

## St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: March 22 and 23, 2006

**Attendees:** Agnes Sullivan/NAVFAC MID LANT  
Todd Richardson/EPA (Region III)  
Jim Cutler/VDEQ  
Karen Doran/VDEQ  
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL  
Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

**Tier II Link:** Stacie Driscoll/EPA (Region III)

**Guests:** Ed Corl (NAVFAC)

**From:** Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

**Date:** August 1, 2006

**Location:** CH2M HILL, Philadelphia, PA

### Wednesday, March 22, 2006

1300 Welcome/Check In

#### Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

**Meeting Manager:** Agnes Sullivan  
**Timekeeper/Gatekeeper:** Karen Doran  
**Host:** Todd Richardson  
**Goalkeeper:** Agnes Sullivan  
**Facilitator:** Kim Henderson  
**Recorder:** Janna Staszak

#### Ground Rules

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

##### Review Agenda:

The Blows Creek Electronically Enhanced Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (eBERA) and the Site 2 discussions were switched. Additional revisions were made throughout the meeting as needed.

The February meeting minutes were added to the parking lot.

##### Review Parking Lot:

- Indoor air vapor intrusion - pending guidance

- Team Deliverables (roles and responsibility by entity) – roundtable topic
- February meeting minutes

## II. Blows Creek eBERA

Objective: Provide background information, familiarize the team with the format and outline of the eBERA for Blows Creek, receive preliminary questions, and answer questions.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed and Kim initiated the Blows Creek eBERA discussion.

Ed informed the team that he and Mike Elias (CH2M HILL) will present the eBERA at the quarterly Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG) meeting on April 4, 2006 in Philadelphia. The presentation will be open to BTAG and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) individuals who would like to see the deliverable. Todd indicated that Bruce had some concerns on the overall concept of the eBERA, similar to the Streamlined Record of Decision (S-ROD), such as public accessibility and review of the electronic document. Ed indicated that the eBERA is intended to be a tool for the Remedial Project Managers (RPMs) to help them understand the assessment and make risk management decisions. Unlike a ROD, it is not intended for public use. Kim also indicated that the concerns regarding the S-ROD were legal implications, because rather than providing the details in the S-ROD, there are links to administrative record documents.

Kim presented the background information leading to the development of the eBERA. She explained that the current approach to risk assessments is a hard copy whereas the eBERA uses an innovative electronic approach. The electronic format has several advantages over the hard copy: accessible and user-friendly to a broader audience, graphical orientation, interactivity, and flexibility to allow users to access various levels of information based on their needs. It minimizes the text by reducing the redundancy, focusing on graphic presentation and linking to more detailed information, while meeting regulatory requirements. Kim provided a demonstration of the eBERA. She reviewed the table of contents, showing the hyperlinks to the tiers of information, and demonstrated several of the interactive figures. Ed indicated that it may be useful to develop a spreadsheet or easy tool for the reviewers to incorporate their comments into the document while they are reviewing it.

Ed relayed the positive feedback received at the Environmental Restoration (ER) conference. He indicated that the eBERA is not appropriate for every site, such as very simple sites or locations with limited computer access. He also acknowledged that it is not cost-effective to prepare both eBERA and hard copy documents, so if too many are opposed to the concept then eBERAs may not be prepared.

Ed talked about the background of the TEARs Group meetings, which identified the fact that ERAs were holding up a lot of the sites because RPMs did not understand the ERA documents. The eBERA intends to make ERAs more understandable to the RPMs. Agnes indicated that she likes the format of the eBERA and finds it particularly valuable as a new RPM. Jim agreed.

The team discussed the toxicity results as compared to laboratory control and site reference data. Because the results are not consistent, it is possible to be leery of the results. Ed

explained the comparison of data to laboratory control, which is intended to represent unimpacted conditions, and to reference samples, which is intended to differentiate between site-related and non site-related sources.

Agnes asked what the next steps are. Ed responded that we need to get comments from everyone, both on the content and the concept. Ed said the priority is to help the SJCA team through the process to address Blows Creek. The eBERA concept can be ironed out down the road. Kim asked that the reviewers categorize their comments between concept and content.

Kim reviewed the future applications for electronic documents. EPA has an initiative for RODs, which is being applied at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point. Camp Peary is considering an eBERA. Additionally, in the future, the technology may be considered for human health risk assessments (HHRAs), remedial investigations (RIs), and feasibility studies (FSs).

Kim reviewed the schedule for the eBERA, which was submitted on February 28. Natural Resource Trustee (NRT) comments are due March 27 and team comments are due April 28. The Final eBERA is scheduled to be submitted May 28.

### **III. Site 2 ERI Comments and Recommendations**

Objective: Review the site status, comments on the Deep Groundwater Work Plan, and new comments on the Draft Expanded Remedial Investigation (ERI); present the Tiger Team recommendations; and review the path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the history and layout of the site and the current status within the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process.

Ed reviewed the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Cleanup Review Tiger Team (CURTT). He indicated that CURTT consisted of NAVFAC technical consultants with expertise in groundwater and Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL). He then reviewed why CURTT became involved with the site and the schedule of their review. In August of 2005, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic requested their involvement. CURTT met and visited the site in October of 2005. They also reviewed the Draft ERI. They issued a draft report in February 2006 and met with NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic in March 2006 to discuss the report and path forward.

Ed reviewed the conclusions and recommendations. CURTT recommended further sampling to better characterize the vertical and horizontal boundaries of the DNAPL plume. CURTT indicated that there is no evidence of any DNAPL treatment technology that has sustained maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). In situations where MCLs have been met, there has always been rebound. Therefore, CURTT recommends the use of Alternative Concentration Limits (ACLs) for final long-term goals, which are applicable when active restoration to Applicable and Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) is not practicable. ACLs allow the establishment of an exit strategy. Todd asked if that meant using a technical impracticability (TI) argument. Ed indicated that it would.

CURTT recommends considering the use of various active treatment technologies for short-term goals. Groundwater treatment technologies considered by CURTT included vegetable

oil injection, emulsified zero valent iron (EZVI), thermal treatment, and natural processes or monitored natural attenuation (MNA). Vegetable oil injection and EZVI were identified as viable options. MNA is also a consideration, particularly as secondary treatment. Thermal treatment is not recommended due to the likelihood of mobilizing the contaminants and allowing them to spread. Todd asked if MNA has achieved MCLs. Ed indicated that there is no record of it.

One concern noted by CURTT was the quantity of data qualifiers on the data, which is not typical for groundwater data (more common with complicated matrices such as sediment). Ed indicated that the high quantity of qualifiers is most likely a result of the need for the lab to dilute the samples. Additionally, results between the method detection limit (MDL) and practical quantitation level (PQL), which is a gray area, also lead to J flags, or estimated detections. Ed reviewed the data and concluded that no further action was necessary due to the high level of contaminants at the site, exhibiting that VOCs are present at high concentrations.

The contamination upgradient of Site 2 (Site 21) was also a concern to CURTT. The report recommended no action should be taken at Site 2 until Site 21 is addressed. CURTT also questioned the validity of the ERA because the laboratory control from the toxicity test did not meet the 80% requirement for survival (results indicated only 76% survival). Ed explained that the laboratory control is intended to represent unimpacted conditions but that the sample is not created in the lab; it's collected from a water body that is considered to not to be anthropogenically impacted. Although the laboratory control did not achieve the 80% requirement, the reference control performed very well (in the 90% range). After reviewing the data, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic feels that although the results are not perfect, comparison to reference controls indicates that there is a problem but because the partnering team has assumed that a removal action will be performed at the site, there is no need to spend funds on additional risk assessment. However, if site-specific risk-based cleanup goals are to be developed for the removal, additional testing may be required.

Jim recommended using Frank Chappelle's (United States Geological Survey representative out of South Carolina) MNA software to help determine what level of contamination can be left behind at Site 2. He and Karen just completed a two-day training session on the software. Ed indicated that Cliff Casey (a member of CURTT) helped to develop the software.

Kim reviewed Navy comments and responses for the Draft Deep Groundwater Work Plan.

**Action Todd:** Submit Draft Site 2 Deep Groundwater Technical Memorandum Work Plan for Senior Hydrogeologist review and provide comments by April 21.

Kim reviewed the VDEQ comments received on the Draft ERI. VDEQ comments indicated concern over the petroleum odor noted during the RI and ERI. Kim presented the data from the samples that were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). She also indicated that the field crew who noted the odor stated the odor was more likely trichloroethene (TCE) than petroleum. Agnes added that there are no active Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricant (POL) sites in the vicinity of Site 2. However, there are a number of historical tanks in the vicinity of the buildings east of Site 2 according to the NAVFAC tank database. Agnes explained the POL program, indicating that the Navy has separate funding to clean up POL

sites. Karen indicated that the ERI just has one sentence about the petroleum odor, so she would like it to be further explained in the text. EPA provided comments on the Draft ERI at the meeting. Initial review of the comments did not identify any major concerns. One EPA comment questioned why the Site 17 data was not incorporated into the risk assessment now that Site 17 was part of Site 2; Kim responded that it was because the Site 17 data indicated lower concentrations than the Site 2 data.

Kim reviewed the path forward for the site. Once funding is received, the ERI will be finalized, including revised recommendations based on the CURTT report. The Deep Groundwater Technical Memorandum Work Plan will be finalized once comments are received from EPA. A plan will then be developed to collect the additional data to fill the data gaps for deep groundwater and the DNAPL plume. The data will then be presented in an ERI Addendum. A pilot study will be planned for the shallow groundwater and an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) may also be developed to address soil and sediment.

#### **IV. Tier II Update**

Objective: Stacie provided the Tier II update.

Overview of Discussion: Stacie asked if the team had any ecological issues. Todd responded that the team has no problems and also invited Stacie to the eBERA presentation in April. He indicated that Bruce has already expressed concerns about public accessibility, but that the RPMs like it.

Stacie indicated that the EPA and Navy both came out with perchlorate guidance, and the guidance agrees.

Tier II is looking into holding a partnering training session and Stacie asked if anyone needed training. Both Agnes and Karen need the training.

Tier II's next meeting will be in June.

Todd brought up that EPA is pushing for the implementation of an oversight contractor for each facility, and that it may be a hindrance for SJCA since there are only a few sites left; he asked for Stacie's and Tier II's support.

---

### **Thursday, March 23, 2006**

#### **0830 Check In.**

#### **Review Agenda:**

Site 19 topic from previous day was moved to the Roundtable.

#### **Review Previous Action Items:**

The team reviewed Action Items and carryover items from the February 2006 meeting. The Action Items were added to a separate spreadsheet and tracked at the meeting.

As a result of the responses to the previous Action Items, the following new Action Items were created:

**Action Janna** – Send Todd backup from the May 2005 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting regarding citizens' concerns.

**Action Karen** – Find out the status of St. Juliens Creek for classification/fishing/shellfish.

**Action Agnes** – Write up a success story paper for Tier II regarding the eBERA.

**Action Kim** – Send out revised partnering deliverables and post on Tier II web site.

**Action Agnes** – See Bob regarding comments on Site 4 Post-Closure Plan.

## **V. Roundtable**

### Oversight Contractors:

EPA is considering adding oversight contractors as an additional level of review. If the plan is implemented, the contractor would attend all of the Tier I meetings.

### Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Funding:

Agnes indicated that Navy funding for environmental projects has been delayed. Several projects have been negotiated, but have not yet been funded. She is uncertain on when funding will arrive. In addition, the projects that have not yet been executed (including the Site 5 removal action) may have their funding cut to correct a projected three million dollar deficit. Alternatively, because of the reorganization, funding from some of the projects from the northeast may become available due to delays in execution.

### Navy Environmental Restoration Program Training:

Agnes will attend the Navy Environmental Restoration Program training the last week of March in Norfolk (3-day workshop).

### EPA Performance Standards:

EPA is being pressured to develop performance standards for when activities are going to be accomplished. Todd will let the team know if performance standards become a requirement so the team can prepare a plan to achieve the standards.

## **VI. Site 19 Removal Action**

Objective: Review the site status and scope and schedule for the removal action. Discuss the post-Removal Action submittals.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Janna reviewed the previous site investigations, current status, the scope of the removal action, and project schedule. The survey of the removal areas, utility search, waste characterization sampling, and borrow source sampling were conducted in February. Mobilization for the actual removal action, which should take approximately one week, will be scheduled once site approval is obtained. Agnes indicated that the SJCA Facility Management Division director needs to meet with CDR LaPlatney in order to complete the site approval process, and she is uncertain when the site approval will be finalized. Janna then reviewed the post-removal action submittals. A draft construction closeout report will be submitted approximately 30 days after the completion of construction. A site closeout report will follow.

## VII. Site 5 ERI and EE/CA

Objective: Review the site background, Draft Final ERI, and Draft EE/CA; discuss cleanup goals; and review the path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Janna reviewed the site background and status. She then reviewed the comments received from the Navy and VDEQ on the Draft Final ERI. The team goal for finalization of the ERI of March 31 was not met due to the delay in FY06 funding. Janna indicated that the Final ERI will be submitted approximately 30 days after the receipt of funding.

Janna then reviewed the EE/CA content. She listed the alternatives that were evaluated and presented a table comparing the alternatives, including effectiveness, implementability, and cost. She then reviewed the recommended alternative: excavation to visible limits and site restoration/wetland creation. The recommended alternative includes an excavation of approximately 2.5 feet followed by post-excavation confirmation samples. Six inches of topsoil would then be placed in the bottom of the excavation. Restoration will consist of replacement of the asphalt driveway of Building 272 and establishment of various vegetation zones, including an emergent wetland, a shrub/emergent wetland transition, an upland/tree and shrub transition, and an upland area.

Janna indicated that the team had originally intended to excavate to the mean low groundwater elevation to eliminate the need for confirmation samples, so remediation goals were never established. However, because the seasonal low groundwater level is so much lower (4.6 feet) than the anticipated waste depth, the cost of the removal action would be considerably higher. The team discussed the seasonal mean low groundwater requirement. Jim indicated that Howard Freeland of VDEQ recommends the seasonal mean low groundwater level for remediation of waste sites, although the landfill regulations require excavation to seasonal high. Jim recommended considering using hydric markers in the soil that we may be able to excavate to.

Kim indicated that the team would have to establish cleanup goals in order to determine how to evaluate the confirmation samples. Kim reviewed the results of previous sampling and the HHRA for the site. The human health chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) for surface soil are arsenic, copper, iron, and lead. Ecological COPCs for surface soil include pesticides, metals, and an explosive. Kim indicated that the HHRA for subsurface soil did not indicate any risk. Kim proposed that confirmation samples be collected on 50- by 50-foot grids and evaluated for the arsenic, copper, iron, and lead. She also proposed using residential risk-based criteria (RBCs) and/or background upper threshold limits (UTLs) as the comparison criteria, but indicated concern over whether or not the criteria would be met based on existing sample data and the uncertainty of dredge fill. The team discussed collection of pre-excavation confirmation samples based on potential delays and cost impact to the removal action while the data was evaluated. Kim indicated that it may be impracticable due to the presence of metallic waste resulting in the inability to practice MEC avoidance during the sampling. The variance in waste and burnt soil thickness across the site would also make it difficult to accurately project the bottom of the excavation.

**Action Agnes** – Discuss pre-confirmation sampling options with Ed Corl for application to the Site 5 Removal Action.

The team agreed that it makes sense to analyze for metals for comparison to residential RBCs and Background UTLs. However Todd and Agnes prefer pre-confirmation sampling. Jim suggested that we develop alternative cleanup goals using back-calculations from the HHRA.

**Action Janna** - Talk to human health risk assessor (Roni Warren) about cleanup goals (Alternate Cleanup Levels) for Site 5 subsurface soil.

The team decided to proceed with submission of the Draft EE/CA in spite of the fact that specific cleanup goals have not been established. A plan for the development of cleanup goals will be added to the Draft EE/CA prior to submittal and the team will then discuss the plan and incorporate the specific cleanup goals into the Final EE/CA.

Janna reviewed the path forward for Site 5. The Draft EE/CA will be submitted by the end of March. Team comments will be due May 31. After they are incorporated, a 30-day public review period will be held. The Draft Action Memorandum will be submitted by the end of June. The ERI will be finalized once funding and comments are received. Additional rounds of groundwater samples will be collected in the spring and fall of 2006 (pending funding).

#### **VIII. Perchlorate Guidance**

**Objective:** Review the Navy and EPA Guidance documents.

**Overview of Discussion:** Todd handed out the EPA Guidance and a Center for Disease Control (CDC) Case Study. He indicated that perchlorate salts were used in by the military for explosives and rocket propellants. He also indicated that perchlorate occurs naturally in the environment. Todd reviewed the clean-up goal and indicated that the Navy adopted EPA's cleanup goal, as reflected in their guidance. He reviewed the results of a case study, indicating that most Americans carry perchlorate in their bodies at levels close to safety limits set by the EPA and that 35 states have detected perchlorate in water supplies. Health effects include disruption of normal thyroid function. There is no documentation of perchlorate use at SJCA and no sampling for perchlorate has been conducted.

#### **IX. Site 21 Status Update**

**Objective:** Review the site status, Supplemental Site Investigation (SSI) report content, and schedule.

**Overview of Discussion:** Copies of the presentation were distributed. Kim briefly reviewed the site status and history. She then presented the content of the SSI report, which will include a desktop evaluation, summary of the field data, a CSM for shallow groundwater, and a Human Health Risk Screening (HHRS) for shallow groundwater and the vapor intrusion pathway. Kim presented a figure of the historic and existing site buildings. Todd asked what the purpose of reviewing the history was. Kim indicated that it was to identify the buildings where TCE was used and confirm the unusual distribution of the plume. Todd asked if we had analyzed for 1,4-dioxane, which is associated with TCE. Kim said that it has not been analyzed for but will look into it. Kim presented the TCE plume diagram. Agnes questioned some of the plume contours, suggesting that contaminant levels may be higher in some places. The team agreed and Kim indicated that the data can be interpreted differently, but that the figure will be reviewed and adjusted based on team discussion.

Comments due	Document
--------------	----------

Kim reviewed the deep groundwater data, which had a previous MCL exceedance of arsenic.

Kim presented the potential sources and the CSM. She then discussed considerations for developing treatment, indicating that DNAPL may be present based on the soil analytical results. Injection of enhanced reductive dechlorination (ERD) with emulsified oil is the preferred treatment method. Additional data may be necessary prior to treatment to refine the injection spacing and volume for treatment design (avoid undertreatment of hotspots) and determine whether and where DNAPL conditions exist. The presence of DNAPL may result in rebound conditions as TCE desorbs from soil, requiring multiple injections. A senior technical consultant will be involved and review the site data to determine is the appropriate approach and development of the work plan.

Based on these findings, Kim indicated that she considered recommending revising this SSI into a RI, but that it would significantly delay the process. Todd suggested that it be revised as an RI because it looks like we will ultimately need a decision document due to the reduced likelihood of achieving our cleanup goals with the initial treatability study. Kim agreed, but because the SSI is nearly complete, a full RI is not currently funded, a treatability study is funded, and the future technology would likely be injection of emulsified oil, it may make sense to proceed with the treatability study. Todd agreed.

Kim then reviewed the results of the HHRS. For shallow groundwater, there is potential non-cancer risk for cis-1,2-dichloroethene (DCE) and molybdenum and potential cancer risk for 1,2-DCE, benzene, chloroform, MTBE, TCE, vinyl chloride, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, heptachlor epoxide, RDX, and arsenic. For deep groundwater, there is potential cancer risk for chloroform and arsenic. Kim also reviewed the results of the vapor intrusion evaluation. The modeling of the indoor air concentrations indicated that indoor concentrations of TCE, vinyl chloride, and cis-1,2-DCE were all below the lowest published exposure limits. The cancer risks were calculated to be below the EPA's range of acceptable risk; therefore, there are no unacceptable human health risks due to vapor intrusion at Building 1556. Todd asked about the toxicity value for indoor air for TCE. The Navy currently specifies using  $1.7 \times 10^{-6}$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

**Action Todd** - Check with Linda regarding the cancer slope factor for TCE for indoor air/vapor intrusion.

Kim reviewed the path forward. The Draft SSI Report is scheduled for April submission. A video survey for leaks will be conducted in the summer, pending funding, and will be followed by the repair of any detected leaks. A treatability study will then be conducted. The team goal for submission of the draft work plan for the treatability study is September 30, and the schedule is dependent on funding. Additional data collection may be necessary prior to the implementation of the treatability study.

**X. Schedule and FY 2006 Team Goals Update**

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

The following document review deadlines were discussed:

Draft Final Site 5 ERI (HHRA Revision)	Over due (Now 4/30)
Draft Deep Groundwater Tech Memo Work Plan – Site 2	4/21
Redline Revised Post-Closure Plan – Site 4	4/15
Draft e-BERA	4/28
Draft EE/CA – Site 5	5/31
Draft Supplemental Site Investigation – Site 21	6/15

**FY 2006 Team Goals:** The FY 2006 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

#### **XI. RAB Agenda Building**

No agenda topics were selected for the RAB meeting. Instead, a site tour of SJCA will be conducted. Linda Baxter will attend the next RAB meeting to help address community concerns and the potential EPA site assessment of St. Juliens Creek.

**Action Agnes** – Contact the RAB regarding the site visit on May 17 or 18; if wanted, coordinate it by April 7.

#### **XII. Partnering Activity**

The team conducted an entrance activity for Karen and an exit activity for Jim.

#### **XIII. Agenda Building – May Meeting Agenda**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
Site 2 ERI Comments & Recommendations	I – EPA comment response, possible redline review, and recommendations	Kim	1 hr
Blows Creek eBERA Success Story	I – Present the eBERA success story write-up; review preliminary comments	Agnes & Kim	1 hr
Site 5 ERI & EE/CA	I, C, D – Discuss ERI and EE/CA comments; confirmation sampling consensus	Kim & Janna	1 hr
Site 19 Status Update	I – Update the team on the removal action status	Janna	0.5 hr
Site 21 Next Steps	I – Considerations for Treatment	Kim	1 hr
RAB Review	I – Discuss how the RAB went/any necessary follow-up actions	Team	0.5 hr
Roundtable	I – open	Team	0.5 hr

**Next meeting:** May 17 and 18, 2006  
**Location:** TBD, Norfolk, Virginia

**Lodging:** TBD, Norfolk, Virginia  
**Start time:** 1:00 PM at SJCA (RAB site visit)  
**Finish time:** 5:00 PM

**Chair:** Karen Doran  
**Host:** Janna Staszak  
**Timekeeper:** Kim Henderson  
**Goal Keeper:** Agnes Sullivan

**Recorder:** Janna Staszak  
**Facilitator:** Todd Richardson  
**Tier II:** Bob Schirmer  
**Guests:** none

**Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call:** 10:00 AM on May 9, 2006  
**Call-in number:** 1-888-232-0362 (Host Code: 100890 Participant Code: 191819)

#### **XIV. Future Meetings Schedule**

July 19 - 20, 2006	Richmond, VA
August 30 - 31, 2006	Chincoteague, VA
October 18 - 19, 2006	Tidewater, Virginia with RAB Meeting
December 6 - 7, 2006	Washington, DC (Marriott Residence Inn? Hilton Alexandria?)

#### **XV. Meeting Evaluation**

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

#### **XVI. Parking Lot**

##### **Review Previous Meeting Minutes:**

February meeting minutes were accepted as final.

**Consensus:** February 2006 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final with grammatical revisions. The final minutes will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

To remain in parking lot:

- Indoor air vapor intrusion - pending guidance