

N60191.AR.000882
NAS OCEANA
5090.3a

DRAFT PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 41 23 OCTOBER 2001 NAS OCEANA VA
(DRAFT ACTING AS FINAL)
10/23/2001
PARTNERING TEAM

DS
1930

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

LOCATION: CACAPON, WVA

MEETING MANAGER: Mr. S. Milhalko
RECORDER: Mr. Don Joiner/M. Mullen
TIMEKEEPER: Mr. Jeff Harlow
MEETING HOST: Mr. Jeff Harlow
FACILITATOR: Ms. J. Davis/L. Boucher

Introduction

The 41st formal WPNSTA partnering meeting was held on October 23 and 24, 2001 at the Cacapon Lodge in Cacapon, West Virginia. The focus of the partnering meeting continues to be WPNSTA/CAX work priorities, Site 6 Sample Collection, update of NWS Yorktown SSA sites (identify sites for No Further Action), Cheatham Annex Site History Overview, review team goals for 2001 and 2002, team partnering deliverable (roles, Myer's Briggs) skills and team facilitation.

October 23, 2001 Meeting Attendance

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Bob Stroud	USEPA Region III
Steve Mihalko	VDEQ
Jennifer Davis	LANTDIV
Scott Park	LANTDIV
Don Joiner	Baker Environmental
Mary Mullen	Baker Environmental
Dave Martin	Baker Environmental
Jeff Harlow	WPNSTA Yorktown
Mr. Peter Knight	USEPA Region III
Ms. Laurel Boucher	Management Edge

Metrics

Metrics remained the same during this meeting. Metrics for FY 2001/2002 IR - work at WPNSTA and the remediation of CAX Sites were discussed.

Meeting Accomplishments

The following items/issues were discussed on October 23, 2001:

Oct 23-minutes
Page 1 of 14

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Reviewed Sept. Meeting Minutes (8:30): The team reviewed the Sept 2001 meeting minutes, including Action/Concensus Items List. The following items were noted from the minutes:

- Team agreed to review draft Sept. Meeting Minutes, and adopted the following timeline: provide comments to team 1 week prior to next meeting, and finalize minutes at next meeting.
- Reviewed Sept. Action Items: Add CAX to FFA for NWSY as an addition/amendment since the facilities are treated as one. Added to Parking Lot list to be finalized. Scott Park read draft language provided by Navy legal staff.
- Team agreed to update goals on website. Coordinate with J. Sachdev on this.
- Agenda for next meeting.
- Dave Martin provided an update on status of Data for Site 6 sampling. This will continue until resolved.
- Team agreed to discuss Groundwater Conference Opportunities at Dec 2001 meeting.
- Team agreed to schedule CAX site visit as part of the December 2001 meeting.

Team reviewed proposed CAX NFA Sites (Scott Park/Don Joiner presented (9:45):

- Dave Martin provided an update on Yorktown SSA sites proposed for NFA and a Draft summary document with signature page. The group agreed that due to the length of the discussion, this topic would be continued during a conference call at a future date.
- For SSA 3, Peter Knight questioned the absence of sediment samples along the 1,000 foot drainage swale and support for a NFA decision. Team needs to evaluate the need for sediment samples. The Team agreed to table the discussion pending the December Meeting site visit. With respect to SSA 4 Summary, Peter Knight requested that the document language be revised to use quantifiable terms instead of terms such as "similar to background levels" to improve support of the NFA decision. Same language revisions apply to SSA 5 and specifically refer to which USEPA Region III screening criteria were exceeded (human health, ecological or both) (See third bullet of SSA 5 pg. 1 summary).
- Team scheduled a **conference call** to discuss SSA NFA site closeouts. **Nov. 13 10 a.m.** Don to initiate call

RAB Presentation Site 18 (Letty Savage added via conference call) (11:15)

- No human health risks, minimal ecological risks (metals)
- Team to forward comments to 1998 ROD and the RI to Letty, Peter Knight to check on existence of BTAG letter. Afterwards, the Team is to decide whether to continue with a Public comment period on the ROD as a follow-on to the RAB meeting.

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

- Peter Knight commented Mercury concentrations & relationship to Site 18. It appears that Site 18 is not the source of Mercury. Jeff Harlow suggested an approach of including tracking mercury distribution in the Lee Pond investigation and to track mercury concentration to find the source area. Peter Knight agreed with this approach.. Bob Stroud to provide comments. **CONSENSUS:** The Team agreed to separate the Mercury issue from the Site 18 ROD.
- Comments to PRAP received from Jeff and Scott, Letty has incorporated.

2001 – 2002 Goals (13:30)

- Team discussed the approach to prioritizing the goals using criteria of funding issues, review times (Bob Stroud), ROD signatures (final), Schedule driven projects (LTM type, SMP), Staffing requirements (Baker and Partnering Team)
- NWSY Existing Funded projects
 - RAC Work – NWSY
 - RA-Site 2 (2/15/02) (Second Qtr. Funding)
 - RA-Site 8, SSA 14 (2/15/02) (Second Qtr. Funding)
 - RA-Site 20 (2/28/02) (Second Qtr. Funding) (Maybe different site)
 - RA-Site 23 (4/30/02) (Third Qtr. Funding)
 - RA-Site 24 (4/30/02) (Third Qtr. Funding)
- NWSY IR Work (CLEAN)
 - CTO 213 2/28/02 GW OU I (Second Qtr Funding)
 - GW RI/FS Sites 8, 22, SSA 14 (3/30/02) (Second Qtr Funding)
 - CTO 214 Site 25 & 26 (3/30/02) (Second Qtr Funding)
- CAX Existing Funded projects
 - RAC Work – CAX
 - IPA Site 1 (1/30/02) (Second Qtr Funding)
- CAX IR Work (CLEAN)(First Qtr)
 - RI/FS Sites 5 (Maybe a different site) & 11 (10/15/01) (First Qtr)
 - GIS Implementation (10/15/01) (First Qtr)
 - Verification Sampling/Doc for NFA Sites (11/30/01) (First Qtr)
- The team discussed the approach to prioritizing the goals and decided to hold a **conference call (Scott, Jennifer & Don) by 10/31/01** to prioritize goals based on funding and distribute to the group by 10/31/01. Finalize during conference call 11/13/01. Funding schedules listed above.
- The team discussed the review schedule requirements for state and USEPA Region III attorneys (goal is to complete 1 ROD/quarter).

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Site 18 Timeline (14:15)

- Draft RI (2, 8, SSA 14) submitted July 1998 but the Team has to find, review and address any comments received.
- Peter Knight – found one letter (NOAA Letter) on his hard drive but no draft BTAG letter or comment response letter (BTAG letter consists of Peter Knight's and John McCloskey's comments combined and in 1998 would have been forwarded under Bob Stroud's signature. Peter Knight is concerned about whether or not comments were generated, submitted to the team and addressed. Letty Savage will check Baker files and contact Rich Hoff to locate comments/response. Peter Knight will e-mail comments to list of partnering team members.
- Letty Savage received formal comments from Gannett Fleming and Dynamac (CTO 363 RI). Letty will e-mail comments to the Team.
- Bob Stroud will review his partnering notes to identify whether there are previous comments on RI. Bob Stroud requested that Peter Knight's comments be distributed to the team for review.
- Jeff Harlow suggested that the team review the comments prior to establishing a timeline for Site 18. The Team reviewed the Site 18 timeline attached to Sept. Meeting Minutes.

Bob Stroud requested that timeline for Draft Final PRAP and Draft ROD be extended 30 days.

- Scott Park, Steve Milhalko and Bob Stroud suggested that the team review the comments prior to providing comments on the Draft Final PRAP and ROD.
- The team agreed to bring comments to the December meeting (proposed that meeting be held Dec. 3, 4, & 5).
- Don Joiner is to check old meeting minutes for references to comments on the RI.

Open Discussion and LUCIP/LUCAP Update Tier III (Meeting with LANTDIV P. Smith, P. Rakowski) (15:00)

Jeff Harlow led an open discussion including the LUCIP/LUCAP.

- This issue is global not just NWSY
- Schedule unknown of when LUCIP/LUCAP will exit the Tier III process
- NWSY started demolition of biocell, some discharge of red water, potential that treatment may not have achieved levels desired but confirmation samples indicate residuals meet demolition levels
- Third cycle of treatment starts week of Oct. 27, 2001

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

- The Team needs to evaluate placing treated soil on Site 6 with respect to ecological issues raised by John McCloskey during previous partnering meetings. Agricultural samples collected by Natural Resource representative (ph~7.6, Ca high)
- Check on previous parking lot lists of coordinating with USFWS on wetland mitigation and restoring Site 6 to wetland habitat. NWSY to assist with backfilling and USFWS with planting.
- Peter Knight asked about the rationale for not collecting floor or wall samples. Jeff Harlow said excavation caused caving of excavation pit walls.
- Peter Knight asked about the status of fish data collected previously from Felgates Creek. Status was presented by Carl (Dynamac). Bob Stroud to check on this.

RAB Topics November 2001 (15:45)

- SSA Report – what’s complete?
- Goal Summary – what’s coming next?
- EPA Presentation (Feb. 2002)
State Presentation (Feb. 2002)
- Eco-risk tape (40 minutes), possible for future RAB, Ed Carl has tape
- Peter’s presentation

December Meeting

The team discussed moving the meeting start date ahead one day to Dec. 3 starting at 12:00, condense meeting to two days and/or use Dec. 6 for site visits, meet jointly half-day with NAS Oceana of all of the above.
CONSENSUS: The team agreed to start at 12:00 noon Monday, December 3, 01 (lunch on own prior to starting) and meet through Wednesday evening with site visits Thursday December 6, 2001.

October 24, 2001

Z-Model (Laurel) 8:20

Laurel presented Z-model, a decision making tool, for new members on methods of getting to decisions. This method incorporates different decision-making and information gathering skills and preferences

1. State the facts/background
2. State the goal or problem, get consensus on goal of discussion
3. State the desired outcome, brainstorm options

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

4. Evaluate options from brainstorm, combine ideas and delete/add options as needed, check for team comfort level & consensus

Follow steps in numerical order, watch out for those who want to go from step 1 to 4 without using steps 2 & 3

CAX Site Update (8:15) (John McCloskey via conference call)

Dave Martin led a discussion regarding update of CAX sites, based upon CAX SMP 2002/2003 starting on page 2-23 and a two-page summary table of sites. 12 Sites and 5 AOCs; refer to the SMP for details on each site

- Goal: Propose sites that can be grouped for NFA/EE/CA
Prioritize Sites that will need RI/FS/PRAP/ROD, Additional investigation/EE/CA
- Goal Revision: The Team decided to review each site, state what was needed for the December site visit, the team's approach to the site during meeting, and what information is needed for each site to prepare for the December site visit in support of a final decision for NFA.

Brainstorming: The team differed on the approach to establishing the site status (NFAs first versus review in numerical order) and the level of detail to be reviewed during the meeting. **CONSENSUS:** Dave Martin, as topic leader, and other members wanted to focus on reviewing sites proposed for NFA, then review sites during site visit & what the team wants to do during the site visit (drive by versus walk the site).

Overall Goal for site visit will be to determine the location of each site.

CONSENSUS: For site visit, the team decided that a technical guide to the sites would be prepared that incorporates previous information on the site, the Partnering Team discussion, approach to the site, data gaps. This package is to include: site descriptions, maps, previous sampling locations, aerial photographs with site locations/approximate boundaries and for some sites a proposed sampling plan.

Site 2 – Contaminated Food Disposal Area

Details provided in SMP summary. The team discussed details of site, IAS recommended NFA, Estimated 1100 yards waste based upon 50 ft. diameter by 15 ft. deep pit. The team reviewed an aerial photograph that illustrated location and approximate boundary of sites.

Consensus – team thinks NFA for site review site at end of site visit

John M. asked whether DEQ would regulate the site as a landfill. S. Milhalko site was pre-RCRA and not an open dump as waste was not at surface. S. Milhalko stated no issues for DEQ.

Site 3 – Submarine Dye Disposal Area

Revise last sentence of description: replace “no longer” with “doesn't”

Jeff suggested that the MSDS be checked for fate, degradation and transport information on fluorescein dye

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Consensus: The team decided to review the site at the end of the site visit

Site 4 – Medical Supplies Disposal Area

Proposed EE/CA

Consensus: The team wants to use the site visit to determine the extent of the debris. S. Milhalko stated that DEQ would require that site would either have to have removal with backfill or cover such that it would not be uncovered again.

The team decided to visit the site with a priority of evaluating an EE/CA approach. Review as a funding issue

Small area

Recommend removal action and additional cover

SSA status proposed

Youth Pond PCB issue may alleviate site priority

Site 5 – Photographic Chemicals Disposal Area

May have difficulty locating this site

Consists of a marl pit (clay shell mixture that can be porous and varying transmissivity)

Groundwater flow probably toward Penniman Lake (1000 feet). Penniman will be investigated later (PCBs)

S. Park stated that predecessors on this facility may have additional information (Shirmer); the team needs to evaluate size of area, location of area, potentially collect samples downgradient of site, ID sampling scheme during the site visit

Thought to be upgradient of Site 11 and that discharge may be to Penniman Lake

Site 6 – Spoiled Food Disposal Area

750 cy disposed of in 1970

Consensus: drive by site to determine location at end of site visit;

S. Milhalko asked about groundwater sampling, 3 wells at Site 10 were sampled but not directly along gradient, Jeff H. says No.

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Site 7 – Old DuPont Disposal Area

Rob Thompson, based on Nansmond Ordnance Depot experience, concerned that burn area for explosives may be on beach near the cabins close to a possible landfill area near river, may be eroded due to proximity to the river. Suggest that removal action be conducted due to erosion issues and implement erosion control. Probably a small second area, suggest that segregate into a Site 7 and Site 7 Area A. Suggested that due to erosion control issue that higher priority be placed on the site. Can removal action be coordinated with Site 1 removal - funding may prevent this.

Most likely this site will proceed to RI/FS

Schedule along with Site 4 visit due to proximity.

Site 8 – Landfill Near Building CAD 14

Was clothing contaminated or chemically imprenated – Jeff H. said No because this was supply center

Currently covered by a quonset hut with a concrete slab floor and footings (to be confirmed by Jeff or during site visit),

Baker update mapping with building

Site 9 – Transformer Storage Area

Steve M. suggested that because the site will go to an RI/FS that details on site do not have to be discussed.

Jeff H. suggested that Site 9 be expanded to include Youth Pond (near Site 4) since it was impacted by storm drainage from Site 9 to Youth Pond. Removal action at Site 9 removed PCB contaminated soil. Storm drains by design are self-cleaning and may not contain PCBs. Steve M. suggested that concrete pipe joints in storm drain may require sampling. Jeff H. suggests PCBs have been transported and discharged into Youth Pond and are widely dispersed within the Pond.

Site 10 – Decontamination Agent Disposal Area

NFA recommended

Disposal in '82

Obtain additional chemical information on DS-2 (Weston report listed components were: ethylene glycol, sodium hydroxide and a 3rd compound (check with Don))

Included in Weston study, John M. suggested that the team investigate the fate, degradation and transport information for DS-2 (MSDS), what is potential for transport via groundwater

If DS-2 not found trace individual components listed in Weston Report

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Site 11 – Bone Yard

RI/FS recommended

Jeff H. suggest that include in Penniman Lake PCB issue investigation as Site 11 most likely source for PCBs

Prior to Consensus the team agreed to evaluate whether to include Penniman Lake in Site 11 during the site visit

Site 12 – Disposal Site Near Water Tower

Typo in summary table of handout, IAS recommended NFA but table indicates “RI/FS”

CONSENSUS: the team proposed that approach be a SSA and during site visit evaluate need for this, For site visit, evaluate a proposed sampling plan to be evaluated during site visit, prepare site map for site visit

AOC 1 – Scrap Metal Dump

For site visit, prepare a site map with previous sampling locations, evaluate the extent of sampling required along the length of the ravine for removal action

Close to Site 12

B. Stroud will request presence of P. Knight and J. McCloskey for site visit

AOC 2 – Dextrose Dump

Correct name in CAX SSP summary table

Jeff H. burial to 15 feet, partial removal action conducted, appeared to be buried empty drums, removal action needs to be completed to about 15 feet, suggests trenching to identify depth of disposal

Dextrose bottles and respirator cartridges (failed TCLP)

Potential trenching confirmatory sampling, boundary seems to be well defined

AOC 4 – IR Site 4 – Medical Supplies Disposal Area

Jeff suggested that AOC 3 (metal bands disposal area across tributary from AOC 4) be made part of AOC 4

Scott requested that a cost estimate be prepared and if within range then can proceed

Need to correct in SMP if we do, investigate during site visit

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Consensus: During the site visit, this approach will be evaluated and a decision is to be made

AOC 5 – Debris Area

Consensus: Group decided to combine AOC 5 and Site 1, eliminate AOC 5

Penniman AOC

What is Rob Thompson's concern (similar waste seen at Nansemond – initiators); Rob wants to determine whether the initiators were transported from/to Nansemond/CAX

Also similar waste at Site 7

Drum Storage – Identified from old Penniman photos – wooden barrels

1999 Weston collected 2 samples, high Arsenic at 24 inch bgs

Peter's concern is that 2 samples are not enough for an area of unknown size and depth

For Site Visit – determine what information is available (LANTDIV, DEQ & Baker predecessors), confirm and decide what approach to take with site. Why were only 3 of 5 AOCs addressed?

Some funding in late 2002 and 1003 for investigation

Baker to draft a proposed sampling plan based on information obtained from predecessors

A conference call will be held to discuss this

Draft
 October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

ACTION LIST

No.	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTCOME	DATE
1	Ensure FFA amendment is in line with existing FFA language and send to regulators	Scott	A	Dec. Meeting
2	Clear FFA addition/amendment w/State and EPA legal check on "official" documentation	Bob/ Steve	A	Dec. Meeting
3	Site 6 Data - Coordinate combine OHM/IT & Baker Data	Baker	A	<i>ON-GOING</i>
4	Formulate LUCIP comments and provide to Don, Don e-mail LUCIPs	Tea/Don	A	11/26/01 10/30/01
5	Confirm no sediment data for SSA 3, investigate correlation of sediment data for Site 3	Dave	A	Dec. Meeting
6	SSA 3, 4, 5, and 21. Revise SSA presentation to present significant data findings summary	Baker	A	Conf. Call Nov. 13 10:00 AM & prior to Dec. Meeting
7	Set-up SSA Closeout conference call for 11/13 and send notification	Don	A	11/5/01
8	Send comments (circa 1998) on R I for Sites 8, 18, SSA14 to Letty Savage (Peter Knight has no comment response letter on Site 18)	Team & (BTAG)	A	11/14/01
9	Address potential Hg issues separately from Site 18 ROD (possibly associate with Lee Pond)	Team	C	10/23
10	Meet on Prioritization of FY01/02 Goals & 10 sites that will require ESDs (based on funding, review times, ROD signatures, Schedules (LTM projects), Distribute to group for comment, Can/should we list on "final" documents/actions, & Identify sites that requires ESDs, distribute to group for comment	Scott, Don, Jeff, Jen	A	10/31/01
11	Agenda for 11/14 RAB Meeting	Jeff	A	
12	Provide Comments on Site 18 ROD by 12/3/01 - Steve - "No comment at this time"	Team	A/C	12/3/01
13	P. Knight to e-mail comments to Team & Letty S., Letty to send response to comments to Peter, Letty to call Peter morning of 11/1/01	Peter, Letty	A	11/1/01
14	Track down fish data from Felgates Creek - Mary - Dave M has this data	Stroud/Dave	A	12/3/01
15	December partnering meeting starts at 12:00 noon through 12/5/01 Wednesday evening followed by site visits as necessary on 12/6/01	Jeff/Scott	C pending NASO team schedule	12/3/01
16	Add Open Discussion as a standard Agenda item for next three meetings, then as needed	Team	C	12/3/01

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

17	Package for Site Visit to include: Site descriptions, maps/aerials with site location & boundary, previous sampling locations, possible site location/boundary, update Site 8 figure with location of quonset hut, Youth Pond – PCB sediment samples were these taken @ depth?	Baker (Dave)	A	12/3/01
18	Include Penniman Lake in Site 11? Investigate during site visit		A	12/3/01
19	Site map with proposed sampling plan for site visit for Sites 5, 9, 12, AOC 1 and Penniman	Baker	A	12/3/01
20	Eliminate CAX AOC 5 and include with Site 1	Team	C	10/24/01
21	Find information on "agreement among LANTDIV, VDEQ, and Baker from predecessors, why were only 3 of 5 AOCs addressed? Prepare sampling plan for Penniman AOC, set conference call to discuss	Team & Don	A	12/3/01
		Jeff - was there a site visit w/ Shana Wilcox, Rob Thompson that this was agreed to - prior to Dec 1997.		
22	Provide Review comments to Don J on LUCIP			11/26/01-
23	Provide copy of schedule for next meetings to P. Knight	Baker	A	12/3/01

Pending
DOD/
EPA
Resolution

PARKING LOT ITEMS (10/23/01)

- ~~Define Metrics, what are they?~~
- Potential FFA amendment/addition of CAX to NWSY FFA
- Check with J. Sachdev on updating website and posting minutes, goals
- Add attachments to FFA for CAX sites (for Feb 02 meeting agenda item)
- Mentoring/Training for new members on team structure – subgroups Tier II/III
- ~~Honser – "To be or not to be"~~

FACILITATOR FEEDBACK

Lacked Focus – didn't get to goal until end of discussion time (agenda items too broad?), narrow topics, add more time

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Atmosphere (group mood) – half team involved in discussion, need more even participation

Role sharing – good, lost track of time, all participated in focusing discussion and record keeping

Dynamics – sidebars minimal, no conflict, need to be more cognizant of subgroup roles, roles within group – appropriate for topics and group members familiarity with topics

Subliminal behavior – open discussion good

Tool Box/Ground Rules – good

Co-facilitator feedback

Dynamics – topic leader should put together goal of discussion on a flip chart, leader role is shared among team members but danger is that there is no one leading the discussion

Be clear about who is to lead on responsibility for action items (individual instead of just Baker)

Interactions – sense of humor, sharing of group meals

Ground rules – try to be on time – frustrating to some members

MEETING +/- Δ

+	Δ
Meeting manager	Record keeping & Sidebars – difficulty with record keeping during SSA discussion – several conversations

Draft
October 23-24, 2001
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CHEATHAM ANNEX

Peter's back	Clearer expectations
Location, location, location	Too much on the agenda (need R & R)
Recognize our successful habits	
got a lot done	
Jennifer's facilitation of Dave's presentation on CAX	
NAS Oceana flexibility with time	
Laurel's assistance in meeting & guidance	
Refocus on partnering issues	
Dinner on 10/23/01	
The team let Dave do the CAX presentation his way (not without angst)	
More personality	

NEXT PARTNERING MEETING

DATE: December 3-5, 2001

LOCATION: CAX

MEETING MANAGER: Ms. J. Davis

RECORDER: Mr. Don Joiner

TIMEKEEPER: Ms. M. Mullen

MEETING HOST: Ms. Jeff Harlow

FACILITATOR: Mr. J. Harlow

NWS YORKTOWN/CAX/NAS OCEANA PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41

October 24 - 25, 2001
Joint Meeting Minutes

Introduction

The joint partnering meeting was held on October 24 - 25, 2001 at Cacapon, WV. To start the meeting the team reviewed the agenda items. The revised agendas are provided below. The following participants were in attendance personally or by conference call as team members or the Tier II link for this meeting:

Name	Organization
Will Bullard (conference call, Tier II update)	Navy
Jennifer Davis	LANTDIV
Tim Reisch	LANTDIV
Scott Park	LANTDIV
Jeff Harlow	WPNSTA Yorktown
Bob Stroud	USEPA Region III
Steve Mihalko	VDEQ
Peter Knight	BTAG
Laurel Boucher	Management Edge
Don Joiner	Baker Environmental
Mary Mullen	Baker Environmental
Dave Martin	Baker Environmental
Jack Robinson	CDM Federal Programs Corporation
Jayanti Sachdev	CH2M HILL

Revised Agendas

Date	Agenda Item	Leader	Purpose/Goal	Time
10/24 1130 hrs	Check-In & Review Agenda	Steve	Standard Meeting Format - More Efficient Meeting	30 min.
1230 hrs	Partnering Deliverable Update	Laurel	Update the following sections: -Partnering meeting roles (30 min) -Member/subgroup responsibilities (45 min)	1 hr. - 15 min.
1330 hrs	Lunch	Team	More chit chat	60 min
1430 hrs	Partnering Deliverable Update, continued	Laurel	Update the following sections: -Finalizing Baker roles (30 min) -Myer's Briggs (60 min)	1 hr. - 30 min.
1600 hrs	End Day 1			

Date	Agenda Item	Leader	Purpose/Goal	Time
10/25 0800 hrs	Welcome	Steve	Warm-up and settle in.	10 min.
0810 hrs	Check In	Steve	Standard Meeting Format - More Efficient Meeting	10 min.
0820 hrs	Review Agenda	Steve	Focus on what needs to be accomplished on Day 2	10 min.
0830 hrs	Tier II Update	Will Bullard	Tier II news and notes	30 min.
0900 hrs	Partnering Deliverable Update	Laurel	Update the following sections: -Conflict Resolution	1 hr.
1000 hrs	Break	Team	Renewal	15 min.
1015 hrs	Partnering Exercise	Laurel	Team Bonding	2 hr.
1215 hrs	Facilitator Feedback	Laurel	Feedback	15 min.
1230 hrs	Agenda Building for Joint Meeting	Jen	Agenda for Next Time	15 min.

Meeting Responsibilities (both days):

MM: S. Mihalko

Rec: D. Joiner/M. Mullen

Time: J. Harlow

Fac: L. Boucher & J. Davis (NWSY a.m.)/B. Stroud (Joint Mtg p.m.)

**NWS YORKTOWN/CAX/NAS OCEANA
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
October 24 - 25, 2001
Joint Meeting Minutes, cont.**

Partnering Deliverable Update

Objective: Update the Partnering Deliverable.

Desired Outcome: Revised Partnering Deliverable.

Revised Partnering Meeting Roles

Coach

1. Train team members in the art of facilitation
2. Make observations as necessary, sidebar in or out of the room
3. Laugh with us
4. Attend as requested

Host

1. Identify meeting access requirements
2. Provide meeting logistics (maps, transportation information, hotels, per diem, refreshments, meeting room, flip charts, tape, markers, audio visual equipment)
3. Recommend activities/ meals, etc.

Meeting Manager

1. Manages the agenda
2. Conducts meeting and acts as meeting chairperson
3. Prepares the agenda before the agenda conference call
4. Confirms the agenda one week prior to the next meeting - QA/QC with recorder for final dissemination
5. Notifies meeting attendees about changes in meeting status, if any
6. Consensus building - seeks consensus/closure from all members of the team
7. Encourages participation

8. Identifies new member, announces guests and sponsors
9. Announce unannounced guests, if appropriate
10. Focus purpose and goals of agenda topics

Timekeeper

1. Remind team of time during meeting
2. Give 5-minute warning when appropriate
3. Negotiates "wrap-up" time during team's discussions
4. Keeps the meeting moving
5. For complex discussions, provide a "roadmap" (e.g. time allotted for topic, consensus, etc.)
6. Manage access

Facilitator

1. Develop partnering exercises/tools and obtain external expertise and resources
2. Use the Facilitator Checklist
3. Help team use team decision tools
4. Assure ground rules and roles and responsibilities are being kept
5. Look for and call "plops"
6. Encourage even participation
7. Ensure summaries are recorded on flip charts
8. Use conflict resolution process to resolve conflicts
9. Be "honest" and forthcoming with all team members
10. Provide real time feedback with minimal impact on the meeting
11. Identify partnering tools as needed by the team
12. Provide feedback at the end of each meeting as part of the daily plus/delta

13. Help to maintain focus on agenda topic
14. Help the team come to closure or consensus

Core Members

1. Participate in consensus process
2. Meeting agenda builders
3. Perform meeting roles
4. Can designate proxy authority to other core or adjunct members
5. Can designate the formation of subgroups and identify issues to be addressed
6. Can act as a subgroup link
7. Prepare for meeting
8. Serve as guest sponsors and are responsible for going over "Guest Participation Summary" with guest
9. Need to participate in every meeting

Recorder

1. Compiles list of agenda items, forwards to meeting manager following the meeting
2. Recorder can function as "host" but does not share in other meeting roles
3. Takes/keeps meeting minutes; maintains team minutes/log book
4. Clarifies all points of and objections while recording minutes
5. Sends minutes to all Tier I members prior to the next meeting and post on the Partnering website
6. Collects comments on minutes, revises and distributes accordingly
7. Distributes necessary meeting/partnering deliverables to all new members
8. Maintains and updates team member address list
9. Nag the team to review the meeting minutes prior to the meeting

Adjunct Members

1. Participate in consensus process when appropriate
2. Notify a core member (if) is unable to attend
3. Can designate proxy to other core or adjunct member
4. Can act as a subgroup link
5. Prepare for meetings
6. Expected to participate in specific agenda items; however, does not need to attend every partnering meeting or entire meeting

Subgroups

1. Each subgroup will have a core or adjunct member serve as a link between the subgroup and the partnering team
2. Each subgroup should have a core member RPM included in all meetings and conference calls
3. Each subgroup will meet on an "as-needed" basis. Participants will include members of each partnering organization's technical support staff as necessary and may include others knowledgeable in the subgroup's area of expertise.
4. Subgroup participants that are not core or adjunct members of the NWS Yorktown/CAX/NAS Oceana Partnering Team will attend partnering meeting as guests when their attendance is required.

No subgroups currently.

Technical Members/Guest

1. Prepare for meeting
2. Participate in pertinent discussions
3. Do not participate in consensus process
4. Will attend partnering meetings as guests when their attendance is required.

CONSENSUS: We agree on the partnering meeting roles and responsibilities as defined here. We will utilize "honset" for team member revised deliverable copies and "honest" for distribution outside Tier I membership.

CONSENSUS: We accept the Partnering membership roles and responsibilities as defined here, including the identification of members.

Revision of Member/subgroup responsibilities

What addition, deletions or modifications do we recommend to the Partnering Member Definitions?

Clarifying Questions

What are the core, adjunct, technical and sub members, using these definitions?

NWS YORKTOWN/CAX/NAS OCEANA PARTNERING TEAM MEMBERS

Core	Adjunct	Technical
NWS Yorktown		
Scott Park Jennifer Davis Jeff Harlow Bob Stroud Steve Mihalko Don Joiner Mary Mullen	John McCloskey Peter Knight	Dawn Ioven Bruce Rundell Jay Newbaker Ed Corl Heidi Maupin Karen Wood John Malinowski Letty Savage Dave Martin
NAS Oceana		
Tim Reisch Jeff Harlow Bob Stroud Steve Mihalko Jayanti Sachdev Jack Robinson	John McCloskey Peter Knight	Steve Petron Laura McCarthy Ronnie Warren Betty Ann Quinn Holley Rosnick Jack Hwang

Myer's Briggs Evaluation

NWS YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM
MBTI TYPE TABLE

ISTJ Peter Mary	ISFJ John Steve	INFJ	INTJ
ISTP Bob Dave	ISFP	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
ESTJ Jennifer Jeff	ESFJ Scott Don	ENFJ	ENTJ

SJ-8	NT-0	I-6	E-4
SP-2	NF-0	S-10	N-0
		T-6	F-4
		J-8	P-2

NWS YORKTOWN PARTNERING TEAM
TEAM MBTI SWOT ANALYSIS

PARTNERING EXERCISE: MBTI ANALYSIS "SWOT" (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats)

From the MBTI perspective....

1. What is the team's strength?
 - All "sensing", Like to work with facts, concrete thinkers
 - Balance of thinking and feeling members
 - 4 SJs that should work well together - Make decisions

2. What is the team's weakness?
 - Not balanced (no N's): can't plan far into future easily

3. What is the team's greatest opportunity?

- Make decisions quickly and move on
- Have Jennifer, then Mary and then Dave help with “N” strengths

4. What is the team’s greatest threat?

- If members leave the team it upsets the team balance
- Team has lots of SJ’s – lots of General Patton’s that go in a direction and may not be the right direction

**NAS OCEANA PARTNERING TEAM
MBTI TYPE TABLE**

ISTJ Peter	ISFJ John Steve	INFJ Jack	INTJ Jayanti
ISTP John	ISFP Steve?	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP Tim
ESTJ Jeff	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ

**NAS OCEANA PARTNERING TEAM
MBTI TYPE BREAKDOWN**

SJ: 4	NT: 2	I: 6	E: 2
SP: 1	NF: 1	S: 5	N: 3
		T: 5	F: 3
		J: 6	P: 3

**NAS OCEANA PARTNERING TEAM
TEAM MBTI SWOT ANALYSIS**

1. From an MBTI perspective, what is the greatest strength of this team?

- Balance (i.e. Male / Female, detailed vs. big picture, N/S personalities [goal / process orientation], F/T [feeling / thinking].
- Have all 4 types of temperaments
- Have an NF (built-in facilitator)

2. From an MBTI perspective, what is the greatest weakness of this team?

- I/E as it pertains to the roles that we are in:
 - Navy - contractor, regulators
- No FPs (feeling/spontaneity)

3. From an MBTI perspective, what is the greatest opportunity?

- Despite varying personalities, can all work together to meet goals agreed upon.

4. From an MBTI perspective, what is the greatest threat?

- NTs leaving team.
- NF leaving team.

Tier II Update – Will Bullard

Tier II topics for Team
Joint meeting – May 16 and 17, 2002 at the Bolger Center. It is up to the team whether they want to hold a partnering session either before or after the meeting. Let someone know if that is the case. Unknown whether rooms would be available.
Start preparing the presentations for the joint meeting.
Provide suggested topics for the joint meeting ecological and legal panels – provide to Bob Schirmer or Doug.
Dispute over Pentagon and EPA on how to handle IC language in DDs is holding up cleanup at many sites.
Still looking for success stories for brochure.
Establish a place for a website for posting different team’s success stories.
Update team goals on the website.
Change structure with partnering facilitation – up for debate
Send any updates to meeting dates/locations to Will following this meeting
December 3 and 4 th , 2001 – next Tier II meeting. Next is March 12 and 13 th , 2001
Team topics for Tier II
Topic for joint meeting legal panel – how is the LUCIP/LUCAP language being resolved for DDs.

Partnering Deliverable Update, continued

Objective: Update the Partnering Deliverable.

Desired Outcome: Revised Partnering Deliverable and, collectively as a team, resolve a conflict.

Conflict Resolution Section/Joint Partnering Exercise

Conflict Resolution Process:

1. Acknowledge that there is a conflict.
2. Identify / name the conflict.
-Decide if a 15-minute cooling off time-out is needed.
3. A neutral party acts as facilitator and mediator of discussion and “goes to the board”.
4. Each party in the conflict gets a chance to be heard, uninterrupted.
5. Neutral party “peels the onion” to get the real / underlying concerns/issues.
6. Other team members help by asking clarifying questions to get to real concerns.
7. Generate options based on real concerns.

8. "Flesh out" modify options through discussions.
9. Seek/obtain agreement among the options.
10. Determine if follow-up action is needed, or elevate to the Tier II.

Conflict: The use of the word "honest" vs. "honset" in the partnering deliverable.

Each party in the conflict expressed their thoughts (bullet form on flipcharts):

Use of the word "honest":

- Someone taking the misspelling as a reflection of the team's work.
- Attention to detail.
- What else is the team doing, if they can't even spell.
- Question relationship by knowing there is an error.
- Don't think the "joke" needs to be documented. We can just say it and keep it to our selves.
- The issue is not affecting me to the point that I feel the need to walk out.
- It is not professional.
- If the deliverable reaches those outside the team; others will not get the history/meaning.
- Appropriate places for fun/levity - not necessarily in a document that may go outside the group/team.
- Does not mean that we should not continue to have fun. Recommend correct spelling and have "honset" remain inside.
- Later review is seen as a typo.

Use of the word "honset":

- Have history with word; more than just misspelling one time.
- Some of the nuances that Don mentioned.
- Does not show unprofessionalism.
- Would not be a reflection of the group - has meaning to some members to this group.
- Noting the misspelling would highlight it even more.
- This spelling is unique to the group (not all, but many).
- It's part of the group history.
- Don't see it as flippant.
- Team assumes the misspelling would be interpreted as typo; however others may not.
- Those outside of the team would not see it as a reflection of the team.
- Got history in it.
- Need to maintain something of the past that the team may want to hold on to.
- Sense of identity to team is important.
- Explained by "history" to not correct.

"PEELED the ONION" TO IDENTIFY THE TRUE ISSUES / NEEDS

- Need to preserve something from the past.
- Need to present ourselves "professionally".
- Need for a mechanism in which we can be forthcoming/comfortable.
- Need to work as a team without "catering" to individuals/need to meet team as well as individual needs.
- Need for team participation to show up in a certain way.
- Level of participation is dependent upon the team.

ACCEPTED ALTERNATIVE TO RESOLVE CONFLICT

Submit the revised partnering deliverable to the team with the word "honset". Also have a copy of the revised partnering deliverable for distribution outside of the team (when and if necessary), employing the word "honest".

Facilitator Feedback (Laurel/Bob)

- At this meeting, had a chance to learn about honesty and relationships in partnering. This level of honesty does not exist within most teams (only the 2nd group to get to this level).
- Facilitator was comfortable enough to "confront" the group. If the relationship is strong enough, confrontation among team members is easier.
- Work well together and have combined the teams very well. Only team that is composed of two teams (NAS Oceana and NWNSTA Yorktown/CAX).
- Should acknowledge and celebrate accomplishments, especially as NAS Oceana winds down.
- Team should work out entertainment/meals better (coordination), especially with newer members. Newer members should not hesitate to ask, as well.
- Meeting was slightly disjointed, with check out/future reservations, etc. breaking the meeting. Still finished on time, though, despite this.
- Team realized that the conflict resolution exercise was valuable for learning how to "extract" feelings.
- Felt that this is one of the best meetings, and feels closer to everyone than before the conflict resolution exercise.

Discussion of Next Partnering Meeting Dates/Locations

2001		
December 3 rd – 5 th	Williamsburg, VA (CAX or Hospitality House)	MM: T. Reisch/J. Davis Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: M. Mullen Fac: J. Harlow
2002		
February 5 th – 7 th	Somerset, PA	MM: J. Harlow Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: S. Mihalko Fac: S. Park/T. Reisch
March 12 th – 14 th	Philadelphia, PA (Embassy Suites for hotel, and CH2M HILL office for meeting room?)	MM: M. Mullen Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: J. Davis Fac: S. Mihalko
April 23 rd – April 25 th	Cacapon, WV	MM: T. Reisch/S. Park Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: B. Stroud Fac: M. Mullen
May 16 th – May 17 th (Joint Meeting)	Bolger Center	
June 18 th – 20 th	Richmond, VA	MM: TBD Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: TBD Fac: TBD
August 6 th – 8 th	Northern Virginia, VA (TBD)	MM: TBD Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: TBD Fac: TBD
September 17 th – 19 th		MM: TBD Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: TBD Fac: TBD
October 22 nd – 24 th	Cacapon, WV	MM: TBD Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: TBD Fac: TBD
December 3 rd – 5 th	Williamsburg, VA	MM: TBD Rec: Baker /J. Sachdev Time: TBD Fac: TBD

**NWS YORKTOWN/CAX/NAS OCEANA
PARTNERING MEETING NUMBER 41
October 24 - 25, 2001
Joint Meeting Minutes, cont.**

Consensus Decisions

The following summarizes the Consensus Decisions achieved during the October 2001 Joint Partnering Meeting.

CONSENSUS: We agree on the partnering meeting roles and responsibilities as defined here. We will utilize "honset" for team member revised deliverable copies and "honest" for distribution outside Tier I membership.

CONSENSUS: We accept the Partnering membership roles and responsibilities as defined here, including the identification of members.

Joint Team Action Items

Item	Person	Outcome	A/C	Date
ERA feedback	Team	Provide any feedback on the ERA process to Tier II	A	May 2002
Agenda call - November 20, 2001 at 3 p.m.	Tim	Set up agenda-call number	A	November 6, 2001
LUCIP	Baker	Add survey control to figures for all LUCIPs	A	12/03/01
LUCIP/LUCAP	Baker	Forward word and pdf version of LUCIP and LUCAP to Jayanti for use at NAS Oceana	A	12/03/01
LUCIP	Scott/Jeff/Jayanti	Determine how the LUCAP/MOA/LUCIP will work, who will maintain, who will update, region?, LANTDIV (admin. Rec.)?, facility?	A	12/03/01
Reserve a meeting room at CH2M HILL's PHL office for the March 12-14, 2001 meeting	Jayanti	Meeting Room for the March 2002 meeting	A	12/03/01

Keep minutes updated on the website (NASO and WPNSTA)	Jayanti/Don	Update website	A	12/03/01
Update calendar (NASO and WPNSTA)	Jayanti/Don	Update website	A	12/03/01

Joint Team Parking Lot

- Update partnering deliverable after the December 2001 meeting.

Joint Team Agenda Building Items for the December 2001 Meeting

Agenda Item	Estimated Meeting Time
Joint Team	
Brainstorming presentation for Tier II meeting	2 hrs
Tier II update	30 min
Partnering Exercise (use team evaluation exercise)	1 hr
Meeting Management (pre meeting, post meeting)	50 min
Conflict resolution process and R&R – consensus (in order to update the deliverable after the December 2001 meeting)	30 min

NSWSTA Yorktown has approximately 8 hours 15 minutes (2 full days on their agenda for December 2001) and a day of site visits to CAX sites.

Agenda building conference call: **Tuesday, November 20, 2001 at 3:00 p.m.**

Mail Message

[Close](#)[Previous](#) [Next](#) [Forward](#) [Reply to Sender](#) [Reply All](#) [Move](#) [Delete](#) [Properties](#)

From: Mary Mullen
To: Don Joiner
Date: Wednesday - October 17, 2001 12:58 PM
Subject: CAX - Penniman

Don:

I quickly went through my notes from previous Partnering Meetings to find references to CAX-Penniman. My notes from the March 2000 meeting indicate that Peter Knight & others planned a field visit sometime in April-May 2000 and the RAB members planned a field visit in early April. Discussions on Penniman may have occurred during these site visits. My notes on the March meeting indicate Rob Thompson's name came up but I didn't record the context. In general, my notes refer to CAX sites but not specifically to Penniman. I recall the Partnering Team discussed Penniman in general during a side bar at the May Partnering Meeting but I don't recall that a decision was reached and I didn't record any notes from the discussion.

Over the weekend I'll look over my notes in detail to see if there are any other references.

Mary

Partnering Meeting Roles Section

Coach

1. Train team members in the art of facilitation
2. Make observations as necessary, sidebar in or out of the room
3. Laugh with us
4. Attend as requested

Host

1. Identify meeting access requirements
2. Provide meeting logistics (maps, transportation information, hotels, per diem, refreshments, meeting room, flip charts, tape, markers, audio visual equipment)
3. Recommend activities/meals, etc.

Meeting Manager

1. Manages the agenda
2. Conducts meeting and acts as meeting chairperson
3. Prepares the agenda before the agenda conference call
4. Confirms the agenda one week prior to the next meeting – QA/QC with recorder for final dissemination
5. Notifies meeting attendees about changes in meeting status, if any
6. Consensus building – seeks consensus/closure from all members of the team
7. Encourages participation
8. Identifies new member, announces guests and sponsors
9. Announces unannounced guests, if appropriate
10. Focus purpose and goals of agenda topics

Timekeeper

1. Remind team of time during meeting

2. Give 5-minute warning when appropriate
3. Negotiates “wrap-up” time during team’s discussions
4. Keeps the meeting moving
5. For complex discussions, provide a “roadmap” (e.g. time allotted for topic, consensus, etc.)
6. Manage access

Facilitator

1. Develop partnering exercises/tools and obtain external expertise and resources
2. Use the Facilitator Checklist
3. Help team use team decision tools
4. Assure ground rules and roles and responsibilities are being kept
5. Look for and call “plops”
6. Encourage even participation
7. Ensure summaries are recorded on flip charts
8. Use conflict resolution process to resolve conflicts
9. Be “honest” and forthcoming with all team members
10. Provide real time feedback with minimal impact on the meeting
11. Identify partnering tools as needed by the team
12. Provide feedback at the end of each meeting as part of the daily plus/delta
13. Help to maintain focus on agenda topic
14. Help the team come to closure or consensus

Core Members

1. Participate in consensus process

2. Meeting agenda builders
3. Perform meeting roles
4. Can designate proxy authority to other core or adjunct members
5. Can designate the formation of subgroups and identify issues to be addressed
6. Can act as a subgroup link
7. Prepare for meeting
8. Serve as guest sponsors and are responsible for going over “Guest Participation Summary” with guest
9. Need to participate in every meeting

Recorder

1. Compiles list of agenda items, forwards to meeting manager following the meeting
2. Recorder can function as “host” but does not share in other meeting roles
3. Takes/keeps meeting minutes; maintains team minutes/log book
4. Clarifies all points of and objections while recording minutes
5. Sends minutes to all Tier I members prior to the next meeting and post on the Partnering website
6. Collects comments on minutes, revises and distributes accordingly
7. Distributes necessary meeting/partnering deliverables to all new members
8. Maintains and updates team member address list
9. Nag the team to review the meeting minutes prior to the meeting

Adjunct Members

1. Participate in consensus process when appropriate
2. Notify a core member (if) is unable to attend
3. Can designate proxy to other core or adjunct member

4. Can act as a subgroup link
5. Prepare for meetings
6. Expected to participate in specific agenda items; however, does not need to attend every partnering meeting or entire meeting

Subgroups

1. Each subgroup will have a core or adjunct member serve as a link between the subgroup and the partnering team
2. Each subgroup should have a core member RPM included in all meetings and conference calls
3. Each subgroup will meet on a “as-needed” basis. Participants will include members of each partnering organization’s technical support staff as necessary and may include others knowledgeable in the subgroup’s area of expertise.
4. Subgroup participants that are not core or adjunct members of the NWS Yorktown/CAX/NAS Oceana Partnering Team will attend partnering meeting as guests when their attendance is required.

No subgroups currently.

Technical Members/Guest

1. Prepare for meeting
2. Participate in pertinent discussions
3. Do not participate in consensus process
4. Will attend partnering meetings as guests when their attendance is required.

2.3.1 Site 1 - Landfill Near Incinerator

Site 1, which covers approximately 1.3 acres, is located along the York River behind the old incinerator. The incinerator was dismantled between 1989 and 1992. From 1942 to 1951 the landfill was used as a disposal area for burn residues and from 1951 to 1972 it was used as a general landfill. A variety of wastes, including empty paint cans and paint thinner cans, cartons of ether and other unspecified drugs, railroad ties, tar paper, sawdust, rags, concrete, and lumber, were burned and disposed in the landfill until 1981. The landfill was not used after 1981. An estimated 34,500 tons of solid waste were buried at the landfill. The surface of the landfill is relatively flat and is overgrown with vegetation most of the year. In 1981 the landfill was regraded and a 2-foot soil cover was placed over the debris. Part of the landfill is enclosed with a fence and a locked gate. The fence does not correspond with the landfill perimeter. Very rugged terrain and dense vegetation outside the fence limit access to the unfenced parts of the landfill. The areas immediately adjacent to the former landfill are wooded.

There is a steep drop to the York River 25 feet below the landfill. The bank of the York River adjacent to the landfill is extremely steep and is not vegetated. Baker conducted a limited shoreline erosion assessment of the river bank in the vicinity of Site 1. The assessment concluded that the erosion of the river bank is caused by high water levels and wave action.

A large area of debris is present to the north of the landfill. The area contains cables, conex boxes, an empty storage tank, automobiles, airplane/boat parts, and other miscellaneous items. This area was previously designated as AOC 5 - Debris Area, but is currently being managed as part of Site 1.

A small area along the northeastern perimeter has been eroding. The area in which the landfill perimeter was eroding was difficult to access during high tide and was littered with fallen/washed up trees/wood. A TCRA was conducted to remove the debris that had collected on the beach area (December 1999) and to stabilize the toe of the bank in the erosion area (January 2000). Three sand-filled geosynthetic tubes were installed to stabilize the toe of the landfill. This will stabilize the site until the long-term solution for the management of the Site 1 landfill is implemented.

Based on the analytical data collected during investigations at the site, soil and sediment in the vicinity of the landfill have been adversely impacted by contaminants. The most significant

contamination consists of SVOCs, PAHs, and metals (including lead and other heavy metals). PCBs were also in soil and sediment. LANTDIV is actively addressing the contamination being released by the site.

2.3.2 Site 2 - Contaminated Food Disposal Area *N*

This site is located in a grassy area in the woods behind the cold storage warehouse. Ammonia-contaminated frozen food was buried in a disposal pit approximately 50 feet in diameter and 12 to 15 feet deep in 1970. The ammonia was the result of a leak that developed in one of the cold storage rooms. The food was buried with cellophane wrappers and boxes intact. The site was overgrown at the time of the IAS (NEESA, 1984). The IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted for the site because the wastes buried at the site would naturally decompose.

2.3.3 Site 3 - Submarine Dye Disposal Area *N*

This site is located at the northeastern corner of Building CAD 15. The area is presently used as a storage lot. Dye was stored in 55-gallon drums on two or three pallets located between the warehouses. The drums corroded and dye leaked onto the ground and into the storm sewer system. On rainy days, puddles containing a green fluorescein dye were observed. At times, the dye would leak into the storm sewer leading to the York River, turning the river green. The Coast Guard notified the Activity and the drums were subsequently removed in the early 1970s. The IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted for the site because the dye no longer posed an environmental hazard.

CTO-104

2.3.4 Site 4 - Medical Supplies Disposal Area *SS. confirm*

Site 4 is located along the pond just upgradient of Youth Pond, between buildings CAD 11 and CAD 12. In 1968 or 1969, out-of-date medical supplies possibly including syringes and empty IV bottles, and one-inch metal banding were unloaded down a bank in this area and covered with soil. Much of that material was reportedly removed from the site because syringe needles were getting stuck in deer hooves. After heavy rains, what appeared to be syringes could sometimes be seen floating in the adjacent pond and in Youth Pond.

The IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted for the site due to the inert nature of the materials disposed. During a May 4, 1998, site visit with VDEQ representatives, packages of what appeared to be unused needles wrapped in foil were noted within the drainage swale leading to the unnamed pond. In May 1998, Reactives Management, Inc. removed surficial debris. Approximately 200 pounds of debris and 13 pounds of sharps (metal and plastic) were recovered from the site and incinerated. Debris was removed from the surface, by hand or with hand tools, and no intrusive work (e.g., excavation) was conducted.

The Final Site Inspection Report (Baker, 2001a) recommended that a limited investigation to define the lateral extent of debris at the site be performed. In addition, an EE/CA was recommended to evaluate the most appropriate means of removing or covering the debris that is present at the site.

2.3.5 Site 5 - Photographic Chemicals Disposal Area

Revise

In 1967 or 1968 outdated photographic chemicals were reportedly disposed in a pit of unknown dimensions. This site was originally a "marl pit" located behind (southeast) of the old DuPont munitions factory area, near Second Street. The IAS concluded that, based on the small quantity and the non-hazardous nature of the chemicals that were disposed, further study was not warranted.

In June 1998 Baker and LANTDIV representatives visited Site 5 and reconnoitered the area to locate the site. No signs of contamination, distressed areas, or evidence of the disposal pit could be seen. Based on the small quantity of the chemicals that were reportedly disposed and the lack of evidence of contamination, the site is not considered to be a significant source of contamination.

2.3.6 Site 6 - Spoiled Food Disposal Area

N

Site 6 is located to the west of the old DuPont ammunition factory. Reportedly, approximately 750 cubic yards of food spoiled in cold storage was buried in a 12 to 15 foot deep pit around 1970. The IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted for the site because the decomposed food was not hazardous.

2.3.7 Site 7 - Old DuPont Disposal Area C70-104

Site 7 is located along the York River. The area is comprised of a flat, sparsely vegetated depression, with a berm along the northern perimeter. Gravel and ballast rock can be seen on the ground surface. To the east of the flat area, the land drops off slightly and in a very small area along the perimeter buried debris (pipe, metal, wood) can be seen outcropping from edge of the slope. The nature of the debris indicates that the disposal occurred more recently than the World War I era.

According to the IAS, Site 7 received wastes from the City of Penniman and from the DuPont facility. The wastes were reported to be non-hazardous and/or inert. However, specific information documenting the types and quantities of wastes was not available. E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company was contacted during the IAS, but specific information regarding disposal practices was not available. The surface of the site was described as level and supporting a variety of grasses. No evidence of stressed vegetation was noted during the IAS. The western, northern, and eastern boundaries of the site are clearly defined by steep banks rising an estimated 10 to 20 feet in elevation. The IAS also indicates that ammunition waste was disposed at the site, but it is not clear how this determination was made. LANTDIV recognizes that sources of contamination may be present at the site. Further investigation and possible removal of sources of contamination may be required.

2.3.8 Site 8 - Landfill Near Building CAD 14 ✓

Site 8 is located approximately 300 feet north of Building CAD 14 and is estimated to be less than one quarter acre in size. The disposal area reportedly consisted of a series of trenches 2,000 feet long and 10 feet deep. The site was used at various times since the early 1940s but was most active before the Landfill near the Incinerator (Site 1) was opened. Waste was reportedly disposed at the site as recently as 1980.

Specific information documenting disposal practices is not available. Reportedly, only non-hazardous materials such as spoiled meat, spoiled candy, and clothing have been disposed at the site. The surface of the site is level and overgrown with tall grasses, and at the time of the IAS, there was no surface evidence of waste and no stressed vegetation.

The IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted for the site because wastes disposed at the site were not hazardous. Based on the inert nature of the materials that were reportedly buried at Site 8, the site is not considered to be a significant source of contamination.

2.3.9 Site 9 - Transformer Storage Area CTD-104

This site is approximately 7,000 square feet in size and located adjacent to the northwest corner of Building CAD 16. Between 1973 and 1980, electrical transformers, some of which contained PCBs, were reportedly stored at the site for repair or disposal. Between six and thirty transformers were stored at the site at a time. The storage area was not paved although it was enclosed by an earthen wall. Transformers were not stored at the site after 1980 and the area was graded and covered with gravel (NEESA, 1984).

The IAS recommended additional study due to the potential for PCB contamination. The Confirmation Study Step 1A (Verification), Round One (Dames and Moore, 1986) included collection of 13 soil samples from Site 9 for analysis of PCBs and 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD). Arochlor 1260 was the only PCB detected (eight of 13 samples). TCDD was not detected in any samples. Detected concentrations of Arochlor 1260 ranged from 21 micrograms per kilogram (mg/kg) to 321 mg/kg. No additional sampling was recommended because of the low levels of the detections.

A Draft Final NFRAP Decision Document was submitted for the site in December 1999. The document was reviewed by the VDEQ and USEPA and further investigation and an ecological risk assessment were recommended.

2.3.10 Site 10 - Decontamination Agent Disposal Area Near First Street CTD-104

Site 10 is located south of First Street in the southernmost part of the old DuPont munitions plant. An estimated 75 to 100 gallons of decontamination agent (DS-2) was reportedly buried at the site before 1982. DS-2, which is toxic to humans and corrosive to metals, is used for decontaminating equipment contaminated with nerve or blister agents. It is not known if the DS-2 was neutralized prior to disposal.

At the time of the IAS, the surface of the site was covered with a variety of grasses. No evidence of stressed vegetation was noted and surrounding vegetation and animal life showed no visible adverse effects.

The IAS recommended that a magnetometer survey be performed to locate metallic containers of DS-2. A magnetometer survey of Site 10 was performed in December 1985 (Geosight, 1985). The mounds of soil present in the wooded area appeared to contain little iron. The magnetometer survey was summarized in the Final Remedial Investigation Interim Report (Dames and Moore, 1991). The report recommended that historical aerial photographs be reviewed to ascertain additional information about the disposal activities and that a risk assessment be performed.

The Site Investigation for Site 10 was performed in 1992. As part of the Site Investigation, three monitoring wells were installed within the shallow aquifer. One surface soil sample and three subsurface soil samples were collected from each monitoring well boring. Groundwater samples were collected from each well. The report concluded that low levels of contamination in soil and groundwater did not appear to be related to DS-2.

In 1997, as part of the SSP investigation Baker re-sampled the three Site 10 monitoring wells to confirm the Site Investigation results. No organic compounds were detected in groundwater.

SI and SSP investigation sampling did not locate any significant sources of contamination at the site. The buried containers of DS-2 have not been located to date. Based on the results of these investigations and the relatively small volume of DS-2 that was reportedly buried, the site does not appear to pose a significant threat to human health or the environment.

2.3.11 Site 11 - Bone Yard

CTB-104
Va fuel lines

Site 11 encompasses an estimated 8-acre area located approximately 250 ft south of Antrim Road, behind the public works facility. The site was reportedly used between 1940 and 1978 to dispose oil, asphalt, and gasoline. These wastes were contained in 15 barrels and two 500-gallon above-ground tanks at the time of the IAS. It was reported that unspecified wastes might also have been buried at the site.

During the IAS, scrap metal, old containers (fuel oil, mixing tanks, etc), fence posts, and abandoned cars were found inside the gate within an estimated 1-acre area. Various discarded clamshell buckets and other surplus metal objects used in heavy construction were also located throughout the area. Approximately ten 5-gallon containers labeled "paraplastic" (concrete sealant) were also present. South of the entrance, numerous barrels containing petroleum products were discovered, as well as several 500-gallon square tanks containing asphalt or oil used in making asphalt. These tanks were reported to have leaked in the past.

Numerous tar cylinders were deposited at the end of the road leading into the site. The cylinders had apparently been there for quite a while, as their initial cardboard containers had decomposed and the tar had melted. Numerous pieces of scrap metal and surplus construction equipment were scattered along the path. Due to the oil and gasoline at the site, and reported spills and waste burial, the IAS recommended additional study for Site 11.

During the SSP groundwater investigation (August 1997), approximately 60 drums were noted in the woods along with three tanks that contained tar. Approximately one half of the drums were empty. The remaining drums contained one or a combination of the following: tar, leaves, soil, or sludge. The drums and tanks were removed from the site in early September 1997 by Industrial Marine Services, Inc. of Norfolk, Virginia. Approximately 60 tons of material, including drums, tanks, solidified tar, and miscellaneous scrap/materials were disposed as non-hazardous waste.

The Draft Removal Closeout Report (Baker, 2000a) summarizes removal activities that have occurred at Site 11 - Bone Yard. Previous investigations at Site 11 have not located any sources of significant contamination at the site. Previous removals and housekeeping activities have eliminated sources of contamination from the site; however, an RI/FS is planned in the future to thoroughly evaluate the site.

2.3.12 Site 12 - Disposal Site Near Water Tower

*P.R. Spurs?
Discuss @ C appon*

Site 12 is located approximately 2,000 feet west of Jones Pond. The site was used for surface disposal of scrap metal, primarily old automobile parts and iron pipe. Based on visual inspection of the site approximately 10 to 110 cubic feet of material was disposed at the site. Because the

materials disposed of at the site were reportedly not hazardous, the IAS recommended no further study.

2.4 CAX Area of Concern Descriptions

2.4.1 AOC 1 - Scrap Metal Dump

*SS
other side of hill*

AOC 1 is a debris disposal area located just west of Chapman Road in two ravines along unnamed tributaries to Jones Pond. Wood and metal debris outcrop from the banks of the ravines.

In November 1999 a field investigation that included a geophysical survey and collection of soil, surface water and sediment samples was performed. VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, inorganics, and cyanide were detected in the surface soil samples. SVOCs and inorganics were detected in the surface water at low levels. VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, and inorganics were detected in the sediment samples. The extensive volume of debris at the AOC is a potential source of contamination.

The Final Site Inspection Report (Baker, 2001a) recommended that a limited investigation to evaluate disposal parameters be performed. In addition, an EE/CA was recommended to evaluate the most appropriate means of removing or covering the debris that is present at the site.

2.4.2 AOC 2 - Dextrose Dump

*SS.
S.B.*

AOC 2 was discovered during site visits performed by LANTDIV, USEPA, VDEQ, and Baker in late 1997 and early 1998. The area is situated in woods, north of Garrison Road, along the southern perimeter of CAX. The area contains several rows of concrete foundation piers, which at one time apparently supported a Shipping House at the former Penniman Shell Loading Plant. Most of the Penniman facility was demolished between 1918 and 1925. Grass-covered lanes, which lead to the area are likely locations of former rail lines that have been removed. Several glass bottles, many of which are labeled dextrose, were present. In addition, several partially buried empty drums were also noted. Mounds of soil that are present may also indicate buried materials. Additional buried drums may be located in this area.

During May 1998, Reactives Management, Inc. removed 470 bottles from the site as part of a routine housekeeping operation and selected 24 bottles for random analysis. Each bottle contained greater than 2,000 ppm glucose indicating that the bottles did contain dextrose, as suspected.

In 1998, Baker performed a Field Investigation for AOC 2 that consisted of a geophysical survey and soil and groundwater investigations. The Field Investigation Report (Baker, 1999b) recommended that the sources of the geophysical anomalies and potential sources of contamination be identified by excavating a total of six shallow test pits in the vicinity of the most significant anomalies detected.

In November 1999 Baker performed a field investigation that included test pits and exploratory hand auger borings to define the lateral extent of buried debris at the site. Samples of native soil and soil within the debris zones were collected. During the investigation, a large volume of buried drums and respirator filter canisters was encountered. A few of the drums contained a thin layer of tar coating or residue. The remaining drums were empty.

In the Final Field Investigation Report (Baker, 2001b), additional geophysical surveying with confirmatory test pitting was recommended to further delineate the extent of buried debris, with emphasis placed on locating areas of buried respirator cartridge canisters. Based on the findings of the investigation, it was recommended that an EE/CA be completed to determine the appropriate management strategy for the site.

2.4.3 AOC 3 - CAD 11/12 Pond Bank

AOC 3 consists of an approximately 20 foot by 20 foot by 10 foot high pile of metal banding along the north bank of the unnamed pond, north of D Street. The pond is situated between Buildings 11 and 12. This area, which also contains a few empty drums is adjacent to Site 4 - Medical Supplies Disposal Area. This location was designated as an AOC in 1998 following site visits by LANTDIV, USEPA, and VDEQ representatives.

During the 1999 field investigation two soil samples and two sediment samples were collected next to the metal banding pile. Results for the samples (which were collected as part of the Site 4

investigation) were included in the Site Inspection Report - Site 4 and AOC 1 (Baker, 2001a). The site is not currently considered to be a significant source of contamination.

This area will be managed separately from Site 4. The samples collected during the 1999 field investigation were intended to determine if future investigation is warranted and to confirm that there are no sources of contamination present within the pile so the pile can be removed as part of a housekeeping measure, rather than under a removal action. Removal of the metal banding pile or other actions at the site are not currently scheduled or funded.

2.4.4 AOC 4 - IR Site 4 - Medical Supplies Disposal Area

During 1998, AOC 4 was identified as a new AOC by LANTDIV. However, based on review of site history and available information, it was determined that AOC 4 is actually the same area as Site 4. AOC 4 will no longer be addressed as separate entity.

2.4.5 AOC 5 - Debris Area

During 1998, AOC 5 was identified as a new AOC by LANTDIV. AOC 5 is the large pile of debris at the toe of the Site 1 landfill which contains cables, convex boxes, an empty storage tank, automobiles, airplane/boat parts, and other miscellaneous items. Based on the results of the 1998 field investigation (Baker, 1999b), which included a geophysical survey and soil and sediment sampling in the vicinity of the pile, LANTDIV decided that it was more appropriate to manage these two areas (Site 1 and AOC 5) as one unit. VDEQ concurred. Consequently, AOC 5 will no longer be addressed as a separate unit and will be managed as part of Site 1.

2.4.6 Penniman AOC

There are five sub-areas within this AOC:

- **Ammonia Settling Pits** - This area consists of earthen ammonia settling pits that were part of a former shell loading area located on Cheatham Annex. Wastewater from an ammonia finishing building was discharged through these settling pits.

- Trinitrotoluene (TNT) Graining House Sump - This area consists of a concrete-lined, open top pit believed to be the sump pit for the TNT graining house in the former shell loading area.
- TNT Catch Box Ruins - This area consists of an earthen, brick-lined depression located immediately adjacent to the TNT graining house in the former shell loading area. This area was used to separate TNT particles from waste water.
- Waste Slag Material - This area consists of waste metallic slag material that is located throughout the shell loading area predominantly along the railroad tracks.
- 1918 Drum Storage - This area was used for the storage of 55-gallon drums when the shell loading area was active.

Based on an agreement among LANTDIV, VDEQ, and Baker, only three of the five sub-areas will be addressed in the upcoming field investigation: Ammonia Settling Pits, TNT Graining House Sump, and TNT Catch Box Ruins. All parties agreed that there was insufficient evidence of site-related activity to warrant further investigation at the Waste Slag Material and 1918 Drum Storage sub-areas.

The following investigative activities are proposed at the Penniman AOC: collection of soil samples, collection of surface water and sediment samples, and installation of temporary monitoring wells. A topographical and horizontal feature survey of the three sub-areas will be performed to establish accurate mapping.

These sub-areas of the Penniman AOC have not yet been investigated. Detailed figures presenting the site plan have not been developed. A Site Investigation Report, including figures and site photographs, summarizing results and conclusions of the field investigation (June 2001) is scheduled to be finalized in July 2001. Pending results of the Site Investigation Report, a RI/FS may be recommended for the Penniman AOC.

804-693-9032

John McCloskey

CHEATHAM ANNEX
SITE STATUS

Site	Background	Planned Activities
Site 1 – Landfill Near Incinerator	TCRA conducted to remove debris on beach and to stabilize the toe of the landfill. Based on site investigation data, soil and sediment have been contaminated with SVOCs, PAHs, PCBs, and metals.	Funded for Study/Design
Site 2 – Contaminated Food Disposal Area	IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted	NFRAP
Site 3 – Submarine Dye Disposal Area	IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted.	NFRAP
Site 4 – Medical Supplies Disposal Area	May 1998 surface debris removed. Final Site Inspection Report (2001) recommended a limited investigation to define the extent of debris and an EE/CA.	EE/CA
Site 5 – Photographic Chemicals Disposal Area	IAS concluded that no additional investigation was warranted. Site not considered to be a significant source of contamination.	RI/FS
Site 6 – Spoiled Food Disposal Area	IAS concluded that additional study not warranted.	NFRAP
Site 7 – Old DuPont Disposal Area	Sources of contamination may be present. Further investigation and removal may be required.	NFRAP/EE/CA
Site 8 – Landfill near Building CAD 14	IAS concluded that additional study was not warranted	NFRAP
Site 9 – Transformer Storage Area	IAS recommended additional study. PCBs detected during confirmation study at low levels (21 – 321 mg/kg). Draft Final NFRAP submitted in December 1999. During review further investigation and ecological risk assessment recommended.	RI/FS
Site 10 – Decontamination Agent Disposal Area Near First Street	IAS recommended magnetometer survey. Survey (December 1985) summarized in Final Remedial Investigation Interim Report (1991). Site investigation performed in 1992. Included sampling and well installation. Wells resampled as part of SSP investigation in 1997. No organics detected. No significant sources of contamination located.	NFRAP
Site 11 – Bone Yard	Surface debris, drums, and tar cylinders found during IAS. Additional study recommended. During SSP Investigation (1997) drums, tanks, and tar identified. Debris removed in September 1997. Removal activities summarized in Draft Removal Closure Report (2000).	Future RI/FS planned
Site 12 – Disposal Site Near Water Tower	IAS recommended no further study.	RI/FS – ? NFRAP

**CHEATHAM ANNEX
SITE STATUS
(Continued)**

Site	Background	Planned Activities
AOC 1 – Scrap Metal Dump	Field investigation in November 1999 identified VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and inorganics in soil and sediment and SVOCs and inorganics in surface water. The Final Site Inspection Report (2001) recommended a limited investigation and EE/CA.	Additional Investigation EE/CA
AOC 2 – Dextrose Drum	Dextrose bottles removed in May 1998. Field Investigation (1998) included geophysics and soil and groundwater investigations. November 1999 investigation included test pits. Buried drums were encountered. Final Field Investigation Report (2001) recommended additional geophysics and test pitting to delineate debris and an EE/CA.	Additional Investigation EE/CA
AOC 3 – CAD 11/12 Pond Bank	Soil and sediment samples collected in 1999. Results were included in the Site Inspection Report – Site 4 and AOC 1. AOC 3 is not considered a significant source of contamination. A metal banding pile will need to be removed as a housekeeping measure.	No additional actions at the site are scheduled or funded.
AOC 4 – Medical Supplies Disposal Area	Same as Site 4.	Will be addressed with Site 4
AOC 5 – Debris Area	AOC 5 will be managed as part of Site 1, based on a 1998 field investigation.	Will be addressed with Site 1
Penniman AOC	Includes five subareas. Subareas have not been investigated. A Site Investigation Report summarizing the June 2001 field investigations of the general area has been prepared.	Based on the results of the Site Investigation Report, an RI/FS may be conducted.

Mail Message

[Close](#)[Previous](#) [Next](#) [Delete From This Mailbox](#) [Delete From All Mailboxes](#) [Forward](#) [Properties](#)

From: Don Joiner
To: GATEDOM.gwia:GATEDOM.gwia:deq.state.va.us:samihalko,
GATEDOM.gwia:GATEDOM.gwia:pwcnorva.navy.mil:HarlowJC,
GATEDOM.gwia:GATEDOM.gwia:epa.gov:stroud:robert,
GATEDOM.gwia:GATEDOM.gwia:efdlant.navy.mil:ParkSR
Date: Friday - October 12, 2001 11:04 AM
Subject: Draft Agenda and Action Items for Yorktown/CAX
 NWSY-mtg-agenda10-01.doc (41472 bytes) [View](#) [Save As](#)
action-items-9-01.doc (58368 bytes) [View](#) [Save As](#)

Attached is draft agenda for Oct meeting based on my notes from the Sept meeting. I have also listed the parking lot items from the Sept meeting.

I also attached the action items list and I have the following updates:

Item 3 - revise site 6 sampling plan - done

Item 4 - Myers-Briggs test for Joiner -received from Laurel and and I have sent this back to her.

Item 11 - '01/'02 goals - Scott and I met and discussed on 9/28

Item 12 - Dave Martin will be attending Oct partnering meeting

Item 15 - Scott has provided Mary Mullen with comments on GIS needs assessment questionnaire

Item 22 - Tim has set conference call

I will get draft meeting minutes ready next week.

I will be in Baker's Richmond office on Oct 15. Talk to you on Oct 16 at 10:00 conf call.

DJ

**OCTOBER 2001
WPNSTA YORKTOWN/CAX**

**OCTOBER AGENDA ITEMS
DRAFT**

Item	Purpose	Time
Review Action Items		1 hour
✓ FY 2001/2002 Goals	Review and update Team Goals Identify sites that will require ESDs	1 hour
✓ Discuss Site 18 ROD, including revised site risks Site 18 timeline	Provide executive summary of ROD for Bob Stroud brief to F. Fritz Review and update schedule for Site 18 if necessary	1.5 hours 30 minutes
✓ Yorktown SSAs Brief	Provide an update of Yorktown SSA sites. Which sites are proposed for NFA. SSA Sites that are now IR Sites.	1 hour
CAX Overall Site Update (including Pennimam sites)	Brief on site histories, remedial actions to date. Propose sites that can be grouped for NFA Prioritize sites that will need RI/FS/PRAP/ROD	2 hours
Partnering Deliverables and Partnering Skills (with Laurel Boucher)	Review Partnering Team Roles (core members, adjunct members, subgroup members) Finalize Team in terms of Baker participation Team Metrics Myers/Briggs review Conflict Resolution Team Assessment	30 minutes 30 minutes 30 minutes 1 hour 1 hour 2.5 hours (total of 6 hours)
Open discussion – “Gripes”		1 hour

PARKING LOT ITEMS

1. Keep looking for groundwater training conferences
2. Location of May 2002 Joint Meeting (Stacie gave us information during our Tier II update – meeting is scheduled for May at the Bolger (sp) Center in Potomac MD)
3. Status of Yorktown Goals – post to Partnering Web Site (this is an October agenda item)
4. Check with Stacie Driscoll on when 2002 goals are needed (Stacie gave us this information during our Tier II update)
5. Initiate a Brainstorming Period in future meetings
6. LUCIP comments (for December meeting site visit to determine land use restriction areas)
7. CAX site visit to look at potential NFA and RI/FS sites
8. Start to build a presentation for May Joint Meeting
9. Partnering Deliverables and Team Roles for Baker (this is an October agenda item)