St. Juliens Creek Annex (SJCA) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary: October 18, 2006

RAB Members Present:			
Agnes Sullivan	NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic	Linda Baxter	EPA (Region III)
Josh Barber	EPA (Region III)	Kevin Lew	SPAWAR
Karen Doran	Virginia DEQ	Kim Henderson	CH2M HILL
		Janna Staszak	CH2M HILL

Location: Major Hillard Library, Chesapeake, Virginia

From: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

Date: December 22, 2006

RAB Welcome and Introductions

At 3:30 pm Ms. Sullivan presented opening remarks and introductions. Handouts of all of the presentations were distributed.

Fiscal Year 2007 Goals

Ms. Sullivan informed the RAB of the current status of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites and the Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 goals. Ms. Sullivan provided an overview of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. Ms. Sullivan explained that goals are established in order to serve as a budgeting tool for allocating funding, to prioritize sites to be investigated and remediated based on their risk, and to keep the remediation projects on schedule. The presentation addressed the five active sites (Sites 2, 4, 5, 19, and 21) and indicated that to-date, 48 sites have been determined to require no further action. For each of the active sites, Ms. Sullivan showed an aerial photograph then reviewed the site history and current status. Summaries of the discussion for each site were as follows:

Site 2: Waste Disposal Area B

Site 2 is a 4.4-acre unlined waste disposal area that operated from 1921 to 1942. Construction debris, blasting grit, waste ordnance, and solvents were disposed there. The Remedial Investigation phase began in 1997 and is ongoing. Potential concerns include waste; chlorinated solvents in groundwater and surface water; and metals, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in soil and sediment. The FY 2007 goals for Site 2 are to develop a draft work plan for additional Remedial Investigation activities by March 31, 2007, conduct the investigation activities, and to finalize the Expanded Remedial Investigation Report by September 30, 2007.

Site 4: Landfill D

Site 4 is an 8.3-acre sanitary landfill that operated from 1970 to 1981. Wastes managed included primarily trash, wet garbage, construction material, some solvents, acids, bases, and PCBs. Potential concerns included waste; metals, PCBs, and PAHs in soil; and mercury in drainage sediment. The Record of Decision and Remedial Design were completed for the soil cover and drainage ditch sediment removal in 2004. The Remedial Action was conducted from March through October 2005. The Remedial Action Completion Report, documenting that the remedy at Site 4 is operational and functional in accordance with CERCLA and memorializing the response complete, was signed in October 2006. The FY 2007 goals for Site 4 are to finalize the Voluntary Groundwater Monitoring Work Plan by December 31, 2006 and begin to conduct quarterly groundwater monitoring.

Site 5: Burning Grounds

Site 5 is a 21-acre former burning grounds for ordnance disposal that operated from 1930 to the 1970s. Other wastes reportedly disposed of included solvents, paint, sludge, pesticides, and various types of refuse. The Remedial Investigation phase began in 1997 and is ongoing. Potential concerns include waste; metals, pesticides, and PAHs in soil and drainage sediment; and metals in groundwater. An Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) has been prepared to address waste, burnt soil, surface soil, and drainage sediment. The FY 2007 goals for Site 5 are to finalize the EE/CA, collect an additional round of groundwater samples and re-evaluate human health risk, and to draft a removal action work plan by September 30, 2007.

Site 19: Building 190

Building 190 was used for ordnance management activities from the early 1900s through the 1970s. The Site Investigation phase was completed in 2005. Potential concerns included metals and PAHs in soil. The final EE/CA for Site 19 was completed in November 2005 and the removal action was completed in May 2006. The FY 2007 goal for Site 19 is to finalize the Site Closeout Report for no further action by December 31, 2006.

Site 21: Industrial Area

Site 21 is an industrial area where buildings were historically used as maintenance and electrical shops for equipment and chemical storage. The Site Investigation phase for Site 21 began in 2004. The potential concern at Site 21 is the presence of chlorinated solvents in groundwater and the adjacent storm sewer line. The FY 2007 goals for Site 21 are to conduct additional site investigation activities, to finalize the Supplemental Site Investigation Report by June 30, 2007, and to draft the Treatability Study Work Plan by September 30, 2007.

Blows Creek

Several past and present IRP sites are potential sources of chemicals to Blows Creek. The Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) investigation of sediment for Blows Creek was completed in 2005. Potential concerns identified included metals and PAHs in sediment. The FY 2007 goal for Blows Creek is to finalize the report of findings by December 31, 2006.

Additional FY 2007 Goals

Additional non-site-specific goals are to draft the Site Management Plan for FY 2008 through FY 2012 by June 30, 2007 and prepare a Success Story by September 30, 2007. The Partnering Team is planning for FY 2007 with anticipated funding of $2.1 million.

Electronic Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment for Blows Creek

Ms. Henderson presented an overview of the electronically-enhanced BERA (eBERA) to the RAB. She presented the background information for the eBERA, explained the format, and provided a demonstration of the document.

Ms. Henderson explained the advantages of the electronically-enhanced format: It is more accessible and user-friendly to a broader audience because it is easily navigable, graphically oriented, and interactive. It is flexible in that it allows users to access a level of information consistent with their needs. Its format allows faster review and decision making.

Ms. Henderson then reviewed the format and outline of the eBERA. The eBERA relies on freeware and self-launching, hyperlinked CD technology. It minimizes text and focuses on graphic presentation. The eBERA meets all of the regulatory requirements and can be designed to provide more information than a traditional hard copy Ecological Risk Assessment. The document is laid out in three tiers. The first tier contains streamlined text and hyperlinks to figures, tables, and supporting documentation. The second tier is more visually oriented and focuses on interactive summary tables and figures with clickable information boxes. It also contains links to third tier and supporting documentation. The third tier contains summary tables and raw data. This tier has limited interactivity and few hyperlinks.

Ms. Henderson provided a demonstration of the eBERA. The eBERA will be finalized by December 31, 2006 and will be placed in the Administrative Record. In the future, a similar electronically-enhanced approach may be considered for Remedial Investigations, Feasibility Studies, or other CERCLA documents. Mr. Lew expressed interest in obtaining the final interactive document.

Site 5 Removal Action

Ms. Staszak presented an overview of the Site 5 removal action. She reviewed the history of Site 5, presented the EE/CA and recommended removal action alternative, and discussed the schedule and path forward for the site.

Ms. Staszak reviewed the EE/CA process. EE/CAs are completed to compare removal alternatives based on technical feasibility, ability to protect human health and the environment, ability to prevent the potential release of hazardous constituents, cost, and community involvement. EE/CAs can be prepared to address portions of a site or select media. The Site 5 EE/CA addresses waste, burnt soil, and impacted surface soil and sediment.

Ms. Staszak reviewed the removal action objectives for Site 5:

- Implement measures that mitigate potential unacceptable risk to human health and the environment posed by exposure to waste, burnt soil, and impacted surface soil and sediment

- Remove the potential source of contamination to the groundwater
- Perform a removal action in preparation for site closeout under CERCLA with no further action

Ms. Staszak described the four removal action alternatives evaluated in the EE/CA; including no action, cover installation, excavation and backfill, and excavation and restoration/wetland creation; and compared them based on effectiveness, ease of implementation, and present worth cost. Based on the comparison, excavation and restoration/wetland creation was the recommended alternative. This alternative meets all of the removal action objectives and enhances the ecological habitat at the site. Ms. Staszak explained that although the cover alternative is less expensive, it does not meet the removal action objectives because it cannot lead to no further action and it does not remove the source of contamination to the groundwater.

Ms. Staszak reviewed the schedule for Site 5. The draft final EE/CA was submitted for regulatory review on October 16. After the regulatory review is completed, it will be placed in the Major Hillard Library for a 30-day public review period. A notice of the public review period will be placed in the *Virginian-Pilot* newspaper. The final EE/CA will then be submitted in December 2006, followed by an Action Memorandum in January 2007. The removal action is planned to begin in FY 2007 in a phased approach, based on funding.

Site 19 Closeout

Ms. Henderson discussed the closeout of Site 19. She showed where the site is located on the SJCA map, displayed a photograph of the building (Building 190) that was demolished in 2000, and reviewed the history of the site. During the Site Investigation completed in 2005, metals and PAHs were identified in soil posing a potential human health risk.

Ms. Henderson indicated that an EE/CA was prepared to compare the removal alternatives based on technical feasibility, protection of human health and the environment, prevention of the release of hazardous constituents, and cost. Ms. Henderson indicated that the removal action objectives for Site 19 were to implement measures that would eliminate potential unacceptable risk to human health and the environment and to prepare the site for closeout under CERCLA with no further action. The three alternatives that were evaluated in the EE/CA were no action, excavation and backfill, and soil cover. Excavation and backfill was the recommended alternative, and the removal action was conducted from February to May of 2006. A total of 497 tons of soil were excavated and disposed off-site from the Metallic Slag Area and the Elevated Subsurface Soil PAHs Area. The site was then backfilled and seeded.

Ms. Henderson indicated that a Draft Site Closeout Report for Site 19 was submitted in September 2006 for regulatory review. The report recommends no further action based on the removal action alternatives resulting in no further risks to human health and the environment. The report will be finalized in November 2006 after it is signed by Navy, EPA, and VDEQ representatives.

Joint EPA and VDEQ Elizabeth River Watershed Pilot Program

Ms. Baxter introduced herself as the National Priorities List (NPL) Coordinator for EPA Region III. Her job is to evaluate sites for placement on the NPL to receive federal dollars for cleanup. She attempts to identify sites and their sources of contamination. Ms. Baxter indicated that she is at the RAB today to address community concerns raised at previous meetings regarding sediment buildup in St. Juliens Creek and potential contamination. Ms. Baxter indicated she has performed a screening assessment of the area (reading documentation, consulting with VDEQ, Navy, etc.) and she does not feel that this site should be placed on the NPL.

The site does fall under EPA's Urban Rivers Restoration Initiative, which has identified the Elizabeth River Basin as a pilot project. The EPA is working with VDEQ and the Elizabeth River Project to further restore the river and reduce the risks to human health and the environment from toxic substances. Ms. Baxter provided handouts including a fact sheet about the pilot project and a map of the subject area that includes St. Juliens Creek. She indicated that the sunken bridge area of St. Juliens Creek is a good fit for EPA to investigate as part of this effort. If a cleanup is determined to be warranted, the EPA with the pilot program and Elizabeth River Project may be able to identify a way to address the site without listing it on the NPL. Ms. Baxter indicated that she will conduct a Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection under the CERCLA process later this year, after she completes desktop research.

Mr. Lew reviewed the history (theory) of the bridge crossing St. Juliens Creek. It was dropped in the creek to get rid of it; now, as the tide comes in and out, the sediment is trapped upstream of the bridge and is building up. Mr. Lew indicated that the overall objective of the community is to have the bridge removed, along with potential dredging of the built-up sediment. Mr. Lew asked who would be responsible for addressing the bridge; Ms. Baxter indicated it would be the party who dropped the bridge.

Mr. Lew asked if it turns out that the Navy dropped the bridge in conjunction with securing the boundary, even if the Navy did not own the bridge, would they be responsible? Ms. Sullivan indicated that the Navy has no record that they have ever owned the bridge or participated in demolition of the bridge. Ms. Baxter indicated that if further research indicates the Navy dropped the bridge, the coalition may be able to compel the Navy to act. Ms. Sullivan indicated the bridge is out of the scope of the IRP, which is addressed by this RAB; however, she suggested that the community contact the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) or their local officials.

Mr. Lew asked when the bridge was dropped. Ms. Henderson reviewed the aerial photographs and indicated that it appears to have been dropped prior to 1937.

Mr. Lew asked if contaminated surface water runoff went across the SJCA property boundary, would the Navy be required to clean it up? Ms. Sullivan indicated that if SJCA determined that there was a CERCLA release, the program would address it. There are two outfalls from SJCA to St. Juliens Creek, and the Navy monitors both outfalls and reports to the state.

Roundtable / Q & A

There were no roundtable topics or questions.

Next Meeting: May 2007, RAB members will be notified by email and a public notice will be issued in the *Virginian-Pilot* newspaper.

Meeting Adjourned.