St. Juliens Creek Annex (SJCA) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Summary: May 11, 2005

RAB Members Present:	
Valerie Walker	CNRMA
Bob Schirmer	NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic
Jeff Weisman	NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic
Todd Richardson	EPA (Region III)
Jim Cutler	Virginia DEQ
Bob Mann	Community Co-Chair (Geneva Shores)
Dave Tugwell	Geneva Shores Resident
Mike Grant	Brentwood Resident
Byron B. Scott III	Geneva Shores Resident
Kim Henderson	CH2M HILL
Janna Staszak	CH2M HILL

FROM: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

DATE: June 20, 2005

Location: Major Hillard Library, Chesapeake, Virginia

RAB Welcome and Introductions

At 5:30 pm Mr. Schirmer presented opening remarks and introductions.

NAVFAC Reorganization

Mr. Schirmer presented an overview of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) transformation. Handouts of the presentation were distributed. The presentation explained the new organizational structure of NAVFAC and how it is different from the past. Key milestones of the reorganization include combining 25 commands into 16, cutting from 15,000 to 12,000 civilian employees, saving $1.4 billion from the current $8.5 billion annual budget by FY11, and reducing the Civil Engineer Corps (CEC) force from 1,600 officers to about 1,250.

Mr. Mann asked if "No BRAC-05 Impact" on the NAVFAC Organizational Structure slide meant SJCA was not affected by Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Mr. Schirmer clarified that the slide referred to impact on the organizational structure. Mr. Schirmer provided the following email address and phone number for BRAC information: http://www.defenselink.mil/BRAC and Ms Robin Willis (Commander, Navy Regional Mid-Atlantic (CNRMA) Public Affairs Officer (PAO)) at 445-8732

Mr. Schirmer reviewed the past roles and responsibilities of the NAVFAC Regional Project Manager (RPM), Commander, Navy Regional Mid-Atlantic (CNRMA) Installation Restoration (IR) Program Manager, and CNRMA Out Reach Coordinator. He indicated that in the future, all responsibilities will fall on the NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic RPM.

Community Relations Plan

Ms. Henderson presented an overview of the Community Relations Plan (CRP). Copies of the presentation were distributed. The goal of the presentation was to inform the RAB about the update to the SJCA CRP and solicit feedback. Ms. Henderson reviewed the governing regulations and guidance for community involvement programs for IR sites. The objectives of the CRP are to ensure the public has opportunities for involvement in site-related decisions, to determine appropriate activities to ensure public involvement, and to provide appropriate opportunities to learn about the site. The CRP for SJCA was last updated in 2000 and is currently being updated.

Interviews are being conducted to review the best methods for keeping the community informed, determine the level of interest in SJCA, and to identify information needs to enhance community relations needs. Twenty interview questionnaires have been distributed and 12 responses have been received to-date. Ms. Henderson offered interview questionnaires to the RAB guests.

Highlights of the SJCA CRP include designating Navy contacts to maintain ongoing communication, maintaining an up-to-date email list, conducting regular RAB meetings, preparing fact sheets to update the community, maintaining and updating SJCA's IR Program web site (http://public.lantops-ir.org/sites/public/sjca/default.aspx), holding public meetings, maintaining an Administrative Record file (http://public.lantops-ir.org/sites/public/sjca/ or Major Hilliard Library), and maintaining an Information Repository (Major Hillard Library). Ms. Walker asked the new attendees how they heard of the RAB Meeting. The guests responded that they had heard by word of mouth.

Site Status Update and Fiscal Year 2005 Goals

Mr. Weisman informed the RAB of the current status of the IR Program sites and the Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 goals. Handouts of the presentation were distributed. The presentation addressed the six active sites and indicated that to-date, 48 sites have been determined no further action (NFA). For each of the active sites, Mr. Weisman showed an aerial photograph then reviewed the site history and current status. Summaries of the discussion for each site were as followed:

Site 2: Waste Disposal Area B

Site 2 is a 4.4-acre unlined waste disposal area that operated from 1921 to 1942. Garbage, acids, waste ordnance, and blast grit were reportedly disposed of by open burning. The Remedial Investigation phase was completed in 2004. 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 2005 goal for Site 2 is to complete the Draft Expanded Remedial Investigation Report of findings and determine potential remedial actions by June 30th.

Site 3: Waste Disposal Area C

Site 3 was a 2.1-acre unlined waste disposal area that operated from 1940 to 1970. Refuse was dumped and burned, and the ash was used to reclaim low-lying areas. A removal of waste, contaminated soil, and drainage sediment was conducted from 2002 to 2004. The FY 2005 goal for Site 3 was to complete the NFA Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) and

Record of Decision (ROD) by March 31st. The PRAP and ROD are complete and the ROD is currently awaiting signatures.

Mr. Grant asked what the remedial method for Site 3 material was. Ms. Henderson responded that it was removed and sent to a permitted disposal facility.

Site 4: Landfill D

Site 4 was a 10-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 include waste; metals, PCBs, and PAHs in soil; and mercury in drainage sediment. The ROD and Remedial Design were completed for the soil cover and drainage ditch sediment removal in 2004. The FY 2005 goal for Site 4 is to complete the soil cover construction and drainage ditch removal by October 31st.

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 was completed in 2004. Potential concerns include waste; metals, pesticides, and PAHs in soil and drainage sediment; and metals in groundwater. The FY 2005 goal for Site 5 is to complete the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) to evaluate the remedial alternatives by June 30th.

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 2004. Potential concerns include metals and PAHs in soil. The FY 2005 goal for Site 19 is to complete the soil removal by October 31st. However, it may not be accomplished in FY 2005 due to lack of funding, but will be negotiated to try to take advantage of any end of the year 2005 monies.

Mr. Grant asked the location of the removal area. Ms. Henderson showed him the location on the aerial photograph.

Mr. Grant asked if there were concerns with the groundwater. Ms. Henderson responded that the groundwater has been tested and that no concerns were identified.

Site 21: Building 187

Site 21 was a former locomotive shed used for maintenance. The Site Investigations phase for Site 21 began in 2004. The potential concern is chlorinated solvents in groundwater and the adjacent storm sewer. The FY 2005 goal for Site 21 is to complete the investigation of chlorinated solvents in groundwater and prepare a Supplemental Site Investigation Report of findings and recommendations for the next steps.

Blows Creek

Several past and present IR Program sites are potential sources of chemicals to Blows Creek. The Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) investigation of sediment for Blows Creek was completed in 2004. Potential concerns identified for Blows Creek include metals and

PAHs in sediment. The FY 2005 goal for Blows Creek is to complete the report of findings, including recommendations for next steps, by June 30th.

Mr. Grant asked what metals were being found. Ms. Henderson indicated that in Blows Creek, the primary concern is mercury. Mr. Richardson indicated that higher levels were found at the mouth to the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River and upstream of SJCA, indicating the source may not be related to the IR Program sites.

Mr. Scott asked what the mercury levels are. Ms. Henderson responded that the levels are approximately 1.1 parts per million. Mr. Schirmer added that each site is evaluated for both ecological and human health risk and that the ecological risk values are much more stringent than human health. The results of the evaluation will be presented in the upcoming BERA report

Mr. Grant mentioned that the area of Sites 3, 4, and 5 is all dredge fill and asked who is responsible for the dredge fill because it is on Navy property. Ms. Henderson explained that background levels have been established in dredge fill areas not impacted by IR site activities to screen out the impact from IR sites versus the impact from the dredge fill itself. Mr. Scott asked if the Navy accepts the responsibility of the property that they bought and feels they should be responsible for all environmental issues, whether from Navy activities or prior. Mr. Richardson explained that the dredge fill issue is being discussed and that no resolution has been reached to-date. He indicated that institutional controls will be put in place, and that "finding of suitability" will be determined before property is transferred (either through restrictions for use or by determination/splitting of responsibility). Ms. Henderson added that the human health risk assessments cover the various exposure levels (resident, construction worker, etc.) so information will be available if the property is ever transferred. Mr. Schirmer indicated that dredge fill is a problem for many Navy bases due to their location adjacent to water bodies.

Mr. Weisman added that additional FY 2005 goals include the Draft Site Management Plan for FY 2006, Draft Community Relations Plan, and installation of signs at IR Program sites to provide information on the environmental hazards.

Mr. Weisman summarized the FY 2005 funding ($1,775,000) and indicated that only one goal may not be accomplished, the removal action at Site 19. The partnering team is starting to plan for FY 2006 with anticipated funding of $3,109,000.

Mr. Scott and Mr. Tugwell inquired about the water quality of St. Juliens Creek, indicating that they have oysters and eels in their backyards and frequently see commercial crabbers. They expressed concern over eating oysters and crabs from St. Juliens Creek and asked about restrictions. Ms. Henderson indicated that the Virginia Department of Health (VDH), Division of Shellfish Sanitation is responsible for classifying and restricting shellfish harvesting. If shell fishing was restricted, signs would be posted throughout St. Juliens Creek and that restrictions are primarily determined from bacteriological testing rather than chemical testing. Mr. Cutler indicated that the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) is developing a new program for Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) to look at water quality in relation to swimming and fishing and that there are several monitoring stations on the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. Ms. Walker indicated that the Navy conducts monthly testing at St. Juliens Creek and she is not aware of any

current advisories. St. Juliens Creek is currently within all regulatory standards under the Virginia Department of Health. Ms. Henderson added that chemical data was collected in transects from Site 2 into St. Juliens Creek and upstream in St. Juliens Creek to determine the potential impacts. The results indicated that with the exception of the outfall location, similar concentrations were detected upstream of Site 2. (Note- After the RAB meeting, Mr Schirmer showed Mr Grant a copy of a public health assessment done by ATSDR, as well as old RAB meeting minutes, where concerns about eating local fish were previously discussed. These documents were contained in the information repository at the Major Hillard library.)

Mr. Grant asked what is being done at Site 2 to prevent storm water from getting into the creek. Ms. Henderson indicated that there is a boom placed at the Site 2 outfall. Ms. Walker indicated that the outfalls are being monitored monthly by the Navy and meet the regulatory requirements. Ms. Henderson indicated that the only parameter identified in the surface water at Site 2 was volatiles and no human health or ecological risks were identified.

Mr. Scott asked who monitors the Navy to make sure they are doing the monitoring. Ms. Walker indicated that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), VDH, and VDEQ monitor. Mr. Richardson explained how the Navy, EPA, VDEQ, and CH2M HILL work together in the partnering process. He indicated that the team scopes out how each site will be handled and determines what sites are time critical. Site 2 is very complex and is still under investigation to determine the scope and extent of the contamination. Ms. Henderson indicated that Site 2 is the highest priority site at SJCA based on the contamination identified. Mr. Schirmer indicated that sites are prioritized and funding influences what sites will be addressed each year. Ms. Henderson indicated that Site 21 has an impact on Site 2 and must be cleaned up first in order to prevent the possibility of recontamination.

Mr. Scott asked if Site 2 will realistically be cleaned up. Ms. Henderson indicated that based on funding, the expected completion date is 2011. Mr. Schirmer indicated that the goal was initially to have high-risk sites cleaned up by FY 2007. Twice a year, the Navy provides a projection of costs for the sites to higher-ups (NAVFAC HDQ), and they in turn budget money across the entire United States. Mr. Schirmer indicated that the impact of IR sites on adjacent water bodies is being investigated but if any water body is remediated, recontamination from adjacent contaminated sources that remain in place after Navy remediation (i.e. the Elizabeth River) needs to be considered, in accordance with Navy policy.

Mr. Grant asked about recent changes to SARA in determining responsibility. No one was aware of recent SARA revisions.

Mr. Grant asked that for each block of taxpayer money was a certain part of that money supposed to come from the industries that caused the problem? Mr. Richardson indicated that the Superfund money has been used up and Congress has been appropriating money to keep the program alive. Mr. Schirmer indicated that he feels the only way the Elizabeth River will be effectively cleaned up is to get the funding and clean it all up at the same time. Ms. Walker indicated that Congress determines how much money each program receives and recommended the RAB address their concerns to Congress.

Mr. Mann asked whether a field trip to SJCA is being planned and if the new participants were interested. Ms. Henderson indicated that a site visit could be planned for the October RAB meeting after completion of the Site 4 cover. She indicated that an email will be sent prior to the October RAB meeting to gage interest in a site visit.

Site 4 Construction

Ms. Staszak presented an overview of the Site 4 Remedial Action. Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Ms. Staszak provided the background information for Site 4. She indicated that the site covers approximately 10.2 acres, of which 8.3 acres is the landfill and 1.9 acres is a tidal wetland adjacent to the landfill. Site 4 is located at the confluence of Blows Creek and the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. It was operated as a sanitary landfill from 1970 to 1981. Wastes disposed at Site 4 included primarily trash, wet garbage, construction material, and out-dated civil defense stores. The quantity of waste disposed at Site 4 is estimated at 1,500,000 cubic feet. Based on the history and Remedial Investigation findings, the site did not require closure as a hazardous waste landfill. A soil cover was selected as the remedy.

Ms. Staszak summarized the remedial design components, including removal and consolidation of surface debris from the wetland area and landfill surface, improvement of site drainage, construction of a 2-foot soil cover over landfill, excavation of sediment from the eastern drainage ditch, stabilization of the southern landfill toe, and installation of a chain-link fence and signs around the landfill perimeter.

Mr. Grant asked if we've considered using dredge fill for our landfill cover. Ms. Staszak responded that the cover material is being brought from an off-site borrow source after testing indicating that it was "clean" based on VDEQ standards.

Mr. Grant asked what will be done with the dredge fill and Blows Creek once the site is covered. Mr. Schirmer indicated that once the SJCA sites have been addressed, Blows Creek will follow. Mr. Grant indicated that he is more concerned with St. Juliens Creek than Blows Creek because of the human habitation.

Ms. Staszak reviewed the construction activities and schedule. Mobilization, installation of erosion and sediment controls, clearing of site vegetation, excavation of mercury-impacted sediment from the eastern drainage ditch, and removal of the surface debris from the wetland have been completed. The current activity is the placement of the soil cover. Upcoming activities include site restoration and installation of a chain-link fence and signs. Ms. Staszak displayed several photographs of site conditions and construction activities. The expected construction completion date is mid-September.

Mr. Scott asked where the waste goes, and if another site is being created down the road. Ms. Staszak indicated that material disposed of off-site is sent to a permitted disposal facility.

Roundtable / Q & A

Mr. Mann inquired about the trolley bridge that was dropped in the creek around 1939 that prevents the tide from washing the silt back out. Mr. Mann thought that the bridge belonged to Virginia Power but recently, he got some information from the Naval Museum

that stated the Department of Navy bought the railway tracks from Virginia Power. Mr. Mann distributed copies of the information (Attachment A: Hampton Roads Naval Museum [HRNM]. *The Daybook*, Volume 1, Issue 10.) Mr. Mann indicated that he is aware that the trolley bridge does not have anything to do with the IR Program and that he is not trying to get the trolley bridge issue included in the RAB, but is asking for help. He stated that before the bridge was dropped, it was a navigable waterway and the removal would be beneficial to the community. He feels that if the Navy is responsible then they should resolve the problem.

Mr. Scott indicated that he has satellite images of the bridge. He stated that from the images, you can see that the Gilmerton Bridge side of St. Juliens Creek is very clear but the other side looks horrible. He then pointed out that St. Juliens Creek is a very wide creek, but that it is very silted. Mr. Scott asked if when the Navy purchases property knowing there are environmental hazards, doesn't the Navy take responsibility for those hazards? Mr. Richardson indicated that at that time they did not necessarily know about the hazards and that liability is an ongoing issue. Mr. Schirmer indicated that Navy has good records of land parcels that have been purchased.

Mr. Grant indicated that he had prepared several questions that he would like to have placed in the official record. Mr. Grant provided a hard copy of the questions (Attachment B). The questions and resulting discussion were as follows:

- *"What is the current and possible future status of St. Juliens Annex as to its BRAC status and how will any current and forthcoming planned restoration be affected? Anecdotal evidence suggests that any environmental cleanup may be affected by change in BRAC status. I reference Mar Island, CA where cleanup monies and work on restoration supposedly dried up and virtually came to a standstill. It's in the courts."*

  Mr. Schirmer provided the BRAC information web site http://www.defenselink.mil/BRAC and indicated that frequently asked questions and answers were listed. He also indicated that these types of questions and concerns should be provided to the Public Affairs Officer (PAO): Robin Willis 445-8732, x3096.

- *"What is the status of right-of-way and easement agreements with Dominion Power as to the high voltage power lines crossing St. Juliens Creek between the WW Reasor property and the area near the St. Juliens Creek Annex fire station? This question has bearing on the next questions. (Anecdotally, two sailboats have struck those power lines within the last few years.) Can some sort of signage be placed at the entrance of the ICW. See photo provided."*

  Mr. Schirmer indicated that most of Mr. Grants the questions will have to be passed off to the Norfolk Naval Shipyard (NNSY) PAO.

- *"What is the working relationship between the Navy and the owners of the property directly across the creek? I refer to property(s) owned by W.W. Reasor and his heirs, The City of Chesapeake, and HRSD. These are the properties that lay directly across the mouth of the creek. In the late 1980's, early 1990's the Navy had contractors use the land to construct facilities to enable NNSY to hide submarines in the shipyard from view while work of a sensitive national security nature were performed. Also, an incident involving the dumping of some "hot material" occurred and was publicized shortly after that work was completed. City, State, and Federal environmental personnel got involved and it was cleaned up quickly and no further incidents*

occurred. This question is germane to establishing an historical perspective and to show patterns of use of lands adjacent to the Annex to explore if an expansion of environmental restoration is needed." Mr. Grant continued, indicating that if the Navy has been using the other side of the creek, then they should be responsible for it. Mr. Grant stated that the Navy used the Reasor property to build submarine pens in the 1990/1992 timeframe. He recalled metal piled up and smoking, with RADCON tags on some of the debris. He asked that if the Navy is using the Reasor property, then are they culpable? He asked if the Navy and Reasor have any working agreements.

Mr. Schirmer indicated that the problem is common to GOCO (Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated) sites. Mr. Schirmer indicated that the questions will have to be passed off to the PAO. Mr. Grant asked if historical use of adjacent land opens up the IR Program to adjacent properties. Mr. Schirmer responded that the IR Program currently only addresses Navy-owned property. In the case of former Navy-owned property, sometimes environmental responsibility was transferred with the sale.

- *"What is the history of the Navy's dredging of the waters adjacent to the Annex including the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River and St. Juliens Creek. What was the disposition and distribution of the spoils? What sampling has been done, if any, of the spoils and the findings of sampling as to toxicity, levels of heavy metals, TNT residue, etc?"* Mr. Grant indicated that the question was addressed in previous discussions.

- *"Were dredge spoils placed across the creek to build up and be compacted for a railway roadbed at the site of the power lines. If so, when will these spoils be removed to restore the free tidal movement of St. Julians Creek. St. Julian's Creek, according to many of the older, long term residents of the creek can remember when tugs and barges used the creek to engage in commerce (truck farming, logging, etc. prior to WWII). It was a navigable waterway all the way to George Washington Hwy. Since the Navy blocked the creek for their necessity, can the restoration of the creek be imposed upon the Navy? Also, in addition, there was an incident in the early 1950's involving the release of dredged spoils clogging the creek. According to my next-door neighbor, Vincent T. Hill, the mud "flowed like molasses" that morning when the backed up spoils were pushed by the incoming tide. A lawsuit was brought Federal court in Norfolk against Norfolk Dredging and was dismissed when the plaintiff's lawyer failed to show. The Navy supposedly offered to dynamite the mud out but the few homeowners along the creek feared damage to foundations/windows etc. of the structures. The property owners brought an old landing craft and ran it up and down the creek at high tide to open it up some. Mr. Hill told me when he built his house on Battery Park Rd that he had almost 5 feet water at low tide and a nice sand bottom. We now have barely three feet on the average navigable depth. Ironically, on the other side of George Washington Highway, although there is marsh mud, there is a hard sand bottom. Charts showing the creek read "reported three foot depth 1976", yet the creek is as wide if not wider than most of the other creeks along the Southern Branch that enjoy a much greater depth at low tide. This is not all to sedimentation/eutrophication conditions normally noticed along development of similar streams, but from conditions arising from the facts noted. The question is: Who's culpable and responsible and what can be done to remediate the problems. At the end of St. Julian Ct. storm water outfall is almost completely clogged, causing water to remain in the street after storms and most notably during the latest round of hurricanes. There are several outfalls in the Brentwood side of the creek that are in similar shape. I realize that ongoing sedimentation is partially responsible but the creek has suffered impact of an extraordinary and man-made nature going back to the Navy's involvement along the waterfront of the Annex and that it is beyond*

normal sedimentation rates." Mr. Grant continued, asking what the distribution of the dredge spoils was and what sampling was performed. Mr. Grant also asked if dredge soils were placed across the creek and compacted to construct a railway. Mr. Grant asked when the dredge fill will be removed to restore the waterway and indicated that it was previously navigable all the way to George Washington Highway. Mr. Grant also stated that in the 1920s, there was significant activity around the point (wharf area) by SJCA.

Ms. Henderson indicated that no hazardous contamination has been identified in the housing area or wharf area of the base. Mr. Schirmer indicated that courtesy of the EPA, aerial photographs were taken every 5 to 10 years and evaluated for past activities. Mr. Richardson summarized the Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC) photo system and indicated that the EPA uses the EPIC photographs in conjunction with records and historical information to identify areas for investigations. He also stated that the team has reviewed and evaluated the photos for SJCA.

Mr. Schirmer recommended Mr. Grant look at the Watershed Contaminant Source Document (WCSD) and explained the information contained in the report. The report covers past dredging, refers to web sites, identifies potential areas of contamination, and compiles sampling data conducted in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River watershed. The report does not list potential contributors by name. The conclusion of the report is that the Elizabeth River is a typical industrial waterway with typical industrial-related contamination. Mr. Schirmer indicated that the Navy understands that they may have contributed to the contamination and is willing to accept responsibility and provide funding to clean up their portion of contamination when the time comes. Ms. Henderson mentioned that the attendees may be interested in the Elizabeth River Project (ERP) meetings. (Note- After the RAB meeting, Mr. Schirmer showed Mr. Grant a copy of the WCSD in the information repository held in the Major Hillard library.) Mr. Grant asked "*What is it going to take to get our creek cleaned?*" He indicated that outfalls are clogged along the creek. Mr. Grant realizes that some of the impact is from natural sedimentation, but also Navy's involvement. He pointed out that the Navy is the primary activity, and that Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) is the only other major activity, except for Virginia Power where the power lines cross. Mr. Grant pointed out that barges can not even be brought in to dredge due to the power lines. He recalls two boats coming up the creek and hitting the power line and indicated that the charts show 38 feet of vertical clearance under the power lines, but does not believe that is accurate. Mr. Grant would like to know who the responsible party is and expressed concerns over general health and safety.

Since most of these issues are not related to the Navy's IR program, Mr. Schirmer suggested that Mr. Grant may need to contact the PAO, Capt. Eichert, or Cheryl Barnett for additional information. He also suggested that another possible course of action was for the attendees to contact their Congressman if they still were not satisfied with the information provided..

Next Meeting: Tentatively scheduled for October 12.

Meeting Adjourned.