

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

CH2MHILL

St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: March 21 - 22, 2007

Attendees: Agnes Sullivan/NAVFAC MID LANT
Josh Barber/EPA (Region III)
Karen Doran/VDEQ
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL
Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

Tier II Link: Tim Reisch/NAVFAC MID LANT

Guests: None

From: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

Date: March 22, 2007

Location: CH2M HILL, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Wednesday, March 21, 2007

0130 Welcome/Check In

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager: Agnes Sullivan
Timekeeper/Gatekeeper: Karen Doran
Host: Josh Barber
Goalkeeper: Agnes Sullivan
Facilitator: Josh Barber
Recorder: Janna Staszak

Ground Rules

I. Review Agenda, Meeting Minutes, Action Items, and Parking Lot from the Previous Meeting

Review Agenda: No changes were made to the agenda.

Review Meeting Minutes: Not applicable (no outstanding minutes).

Review Parking Lot: Parking Lot items were reviewed.

- Environmental Indicators: Josh will look into how Environmental Indicators under control can be achieved in FY08.
- Consensus on Final Documents: Item was removed from the Parking Lot.
- Site 4 Groundwater Monitoring at 5-Year Review: Remains in Parking Lot.

- **Indoor Air Vapor Intrusion:** Johnson and Ettinger model allows parameter selection (i.e., soil moisture) to significantly affect the outcome. The Indoor Air Vapor Intrusion analysis for Site 21 was included in the SSI Report. Kim will post the document on the web site and Josh will review the input parameters.

Review Action Items: The site tour was removed from the agenda. EPA Guidance: Documenting and Reporting Performance in Achieving Land Revitalization was moved to the end of the first day.

Action Janna - Get new markers.

II. Site 21 Additional Investigation Summary and Preliminary Results

Objective: Review the site history and status, present data from February field investigation, review storm sewer video survey results and recommendations, discuss the site closure approach, and review the schedule.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation and a figure of the groundwater plume were provided. Janna reviewed the presentation.

Agnes explained that she has been working internally to update GIS and noticed that some facilities do not update site boundaries as the contamination (i.e., groundwater plume) is investigated. They use different indicators (i.e., groundwater plume layers) to show the extent of contamination. SJCA decided to reflect the contamination within the site boundary and adjust as needed to aid the facility in planning for intrusive activities.

Action Kim/Agnes - Look at buildings at Site 21 in relation to the groundwater plume and assess the current use. Update the site vicinity and plume figure to reflect demolished buildings.

Janna discussed the storm sewer inspection and showed the video to the team, reflecting light to moderate damage (on a scale from light to severe). The conclusions of the inspection are that infiltration is present and does provide a transport mechanism for CVOCs to the outfall but because damage is not significant enough to adversely affect the treatability study, no repairs are recommended. Additionally, the storm sewer may be influencing groundwater flow away from Building 1556; repairs may alter groundwater flow direction and allow CVOCs to further migrate under the building.

Agnes explained that the Navy is assessing all the remaining IR sites and the time and money that it will take to achieve RIP. So Agnes, Kim, and Janna have been tasked to pull estimates together. The current site closeout approach for Site 21 was evaluated and Janna discussed the current approach and how the schedule could be expedited.

The team agreed that the actions that will be taken will be the same regardless of the documentation path. Josh felt it may be acceptable to conduct a NTCRA to address groundwater contamination and dependent upon the results, go straight to a ROD that will include LTM/LUCs/MNA rather than going through the RI/FS process.

Action Josh - Check with EPA regarding acceptance of ROD with LTM following an EE/CA NTCRA for Site 21 by March 28.

Action Karen - Check with Pat regarding Site 21 HHRS vs. HHRA.

Josh discussed implementation of NTCRA Removal Action with Frank Fritz (EPA lawyer). It seems like it will be an acceptable path forward; Frank is going to confirm that groundwater treatment is an allowable removal action.

Path Forward: The draft storm sewer inspection report will be submitted March 22. The schedule will depend on the path forward for the site. Assuming the SSI to EE/CA path, the Draft Final SSI would be submitted April 15 and the Draft EE/CA would be submitted April 30.

Thursday, March 22, 2007

0830 Welcome/Check In

Reviewed Roles and Responsibilities

Reviewed Ground Rules

Reviewed current agenda: The technical topic was removed from the agenda to shorten the meeting due to a weather advisory. Additional changes will be made as necessary.

III. Site 5 Hot Spots and Groundwater

Objective: Review the site history and status; discuss plan for hot spot delineation; develop exit strategy for shallow groundwater; review path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation and a table of data were provided. Kim briefly reviewed the history and status of the site.

Agnes has completed the scope for the removal action. The removal contract will go to the Agviq CH2M HILL Joint Venture. The removal will begin with the burnt soil area, but may add additional areas if funding remains. Kim reviewed the removal areas defined in the EE/CA and presented the logic (iterative approach) for the delineation of the three hot spots. The team expressed concern over the averaging approach for lead, but accepts the concept based on its consistency with the overall site approach and will review the work plan.

Kim reviewed the shallow groundwater risk. RME and CT risk are present at the site for various metals. In addition, there are MCL exceedances for select metals.

Karen and Josh talked to their human health risk assessors about use of RME and CT risk. Both VDEQ and EPA risk assessors do not condone the use of CT risk. Pat McMurray (VDEQ risk assessor) suggests groundwater monitoring following the removal action. Josh talked to Linda and Mindi at EPA; in order to get the site to ROD sooner, EPA suggests waiting for equilibrium after the removal action then monitoring and performing a statistical analysis (8 samples over 2 years, quarterly). ROD would need to include monitoring and land use controls.

Agnes indicated that she has sold the removal action as an avenue for risk management for groundwater. Without risk management of groundwater, it would not make sense to

remove the waste rather than covering it. Agnes is going to put a hold on the removal action award until a path forward for shallow groundwater is established.

The team discussed aluminum and arsenic considerations for risk management. Neither arsenic nor aluminum pose CT risk. In addition, arsenic has not exceeded the MCL since 1997 (during which no field parameters are available and turbidity may have been a factor) in any well other than MW1S (located within the waste). Arsenic exceeded the MCL in June of 2006 but did not exceed the MCL in the October 2006 round.

Action Karen/Josh – Check into why CT is not acceptable for risk management (aluminum and arsenic) by April 3.

Action Kim/Janna – Provide examples (NNSY Site 10) of sites using CT risk for risk management in support of Site 5 COCs path forward.

Path forward: The Action Memorandum for the Site 5 Waste/Burnt Soil Area and Impacted Surface Soil and Sediment has been signed and the final CDs will be distributed next week. The work plan for the hot spot delineation has been submitted; comments are due April 16. A conference call will be held to discuss groundwater path forward and impact to removal action on April 3 at 10 AM. The removal action scope for the waste/burnt soil area has been submitted; however it is on hold until after the April conference call.

IV. Site 2 Dynamic Work Plan Comment Resolution and Deep Groundwater Path Forward

Objectives: Discuss comments on the Site 2 Dynamic Work Plan and plan for closure of deep groundwater.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were provided. Kim briefly reviewed the site status and objectives/activities of the Triad Investigation. No official comments have been received on the dynamic work plan.

Karen provided VDEQ preliminary comments:

- In MIP decision logic, clarify that the first box intends to “calibrate” current investigation with previous.
- On Figure 1-7, the soil and groundwater paths are reversed.
- On 2.5.2, remove discussion of SD20 (or add it to the figure).

The remaining VDEQ comments and EPA comments will be submitted after the meeting due to time constraints.

Kim presented the deep groundwater flow evaluation. Due to the difficulty in modeling natural groundwater flow in the deep aquifer, velocity calculations have a large margin of error (an order of magnitude). Therefore, identifying the timeframe when the contaminants may reach the downgradient well is unrealistic. Josh and Karen indicated they are okay with no additional sampling of the deep wells beyond the May 2007 site-wide sampling event.

Consensus: The team has received and reviewed the Site 2 Deep Groundwater Technical Memorandum and accepts it as final.

Path forward/schedule: Comments are due on the Draft DWP on April 6. The Triad investigation will begin April 17 with the installation of the sediment diffusion samplers and continue April 30 through May 25. The Draft Final ERI report will be submitted in August (meeting Team Goal of September).

V. EPA Guidance: Documenting and Reporting Performance in Achieving Land Revitalization

Objectives: Educate the team on the new EPA guidance.

Overview: Josh distributed copies of the new EPA guidance for documenting and reporting performance in achieving land revitalization.

Path Forward: The EPA is developing the module for tracking. Data will be entered between July and September of 2007. Josh will need CH2M HILL support in determining areas through GIS.

VI. Roundtable

Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC): Agnes talked about a recent meeting held with Doug Murray (NOSSA) to confirm that the appropriate MEC support measures were being implemented for intrusive activities. Doug confirmed that the current level of support is appropriate.

Public Website: Consider adding a public review section to the public web site, similar to Camp Lejeune's.

Action Janna - Add something to public web site about documents out for review.

VII. Tier II Update

Proposed Plan Concurrence: EPA and VDEQ need management approval prior to PPs being submitted for public review.

New Members: All new members should be integrated and receive a copy of the Partnering Guidelines.

Tier III: There is a Tier III. The membership and responsibilities are being finalized. Bob, Chris, and Hank will likely be on the team.

Streamlined ROD: Cherry Point and Region IV signed a streamlined ROD in September. It has been presented DOD wide. DOD is now pushing the format for all teams who are willing to use it. Region III's acceptance hasn't yet been determined.

VIII. RAB Agenda Building

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>
Site Update	Janna
Site 2 Triad Investigation	Kim

Site 21 Plume Investigation and Treatment	Kim and Agnes
---	---------------

Action Kim – Send Kevin Lew final BERA CD.

VIII. Site 2 Dynamic Work Plan

Objectives: Present the work plan developed based on the Site 2 Triad planning meeting and review the schedule for deliverables and activities.

Overview: Copies of the presentation and decision logic were distributed. Kim presented the field activities and logic associated with each. The team discussed the deep groundwater monitoring. Additional groundwater samples from the downgradient wells should be collected to confirm that the VOCs are not migrating in the deep aquifer from the vicinity of MW10D. Samples will be collected in April from MW02D and MW05D. Future monitoring will be based on consensus developed in the March partnering meeting.

Path forward: The draft dynamic work plan will be submitted to the Navy for initial review tomorrow or Monday. The draft will then be sent to the team around February 14, 2007. A 30-day review is requested, followed by finalization at the end of March. The field work will then be conducted beginning in April.

IX. Schedule and FY 2007 Team Goals Update

Schedule: The Schedule was updated and is included as a separate file.

FY 2007 Team Goals: The FY 2007 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

Action Kim – Send Agnes GIS boundaries.

IX. Agenda Building – May Meeting Agenda

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
Site 2 Triad Investigation	Discuss status of investigation and conduct site visit	Kim	4 hrs
Site 4 Groundwater Monitoring	Present round 2 of data	Janna	0.5 hr
Site 5 TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Agviq CH2M HILL JV	Introduce the JV contract mechanism to team.	Guest	0.5 hr
Site 21 SSI, EE/CA, and Path Forward	Address comments on DF SSI Report & EE/CA.	Janna/Kim	1.5 hr
Roundtable	Open (Environmental Indicators, etc.)	Team	0.5 hr
Technical Topic: Dechlorination using bioaugmentation	Educate the team.	Agnes	0.5 hr
Partnering Activity	Improve team working relationship or entrance/exit activities	Team	0.5 hr

Next meeting: May 22 - 23, 2007 (RAB May 22)
Location: CH2M HILL, Virginia Beach
Lodging: Marriott? (some where with free breakfast)
Start time: 9:00 AM
Finish time: 5:00 PM

Chair: Josh Barber
Host: Janna Staszak
Timekeeper: Kim Henderson
Goal Keeper: Agnes Sullivan

Recorder: Janna Staszak
Facilitator: Karen Doran
Tier II: TBD
Guests: JVI Representative

Pre-Meeting Agenda Conference Call: 2:00 PM on May 14, 2007

X. Future Meetings Schedule

July 17 - 18, 2007	Richmond, Virginia
September 18 - 19, 2007	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
November 13 - 14, 2007	Tidewater, Virginia

XI. Meeting Evaluation

Josh provided facilitator feedback. During the Partnering Session, the Team filled in "+" and "Δ" to list the positives and negatives of the meeting.

XII. Parking Lot

- Incorporate Environmental Indicators into FY2008 Goals
- Site 4 groundwater monitoring during the 5-year review
- Indoor Air Vapor Intrusion at Site 21

Consensus: The team agrees to accept these meeting minutes for the March 2007 meeting as final. The final minutes will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint Installation Restoration (IR) Teams web site.