N61414.AR.001887
NAB LITTLE CREEK
5090.3a

MEETING MINUTES FROM INSTALLATION RESTORATION PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 12 SEPTEMBER 2000 NAB LITTLE CREEK VA

9/12/2000

CH2MHILL

Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek IR Partnering Team Meeting Minutes:

Partnering Meeting – September 12-13, 2000

ATTENDEES:

Bob Schirmer/LANTDIV
Robert Weld/VDEQ
Donna Caldwell/CH2M HILL
Bruce Beach/ USEPA
Scott MacEwen/CH2M HILL
Bruce Frizzell/Tier II
Randy Sawyer/WNSTN
Matt Louth/Guest

COPIES:

FROM: Matt Louth/CH2M HILL

DATE: September 12-13, 2000

LOCATION

Linden Row Inn, Richmond, VA

MINUTES

September 12-13, 2000

9:30 Check In,

Review Groundrules.
Review assigned roles
Review previous meeting minutes

I. Parking Lot:

Parking Lot

- LANTDIV position on outfalls/water body sampling
- Former Incinerator Site near the northern part of Site 10
- Site 9 & 10 PRAP

- Second Round of Background
- ECO Subgroup Process

II Meeting Minutes/Action Items

Consensus: August Meeting Minutes accepted as edited.

III. SASR Review

Scott provided an update of the SASR and current schedules. The Master Project plans were completed and sent out to each Team member. Donna indicated that the Draft Background Report will be sent out by September 22, 2000 and comments associated with the Background Report will be resolved by the November 14, 2000 Partnering meeting. Susan Hulbert has draft FFA for legal review. She will have her comments by the second week of September. LANTDIV legal review is expected by September 15, 2000 and will include editorial comments and format comments to ensure a presentable document is provided to EPA. Anticipate setting up a meeting for legal comments and it should be scheduled for mid-November 2000. Comments for Site 9 & 10 RI/FS/HHRA will be resolved by September 12, 2000. The Site 13 revised HHRA – RAGS IS 2 will be completed in Mid-October 2000. The SWMU 7 and 8 Draft SI Report will be submitted by October 15, 2000.

IV. Site 12 SRI

The purpose of this agenda topic was to conduct Comment Response Resolution for the Navy's response to EPA comments. The goal for this discussion was to review the comments on SRI and provide preliminary responses. Scott presented a Site 12 update and reviewed the Navy's responses to the following EPA comments:

- Comment # 2 – Recommended to install an addition monitoring well for sampling. Geoprobe several locations to pinpoint where the well should go, based on the underlying clay layer. Bruce indicated that the samples should be analyzed for VOC concentrations. Scott and Bruce agreed that the additional work would be conducted as part of the FS. A7 LeRS
- Comment # 3 – Propose additional geoprobe samples for tracking the leaking sewer lines along the canal. This work would also be conducted as part of the FS. The canal has been dredged by City of Virginia Beach, who also conducted additional sampling. **Action Item** for Scott & Robert to look into the City of Virginia Beach data for screening purposes.
- Comment # 4 – This issues would be addressed under Step 3 of the Site 12 Ecological Risk Assessment.
- Comments # 5 through comment #8 were agreed upon and would be revised accordingly.
- Comment # 9 – Agree/Revise "If ground water is restricted from use and except for .. then included the rest of the original sentence…"

- Comments # 10 through comment #20 were agreed upon and would be revised accordingly.

The report will be finalized based on the discussed comments. The RI is in the Final stage with a goal to be completed by October 30, 2000.

V. Background Investigation

Donna to update Team on the conference call with Alvero. The primary comment was associated with ground water not being carried through to final process. The Team wanted EPA guidance with this ground water approach. There has been only one sampling event, January 2000. The Box plots reveal a couple samples are statistically outside the normal distribution of the data. Two monitoring wells, MW2(only well in dredge fill) and MW3 (Up-gradient for site 7 or HRSD), were not used for background study. Alta will do statistics and background evaluation on the eight remaining wells. Alvero will proceed and establish the MCL of background for site comparison and screening. The data set will be supplemented by an additional sampling during the summer months of 2001. The data will be added to the current data set and recalculated for the UTLs. The background data will be used to recognize the limitation of using the UTLs, which is not 100%. The UTLs will still be utilized, but recognize that the data can risk manage data away completely. In summary, the two wells will be omitted and the remaining 8 monitoring wells will be resample in summer 2001. For the report, an additional sampling round will be recommended.

Alta indicated that the soil data was clear cut and was able to calculate the UTLs. Alvero did not have a problem with the soil data, but was surprised by the native soils when compared to urban and fill material. Alvero long term comment focused on how to use data for site comparison. The data should not be compared parameter to parameter for site screening, but as population to population to be more representative. No changes to the soil section, the ground water section will be finished based on conference call (drop 2 wells and resample 8 wells next summer). The schedule will be to submit the Draft Report, provide review and comment, submit final report, then resample , recalculate UTLs, and finally resubmit new section of report.

VI. Tier II Update

Bruce update the Defense and State Memorandum ~~Agenda~~ of Agreement report, concerning Durwood's problem with how Team goals are formatted. An example of the work sheet was provided by Robert. The program should match the agency goals per base for scheduling purposes. This was established at least year ago.

Post quarterly goals by October 15, 2000. **Action** – Bob to update the goals and send to Scott to post on the web-site for quarterly goals, RODs, and Success stories.

Schedule next meeting for Tier II links.

VII. SWMU 8 EECA/Fact Sheet/Public Notice

Donna update the Team on status of SWMU 8 removal action. The Final EECA was passed out to each of the Team members. The Fact sheet was updated and passed out with Bruce's comments added for the dates. Soil removal was outlined on fact sheet and was update with Final SI document submitted to EPA and DEQ. Bruce commented on the other metals

to consider in removal action. The text needed to be changed to indicate that lead was most prevalent. Lead concentrations 1,000 mg/kg for EPA limits at industrial sites. Public comment period will be for 30 days. Removal action work plan for review. Donna will accept comments and Donna will email the updated Fact sheet to Team by September 14, 2000. Bruce indicated that the EECA, public comment, and work plan needed to be totally separate. Donna will correct the text for Fact sheet. Final EECA will be available for public review. Donna will make copies (approx. 100). Scott will check number of houses on aerial photos.

Donna indicated that the public notice will reference John Ballinger. Paul Landin will be the lead for the article and it will be in this Thursday's paper (September 14, 2000). **Action -** Bob provided 4 copies for information repository by September 14, 2000. **Action -** Randy will give 9 copies to John Ballinger. **Action –** John Ballinger will distribute the Fact sheet to the RAB.

In addition, the Fact sheet will be given out by hand to the neighborhood by SMWU 8. The Team conducted a brainstorming session to come up with questions and responses for John Ballinger. **Action –** Paul Landin will write-up the questions and formulate draft answers for the navy to review by September 15, 2000. **Action –** Bob review Site 13 lessons learned and apply to SWMU 8.

The following are the issues cultivated by the brainstorming session:

- Why removal performed?
- Influence on kids?
- Any danger or hazards? Conservative risk calculated
- Pets? Dogs digging?
- Dust? Dust control
- Sleeping hours? Hours of Operation? Stock Densmore (ROICC)
- Point of contact for construction?
- When? Nov. 6th
- How long has it been out there and why has the Navy waited to clean up?
- How long?

SWMU 8 Schedule: Hand out in EECA, Donna spoke with Stock Densmore and Taylor Sword to confirm the start by November 6, 2000. Two weeks prior pre-construction meeting, OHM will provide comments on work plan by October 29, 2000. The work plan will be re-issued incorporating the comments. CH2M HILL will draft a work plan for sampling and analysis by next week, and provided 30 day review. Mary Ellen (EPA) may need 6 weeks for review of confirmation sampling. Sampling and analysis plan will reference the Master Sampling Plan. **Action –** Bruce check on review period needed by Mary Ellen Schultz for SWMU 8 Sampling and Analysis Plan for 30 days and report back to the Team by September 26, 2000. **Action:** Donna mail draft SAP to M.E. Shultz.

Start : early Nov 00, take 15 days

VIII. RAB Meeting

Last RAB Meeting was February 29, 2000. Possible dates are November 13, 14, or 15. Possibly poll the RAB members to see what date is best for them and tie the RAB into our November meeting (13-15). Potential topics are:

- Site 13, ORC and update (10 min) Scott
- Ecological Process...possible workshop (10 min) Bob
- Regionalization update...(10 min) Randy
- Regulatory update DEQ/EPA update of FFA (10 min) Bruce/Robert
- Site 12, last meeting, no new items
- Background, last meeting, no new items
- Bring color Fact Sheets to RAB meeting
- Open Question & Answer (10 min)
- SWMU 8 Removal Action -photos (10 min) Donna/Matt

Action: Bob and Randy will talk with John Ballinger about scheduling the RAB meeting and possibly polling the RAB members for preferred meeting date: November 13th or 16th (The Team prefers 11/13). Randy and John will reserve Drexler Manor Conference Center for both meetings (Partnering & RAB). Reservations should be made by September 30, 2000.

New Little Creek Partnering Team member introduction will be completed at the next RAB meeting.

IX. ECO Subgroup Update

The goal of this discussion was to summarize to the Tier I Team members where the Eco process was with respect to Step 1 and Step 2, and develop formal procedures for future SERAs.

<u>The Existing Eco Process</u>

1. Formation of Tier I
2. Tasking by Tier I
3. Deliverable Development

- Tech Memo
  - Review comments
  - Comment resolution (Meetings and Conference calls)
- Deliverable submittal
- Reviews
  - Review comments
  - Comment resolution (Meetings and Conference calls)

- Tier I Link
  - Provides feedback to Tier I

4. Deliverable Approval

- Subgroup
- Tier I

Problem: The ECO process is broken.

Existing Eco Problems

1. Meeting Management

- Not prepared (no review of previous site history and previous technical issues)
- Getting "bogged" down in technical issues.
- Inconsistent documentation of comments /responses/meeting minutes.

2. Technical Issues

- Comment Process
  - Are all comments supposed to come through BTAG coordinated and EPA RPM.
  - Will EPA RPM screen comments.
  - Will formal written comments be provided.

- Comments
  - Comments received in various stages of being complete.
  - Incomplete comments mean never ending comments.
  - Comments are received at the last second.
  - Inappropriate comments not typically withdrawn when previous agreements are pointed out; they are made revised comments.
  - Comments are not consistent from one base to the next.

3. Personal Issues

- No ownership of the problem.
- Poor memory.
- Head strong personalities.

Resolution

Need to:

- Reduce the number of submittals
- Extend review times
- Limit review cycle

Recommended Eco Procedure for Step 3 at Sites 9 & 10

1. Tier I provide Eco subgroup with tasking.

2. CH2M HILL provide draft submittal for review by October 2, 2000.

3. EPA will provide interim opinion on general approach within 20 days and formal BTAG comments to the Navy RPM within 60 days.
4. Navy provides written responses within 30 days.
5. Eco subgroup given the opportunity to resolve differences according to Tier I schedule in a face-to-face meeting with a facilitator within 30 days.
6. Outstanding issues are presented to Tier I within 30 days.
7. Tier I decides on remaining area of disagreements.
8. Tier I finalizes the document.

This 8 step process will be utilized for the Site 9 & 10 Step 3 as trial process with partnering to help the Eco subgroup work as a Team. The recommendation of partnering will be made for the Eco-subgroup. The Team will proceed with Step 3 for other Sites (Site 11 & 12).

Action: Bob and Bruce check with each agency to see if Eco subgroup will partner.

Final Comment Resolution for SERA at Sites 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, and SWMU 3

The Team discussed the five responses from the Navy for BTAG's comments on the SERA for Sites 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, and SWMU 3. The goal of this discussion was to reach consensus on a resolution to the BTAG comments and to finalize Step 1 & 2 for the SERA.

- Comment # 1- Big issues should be brought up to Tier II. The conclusion will read, "The Navy agrees that this comment does not warrant any changes to the SERA. It should be noted that the Navy and the EPA are currently discussing both the 'large water body issues', as well as the issues of 'historical releases'."
- Comment # 2- The Navy will add a sentence to the last two paragraphs of the conclusions to indicate that the hazard quotion needs to be carried to Step 3. Carry through the parameters with hazardous quotion of 1 through to Step 3. Modify the comment of the last paragraph to read 90% good data, maximum value, or best data available. Good distribution the 90% available or maximum value reported. Best available value HI < 1 carry through to step 3. The document needs to be changed to document and explain what that number means 90%, best value, or what. Carry it through. Complete the table to let BTAG know what the number mean. **Action** – Scott call Bill to confirm the source of the BAF for PCB (15).
- Comment # 3- The Navy acknowledges that there is potential uncertainty with in the volume of waste, information related to uncertainty was included in the final text section of Section 9. The Navy feels that this comment does not warrant any changes to the SERA.
- Comment # 4 – While the removal of the revised sentence will not effect the conclusion of the SERA, the Navy will remove this sentence as requested.
- Comment # 5 – The Navy agrees that this comment does not warrant any changes to the SERA. However, we will expand the uncertainty discussion along the lines outlined in this comment as part of the Step 3 reports.

Bruce additional issues:

-Site 5 ground water issues, historical release to surface water will be written off in Step 3 based on background but failed as potential pathway.

-Language in Risk Assessment for Site 13 for the drainage ditch will drop out in Step 3.

Day 2 September 13, 2000

Check In

Review / Revise Agenda

X. Site 9 & 10 RI/FS/PRAP

Scott indicated that onboard draft not ready...have Bruce go over his comments. Recommended additions/changes.

- FS provides no recommendations, they are evaluates usually in PRAP.
- Alvero's comment- Site 9 and 10 Landfill boundaries were not defined. Scott indicated that soil cover was delineated. The boundary line was extended and kept a conservative estimate to the west. This needs to be clarified. In addition, these data should be in an Appendix.
- Alvero's comments – The report did not evaluate the subsurface soil data because the data was not collected. No risk evaluation of anything below 6", because the exposure to risk to a construction worker will be that the institutional control to not dig into landfill. It must be stated that it didn't evaluate the subsurface soil risk evaluation as institutional controls. Robert indicated that the LUCAPs and LUCIPs will provide site restrictions, utilities, etc. This will be looked at when the scenario comes up again, since it was not evaluated originally. Bruce recommended that changes to the institutional controls be discussed by the Little Creek partnering Team when it comes up. This should be specified in the LUCIP/LUCAP. Regulatory agencies concerning these issues should be contacted for these changes. Bob stated that the driving range, which is operated by MPR, would like to eventually install a sprinkler system. This may require additional sampling and risk assessment.
- Alvero's comment- The chemical MCL for Arsenic will change from 50 to 5 mg/kg, and the report should acknowledge that this level be considered.
- ARAR table in FS section, chemical specific, Appendix F. Bruce commented that it needs to be completed, because it would be required in ROD.

Action: Robert provide his comments by October 5, 2000 and Bruce submit his written comments by October 5th.

Action: Scott Finalize BHHRA 9 & 10 in RI/FS/HHRA document.

Action: Bruce will have HHRA comments for Site 9 & 10 by September 18, 2000.

Scott will provide a Draft Step 3 of the Ecological Assessment by October 2, 2000. This section is scheduled to be approved by January 2001. The section for Ecological Risk summary will be put into the Final report. The Public comment period will be scheduled for February 2001. The ROD will be completed by the end of March 2001.

Parking lot the Site 9 & 10 PRAP for November meeting and any other resolution comments.

XI. FY00 Goal Update and FY01 Goals

FY01 Goals

Bob lead the discussion and presented the following goals for FY01:

1. Final PRAP for Sites 9 & 10 for public comment by March 2001.
2. Signed Rods for Sites 9 & 10 by July 2001.
3. Finalize Background Report by January 2001.
4. Signed FFA by September 2001.
5. Ecological Step 3 for Site 9 & 10 completed by March 2001.
6. Final RI for Sites 11 & 13 by September 2001.
7. Final FS for Site 12 by September 2001.
8. SWMU 8 IRA removal action completed (Final Close Out Report) by June 2001.
9. Implement Site 13 Pilot Test by March 2001.
10. Site 8 IRA surface debris removal field work mobilization by September 2001.
11. Final RI Work Plan for SWMU 3 completed by August 2001.
12. Draft Site Management Plan for FY02 by April 2001.
13. Joint scoping of FY02 work by March 2001.

FY00 Goal Update

1. Submit Draft RODs for Sites 9 & 10 (9/00) (Draft ROD does not include legal review)
   12/99 - schedule reviewed during meeting - on schedule;
   2/1/00- work funded
   3/00- additional sampling required, on schedule pending results
   4/00- behind schedule by 20 days for final ROD by 9/30/00; schedule may slip further due to ecological issues and dioxin
   5/00 on schedule for 9/00, but in jeopardy due to "receiving area" discussions and background and BTAG review
   6/00 schedule delayed due to ecological concerns and lack of background in the HHRA;, PRAP now scheduled for 9/00, note draft RI/FS was submitted in June
   8/00- goal missed due to schedule delayed as a result of ERA and lack of background in the HHRA. Delay also due to RI/FS comments being delayed. Draft PRAP scheduled for 9/00
   9/00 - goal missed due to schedule delayed as a result of ERA and lack of background in the HHRA. Goal carried over to FY01.
2. Final Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment for Sites 9 & 10 (5/00)
   12/99 – on schedule pending funding ;
   2/1/00- work funded

3/00- on schedule pending results of site 9 and 10 sampling
4/00- behind schedule awaiting EPA review comments of interim submittal II
5/00 goal delayed for final HHRA in July 00 due to additional sampling at site 10 and review of interim deliverables
6/00 Schedule delayed - Submitted as draft June 12, with comments due July 30.
8/00- Comments due 8/30 with comment resolution by 9/00.
9/00 - Comments due 10/5/00.

3. Final Background Study (9/00)
   12/99 – on schedule;
   2/00- sampling completed Jan 2000.
   3/00- on schedule, may slip due to laboratory deliverable delay
   4/00- on schedule
   5/00 on schedule
   6/00 on schedule
   8/00 Draft report by 9/00, Final 11/00 goal missed by 2 months
   9/00 -Draft submitted in 9/00, Final due 12/00, goal missed by 3 months, Carried over to FY01.

4. Complete Final RI for Site 11 (draft), Site 12 (final), & Site 13 (draft) (9/00)
   12/99 - on schedule, may slip pending re-prioritization of sites.
   2/1/00
   Draft Site 11 SRI (9/00):
   3/00 on schedule
   4/00 on schedule
   5/00 on schedule
   6/00 on schedule; first interim HHRS submittal June 14
   8/00 goal missed, draft expected 12/00,
   9/00 - goal missed, draft expected 01/01, Carried over to FY01.

   Draft Site 12 SRI (1/00):
   submitted 1/00, **Goal Complete**

   Final Site 12 SRI (9/00):
   3/00 on schedule
   4/00 on schedule
   5/00 on schedule
   6/00 on schedule
   8/00 on schedule, comments from EPA 8/30, resolve comments by 9/00
   9/00- Comments resolved, Final document 10/30/00, goal complete.

   Draft Site 13 SRI (9/00):
   3/00 on schedule
   4/00 on schedule
   5/00 on schedule
   6/00 on schedule; first interim HHRS submittal June 14
   8/00 goal missed, draft expected 12/00,
   9/00 - goal missed, draft expected 01/01, Carried over to FY01.

5. Draft FFA (12/99) Submit Final FFA (9/00)
   12/99 – on schedule;
   2/1/00-
   Draft FFA (12/99) –
   1/00 slips to 2/00
   3/00 categorized all sites for FFA draft slip to 3/15/00
   4/00 on schedule revise to June 00
   5/00 on schedule for submittal June 00
   6/00 on schedule; on board review conducted, Navy preliminary prior to submittal to EPA/DEQ
   8/00- Goal Completed Draft to Navy 8/00

   Final FFA (9/00)-
   on schedule
   4/00 on schedule
   5/00 on schedule
   6/00 on schedule to submit draft final for EPA/DEQ review by 9/00
   8/00 Submit Navy comments to EPA Lawyer by 9/15 (editorial/format)
   9/00 – Final FFA submitted to lawyer by 9/00; goal completed.

6. Partnering Deliverables (4/00)
   12/99 – on schedule, completed roles and responsibilities by entity;
   2/1/00- Conflict resolution completed, two partnering deliverable remains
   3/00- On schedule member entrance/exit procedures completed
   4/00- Completed
   6/00 by end of June will be on Web site
   8/00 Completed – posted to web site June 00

7. Complete Site Management Plan (4/00)
   12/99 – on schedule, reviewed during 12/99 meeting;
   2/1/00-On board review of draft SMP scheduled for 2/29/00
   3/00- On board review, draft submittal slip to 3/15, completed
   4/00- Completed

8. Scoping of FY 01 Work (8/00)
   12/99 – on schedule;
   2/1/00- on schedule
   3/00 on schedule
   4/00 on schedule
   5/00 on schedule preliminary completed 5/00, will update 6/14/00
   6/00 will be completed by conference call (July 6, 2:00)
   8/00 Goal completed

9. Set up Eco Subgroup (11/99)
   Goal Completed 10/99;

10. Complete Ecological Risk Assessment through Step 3 for Sites 9, 10, 11, 12, & 13 (5/00)

12/99 – on schedule;
2/1/00- Work funded, Eco-sub group conference call scheduled for 2/2/00 to finalize screening values
3/00 – on schedule, steps 1 & 2 drafts submitted 1/28
4/00- behind schedule, ERA problems with comments; meeting to resolve issues 4/21; goal cannot be met
5/00 Step 2 to be completed 6/00 Step 3 on hold
6/00 Complete Step 2 by 6/00, Step 3 to be determined based on resolution of ECO issues;
8/00 Missed goal Draft Step 3 for Sites 9 & 10 to be submitted mid Sept. Other sites to be determined by end of year.
9/00 – Missed goal Draft Step 3 for Sites 9 & 10 by 10/2 and for Sites 12 & 13 by 11/15, carried over to FY01.

11. Complete Ecological Risk Assessment through Step 3 for Sites 5, 7, 8, & SWMU 3 (9/00)
    12/99 – on schedule;
    2/1/00- Work funded, Eco-sub group conference call scheduled for 2/2/00 to finalize screening values
    3/00 – on schedule, steps 1 & 2 drafts submitted 1/28
    4/00- behind schedule, ERA problems with Step 1 & 2 comments; meeting to resolve issues 4/21; on schedule
    5/00 on schedule Note: Step 2 to be completed 6/00, Step 3 on hold pending tech approach issues, overall on schedule.
    6/00 Complete Step 2 by 6/00, Step 3 to be determined based on resolution of ECO issues;
    9/00 Missed goal Draft Step 3, carried over to FY01. Draft Step 3 for all sires by 12/30.

12. Finalize Master Project Plans (3/00)
    12/99 – on schedule, comments due December 31, 1999
    2/1/00 – VDEQ submitted comments; EPA comments due 2/00
    3/00 - behind schedule
    4/00 did not meet goal, to be completed by 5/00
    5/00 comments discussed in May, final June 00
    6/00 outstanding CLP lab issue delayed until July 00
    8/00 Goal completed

13. Complete Draft Site Investigation for SWMUs 7, 8, & 2 (9/00)
    12/99 – on schedule, may slip due to re-prioritization of sites
    2/1/00-
    SWMU 2, 7 & 8 Project Plans (5/14/00): on schedule
    SWMU 2, 7 & 8 Final Report (9/29/00): on schedule
    Note: SWMU2- Possible problems with ERN funding of an active site- will discuss at next mtg. SWMU 8- disposal/initial characterization samples taken 1/00. Bob will get ready to obligate $$ to OHM for SWMU 8, based on sample results.
    3/00- work plan submitted,
    4/00- on board review of comments; on schedule
    5/00 on schedule note: SWMU 2 has been reprioritized to Appendix B site

6/00 on schedule
8/00 on schedule
9/00 – on schedule to submit by 9/00

14. Evaluate and prioritize site rankings by a risk using Navy Model (2/00)
    12/99 - on schedule, NORM model submitted to Team 11/99
    2/1/00 – Site ranking list reviewed 1/00. **Goal completed**

NEXT MEETING

November 13, 14, & 15 – Virginia Beach, VA

Start: 10:30

End: 2:00 PM

Guests: Tier II

Roles:

Chair: Scott
Timekeeper: Robert
Host: Bob
Facilatator: Bruce
Recorder: Matt
Goal Keeper: All

Guest: Donna

Conference Call: November 9, 2000 10:00 AM

Proposed Agenda:

• Background Report Comment Resolution	Donna	1 hr
• ECO (Interim Process/Tier I Eco Process)	Bob	1 hr
• RI/FS/PRAP for Site 9 & 10	Scott	2 hr
• Routine Meeting Activities	Scott	3 hr
• SI comment Resolution	Donna/Matt	1 hr
• SMP Schedule for FY 01	Matt/Scott	1 hr
• RAB Meeting (Nov. 13 or 16)		2 hr
• Tier II Update		0.5 hr

Following Meeting: December 19 & 20, Williamsburg, VA

Interim Conference call to be set up at November meeting

Future Meeting: February 13 & 14, Annapolis, MD

NEW ACTION ITEMS

9/00-1 Action– Bob schedule Little Creek Site Visit for Dawn, Randy, and Matt.

9/00-2 Action –Scott email Matt and Randy copy of Partnering Deliverable. (on web-site)

9/00-3 Action- Scott set-up Web site access for Randy.

9/00-4 Action – Bob email Randy history and work needed for SWMU 2.

9/00-5 Action – Bob coordinate with Regional Lawyer for Marine Regional Center.

9/00-6 Action - Bruce verify EPA risk using UCLs for background.

9/00-7 Action –Scott/Robert Look for City of Virginia Beach sampling data for Site 12.

9/00-8 Action – Bob provide 4th quarter goals and FY01 update to Scott to post on web page by 10/15/00.

9/00-9 Action – Bob put copies of EECA (SWMU 8) in Information Repository by 9/15/00.

9/00-10 Action - TEAM comments on OHM work plan by 9/29/00.

9/00-11. Action – Scott Agenda for November Meeting by Nov. 8th, 2000.

9/00-12 Action – Robert/Bruce Accept SWMU Report as Final Document by Nov. 14th.

9/00-13 Action – All Discuss proposed step 3 schedules with Eco subgroup reps (Bill, Chris, John, Peter)

9/00-14 Action – Randy assemble the RAB presentation by Nov. 1, 2000.

9/00 –15 Action – Randy send 9 copies of EECA and executive summary to John Ballinger for distribution to RAB by 9/15/00.

9/00 – 16 Action – Bruce check on review period needed by Mary Ellen Schultz for SWMU 8 SAP, push for 30 days, and report back to the Team by 9/26/00.

9/00 – 17 Action – Donna mail draft SAP to Mary Ellen Shultz.

9/00 – 18 Action – Hill write up questions and formulate draft answers. Provide to Navy by 9/15/00. Done

9/00 – 19 Action - Bob review Site 13 lessons learned and apply to SWMU 8.

9/00 – 20 Action – Scott confirm source of BAF for PCBs (90%).

9/00 – 21 Action – Randy work with John Ballinger to poll RAB members for preferred meeting date (Nov. 13 or 16) by 9/30/00. Reserve Drexler Manor conference center for both RAB and partnering meeting.

9/00 – 22 Action – Bruce/Robert Site 9 & 10 comments by 10/5/00.

9/00 – 23 Action – Bruce HHRA comments (Sites 9 & 10) by 9/18/00.

9/00 – 24 Action – Scott finalize BHHRA for Sites 9 & 10 in RI/FS/HHRA document.

UPDATED PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS

6/00-1 Action Scott – get aerial photo from GIS and put on Partnering Deliverable and post on Web site

Completed

6/00-2 Action Bruce/Robert send electronic example of streamed lined PRAP

Completed

6/00-3 Action Scott- finalize SASR by June 20

Completed

6/00-4 Action Bob – get date for RCRA Part B Permit Application withdrawal and provide to Bruce by 6/19.

Completed

6/00-5 Action Dawn- review EE/CA guidance for number of options.

Carryover

6/00-6 Action Dawn- establish FY01 funding for Site 8 and for NAB

Completed

6/00-7 Action Bob- identify NAB LC radiation officer.

Completed

6/00-8 Action Bruce / Robert- check on regulatory approval of the use of XRF

Completed

6/00-9 Action Bruce-check with Peter and John about ERA screening level for metals in soil

Completed, approved alternative screening values finalized in January,

6/00-10. Action Donna- provide metals results from SWMU 8 to Team by July 12.

Completed

6/00-11 Action Bob/Donna- set up tour for Dawn to familiarize her with NAB Little Creek

Carryover

6/00-12 Action Dawn - review previous meeting minutes

Completed

6/00-13 Action Scott get Dawn and Robert access to Partnering Team Tier II Web site

Completed

6/00-14 Action Bob check with John Ballinger about public meeting on August 16, public notice, and fact sheet..

Completed

6/00-15 Action Scott generate list of documents to include in Section 11 of the FFA by early next week.

Completed

6/00-16 Action Scott check on availability of hotel for August 16.

Completed

6/00-17 Action Bob check on the status of Little Creek CRP and provide Bruce an updated version of Section XXXV.

Completed

6/00-18 Action Bruce – incorporate FFA changes to be provided to Bruce by Scott, Robert, and Bob and distribute to the Team by June 26.

Completed

6/00-19 Action Bob – send FY01 scoping update by end of June

Completed

6/00-20 Donna/Scott SWMU 8 EE/CA presentation for public meeting

Completed

6/00-21 Action Donna- draft language for success story to describe the background study and address timeframes that were expedited and joint scoping /cooperation/ coordination with Alvaro to develop plan. Send to Team by 23.

Completed

6/00-22 Action Robert update goals and schedules for PRAP/RODs.

Completed

6/00-23 Action Bruce – define what a CLP lab is and look at Navy's labs to ensure they can perform similar level of CLP work (QA/QC).

Completed-

6/00-24 Action Bob Provide Bruce a fact-sheet on Navy (NFESC) lab certification.

Carryover

5/00-1 Action Scott/Donna - Prepare partnering deliverable; Donna provide deliverable to Scott

Carryover-

Completed 8/00

5/00-5 Action Donna - coordinate schedule to load validated background data into data base and generate rank order file for Bruce, and coordinate conference call between June 20 – 30 for interim deliverable of background.

Completed/carryover for conference call
Completed 8/00

5/00-14 - Action Bruce/Robert check with lawyers about how the absence of a RCRA permit at Little Creek will influence FFA language.

Carryover,

Completed 8/00

5/00-16 - Action Robert identify any NOVs for Little Creek.

Carryover

Carryover 8/00

5/00-17 - Action HILL- Prepare a "one page" memo / work plan for sample of PCBs at Site 16.

Carryover

Carryover 8/00

5/00-18 - Action Bob review SMP/FY01 budget.

Carryover

Completed 8/00

5/00-24 - Action Bruce – provide language for FFA to address the rifle range.

Carryover

Completed 8/00

5/00-27 - Action All review dioxin paper for SWMU 2

Carryover

3/00-2 Action Scott (4/18)- respond to EPA comments on ORC Pilot Test.
Carryover In progress on going (4/25) (5/00)
Completed 8/00

3/00-8 Action Donna - SWMU Report Update to include FFA sorting
Carryover SWMU Report in Progress (6/15/00) (5/00))
Completed

3/00-16 Action Rick/Bob- Check with Francine Blend about sanitary permit for exceedences at SWMU 2. Bob checked with John VanName, John Camberlin, and Brian Lee. At region, Francine deals with Norfolk, Wilke Din has responsibility for Little Creek. If SWMU 2 is under permit then will actions be addressed in the permit

Carryover

1/00-6 Robert address issue of use of "Commonwealth of VA" "VDEQ" in the FFA

Carryover

Completed8/00

4/99-7 - Bruce: Try to obtain 4 copies of EPIC report for IR Group Members
Carry over in progress

8/99 – 7 Bruce/Bob Review Marine Reserve Center status as part of NPL. Investigate if Site 4 can be excluded from the NPL.
Completed/carryover (3/30/ 00), yes can be taken out, **carryover Bob** to further discuss with attorneys. Bob noted all land has been transferred to Chief Mid-Atlantic Region; LANTDIV still responsible for environmental.
Carryover 5/00
Carryover 6/00
Carryover 8/00