M00146.AR.001068
MCAS CHERRY POINT
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 25 JANUARY 2012 MCAS CHERRY POINT NC

1/25/2012

PARTNERING TEAM

Meeting Minutes

Final Minutes January 2012

Partnering Team Meeting
Virginia Beach, VA
January 25, 2012

In Attendance:
Bill Hannah, CH2M HILL
Doug Bitterman, CH2M HILL
Erica DeLattre, Rhea
George Lane, NCDENR
Will Potter, MCAS Cherry Point
Gena Townsend, USEPA
Jason Williams, NAVFAC
Nicole Cowand, NAVFAC

Guests:
Keri Hallberg, CH2M HILL

Roles:

Chair:	Jason
Recorder:	Doug
Timekeeper:	Gena
Facilitator:	Erica
Goalie:	George

Next meeting:

New Bern, NC
April 25, 2012

Roles:

Chair:	Erica
Recorder:	Erin
Timekeeper:	Will
Facilitator:	George
Goalie:	Gena

FY11: Team Successes

- OU1 Central Groundwater Plume FS
- OU1, Site 83 Supplemental RI
- OU2 Site 10 FFS
- OU2, Site 10 PRAP
- OU14 IRACR
- OU14 LTM RD
- Cat Island Water Signage Work Plan

FY12: Team Goals

- OU1 Central Groundwater Plume PRAP
- OU1 Vapor Intrusion Investigation (Phases 2 and 3)
- OU1 PRB Pilot Study – PRB Installed
- OU1, Site 16 Supplemental RI
- OU1, Site 16 PRAP
- OU1, Site 83 PRAP
- OU1, Site 83 ROD
- OU2 ROD Amendment
- OU2 Site 10 RA
- OU2 LTM UFP-SAP
- OU3 RACR
- OU5 RACR
- Cat Island Expanded SI
- Skeet and Trap Range #1 Expanded SI

DECISIONS AND CONSENSUS ITEMS

Consensus — Install one additional OU4 monitoring well at the location suggested by Gena and continue LTM at the existing and new monitoring well at a semi-annual frequency.

Consensus — Instead of having pre-meeting team conference calls, going forward the meeting Chair will send the draft partnering meeting agenda to the team by email and receive team comments electronically.

ACTION ITEMS

NEW ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description
0112-01	Will	Look into the water line, power line and utility pole at Site 16 that would be impacted by the PRB installation to determine a path forward for temporary deactivation or relocation to allow PRB construction.
0112-02	Will	Determine the purpose and status of a 4-inch steel pipe located parallel to the slope to be reconfigured at Site 83.
0112-03	Will	Update the partnering team phone list.

ONGOING ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description

RESOLVED ACTION ITEMS

Tracking Number	Person Responsible	Action Item Description
0911-01	Erin	Finalize July 2011 Meeting Minutes. **Resolved prior to meeting.**
0911-02	Bill	Determine the dimensions of the PRB trenching machine for gate/road clearance. **Resolved prior to meeting.**
0911-03	Doug	Upload Major Successes PowerPoint presentation for RAB and Partnering Team members. **Resolved; uploaded earlier.**

0911-04	Will	Deliver certificate for Bill Smart after it is signed by the CO. **Resolved; delivered prior to meeting.**

Wednesday, January 25, 2012
Start Time 0805

Check-in and Meeting Administration

Check In and Team Introduction
Jason introduced Nicole Cowand to the team. The Team checked in and discussed work and personal activities.

Partnering Ground Rules
Doug went through the Partnering team ground rules and administrative procedures. He reported that there is a partnering training session coming up on March 27-28 in Richmond, Virginia. Nicole stated that she was already signed up to participate in the training.

FY11 Team Successes and FY12 Goals Review
The team discussed the FY11 team successes and FY12 team goals and made a minor revision. The OU1, Site 16 ROD was removed as an FY12 goal as this ROD is likely to be signed in FY13.

Agenda and Action Item Review
The Team went over the agenda for the meeting (no changes) and then reviewed the Action Items from the September 2011 partnering meeting. All new action items were completed and there were no ongoing action items from the previous meeting.

Jason reported that it remains unclear how much congressional funding will be available for the fiscal year. He stated that there are indications that some cost cutting may be forthcoming.

OU1 Central Groundwater Plume Biobarrier Pilot Study

Presenter – Keri Hallberg

Bill Hannah introduced Keri Hallberg as the CH2M HILL project manager for the biobarrier pilot study being conducted at OU1. Keri then led the team through a PowerPoint presentation on the latest progress of the pilot study.

Keri first reminded the team of the pilot study objectives and details of implementation before moving into the results. To date, the baseline groundwater sampling event plus two post-injection sampling events (3 and 6 months) have been conducted.

Upper Surficial aquifer: Significant VOC reductions were observed.
Lower Surficial aquifer: Substantial VOC reductions were observed, though less than in the Upper Surficial aquifer.

Keri reported that the TOC and Volatile Fatty Acid (VFA) results indicate that favorable conditions for biodegradation are continuing. With regard to pH, there has been some reduction in the pH in a couple of wells (52GW79 and 52GW80), though the pH levels have rebounded slightly in the latest round of sampling. For the remainder of the pilot study, pH will continue

to be evaluated to determine if there is a need for pH buffering at a later date or if it would be advisable to buffer during a full scale biobarrier implementation.

After summarizing the observations to date, the presentation listed the remaining schedule for the pilot study (additional sampling events).

Gena went over the overall objective of OU1 near source remediation that the pilot study is related to. The biobarrier is intended to "cut off" the plume downgradient of Building 133 such that eventually, only low contamination groundwater will be present downgradient of the barrier to eventually reach the downgradient treatment zone and significant contamination will only exist upgradient of the barrier.

Jason asked if the drop in bacteria observed in some cases is due to a change in chemical conditions. Keri indicated that since we added bacteria as part of the pilot study, they need to establish their colonies and that there is a period of adjustment before they can thrive.

Gena asked if low pH kills the bacteria. Keri answered that they are sensitive to low pH.

Will asked how far from the injection sites are the upgradient wells. Keri answered 11 feet.

Gena asked how close we are for the pilot system to meet the objectives of the study. Bill indicated that we have made substantial progress. Gena suggested running a biodegradation model to show that the lowered concentrations downgradient of the biobarrier will degrade naturally as migration occurs toward the surface water receptors such that no discharge will occur greater than surface water concentrations. Doug pointed out that such modeling was run previously as part of the RI Addendum under scenarios without any treatment and the results indicated that no surface water discharge above State standards would occur.

Gena stated that she has to present internally the teams proposed remedies to her first line managers and attorneys. They typically have a lot of questions. Gena would like to have as much information as possible regarding the remedies for her to be able to successfully do these presentations and be prepared for their questions. Gena indicated that she thought the data looked good so far, which should bode well for approval of a full scale biobarrier remedy.

The team discussed recent experience getting the OU2 amended ROD remedy approved and parallels to impending approval for OU1 remedies.

OU1 Permeable Reactive Barrier (PRB) Pilot Study

Presenter – Bill Hannah

Bill Hannah delivered a PowerPoint presentation on the upcoming PRB pilot study. He began by reviewing pilot study goals: 90% TCE reduction and 75% overall VOC reduction. Another objective is to see if the DeWind one-pass trenching technique can be successfully implemented to a depth of 45 feet.

The planned PRB layout: 45 feet deep, 2 feet wide, and 600 feet long. The pilot study project also includes the installation of monitoring wells. There are logistical challenges and physical

obstructions, including some above and below ground utilities: water line, power line, utility pole. Regarding the water line, Will took an action item to look into the purpose and extent of the line so we can determine how to address a relocation or temporary shutdown of the line during PRB installation. Bill also indicated that there is an electrical line of undetermined purpose in conflict with the PRB location. Will stated that he would help with determining the purpose of the line and how to have it temporary deactivated. Bill indicated that there is some fencing, trailers, containers, jersey barriers and stockpiled sand that are also in the way of the PRB installation. Will indicated that all of that can be addressed prior to implementation.

Bill showed the PRB installation method (DeWind one-pass trenching system). A bench scale column study is nearly complete that will assist with determining the optimal trench width. In the meantime it has been assumed that a 2 ft width will be recommended.

Keri indicated that there is a magnetic testing procedure used to determine that the iron mixture is correct. All of the implementation details will be outlined in a forthcoming implementation work plan that will be submitted to the team.

Bill pointed out to George that an inquiry with the underground injection office of NCDENR had resulted in a determination that no injection permit would be required for the PRB installation.

Bill then reviewed the bench scale pilot study. The results indicate that the VOCs went to non-detect within 2.5 hours of residence time in the column tests, which is a very favorable result. He reviewed the grain size analysis samples that were collected and are currently being analyzed.

Regarding soil and water handling during the PRB implementation, Bill stated that an estimated 3,000 cubic yards of saturated soil will be generated and staged in two piles onsite that will be lined and covered with polyethylene sheeting. An estimated 120,000 gallons of impacted groundwater is expected to be generated (seepage from excavated saturated soil) and collected in a bermed and lined trench at the base of the soil staging areas to b e pumped into frac tanks for subsequent transport to the IWTP. George asked if the water needed to be filtered to remove suspended solids prior to discharge to the IWTP. Keri responded that the intention is to design the staging area such that sediment in the water has settled to the extent required for discharge to the IWTP without filtering.

The stockpiled soil is intended to be used to perform needed slope restoration at Site 83 (after proper characterization for VOCs). The intention is to reduce the overly steep slope and to redesign stormwater flow paths to achieve a more stable scenario at Site 83. Bill asked if the team was comfortable with this approach. George indicated that he was fine with the approach as long as the analytical results were positive. Jason asked if EPA or NCDENR wanted to review the restoration work plan for the slope rehabilitation work. Gena responded no and George responded yes.

Bill explained the monitoring well installation plan for the PRB pilot study as shown on a figure. George asked if the wells would be installed before or after the PRB installation. Jason

responded that they would be installed after the PRB installation to avoid any impact to wells during the PRB construction.

Bill finished with the schedule for the remainder of the pilot study. The estimated PRB construction date is the 2nd calendar quarter of 2012 with surveying, vegetation clearance, and utility location and relocation to occur before the end of the 1st quarter of 2012.

Erica asked Will about an unidentified 4-inch steel pipe located parallel to the slope at Site 83 that is a concern for the slope rehabilitation project. Will indicated he would look into the purpose and status of the pipe. Erica said the plan will be to protect the pipe in the absence of any information that it is inactive.

Will asked if we know what the residence time is expected to be for groundwater in the PRB relative to the 2.5 hours required for treatment as shown from the bench scale column study. Keri indicated that it had been estimated but could not recall the exact timing. She thought it was on the order of one month - considerably longer than the bench scale column study results showed was necessary.

Jason asked who in EAD would handle inspections related to temporary fuel storage for equipment that will be required during the pilot study. Will responded that EAD has stormwater and tank personnel that would address this issue.

OU1 Vapor Intrusion – Phase II VI Evaluation Results

Presenter – Bill Hannah

Bill ran through a PowerPoint presentation on the Phase II VI Evaluation results. He stated that the Draft Phase II VI Evaluation report will be submitted to EPA and NCDENR in February.

The conclusion of the evaluation is that the indoor air data do not indicate the presence of risks to building occupants above the target risk level. The recommendation of the evaluation is to perform post-OU1-ROD performance monitoring of indoor air to assess temporal variability and to confirm that no unacceptable risks develop over time.

The proposed path forward is to conduct an additional round of data at select buildings (post-ROD) and to proceed with the OU1 Central Groundwater Plume (CGWP) PRAP and ROD. The Navy goal is to achieve remedy in place for the OU1 CGWP in FY2014. Jason indicated that funding is currently in place to complete the PRAP, ROD, and RD for OU1. However, he indicated that the funding to implement multiple, full-scale remedies may not be available at a single point of time, so implementation may need to be performed in a staggered fashion. Looking at the timeline for OU1, Gena questioned whether remedy in place for OU1 in 2014 is feasible given the level of paperwork and approval required for the CGWP. Jason indicated that it will definitely be a challenge, but the VI findings allow us to move forward with the PRAP and ROD to have a shot at meeting the deadline.

Jason then conducted a PowerPoint presentation on a study being performed by Geosyntec to evaluate passive vapor intrusion sampling devices at several Navy and Marine Corps facilities, including MCAS Cherry Point. The issue is to develop alternatives to Summa canister sampling, which is complicated and expensive. The study tested 5 different passive samplers: Waterloo

Membrane sampler, Automated Thermal Desorption (ATD) tubes, Radiello, SKC Ultra II, and 3M OVM 3500. All of them are less intrusive and readily visible during implementation compared to Summa canisters. All of the tested passive sampling devices utilize a known exposure duration and lab analysis of adsorbed contaminant mass leading to a calculation of the contaminant concentration. The devices are simple, inexpensive, easy to ship, and discreet to deploy.

Cherry Point was one of 3 sites that participated in the Navy NESDI Project to field test and evaluate these devices. Summa canisters were also employed during the evaluation to compare results to passive devices. At the various sites, results were generally very close to those from the Summa canister samples. It was noted that adjustments to the devices to increase the uptake rate resulted in favorable results to eliminate a "starvation effect" that occurred when uptake was very low. The cost comparison in the study showed significant potential savings (on the order of 50 percent) from using passive sampling devices. A subsequent lab evaluation of passive sampling devices was also conducted to further evaluate these devices in a wide variety of scenarios. The overall conclusion of the Passive Sampler study is that these devices have many advantages over Summa canisters and that the devices are ready for widespread use in indoor and outdoor air sampling applications. In addition, they seem promising for use in soil gas sampling.

The team broke for lunch at 1130

The meeting resumed at 1320

OU1 Site 16 Supplemental RI

Presenter –Bill Hannah

The team went through the EPA and NCDENR comments recently received for the Draft version of this document, beginning with EPA comments. The EPA comment that was reviewed regarded vinyl chloride detections in soil at Site 16. Gena explained that the document implies that there is contaminated soil at Site 16 that will be addressed separately along with the CGWP, which she felt would be a concern. Bill explained that it is believed that the vinyl chloride is actually related to groundwater contaminant migration and possibly a fluctuating water table and not from a Site 16 source. Gena explained that the document needs to better state explicitly that there is no soil contamination at Site 16. Bill indicated that revisions would be made to make that conclusion clearer.

NCDENR comments: First comment was with regard to statement in the text of a reported 20,000 gallon disposal of waste oil at Site 16. George asked if any sampling for the relevant petroleum constituents occurred at Site 16. Bill responded that the sampling did occur during the OU1 RI.

The second NCDENR comment concerned the debris pile removal action and follow up sampling. Bill responded that additional clarifying language would be added.

The next comment was with regard to inorganic constituents in groundwater in relation to background levels. George indicated that he was comfortable if the detected concentrations were less than the maximum base background concentrations for the respective constituents but would be concerned if they exceeded these levels. He wants to make sure the definition of what is consistent with background is not being stretched.

Another NCDENR comment concerned why a particular benzene concentration was J-flagged at a relatively high concentration. Bill indicated that the specific reason this result was flagged would be researched for the Response To Comments document. Doug stated that it very likely was due to one or more of the other target compounds being present at a high enough concentration that the sample had to be diluted by the lab.

The team discussed Table 3-1 of the RI showing COPCs in Soil that indicates a maximum detected vinyl chloride concentration of 41 µg/kg. Gena indicated that this was related to the EPA comment, and expressed concern that the table shows a potential vinyl chloride concern in soil. Doug suggested adding a footnote to this result stating that it was concluded in the RI report that the shown result was not representative of soil but groundwater since the sample was collected very close to the water table. The footnote would also point out that a subsequent sampling event at the same location showed no vinyl chloride, confirming the conclusion that there is no vinyl chloride concern in soil. The team was satisfied with the proposed footnote solution.

OU2 LTM SAP

Presenter –Bill Hannah

Bill reviewed the EPA and NCDENR comments that have been received on the Draft version of this document. The only NCDENR comment was to update George's address and phone number, which Bill indicated would be corrected.

EPA had two comments. The first comment indicated additional language should be added to better explain how groundwater data would be compared to surface water screening criteria as a threshold for protecting Slocum Creek. Gena explained that the document needs to make clear that the LTM plan satisfies the requirements of the amended OU2 ROD with regard to monitoring. Jason proposed that text be added acknowledging that the ROD was amended and explaining how the data screening is consistent with the ROD monitoring requirements.

The second EPA comment concerned the proposed additional monitoring well location. EPA's comment expressed concern that the proposed location is not downgradient of soil Hot Spot 2. Potentiometric surface maps of OU2 were displayed while the team discussed the direction of groundwater flow downgradient of Hot Spot 2. Bill and Doug stated that existing monitoring well 10GW10 is believed to be directly downgradient of Hot Spot 2, eliminating any need to install a new downgradient monitoring well. Gena pointed out that the groundwater flow arrows in the conceptual site model (CSM) figure give an impression of more westerly groundwater flow such that she was concerned about the gap between existing monitoring wells 10GW10 and 10GW94 and the potential for contaminated groundwater to pass undetected between these wells. Bill pointed out that the arrows in the CSM were intended to be conceptual and not strictly accurate depictions of groundwater flow directions. Jason said that he believed

that water level data from 10GW10 and 10GW94 support the conclusion that any plume of contamination originating from Hot Spot 2 would be captured in one or both of these wells. The team agreed that the groundwater flow arrows in the CSM figure would be eliminated to avoid giving an incorrect perception of flow directions.

Off-topic Discussion of the Upcoming Cherry Point 5-Year Review

The discussion shifted and Gena mentioned that she had found out that Cherry Point had volunteered to "pilot" the new Navy 5-year review format and pointed out that Cherry Point had previously piloted the streamlined ROD, which turned out to cause an arduous ROD approval process. Jason replied that the proposed 5-year review format is very similar to the 5-year review format already being used for Camp Lejeune, and does not represent a radically different departure from agreed upon formats. There is no intent with the new format to depart from EPA guidance for 5-year reviews. Gena indicated skepticism that this would not result in difficulties attaining an approved document. Jason stated that there is no intent for the 5-year review to be reviewed or approved at the EPA headquarters level.

OU2, Site 10 Remedial Action
Presenter –Erica DeLattre

Erica presented a PowerPoint presentation on the implementation of the Remedial Action at OU2, Site 10, which included the following:

- Replaced the old, 8-foot wide gate in the OU2 fencing with a new, 16-foot gate and reinstalled signage.
- Decommissioned Hot Spot 2 monitoring well OU2MW21 to allow the soil cover to be installed.
- Vegetation clearance of the soil cover footprint.
- Site 10 access road was improved to remove 2 deep ruts so that dump trucks constructing the soil cover could access the site. This will also allow easier access in the future to LTM monitoring wells.
- Installed straw waddles for erosion control.
- Soil cover material was obtained from the Cherry Point borrow pile. Material is estimated to be 70-80 percent clay.
- Soil was first placed and compacted in depressions and then placed across the soil cover area in 6-inch lifts and compacted with a vibratory compacting roller. This activity is currently underway and nearly complete. It should be completed in 2-3 days of additional soil placement.

Upon completion of soil cover placement, top soil will be placed above the soil cover and seeded with a native seed mix. If necessary due to truck passage during soil cover construction, the access road will be repaired.

Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) Update
Presenter –Erica DeLattre

Erica presented a PowerPoint presentation on the most recent LTM results for OUs 4 and 13.

Results are from November 2011.

OU4: One monitoring well is sampled for benzene; the result was 2.4 µg/L, which exceeds the NC 2L standard of 1 µg/L. MNA parameter data suggest that conditions are slightly anaerobic. The suggested path forward for OU4 is to continue quarterly LTM sampling. Doug asked if it was necessary to continue sampling on a quarterly basis. Jason responded that the team can discuss this during the upcoming OU4 Update agenda topic, which will better support this discussion.

OU13: One monitoring well is sampled for vinyl chloride; the result was an estimated concentration of 0.48 J and 0.49 J (duplicate) µg/L. MNA parameter data for the current quarter showed less anaerobic conditions than historical norms. The recommended path forward for OU13 is to continue quarterly LTM sampling.

Erica stated that the sampling event for the next quarterly round of LTM at OU4 and 13 is expected to occur on February 1, 2012.

OU4 Update
Presenter –Erica DeLattre

Erica presented a PowerPoint presentation to update the team on activities at OU4. She began with a refresher of historical LTM results for groundwater that led to a team concern that an unidentified residual source for benzene remained at OU4 and the performance of a supplemental investigation and delineation of a more extensive benzene plume than previously known. A technical memorandum was subsequently prepared that recommended investigating sulfate injection to treat the benzene plume.

A bench scale study was recently performed to investigate the effectiveness of sulfate injection on the benzene-contaminated groundwater at OU4. Sulfate reducing bacteria were not found in the OU4 soil and groundwater above detection limits; the lab believes that some bacteria are actually present, but it would take 6 months or so for them to reach levels necessary to conduct the study. Erica indicated that the team needs to decide whether or not to continue the bench scale study given these findings.

Jason presented his thoughts on the scenario at OU4. He stated that the benzene plume as currently delineated would not likely alter the original MNA remedy given that the maximum benzene concentrations are relatively low and the plume is not migrating significantly based on LTM data. He also stated that if the ROD was being developed today with current knowledge rather than in the past he thought that the original MNA remedy would likely be the outcome given no benzene in soil and a modest plume that is not migrating. George pointed out that Oxygen Release Compound (ORC™) could potentially be added to change the aquifer condition to aerobic but that he had no problem returning to MNA as the remedy.

Erica stated that the proposed path forward is to abandon the sulfate injection bench scale study and OU4 pilot study and revert to the current MNA remedy with the addition of one additional monitoring well to the LTM network. A figure was displayed showing the location of a proposed new monitoring well. Gena suggested moving the proposed new monitoring well to the downgradient side of sample location 3E (had a previous result of 10 µg/l).

Will stated that the Air Station is widening the cleared zone around all of the runways and the cleared area might extend in the future up to or near the southern edge of the drum storage pad at OU4. We would need to take steps to protect site monitoring wells should any be potentially impacted.

Erica reported that a monitoring well at the base of the slope at OU1, Site 83 was damaged by a vehicle that crashed onto the well. A drilling company subsequently repaired the well, concrete pad, and bollards.

Partnering Roundtable

Site 83 PRAP

Erica reported that the draft document was just submitted for EPA and NCDENR review. Gena asked when we are projecting to hold the public meeting for this PRAP. Jason responded that there is a proposed April 2012 date in the draft document. The team discussed timing a RAB meeting with the public meeting. Erica looked up the proposed date in the draft PRAP as April 10, 2012. Based on team discussions, a revised date of April 24, 2012 was set for the public meeting. To meet this date, the PRAP would need to be finalized by April 6, 2012.

Gena asked about the schedule for OU1, Site 16. Jason responded it was intended to complete the PRAP this fiscal year and the ROD in FY13. A draft Site 16 PRAP is projected for submittal to EPA and NCDENR in April 2012.

MRP Update

Jason stated that Tuesday, February 7 is the targeted start date for the Skeet Range #1 SI field investigation. Field work should take 2 days.

For Cat Island, the schedule will be set shortly for the additional warning sign installation around the island. Bill stated that boat contracting activities should be completed this week and a tentative target of the second week of February is the current plan.

OU5 RACR and Skeet Range #1 SAP Approval Signatures

Bill passed around originals of the signature pages for team members to sign.

Document Review Schedule (DRS)

Bill handed out hard copies of the updated DRS and went through upcoming dates for submittal and review. Specific updates were recorded in a revised DRS.

Regarding the forthcoming 5-Year Review, Gena suggested scheduling the team site visit/inspection on Tuesday, April 24 in conjunction with the Site 83 PRAP public meeting/RAB meeting. After team discussion, the April 24 date was set.

Partnering Parking Lot

There were no parking lot items to discuss.

Meeting Closeout

The team reviewed Consensus and action items.

Jason brought up the frequency of partnering for 2012. He suggested quarterly meetings based on the activities projected over the course of the year. Jason then mentioned pre-meeting teleconferences. He suggested addressing agenda topics via email instead of conducting pre-meeting teleconferences. The team concurred.

Jason stated that this will probably be the last partnering meeting that he attends. He indicated that he might attend the upcoming RAB meeting if Kirk Stevens asks him to participate.

Future Meeting Dates/Locations:

The team scheduled the next partnering meeting in conjunction with the April 24 site visit/inspection for the 5-year review and the April 24 evening OU1, Site 83 PRAP public meeting/RAB meeting. Partnering was scheduled for Wednesday, April 25 in New Bern.

April 25, 2012; New Bern, NC

- Tuesday, April 24 – Daytime team site visit/inspection of 5-year review sites at the Air Station; 6 – 8 PM OU1, Site 83 PRAP Public Meeting/RAB Meeting at the Havelock Tourist Center
- Wednesday, April 25 – Partnering Meeting 0800-1700

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Meeting attendee contact information:

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Doug Bitterman	CH2M HILL	757-671-6209	doug.bitterman@ch2m.com
Erica DeLattre	Rhēa	724-316-6593	erica@rhea.us
Bill Hannah	CH2M HILL	757-671-6277	.hannah@ch2m.com
George Lane	NCDENR	919-508-8462	.lane@ncdenr.gov
Will Potter	Cherry Point	252-466-5376	william.r.potter@usmc.mil
Gena Townsend	EPA	404-562-8538	townsend.gena@epa.gov
Jason Williams	NAVFAC	757-322-4088	.e.williams2@navy.mil
Nicole Cowand	NAVFAC	757-322-4768	.cowand@navy.mil
Keri Hallberg	CH2M HILL	704-543-3260	.hallberg@ch2m.com