

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown Environmental Restoration Program, Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

LOCATION: Yorktown Library
8500 George Washington Memorial Highway
Yorktown, Virginia 23692

DATE: Wednesday, June 28, 2023; 6:00 – 7:15 P.M.

Attendees

Name	Organization/Role
Captain (CAPT) Christopher Horgan	Naval Weapons Station (NWS) Yorktown/Commanding Officer (CO) and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Co-Chair
Jeff Kissler	NWS Yorktown/Environmental Program Director
Melvin Acree	Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (NAVFAC) Mid-Atlantic/Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for NWS Yorktown
Rashmi Mathur	United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)/Outgoing RPM for NWS Yorktown
Vincent Grassi	USEPA/Incoming RPM for NWS Yorktown
Wade Smith	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ)/RPM for NWS Yorktown
Nate Price	CH2M/Activity Manager for NWS Yorktown
Becky Whalen	Tetra Tech/Project Manager for NWS Yorktown
Steve Oyer	Community Member and RAB Co-Chair
Kevin Krigsvold	Pamunkey Tribal Member
Sandra Shearer	CH2M/Environmental Engineer
Dana Adkins (Virtual through Microsoft Teams)	Chickahominy Tribe/Citizen and Environmental Director
Megghan Smith (Virtual through Microsoft Teams)	CH2M/Cheatham Annex Deputy Activity Manager

Attachments

Attachment 1 is the Public Notice for the RAB Meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Price began the meeting at 6:00 p.m. with a discussion of the virtual meeting logistics and instructions for attendees participating by Microsoft Teams. Mr. Price stated that the meeting will be recorded for use in preparing the meeting minutes and the recording will not be distributed publicly. Mr. Price stated that the presentations are available on the public website.

Mr. Acree welcomed the attendees and provided an overview of the agenda, which included opening and closing remarks, and three technical presentations. Mr. Acree asked the representatives attending in person and virtually to introduce themselves.

CAPT Horgan provided opening remarks and stated this is the first in-person (hybrid) RAB meeting since 2019, prior to COVID, and welcomed the attendees and the Pamunkey and Chickahominy tribal members. CAPT Horgan stated the Navy has been in Yorktown since 1918 and has learned a lot about being good stewards of the land since then, and recognizes they are not the first people to plant a flag there. CAPT Horgan said the Navy takes the commitment to the Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) very seriously as they continue to investigate and improve the sites, and he looks forward to the briefing and questions from the attendees.

The RAB Co-Chair, Mr. Oyer, provided additional opening remarks. Mr. Oyer stated it has been a few years since the RAB was able to meet in person, and it has been good to see participants in person and have people joining online as well. Mr. Oyer stated that everything has been open and up to date in the past and he expects the same for the future.

Mr. Adkins said thank you for extending the opportunity to participate.

All presentation handouts were distributed prior to the meeting and made available on the NWS Yorktown ERP public website.

NWS Yorktown ERP Update

Mr. Price provided the agenda for the ERP and Five-Year Review (FYR) Updates as follows:

- Overview of the ERP at NWS Yorktown
- Update on select ERP sites that had a milestone achievement or significant work over the last fiscal year, which included: Site 3, Site 24, Site 25, Site 33
- Discussion of the 2023 FYR Approach
- Overview of the NWS Yorktown 2023 FYR
- Status of 2023 FYR Sites

Mr. Price provided an overview of the ERP at NWS Yorktown and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process, and identified where each of the NWS Yorktown sites are in the CERCLA process. Mr. Price discussed that there are two programs within the ERP—the Installation Restoration Program and the Munitions Response Program (MRP)—and identified that only one of the NWS Yorktown sites falls within the MRP (UXO 2). Mr. Price then provided the following individual site updates:

- Site 3, Group 16 Magazine Landfill: A No Further Action Record of Decision (ROD) is in place for soil, and a groundwater pre-remedial design investigation was completed in 2021. A ROD for groundwater, surface water, and sediment is being finalized and has been approved by USEPA. Following VDEQ approval, the Navy CO will be briefed, and the ROD will be signed by the Navy, USEPA, and VDEQ. The ROD will include active remediation for groundwater through Enhanced In Situ Bioremediation, which includes injection of emulsified vegetable oil (EVO), a food-grade oil substrate. The ROD includes no further action for surface water and sediment. The Navy will move forward with the remedial design (RD) for groundwater, including groundwater monitoring and land use controls (LUCs) once the ROD is signed. Ms. Mathur recommended that further explanation of the acronyms be provided, and Mr. Price discussed the ROD, RD, and LUC stages of the CERCLA process.
- Site 24, Aviation Field: Groundwater was evaluated in a Remedial Investigation (RI), and the Navy initiated a non-time-critical Removal Action (NTCRA) in 2016, which is ongoing. Munitions and radiological materials were discovered during the NTCRA, delaying the project. The Navy coordinated with the Joint Munitions Command to properly dispose of the radiologically impacted materials in 2023.
- Site 25, Building 373 Rocket Plant: Soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment were investigated under a RI in 2021 with only soil requiring further action. A Feasibility Study (FS) was finalized in 2023 for soil excavation (three small hot-spot areas) and offsite disposal. The Proposed Plan (PP) and ROD for the soil remedial action are being developed. Mr. Price discussed the PP process including public notice. Mr. Acree

highlighted the CERCLA phases where public input is requested, which include the Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI), RI, PP, ROD, and RD/Remedial Action (RA). These were identified on a poster and are also in an updated fact sheet posted on the website with the CERCLA process.

- Site 33: The RI fieldwork was performed in four phases between October 2021 and January 2023 through a collaborative, phased effort with regulatory input. Mr. Price identified the number of soil, groundwater, surface water, sediment, and seep samples collected. The RI also included monitoring well installation, biological surveys, and toxicity testing. Mr. Price said the fact sheet provides a timeline of the CERCLA process at a site from the PA/SI to ROD and RA. Mr. Price discussed that depending on the complexity of the site, the timeline of the RI can be extended.

NWS Yorktown Five-Year Review Update

Mr. Price presented the purpose, content, and process of the FYR; an overview of the 2023 FYR Overview; and FYR site status.

Mr. Price discussed the purpose of the FYR, which is to evaluate the performance of remedies in place and determine if the remedies remain protective of human health and the environment. This is required when RA results in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining in place at concentrations that do not allow for unlimited use/unrestricted exposure. FYRs are triggered by on-site mobilization dates for sites requiring RA construction, or RODs and other decision document signature dates for sites without RA construction. The FYR should be completed and signed within 5 years of the trigger date.

Mr. Price outlined the content of the FYR, which includes site history and background; review of progress since the previous FYR; a technical assessment of the remedy; identification of issues, recommendations, and follow-up actions; and protectiveness statements. The Five-Year Review is prepared in accordance with USEPA FYR guidance and Navy policy. Mr. Price discussed that USEPA's updates to screening levels are reviewed as part of the FYR Technical Assessment of the remedy, and evaluation of previous assumptions and new information. Mr. Price also identified and discussed the meaning of each of the protectiveness statements.

Mr. Price discussed the process that was used for the 2023 FYR. Community Involvement is incorporated into the process through placing an advertisement in the newspaper upon initiation and completion of the FYR, posting the Final FYR in the information repository, and generating and providing a fact sheet to the community. Mr. Price discussed that the Community Involvement Plan (CIP) is updated every 5 years and the public comments provided on the CIP are considered as well. Mr. Price explained that documents are reviewed, and an emerging contaminant review is conducted as part of the process, which is currently focused on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). Additionally, a resiliency review is conducted of each remedy with respect to extreme weather events, which focuses on hurricanes and rising sea levels, and identifies mitigation measures, such as inspections after major storm events. Finally, site inspections (SIs) and interviews with Base personnel that have knowledge of the sites and operations are conducted as part of the process.

Mr. Price identified the sites included in the Fifth FYR (Site 1, 6, 7, 12, 19, and 22), which had a due date of March 16, 2023, but was finalized ahead of schedule with CO signature in January 2023 and approval by the regulators in March 2023. Mr. Price discussed the protectiveness of each site and then discussed the sites individually as follows:

- Site 1, Dudley Road Landfill: A ROD is in place for soil with a PP for groundwater, surface water, and sediment in development. The PP will include an active remedy for groundwater using the USEPA's Adaptive Management strategy, and no further action for surface water and sediment. The public comment period for the PP is anticipated in summer 2023. A groundwater pre-remedial design investigation is planned for late summer 2023. Site 1 was one of the sites identified for an SI investigation in the Basewide PFAS Preliminary Assessment (PA). The sample results will be provided in the Basewide PFAS SI Report, which will be finalized at the end of Fiscal Year 2023 and will be discussed in the next FYR. The protectiveness statement for Site 1 is that the remedy is short-term protective of human health and the environment, and ongoing PFAS investigations will determine if changes are needed for long-term protectiveness.

- Site 6, Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment, Flume Area, and Excavated Area: Site 6 is one of the largest sites at NWS Yorktown at 85 acres and consists of three operational units (Impoundment Area, Flume Area, and Excavated Area). The site was expanded to include investigation of the Plant 2 Area following building demolition. This site was not carried forward to the PFAS SI based on the PA evaluation. A ROD is in place for soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment within the three operational units. The FYR determination was that the remedies for the Impoundment Area and Flume Areas are protective and the Flume Area can be closed out. However, the FYR determination for the Excavated Area was that the remedy is not protective because soil has not been covered or excavated. A soil removal action is necessary for long-term protectiveness to mitigate potential ecological exposures to zinc in surface soil over a 0.17-acre area (60- by 120-foot area). The Navy is preparing an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memorandum for the soil removal, and then the Navy will obtain funding and contract the NTCRA.
- Site 7, Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area: A ROD is in place for soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment within the Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area. The Plant 3 Area to the north is currently being investigated under a Supplemental Pre-FS Investigation and will proceed to an FS. Long-term monitoring conducted under the ROD was suspended because the active investigation is ongoing. Mr. Price discussed the FS process under CERCLA. This site was not carried forward to the PFAS SI based on the PA evaluation. The FYR determination is that the remedy is protective.
- Site 12, Barracks Road Landfill: Site 12 consists of three areas: Area A, Area B/C, and the Wood Debris Disposal Area (WDDA). A ROD is in place for Area A and includes a soil cover, groundwater long-term monitoring, and LUCs. Area B and WDDA were previously closed for no further action. The WDDA was reopened in 2019 with Partnering Team consensus due to presence of surficial debris. WDDA investigation fieldwork was completed in March 2023, and the results of that investigation will be used to determine if the WDDA will remain open. This site was not carried forward to the PFAS SI based on the PA evaluation. The FYR determination is that the remedy is protective.
- Site 19, Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10: A ROD in place for soil. Following demolition of Plant 1 buildings, the investigation area was expanded to include Sites 9 and 19. Soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment are being evaluated in an RI. This site was not carried forward to the PFAS SI based on the PA evaluation. The FYR determination is that the remedy is protective.
- Site 22, Burn Pad: No Further Action RODs are in place for soil, surface water, and sediment. A groundwater ROD is in place. Remedy optimization is ongoing and includes subgrade biogeochemical reactor (SBGR) installation in July 2023 for groundwater. Mr. Price explained that an SBGR is an excavation backfilled with amendments and he described that operation. PFAS data were collected during a pre-remedial design investigation and are included in the 2023 FYR. Additional PFAS data were collected during the PFAS SI and results will be provided in the Basewide PFAS SI Report and discussed in the next FYR. The protectiveness statement for Site 12 is that the remedy is short-term protective of human health and the environment. LUCs are enforced, and remedy optimization activities are ongoing to refine the extent of constituents of concern and PFAS as well as evaluate effectiveness of SBGR as bioremediation technology.

Mr. Price provided contact information and the NWS Yorktown ERP public website for further information, and pointed out the public has 10 days to submit questions following the RAB meeting. Mr. Price also stated that the presentation and fact sheet are available on the website.

PFAS Investigation Overview

Ms. Whalen presented the PFAS update for NWS Yorktown. Ms. Whalen began the presentation by providing background on PFAS, describing that these are a family of manufactured chemicals that are very persistent in the environment, and for naval installations the primary source is firefighting foam. Ms. Whalen described how perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) are the most commonly used and studied in the PFAS family.

Ms. Whalen stated that PFAS are emerging contaminants, and while they are not yet federally regulated chemicals, there are criteria that are guiding investigations, including health advisories, maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) (which were proposed in March 2023 but not yet finalized), and regional screening levels (RSLs). Ms. Whalen provided a timeline of the criteria that are being used by the Navy. Ms. Whalen identified that the May 2022 RSLs for 6 PFAS were used to screen the soil and groundwater data during the SI, per a Department of Defense (DoD) directory published in July 2022, to determine if further investigation of PFAS is warranted in an RI or if no PFAS investigation is required. The RSLs were updated in May 2023 to add RSLs for two additional PFAS, and upcoming DoD guidance is anticipated. Surface water and sediment data were not collected as part of the investigation and those screening levels were shown for reference. Ms. Whalen identified the proposed MCLs and stated that DoD is assessing what actions can be taken to be prepared to incorporate USEPA's final regulatory standard into the DoD cleanup process.

Ms. Whalen provided an overview of the CERCLA process, and identified that the Navy has completed the PFAS PA and is currently in the SI, which marks the start of the investigation phase for a site. Ms. Whalen described that some sites will advance to an RI phase, which is a more comprehensive investigation, and on to other phases of the CERCLA process.

The PFAS PA Report was completed in October 2021, and included desktop research of available documentation and records, site reconnaissance, and interviews with firefighting and other personnel. A total of 75 areas at NWS Yorktown were screened and nine areas of interest (AOIs) were identified for further investigation through an SI. The focus of the SI was on the nine areas for which the Navy, USEPA, and VDEQ reached concurrence on investigation. The on-Base field investigation was completed in March through May 2022, and included the installation of 35 new monitoring wells, and the collection of 78 soil samples and 40 groundwater samples. A Site 1 Data Gap SI groundwater investigation was completed in December 2022 and consisted of collecting seven samples from existing groundwater monitoring wells. The Draft SI Report was provided for regulatory review in March 2023 and is currently undergoing comment resolution with USEPA and VDEQ. Mr. Acree commented that the PA report is on the website and is available to the public.

Ms. Whalen presented each of the nine AOIs as follows:

- **Site 1, Dudley Road Landfill:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to the historic disposal of aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) from fire training pits. Groundwater samples were collected from 12 monitoring wells and three PFAS exceeding screening levels. The Navy's recommendation is to proceed to an RI.
- **Site 22, Burn Pad:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to the use of the site for burning waste explosives from munitions loading operations (PFAS have high thermal resistance properties and can be used in explosives binding), and 2017 groundwater samples showed elevated levels of PFOS. The groundwater and soil investigation included collecting samples from three newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting 20 soil samples from 10 soil borings. PFAS did not exceed screening levels in soil. Three PFAS exceeded screening levels in groundwater. The Navy's recommendation is to combine Site 22 and Site 4 (Burn Pad Residue Landfill) and proceed to an RI for PFAS.
- **Site 4, Burn Pad Residue Landfill:** Site 4 was closed for no further action in 2005 for soil, and in 2011 for groundwater, surface water, and sediment. This AOI was recommended for PFAS investigation as it was the main landfill for debris from Site 22. The groundwater investigation included collecting samples from four newly installed groundwater monitoring wells. One PFAS exceeded screening levels. The Navy's recommendation is to combine Site 22 and Site 4 and proceed to an RI for PFAS.
- **SSA-3 Fire Training Pits and Vicinity; and Building 461, Fire Station No. 14:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to documented use of AFFF for firefighting activities in the former fire training pits, and the historical storage and handling of AFFF at Building 461. The groundwater and soil investigation included collecting samples from eight newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting eight surface soil and eight subsurface soil samples at the well locations. One PFAS (PFOS) exceeded screening levels in soil, and five PFAS exceeded screening levels in groundwater, with high concentrations detected (PFOA and PFOS).

exceeded screening levels in all eight monitoring wells). The Navy's recommendation is to combine these areas and proceed to an RI.

- **Building 24 Betty Warehouse Fire:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to documented use of AFFF to extinguish a fire. The groundwater and soil investigation consisted of collecting samples from five newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting five surface soil and five subsurface soil samples at the well locations. PFAS did not exceed screening levels in soil. Three PFAS exceeded screening levels in groundwater, with concentrations up to 100 times greater than the RSLs. The Navy's recommendation is to proceed to an RI.
- **Building 27 Fire:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to documented use of AFFF to extinguish a fire. The groundwater and soil investigation consisted of collecting samples from five newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting five surface soil and five subsurface soil samples at the well locations. No PFAS were detected. The Navy's recommendation is no further PFAS investigation at this time.
- **Building 71 Former Fire Station:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to the use as a fire station with assumed storage and handling of AFFF; however, there was no documentation of PFAS handling or release. The groundwater and soil investigation consisted of collecting samples from four newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting four surface soil and four subsurface soil samples at the well locations. No PFAS exceeded screening levels in soil. Three PFAS exceeded screening levels in groundwater at one to six times greater than the RSLs. A Human Health Risk Screening evaluation was conducted using conservative assumptions of the maximum detected PFAS concentrations. Risk screening results were compared to and met cancer and noncancer CERCLA risk management benchmarks. The Navy's recommendation is for no further PFAS investigation at this time.
- **Building 703 Main Fire Station No. 13:** This AOI was recommended for investigation due to presumed historical storage and handling of AFFF. The groundwater and soil investigation consisted of collecting samples from six newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and collecting six surface soil and six subsurface soil samples at the well locations. One PFAS (PFOS) exceeded screening levels in soil, and four PFAS exceeded screening levels in groundwater with high concentrations. The Navy's recommendation is to proceed to an RI.

Ms. Whalen provided a summary of the SI results and the Navy's recommendations. The Navy is recommending seven of the nine areas investigated proceed to an RI, and no further PFAS investigation at this time for two areas. The RI will include more data collection, characterization of the nature and extent of PFAS, and risk evaluation. The immediate next step includes finalizing the SI report this year in September 2023, following resolution of VDEQ and USEPA comments. Mr. Acree reiterated that the PFAS SI Update presented the Department of the Navy's recommendations, and the Draft SI Report is undergoing review and resolution of comments by USEPA and VDEQ.

Questions and Comments

Mr. Acree stated that the RAB presentations covered a lot of technical information for a large number of sites. Mr. Acree presented a slide with contact information and stated that questions can be submitted 10 calendar days after the RAB meeting via email or phone to the NWS Yorktown Public Affairs Office or Mr. Kissler. Mr. Acree requested that the figure of the Yorktown sites be posted to the website, in addition to figures included in the Site Management Plan (SMP).

Mr. Acree thanked the Pamunkey and Chickahominy tribes for participating, and stated the Navy is working to keep the lines of communication open. Mr. Acree introduced Mr. Kissler, who agreed that the Navy works to keep the communication lines open through consultation with the tribes in any project undertaking. Mr. Kissler stated that the first step is notifying the tribes in writing with an email or letter from the CO to provide information on the proposed project and 30-days notice. The letter or email provides contact information for Cultural Resources Manager Tiffany Goodrich. Ms. Mathur asked that USEPA be copied on tribal consultation, as USEPA RPMs are supposed to report that consultation within USEPA. Mr. Kissler stated there is not any issue with

that request but asked whether it applies to only environmental sites or all sites. Ms. Mathur said she is just concerned about CERCLA sites, and that this request applies to all facilities in Virginia. Mr. Kissler said they will work with the RPMs. Ms. Mathur commended the Navy in starting the dialogue with the community members and the tribes, as USEPA thinks this is a very important initiative. Mr. Kissler said NWS Yorktown agrees with the importance and has gained approval to have a dedicated cultural resources manager at NWS Yorktown, as the tribal engagement is expected to increase.

Mr. Acree opened the meeting to questions or comments.

- **Question/Comment #1:** Mr. Smith/VDEQ highlighted the SMP to the tribal representatives and public as a great source of information that is updated annually and is a resource to explain the technical information that is provided in the public meeting. Mr. Smith recommended the attendees take the time to review the SMP and follow up with any questions. Mr. Smith said the online administrative record is also a large source of information with the PP and RODs.
 - Ms. Mathur asked that Mr. Smith clarify what the SMP document provides. Mr. Smith said it is an overview of all the sites, updated annually, that presents work completed at each site over the past year and upcoming work.
 - Mr. Krigsvold asked where the SMP is located, and Mr. Acree said it is under the Administrative Record tab of the NWS Yorktown public website and pointed to the URL in the Post Meeting slide of the presentation. Mr. Acree stated that certain documents do require public notification of release, but the SMP does not fall into this category. However, if the public cannot locate the document, they may contact the Public Affairs Office or Environmental Program Director Jeff Kissler (whose point of contact information is in the Post Meeting slide). Mr. Acree stated that documents with public notice (for example, the FYR) are kept at the Yorktown Library.
- **Question/Comment #2:** Mr. Oyer asked about a slide in the PFAS SI Update presentation that shows groundwater flow direction at Building 703. Mr. Oyer wanted to confirm that the slide shows that groundwater flows back onto the Base at Building 703.
 - Ms. Whalen said that groundwater flows west/northwest at Building 703.
 - Mr. Acree pointed out the groundwater flow arrows and confirmed that groundwater flows back onto the Base.
- **Question/Comment #3:** CAPT Horgan asked about PFAS, which he noted is an emerging contaminant that we are concerned about and does not have a lot of history. CAPT Horgan asked a CERCLA-process related question about the Navy's recommendation for no further PFAS investigation at this time at Building 27 and Building 71, which he understands is not finalized. CAPT Horgan asked that if the recommendation is concurred upon with the final result of the SI, how would this get revisited under the CERCLA process?
 - Mr. Acree said if new factual information is unveiled, then the area would be brought back into the CERCLA investigation process. Mr. Price gave an example of the Site 12 WDDA, which was closed with no further action, being reopened following the identification of surface debris.
 - CAPT Horgan said the PFAS SI recommendation is essentially no further action since any area could be reopened where new observations were made.
 - Mr. Smith commented that a site could also be reopened due to the issuance of new regulatory limits.
 - Ms. Mathur said the FYR reviews would identify new screening levels which could result in the reopening of an existing remedy. CAPT Horgan noted that if this was an area of concern identified in an SI, it would not go through FYR. Ms. Mathur and CAPT Horgan both agreed an area would be reopened if new contamination was found. Mr. Acree said there is one site that was closed under the ERP program but was reopened due to the PFAS investigation.

- **Question/Comment #4:** CAPT Horgan asked that since PFAS is somewhat new whether there are any sites within DoD that have reached a ROD milestone. CAPT Horgan said he knows there are no sites at NWS Yorktown that have reached this milestone, as NWS Yorktown is in the SI stage for PFAS.
 - Mr. Acree said the mandate is for the Navy to complete SI investigations by September 30, 2023, but there are some sites that have gone straight to RA due to high concentrations. Ms. Mathur said there are some sites going straight to RA due to drinking water impacts.
- **Question/Comment #5:** Mr. Adkins said he heard the term “consultation” used a lot and asked whether this meeting was considered a consultation.
 - Mr. Acree responded that no, this was a public meeting, not a consultation, and is intended to give the public an update.
 - Mr. Adkins said he appreciated the clarification and confirmed that this meeting does not meet the requirements of a consultation.
 - CAPT Horgan said that the NWS Yorktown and Cheatham Annex facilities that he represents take consultation very seriously, and consultation would be in the form of a formal correspondence from the CO on Navy letterhead. CAPT Horgan said that if there are tribal concerns on another installation, their processes may be different.

Closing Remarks

CAPT Horgan thanked everyone for participating, and for all the hard work and effort by the team. He thanked the community members for attending and actively participating.

CAPT Horgan thanked Ms. Whalen and Mr. Price for the detailed technical briefings, and stated he realizes that a lot of information was presented and will be available for review by the public as needed. CAPT Horgan said the strength of this program is the commitment to the CERCLA process. It is not fast but ensures that everyone with an interest is heard and that the best action is executed. CAPT Horgan asked that the attendees take information back to their tribe and public, in order to encourage engagement and understanding prior to the cleanup stage. CAPT Horgan said the process and transparency is the strength of the program, which is why this meeting is so important and that he appreciates everyone’s time.

Mr. Acree reiterated that there are 10 days for questions or comments. Mr. Acree stated that he is a new RPM for NWS Yorktown and his personal goal is to encourage more public participation, including increasing the RAB participation by bringing on additional RAB members. Ms. Mathur asked if there was a local mechanism to increase RAB membership in addition to the CIP. Mr. Acree asked if there is a NWS Yorktown charter in place, and if not, he recommended initiating a charter with information on how to do a survey and get the information out there. Mr. Acree stated there is information on the website on how to become a RAB member. Mr. Oyer recommended putting a notice in the York County Citizen’s Newsletter that is issued quarterly. Mr. Acree said they could provide the website in the newsletter. Mr. Kissler said once a public affairs representative is brought onboard, one of their actions would be to increase public participation.

Mr. Acree closed the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting concluded at 7:24 p.m.

Next RAB Meeting

Date and Time: June 2024 (exact date and time to be determined; the meeting will be advertised on the public website, and in the *Daily Press* and *Virginia Gazette* newspapers)

Location: To be determined (the meeting will be advertised on the public website, and in the *Daily Press* and *Virginia Gazette* newspapers)

Points of Contact for Questions and Comments, or to Request Additional Information

Mr. Melvin Acree, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic RPM for NWS Yorktown, melvin.l.acree.civ@us.navy.mil or (757) 341-1597

Mr. Jeff Kissler, Environmental Program Director for NWS Yorktown, john.j.kissler.civ@us.navy.mil or (757) 887-4086

NAVFAC Public Affairs Officer, NAVFAC_ML_PAO@navy.mil or (757) 341-1410 or 1411

Public Website

<https://www.navfac.navy.mil/Business-Lines/Environmental/Products-and-Services/Environmental-Restoration/Mid-Atlantic/Yorktown-NWS/>

Attachment 1
Public Notice



PUBLIC NOTICE

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING
Naval Weapons Station (NWS) Yorktown**

Wednesday, June 28, 2023

6:00 – 7:15 P.M.

Yorktown Library

8500 George Washington Memorial Highway
Yorktown, VA 23692

The Public is Invited to Attend

NWS Yorktown is inviting the community to participate in the RAB meeting to be informed of Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) issues, investigations, and cleanups. The ERP addresses past contamination to protect human health and the environment and relies on public awareness and engagement in the process. This is your opportunity to participate by providing direct input during this meeting. NWS Yorktown, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency are committed to the RAB, which symbolizes our commitment to maintaining open dialog with impacted communities as we work together to clean, protect, and restore the environment. ***Please note: Although the RAB is open to the public, there will only be a limited amount of time for public questions following the scheduled RAB presentations.***

This meeting will be held in-person and online. The public is welcomed to attend the RAB in-person, by phone, or virtually through the free webinar tool Microsoft (MS) Teams. Virtual attendees will be able to join the webinar up to 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting. For those using the MS Teams application, please allow time for downloading to your computer or mobile device. If you do not wish to download the application, attendees may also choose “Continue in Browser” to access the meeting.

Virtual Meeting: <https://tinyurl.com/NWSY-June-2023-RAB>

Meeting ID: 257 925 109 113

Passcode: XVPf8Q

Call in Phone Number: (469) 214-8538

Phone Conference ID: 500 842 337#

A link to the virtual meeting and presentations for the meeting will be posted to the public website under Community Outreach. For additional information regarding the RAB Meeting or the ERP at NWS Yorktown visit our website:

<https://www.navfac.navy.mil/Business-Lines/Environmental/Products-and-Services/Environmental-Restoration/Mid-Atlantic/Yorktown-NWS/>

or contact the Installation Public Affairs Officer
Phone: (757) 887-4939