

## St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: March 16 and 17, 2005

**Attendees:** Jeff Weisman/NAVFAC MID LANT  
Bob Schirmer/NAVFAC MID LANT  
Todd Richardson/EPA (Region III)  
Jim Cutler/VDEQ  
Debbie Miller/VDEQ  
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL  
Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL  
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

**Tier II Link:** Bob Schirmer/NAVFAC MID LANT

**Guests:** NA

**From:** Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

**Date:** May 17, 2005

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

---

### Wednesday, March 16, 2005

1300 Welcome/Check In

#### Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

**Meeting Manager:** Bob Schirmer  
**Timekeeper/Gatekeeper:** Jim Cutler  
**Host:** Todd Richardson  
**Goalkeeper:** Bob Schirmer  
**Facilitator:** Kim Henderson  
**Recorder:** Janna Staszak

#### Ground Rules

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

#### Review Agenda:

Revisions will be made to the agenda as needed.

#### Review Meeting Minutes:

Discussion of the Draft January 2005 Meeting Minutes was added to the Parking Lot for Day 2.

### Review Action Items:

The team reviewed Action Items and carryover items from the January 2005 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 Bob/Jeff** – Write letter to EPA/VDEQ switching RPM to Jeff.

**Action Todd** – Send a copy of FFA notification to Team.

**Action Bob** – Respond to VDEQ and EPA regarding survey plats.

**Action Todd** – Check with Simeon regarding soil depths (0 to 2' or 0 to 6") for ecological risk.

**Action Jim/Debbie** – Remind Durwood to send recommendation to postpone full meeting review of SJCA.

## II. Community Relations Plan (CRP) Update

Objective: Discuss progress of community interviews and delivery of the CRP document.

Overview of Discussion: Kim provided an overview of the CRP and a presentation handout was provided.

- 15 to 20 interviews will be conducted throughout the communities of Portsmouth and Chesapeake to determine level of knowledge of SJCA and IRP, identify major concerns and issues, and enhance community relations
- Questionnaires were distributed February 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> by Rebekah Ives/CH2M HILL and John Ballinger/Navy to: Elected officials, community members, community leaders, SJCA employees, business owners, environmental organization employees, school and library employees, civic league/residents
- As of March 10, 2005, five questionnaires have been returned
- Draft CRP is currently being written; team goal for completion is March 30, 2005, this will likely be delayed if additional questionnaires are necessary
- Bill Hudson/EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) reviewed and approved the questionnaire

The team discussed whether or not additional interviews would be required if 15 to 20 questionnaires were not received.

**Action Todd** – Check with Bill Hudson as to whether additional CRP interviews will be required due to low response.

Bob inquired whether a Navy public affairs officer has been contacted. Kim stated that Valerie indicated that it was not necessary and that John Peters had retired.

Bob asked what prompted SJCA to update the CRP. The team discussed that generally, the CRP is to be updated with every action but for SJCA, actions have been limited. Kim indicated that SJCA's CRP was 5 years old and the update was intended to coincide with the action for Site 4.

Bob indicated that Tim Reisch's new responsibilities include the Environmental Business Line Team Leader (BLTL) for SJCA and should be notified of public activities for regional coordination.

**Action Jeff** - Give Tim Reisch CRP schedule.

### III. Site 4 Update

Objective: Provide Site 4 construction schedule, update status of key coordination issues, discuss visitors to site, and discuss quality control (QC) meetings.

Overview of Discussion: Janna discussed the status of Site 4. Janna passed out construction schedules and response to comments on the draft work plan to the team.

Key coordination issues for the Site 4 construction include the following:

- Navy is looking into alternate gate use to reduce traffic through SJCA
- Water is available from hydrant by fire house (backflow preventer will be used)
- JV I meeting with Base Security to review UXO procedures 3/16/2005
- Notification to SJCA for construction activity/restricted access has been made; Signs will be posted
  - Bill expressed concern over public continuing to use Perimeter Road

Pre-confirmation samples were collected 2/22/2005.

- No exceedances of dredge fill background upper tolerance limit (UTL) of 1.3 mg/kg in upland drainage (3 samples collected)
- One exceedances (1.1 mg/kg) of Bohicket background UTL (0.6 mg/kg) in wetland area (2 samples collected)

**Consensus** - Based on the results of the pre-confirmation sampling, the SJCA team reaffirms its decision to remove only one foot within the eastern drainage ditch for the upland dredge fill soils and the Bohicket sediment. The results of the samples collected in the Bohicket sediment, mercury concentrations (non-detect and 1.1 mg/kg), will be incorporated into the BERA data for Blows Creek.

**Action Kim** - Replace Site 4 ditch samples (2) in Blows Creek BERA.

Key dates (expected start dates):

- 3/21 - Mobilization/site setup
- 3/29 - Site preparation/installation of erosion and sediment (E&S) features
- 4/13 - Site clearing
- 4/20 - Excavation of sediment from eastern drainage ditch
- 4/27 - Wetland debris removal
- 5/25 - Soil cover placement
- 9/7 - Site restoration
- 9/16 - Demobilization

Janna reminded the team that all visitors to the site should sign in at the site trailer. Personal protective equipment must be worn by all visitors to the site, including hard hats,

steel toed boots, safety vests, and safety glasses. A site visit will be planned in conjunction with the May Partnering meeting. If additional visits are needed, please notify Janna in advance. Jim and Debbie indicated that they would like to visit during sediment excavation and soil cover placement. Bob reminded team that photos are to be provided during construction.

Janna summarized QC meetings, which will be conducted weekly or biweekly to track progress of construction:

- First QC meeting is scheduled for March 24 at 2:00 PM
- Agendas will be provided prior to meetings; minutes will be generated afterwards

**Action Kim** - Calculate area of all CERCLA IR sites and provide to Bob/Jeff.

Todd indicated that Simeon Hahn/BTAG requested an ecologically friendly seed mixture to be placed on Site 4 instead of a traditional grass mixture (fescues).

**Action Janna** - Report back to team on use of ecologically friendly seed mixture for Site 4.

**Action Janna** - Provide a Final copy of Site 4 Work Plan to Bonnie for Administrative Record.

**Action Bob** - Develop process to add JV I documents to Administrative Record.

**Action Janna** - Develop fact sheet for Site 4 to be available on site.

#### **IV. Site 5 Ecological Visit**

Objective: Provide recap of the March 15 site visit.

Overview of Discussion: Bill provided list of attendees and Bob provided overview of who's who. He noted that Ed Corl's group now includes Jennifer Wright and John Noles and they will be dividing the facilities based on complexity of ecological issues. Ed is handling SJCA for now.

Bill summarized the presentation that was given and provided Todd with copies. The attendees expressed general agreement on the proposed path forward. There were concerns expressed regarding the lead hotspot located in the woods and a hot spot removal was recommended. Bill discussed Port Authority's plan to create emergent wetlands at Site 5. The Port Authority would pay for the construction of the wetland after site contamination is removed.

**Action Bob** - Send Tim a short paragraph about Site 5 meeting.

VDEQ indicated they will require confirmation sampling within the waste area, unless removal is conducted to the depth of to low mean seasonal groundwater. Janna will revise estimate for Site 5 to reflect excavating to the low mean seasonal groundwater level within waste area. Therefore, no confirmatory samples required.

**Action Kim/Janna** - Determine low mean seasonal groundwater level for Site 5; Develop cost for removal to low mean.

Concerns were expressed regarding the dewatering of waste and it was recommended that the waste dry on site to avoid triggering the land disposal restrictions (LDRs). Mechanical or chemical drying may be considered treatment.

For the estimate, no backfill will be factored in because the intent will be to construct a wetland. Low quality wetland (phrag) is better than no wetland and Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG) seems to be willing to lower standards for "clean" if a wetland is created whereas dredge fill has always raised a concern in the past. Because the cost would be significantly impacted if the material was classified as hazardous, it was recommended that sampling be conducted in advance to determine if disposal will be hazardous.

The Port Authority wetland plan may create additional risk due to the new groundwater to surface water interface. Groundwater data will be compared to surface water criteria.

Bob recommended developing a path forward. The path forward is to look at data that is available now; develop some options; present to Simeon and Ed and possibly invite them to the next meeting.

#### **Site 5 Path Forward:**

1. Determine future land use for site; Does the Navy want a wetland there?
2. Wait for BRAC (initial list comes out in April)
3. Decide Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Feasibility Study (FS) or just FS for the entire site
4. Groundwater: seasonal mean low and potential cost impact
5. Screen groundwater compared to BTAG values, Virginia Water Quality Standards (VWQS)
6. Look at existing subsurface soil data (background and BTAG screening)

#### **V. Site 5 Groundwater**

Objective: Present the team with a data summary and the human health risks for Site 5 groundwater; Discuss the potential for risk management and applicability of the groundwater flexibilities in preparation for the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP)/Record of Decision (ROD) phase.

Overview of Discussion: Presentation handouts, data tables, risk tables, and a groundwater flexibility matrix table were provided to the team. Kim summarized the existing monitoring wells/former sampling activities at Site 5. Kim summarized data sets for each well (1 to 4 rounds of data for each well):

- 1997 – Installed 3 shallow and 2 deep monitoring wells during Remedial Investigation (RI) (Sampled in July and November)
- 1999 – Installed 2 additional shallow and 1 additional deep monitoring well during RI (Sampled in May 1999)
- 2003 – Resampled 2 shallow wells and 1 deep well to confirm or deny previous Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) exceedances during the Expanded RI (Sampled in December 2003)
  - RI didn't include 2003 data

Kim discussed the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA): Shallow groundwater was evaluated for construction worker only (acceptable results). Deep groundwater was evaluated based on residential use and noncarcinogenic risks for iron (ingestion by current/future child resident) and chloroform (showing by current/future adult) were identified.

Kim indicated that shallow groundwater data was recently reevaluated for future residential risk because soils are being considered for removal, resulting in potential future residential use. Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME – most conservative risk evaluation) and Central Tendency Exposure (CTE – more realistic, site-specific risk evaluation) methods were used. The risks were evaluated using 2 different data sets because of the variability in the 1997 data.

Results for all rounds (1997 to 2003):

- Noncarcinogenic risks to a future child resident
  - Ingestion of aluminum (RME), arsenic (RME), cadmium (RME), iron (RME & CTE), manganese (RME & CTE), thallium (RME), and vanadium (RME)
  - Dermal contact with manganese (RME)
- Carcinogenic risks to a future lifetime resident
  - Ingestion of arsenic (RME)
- Risks biased based on what appears to be anomalous results from 1997

Most recent rounds (excludes 1997):

- Noncarcinogenic risks to a future child resident
  - Ingestion of arsenic (RME), iron (RME & CTE), and manganese (RME & CTE)
  - Dermal contact with manganese (RME)

MCL exceedances for shallow groundwater, included arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, lead, and thallium. There were no MCL exceedances for deep groundwater.

Kim reviewed the risk management considerations and groundwater flexibilities based on human health risks (including RME vs. CTE risks) and MCL exceedances per parameter for shallow and deep groundwater.

Kim requested consensus to use the HHRA results conducted on the most recent round (1999/2003) due to variability in sample data collected in 1997 and the fact that the more recent rounds are representative of current site conditions. Regardless, risk management considerations can likely be made for both shallow and deep groundwater risks and MCL exceedances. Debbie indicated that most risk assessments require a minimum of 4 rounds of data. The team considered a consensus to collect 2 additional rounds of samples (summer and fall); however, Todd wanted to hold off on that decision until all of the comments on the Site 5 Expanded RI are received and the team looks more thoroughly into the overall picture. Todd wants to keep the ultimate goal/plan in mind, and how everything fits together. Therefore, the Team decided to hold off on additional sampling.

**Action Todd/Jim** – Talk to risk assessors about CTE vs RME and verify minimum rounds for risk assessment.

After the Draft Expanded RI comments are received, Kim recommended that a Draft Final be submitted with the revised HHRA.

---

## Thursday, March 17, 2005

**0830 Check In.**

### VI. Engineering Controls

Objective: Review the selected engineering controls for Site 4 and select engineering controls for the IR sites posing potential risk to human health and the environment. Goals were to select the sign frequencies, sizes, and wording.

Overview of Discussion: Presentation handouts were provided to the team. Janna reviewed the engineering controls for Site 4. A perimeter chain link fence will be installed with one 6' x 3' sign at the gate and 2' x 2' signs around the fence at 100-ft spacing. The team previously decided that the signs should be orange with black lettering. Bob expressed concern over the color of the signs. The color will be verified before ordering. Also, the contact phone number may need to be changed based on the reorganization.

**Action Bob** – Determine the contact information and color for IR warning sites.

Site 2 poses present risk to human health in groundwater, soil, sediment, ABM, and waste in place. The following signage was selected: one 6' x 3' sign adjacent to the parking lot and seven 2' x 2' signs around the site. The signs will say:

SITE 2: WASTE DISPOSAL AREA B  
**NO ACCESS ALLOWED**  
 CONSTRUCTION AND EXCAVATION STRICTLY PROHIBITED  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS ON SITE  
 CONTACT: (contact still to be determined...)

Site 5 poses risk to human health in waste and soil. One large "you are here" sign showing the layout of Site 5 will be placed near the main access area. Ten 2' x 2' signs will be placed around the perimeter stating:

SITE 5: BURNING GROUNDS  
**NO ACCESS ALLOWED**  
 CONSTRUCTION AND EXCAVATION STRICTLY PROHIBITED  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS ON SITE  
 CONTACT: (contact still to be determined...)

**Action Kim/Janna** – Develop large Site 5 sign and send to team for review.

No engineering controls will be necessary for Sites 19 or 21.

### VII. Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Agenda

Objective: Develop agenda for RAB Meeting in May.

Overview of Discussion: Kim discussed the May RAB meeting. She reminded the Team that a site visit for RAB was promised for this year. The Team decided to postpone the site visit until the October RAB meeting based on the Site 4 schedule.

Bob explained the reasoning for RAB meetings to the new members; the RAB is a way for the community to have input into the IR program. SJCA RAB is normally small: 2 community members and 1 SJCA employee.

**Date/Time:** May 11 at 5:30 PM

Topic	Speaker	Time
Site 4	Janna	30 minutes
Regional Dig Permit Process	Bob	15 minutes
Goal Update	Jeff	30 minutes
Site Status (2, 3, 19, 21, 5)	Kim	30 minutes
NAVFAC Reorganization/IRP	Bob	15 minutes

**Action Bob** - Send the new Navy PowerPoint template to Team.

**Action Jeff** - Contact NNSY for involvement in SJCA IRP.

**Action Bob/Jeff/Kim/Janna** - Prepare RAB presentations.

**Action Bob/Jeff** - Schedule RAB meeting May 11 at 5:30 - 7:45 PM. Send out Agenda.

**Action Jeff** - Tell Tim about SJCARAB meeting on May 11, 2005 at 5:30 PM.

### **VIII. Sites 2, 19, and 21**

Objective: Present team with most recent finding based on the validated data; Determine path forward for each site.

Overview of Discussion: Kim discussed the status of each site and presentation handouts were provided.

#### **Site 2**

RI (2003) and Expanded RI activities (2003 - 2004) are complete:

- Waste delineated
- Nature and extent of contamination of groundwater completed; cVOC plume delineated
- Source of cVOCs to inlet surface water identified (Site 2 groundwater and Site 21 groundwater discharge through storm sewer)
- Extent of potential contribution from the Site 2 inlet delineated (outfall location only)
- Reference values for sediment established in St. Juliens Creek.\
- Toxicity testing complete for inlet sediment

**Groundwater:**

- MIP results correlated with monitoring well results
- Plume limited in size

**Sediment:**

- SD21 contains elevated cVOCs (Samples collected from 0 to 2")
- Toxicity samples were collected from within the inlet and in St. Juliens Creek for reference as the next step in the Ecological Risk Assessment [ERA]. Objective was to determine chronic toxicity of sediment to estuarine amphipods during a 28-day exposure. The minimum criteria for this study is 80% survival. Reference sediment survival rate was 83 to 90%. Site 2 inlet had 0 to 58% survival rate for SD05, SD06, SD24, and SD25 and 77 to 87% at SD03 and SD26

**Path Forward:**

- Resample deep monitoring well (MW10D) suspected for TCE carry down and upgradient (MW01D) and downgradient (MW02D) deep wells – end of March, quick turn-around-time (TAT)
- Complete Expanded RI Report by June 30, 2005 to present data collected since the RI
- Begin evaluating remedial alternatives; Site 21 storm sewer discharge needs to be coordinated prior to remediation of Site 2

**Action Janna** – Send Site 2 estimate to Bob and Jeff.

**Site 19**

Site 19 is currently in Site Investigation (SI) phase. The SI was completed in 2003 and recommended additional investigation based on potential risks identified in surface and subsurface soil from metals and PAHs in isolated locations. Supplemental SI was completed in 2004 to further delineate:

- metallic slag pile
- surface soil PAHs in parking lot
- subsurface soil PAHs transport to shallow groundwater

**Surface soil PAHs in parking lot:** Options include either removal or risk management. There is no CERCLA source identified and the team decided to risk manage.

**Consensus:** The team agrees to risk manage PAHs in surface soil sample SS03 at Site 19 based on historical use as a parking lot, no identified CERCLA source, and potential historical dredge fill of the site.

**Subsurface soil PAHs:** No PAHs were detected in shallow groundwater. Considerations for risk management include: no CERCLA source was identified, the site is likely located on dredge fill from Blows Creek and the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, and only 1 PAH exceeded background in SS. However, the top soil has probably been reworked. Todd does not feel comfortable with risk management based on the elevated levels at this location

only. The team decided to collect additional samples to further delineate the PAHs; 3 wall samples and 1 floor sample will be collected and the road will be used as a physical boundary. These samples may pose as pre-confirmation samples for removal.

**Metallic slag pile:** Cadmium and chromium were identified as potential risk drivers in the initial sample. The Supplemental SI results were significantly lower and the removal will be conducted based on the results.

**Path Forward:** Complete Supplemental SI report following additional subsurface soil investigation. The Team goal of hot spot removal by October 31, 2005 will not be met due to lack of funding.

**Action Jeff** – Develop swing project for Site 19 removal.

### *Site 21*

The SI was completed in 2003 and recommended additional investigation to further delineate Shallow groundwater cVOC plume and confirm or deny RDX, arsenic, and vanadium concentrations. Supplemental SI was completed in 2004.

#### **Groundwater:**

- Data gaps still exist under the building and to the east, MW07S had elevated results, but were B flagged (Blank contaminated)
- RDX was detected at MW04S in 2003 but not repeated in 2004
- Arsenic and vanadium were detected in 2003 but were not repeated in 2004

#### **Path Forward:**

- Resample MW07S for VOCs - end of March, quick TAT
- If cVOCs not detected, complete Supplemental SI Report by April 30, 2005
- Evaluate indoor air
- Determine whether treatment is feasible (Treatability Study vs. RI/FS). Discuss treatability of cVOC plume to achieve MCLs with a senior hydrogeologist

**Action Jeff** – Coordinate Site 21 indoor air evaluation with Ed Corl.

## **IX. Tier II Update**

- Groundwater Flexibility Paper – A 2-day meeting on groundwater flexibilities that was planned to be held in Richmond to discuss the applicability and general groundwater concerns has been postponed.
- BTAG is supposed to separate comments into their must haves and like to haves.
- Partnering training has been schedule for May 24 and 25 in DC.
- New PCB strategy for VDEQ. VDEQ can give presentation at the next Richmond meeting if interested.

**Action Jim** – Check into TMDL/PCB presentation for Richmond meeting.

- Kim is the new Tier I link to Tier II.

- Facilitation is normally required for Teams when members switch out. Bob is looking for justification for how the team can avoid facilitation. Debbie suggests that CERCLA training for Jim, Jeff, and Janna would be valuable. Possible justification for not needing facilitation is the fact that SJCA has so few active sites left to address and facilitators may slow the process. Bob will recommend to Tier 2 holding off on formal facilitation; Bob will be here for next few meetings, during which time, Partnering training will be completed by Jim, Jeff, and Janna.

**X. Site 3 ROD**

Objective: Review EPA and VDEQ comments on the Site 3 ROD. Reach comment resolution to prepare the Final ROD for signature.

Overview of Discussion: The team reviewed a redline version Kim pulled together to reflect all comments received.

In Paragraph 1.2 – EPA changes wording from agree to concur and VDEQ wants to check with their legal.

Path Forward: Kim is sending redline comments to Team and comments are due by Friday, March 25.

**Action Debbie/Todd/Jeff** – Have respective agencies take all comments on Site 3 ROD back to legal departments for review and acceptance.

**XI. Site Priorities**

Objective: Prioritize IR Sites.

Overview of Discussion: Bob provided current estimated for remedy-in-place (RIP)/response complete (RC) for each site and the team ranked the priorities based on level of risk.

Site Rank	Site	Current Estimate (CH2M HILL)	RIP/RC Date	Cost To Complete (NORM)
Under construction	4		10/1/2005	\$3,944,598
1	21		11/3/2007	\$2,968,881
2	5	Depends on path	2/28/2007	\$7,159,527
3	19	\$100,000	6/5/2007	\$4,316,243
1	2	\$8.6M	8/16/2007	\$7,480,652
Part of site 2	17			\$92,957
<b>Projected Funding:</b>	FY06: \$3,153,871	FY07: \$2,680,214	FY08: \$660,180	FY09: \$934,014

Site 4: Construction should be complete to meet the goal. CTC seems high, even factoring in LTM.

Site 21: Not currently worth updating based on limited information.

Site 5: Change cost estimate after EE/CA or FS.

Site 19: Change cost to complete to \$100,000, based on removal of slag pile and subsurface soil PAHs.

Site 2: Will be updated in the system based on Janna's estimate.

Site 17: Site 17 has become part of Site 2.

Allocation for SJCA may be increased based on the increases in the cost to completes. If funding is not increased, Navy may not meet their goal of 2007 closure.

Site 2 is highest priority, but Site 21 is a contributing factor to Site 2 and therefore should be remediated first. However, based on availability of funding, other less expensive sites may need to be closed first.

Potential uses for FY 06 funding:

- Site 21 – Video survey of stormwater line for Site 21. Estimated cost of \$75,000.
- Site 2 – Collect additional samples to characterize waste and determine hazardous or non-hazardous disposal; Consider more inexpensive alternatives (i.e., barrier wall)
- Site 19 – May be beneficial to conduct removal and close out because it's inexpensive and achievable.
- Site 4 groundwater monitoring and reporting.
- Basewide IR support (partnering; GIS; etc).

## **XII. Roundtable**

ER,N Funding – Bob reminded the team that in October (or sooner) Valerie will be leaving the team. John Ballinger may also be leaving. Bob will need to figure out how to cover Valerie's responsibilities, which include dig permits, Base coordination, briefings to the Commanding Officer (CO), etc. The Region (CRMA) may pay Navy to handle some of their responsibilities. Bob will need CH2M HILL's help to develop a Regional Scope of Work for all IR sites (not just SJCA) for quarterly inspections.

BERA – Todd indicated that Simeon did not feel the Phase II BERA Work Plan comment was sufficiently addressed. Kim requested clarification on what action to take as a result of the comment and noted that the maps indicated were not attached.

**Action Todd** – Check with Simeon to clarify mercury comments on sediment dynamics.

RCRA – Debbie indicated that Buildings 154Y and 160 at SJCA are under RCRA closure by NNSY. VDEQ is sending a warning letter to the Navy for inappropriate disposal.

Team List – Kim distributed new Team membership list to the Team.

Streamlined ROD – Kim noted that Tim and Dawn presented the Streamlined ROD at the recent IR conference in California and there has been a lot of interest from other states. The

next step is a presentation and discussion with Department of Justice (DOJ) for buy-in which was supposed to take place this week but is being rescheduled.

Watershed Contaminated Source Document (WCSD) – The internal Navy document has been finalized and will be forwarded to VDEQ and EPA.

**Action Bob** – Distribute the WCSD to VDEQ and EPA.

ESS Waiver Procedures – Future ESS Waivers must go through both Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity (NOSSA) and DoD Explosives Safety Board (DDESB), so the process will take longer in the future, approximately 6 months.

**Action Kim/Janna** – Complete ESS Waivers for Sites 19, 2, and 5.

### **XIII. SASR and FY 2005 Team Goals Update**

**SASR:** The SASR was updated and is included as a separate file. Upcoming comment due dates are as follows:

<u>Document</u>	<u>Comments Due Date</u>
Draft Site 5 ERI	April 15, 2005
Draft Site 3 ROD	March 25, 2005

**FY 2005 Team Goals:** The FY 2005 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

### **XIV. Agenda Building**

#### **May Meeting Agenda**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
CRP	I,D - Provide/Discuss draft text	Kim	½ to 1 hour
Site 5 waste removal, groundwater, eco	I,D,C - Provide team with cost estimates	Janna	1 ½ to 2 hours
Site 2 RA	I,D - Discuss RA options and costing	Janna	1 hour
Site 19 RA	I,D,C - Discuss RA options and costing	Kim	½ hour
RAB	Preparation	Kim	½ hour
BERA	I,D - Results of Phase II BERA	Kim	1 hour
FY06 Funding	D - Priorities and split	Jeff	½ hour
Site 4 Update/Site visit	I - Update construction	Janna	3 hours
Roundtable		Team	1 hour
Partnering Exercise		Kim	½ hour
Standard Administrative Items		Team	2 to 3 hours

**Next meeting:** May 11-12, 2005

**Location:** Renaissance, Portsmouth, Virginia

**Lodging:** Renaissance, Portsmouth, Virginia

**Start time:** 9:00 AM Day 1

**Finish time:** 3:00 PM Day 2

**Chair:** Kim Henderson

**Host:** Janna Staszak

**Timekeeper:** Bob Schirmer

**Goal Keeper:** Jeff Weisman

**Recorder:** Janna Staszak

**Facilitator:** Todd Richardson

**Tier II:** Bob Schirmer

**Guests:** BTAG?

**Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call:** 10:00 AM on May 4, 2005

**Call-in number:** 1-888-232-0362 (Host Code: 633363 Participant Code: 416001)

#### **XV. Future Meetings Schedule**

May 11-12, 2005	Portsmouth, VA with RAB
June 29-30, 2005	Richmond, VA
August 10-11, 2005	Philadelphia, PA
October 12-13, 2005	Portsmouth, VA with RAB (Site Visits)

**Action Janna** – Send out upcoming meetings schedule and make sure everyone can attend.

**Action Todd** – Check schedules for future meeting dates.

#### **XVI. Meeting Evaluation**

During the Partnering Session, the Team filled in “+” and “Δ” to list the positives and negatives of the meeting.

Kim provided facilitator feedback.

#### **XVII. Parking Lot**

- Draft January Meeting Minutes – no comments

**Consensus:** January 2005 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final. The final minutes will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

- Phase II Blows Creek response to comments
- Indoor air vapor guidance