the factor to determine where to start and stop at Site 3 until funding expired. Mr. Friedmann responded that since

there was no area which appeared to present more concern than another, the removal was conducted in a north to south direction, allowing for easy identification for future FY03 removal.

Mr. Carter asked if the decontamination pad was removed or remained in place until returning to Site 3 to complete the removal action. Ms. Hayes responded that the majority of the decontamination pad was removed, however, the large stones were covered over and graded to allow for vehicular traffic through the site.

Mr. Jackson asked what was the future of the area. Ms. Hayes noted the area is currently an active radar site. Ms. Hayes also noted that there are adjacent sites such as Sites 4 and 5 that need to be addressed before the Navy can determine final land use for the area.

Fish Tissue Data Discussion

Mr. Barron described the VDEQ data on fish tissues analysis data for fish collected in Saint Juliens Creek. The data is from 2001 and was presented in table format with two page narrative to the RAB. Data is collected and analyzed by VIMS. The data is available on VDEQ web site www.deq.statw.va.us/rivers/fishsed.html. From St Juliens Creek, no heavy metals were detected in fish tissue. The only noteworthy contaminant noted in the fish tissue data from St. Juliens Creek were PCBs, which is not uncommon in urban watersheds. VDEQ screening values are based on water quality criteria and are presented on the data tables provided. All data are provided to the VA Health Department. The department of health concern for PCB is 600 parts per billion (ppb). The high levels in St. Juliens Creek were in Gizzard Shad and Striped Bass. Mr. Barron noted these fish are transient and travel throughout the watershed of the Elizabeth River and Chesapeake Bay to the Atlantic Ocean. Lyle Jackson asked if there were any indications where the PCBs are coming from. Mr. Barron did not know. The presence of pesticides were also noted. Mr. Jackson asked if recreational activities in the creek are of concern, Mr. Barron explained that the exposure to the fish is very different from the exposure to a recreational swimmer.

Mr. Carter noted fish winter over in typically the most contaminated portions of the Elizabeth River at the "Hot Ditch" where the water is warmer with little tide change at the Interstate 64 High Rise Bridge.

Ms. Hayes noted the discussion of VDEQ fish tissues data is outside the IR Program for St. Juliens Creek Annex. The Navy will address risk associated with Navy sites within their CERCLA process.

Historic Preservation Overview

Mr. Newbill presented an overview of historic preservation aspects applicable to SJCA. Mr. Newbill described the National Historic Preservation Act, that establishes requirements to determine if sites are eligible for National Register of Historic Places. The objective is to balance historic preservation with other priorities, such as construction. At St. Juliens Creek Annex the historic district contains approximately 55 buildings that are eligible but are not listed in the National Register under criteria A and C. The collection of WWI buildings meets two of the criteria for listing. Archaeological sites at St. Juliens Creek Annex are unlikely except along the banks of St. Juliens Creek. Anything that alters the character of

the features (renovation, demolition, change in use) that qualify a property on the National Register can lead to an adverse effect to prevent eligibility. If there is an adverse effect it is important to avoid, minimize, or mitigate sites, for example instead of demolition of a building “moth ball” the building for preservation, or offset mitigation through undertaking or fund preservation at other historic properties. The Navy Region Mid-Atlantic agreement for Navy’s historic buildings in 1991. The Navy is committed to evaluating alternatives to demolition of historic buildings at St. Juliens Creek Annex. There are between 9 and 12 historic buildings under consideration for demolition. The Navy will prepare alternatives study as part of an environmental assessment. The public will be invited to comment and the regulatory process will be followed.

Questions:

Ms. Hayes asked what is the difference between bases which are ‘listed’ and bases which are ‘eligible’. Generally, cost is a factor in preparing the documentation and often senior leadership attitudes. Once determined eligible, the legal constraints are there even if a building is not listed on the National Register.

Ms. Walker asked what are the bases that are listed? Norfolk Naval Station Jamestown, Norfolk Naval Shipyard (Dry Dock 1 is national historic landmark), and Naval Weapons Yorktown (contains the oldest building owned by Navy). There are many historic areas throughout the Hampton Roads area, with approximately 355 historic buildings. Norfolk Naval Shipyard is a historic district fence to fence with about 400 buildings.

Dr. Roberts asked if there were conflicts between historical preservation and environmental clean up. Mr. Newbill commented that there have been no conflicts with regards to environmental issues, that the conflicts typically are associated with construction. If a site is in need of remediation it is adverse as archaeological site.

Roundtable / Q&A

Ms. Hayes noted the status of the ATSDR public health assessment was delayed as a result of reallocation of staff from the September 11, 2001 attacks and the public health assessment is delayed and expected in FY04. Also, the PAH fingerprinting research in the Elizabeth River is in progress and can be included as an agenda item for the next RAB.

Next Meeting Schedule

April 7, 2002, this will be combined with a public meeting for the PRAP for Site 6.

Meeting Adjourned