

St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Meeting Minutes: December 20 and 21, 2005

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

Tier II Link: Bruce Frizell/USMC

Guests: Ed Corl/NAVFAC
Mike Elias/CH2M HILL
John McClosky/USFWS

From: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL

Date: January 6, 2006

Location: The Williamsburg Hospitality House, Williamsburg, VA

Tuesday, December 20, 2005

0900 Welcome/Check In

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager: Kim Henderson
Timekeeper/Gatekeeper: Jim Cutler
Host: Janna Staszak
Goalkeeper: Agnes Sullivan
Facilitator: Todd Richardson
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. Revisions were made throughout the meeting as needed.

Review Previous Meeting Minutes:

October meeting minutes were placed in the parking lot.

Review Previous Action Items:

The team reviewed Action Items and carryover items from the October 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 Todd – Get the Site 3 ROD signed.

Review Parking Lot:

- Indoor air vapor guidance – will remain in parking lot pending guidance
- Site 4 draft consensus statement will be addressed during the Site 4 topic

II. Electronically Enhanced BERA

Objective: Present the electronically enhanced baseline ecological risk assessment (eBERA) concept, outline and schedule.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed. Ed Corl and Mike Elias presented the eBERA to the team. Ed explained the rationale for the development of the eBERA and Mike presented the layout and demonstrated the prototype.

Ed indicated that the Streamlined Record of Decision (SROD) concept was the driving force behind the eBERA. Streamlining and electronic enhancement of documents serves to minimize text, focusing on graphic presentation, while still meeting regulatory requirements. The eBERA provides a more user-friendly ERA to a broader audience. When the concept of the eBERA was first developed, Bruce Pluta was informed and supports the eBERA, with the condition that he could be actively involved throughout the process. John McClosky asked if the report would need to be reviewed on a computer screen and indicated that it may be a potential problem for those who prefer hard copies. Most reviewers will not have the ability to print large color figures and photos. Ed indicated that the deliverable will include a printed “simplified” version, with the text and key figures and tables, and a CD. The CD will include a complete PDF so that a hard copy of the entire document could be printed. Ed acknowledged that the eBERA will not be appropriate for all sites.

Mike explained that the current approach for ERAs is a long hard copy risk assessment whereas the eBERA is an electronic deliverable that relies on a self-launching hyperlinked CD. Key principles for the eBERA are compliance with EPA Superfund guidance, acceptance by the regulatory community, inclusion of all information presented in a traditional risk assessment, user-friendly format, and easily printable version. The eBERA is flexible and adaptable, and allows users to access level of information consistent with their needs. It is also designed to provide more information than a traditional ERA.

The eBERA concept is currently being implemented for the Blows Creek BERA at SJCA. Blows Creek has multiple contaminant sources, potentially receiving chemical input from nine site-related and non-point sources. The Screening Ecological Risk Assessment (SERA) for Blows Creek focused on upland areas and terrestrial receptors while the BERA

investigations focused on ecological receptors in Blows Creek, including benthic-dwelling organisms and piscivorous wildlife.

Mike reviewed the document design and layout. The information in the eBERA is presented in a tiered, easily navigable format. The detail increases with each subsequent tier, and the tiers are logically hyperlinked to subsequent levels. The first tier consists of streamlined text, contains limited key figures, and has text-based hyperlinks to figures, tables, supporting documentation, and internet links. The second tier is visually oriented, focusing on interactive summary tables and figures with clickable information boxes. The third tier consists of summary tables and raw data with limited interactivity and very few hyperlinks.

Mike presented the working prototype of the Blows Creek eBERA. He demonstrated the format and the clickable areas and hyperlinks, along with the data contained in each. The following comments and recommendations were provided:

- Ed recommended that pictures be taken during future sampling events so that the photos can be linked to sample locations in the eBERA.
- Jim indicated that it would be useful to click on a sample location and see all the data associated.
- Agnes recommended that a figure be created to allow the user to filter to specific hazard quotients (i.e., greater than 1, greater than 5, greater than 10).
- Ed discussed the potential for depicting key receptors (i.e., kingfisher), their specific habitats, and the relative sample locations and results. John thinks that may complicate things because each receptor links to other receptors (food web) and there is no clear distinction.
- John and Agnes recommend showing the SJCA site locations in relation to the sample location figures. The site locations could also be hyperlinked to the site descriptions from the conceptual site model (CSM). Agnes also recommended that there be various layers to show drainages, sites, topography, etc.
- Ed recommended that the toxicity results be presented to show the exceedance of effects levels and where toxic responses to invertebrates are expected, considering the receptors, preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), and acid-volatile sulfides/simultaneously extractable metals (AVS/SEM) results.
- John suggested that all the information needs to be tied back to the site and that the visual representation will be incredibly useful. John indicated that the most value for the eBERA will be in the large complicated sites; it will most likely not be cost-effective for smaller sites. He sees it being applicable even at the screening level and built upon for the BERA.

Mike indicated that the challenge will be to make the eBERA complete without so much redundancy that readers get lost in the document. He indicated that changes to the text are easy, but graphic changes can be costly; therefore communication is key throughout the process (preliminary remediation goals [PRGs], agreement prior to figure development and graphic linking). Mike and Ed plan to meet in early January to go through the prototype in more detail and determine the level of detail and interactivity to be included in the Blows Creek eBERA. Ed and Mike indicated that although the possibilities of the electronic enhancement are endless, this initial version is a stepping stone and may not include all the

possible bells and whistles but will focus on the site-specific information necessary for the Blows Creek BERA while demonstrating the eBERA concept.

John asked if Navy is still rolling toward having everything compiled into GIS. Ed said that the Navy is implementing SADA (risk assessment package [GIS type] to compile all data) as part of NIRIS.

III. Site 5 – Potential Wetland Creation

Objective: Provide the site status; review the engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA) alternatives; discuss further evaluation for potential wetland creation, taking groundwater and Port Authority plans into consideration; and review the path forward for the site.

Overview of Discussion: Copies of the presentation were distributed. Janna presented a brief site status update to the team, including the historical use of the site, the Expanded Remedial Investigation (ERI) schedule, the March site visit discussion, and the path forward for the site (EE/CA for the waste/burnt soil area followed by an FS for the surrounding impacted surface soil, drainage sediment, and shallow groundwater).

Janna introduced the alternatives being evaluated in the EE/CA: no action, excavation and backfill, excavation and wetland creation, and soil cover. The vertical limits of excavation will either be based on visible limits of waste with confirmation samples or seasonal mean low groundwater elevation with no confirmation sampling, as recommended by VDEQ. The horizontal limits will be based on visible limits of waste. John recommended scheduling the removal action for July or August, which would result in the driest excavation. John asked if there is subsurface soil data available. Kim indicated that there were subsurface soil data collected during the RI. There were minimal human health risks (arsenic and iron at isolated sample locations) identified and the subsurface soil data was screened against the sediment criteria, and did not appear to be a significant ecological concern.

Janna discussed potential concerns with creating a wetland in the excavation area. Based on the area topography, surface water would not be sufficient to support a wetland; therefore it would be supported almost entirely by groundwater. The groundwater has elevated levels of inorganics. An ecological screening evaluation was performed to evaluate the potential for constituents or properties measured in shallow groundwater to represent a potential risk to aquatic life if it discharges into the proposed wetland. As a result, aluminum, barium, beryllium, cadmium, cobalt, and the pH pose a potential risk to aquatic life. However, it is assumed that the waste/burnt soil is the source of the inorganics in the groundwater. Therefore, the excavation will remove the source, leaving only residual contamination, which would decrease over time. Long term benefits of the wetland, including enhanced habitat, cost-effective site restoration, wetland mitigation credit, and removal of metals from the groundwater, are expected to off-set the potential risk.

John does not foresee the inorganics in groundwater being a problem in the future because the source is being removed and the groundwater flow is from north to the south, so the groundwater coming into the wetland should be of good quality. John asked if the wetland would be tidal. Janna indicated that based on the current site elevation, a tidal wetland is not an option. John indicated that the metals issue would be less of a problem in a tidal wetland because the bioavailability is less, non-oxic conditions would be present, and

organics and salinity would be higher; whereas non-tidal wetlands are oxic and have greater bioavailability.

John recommended creation of a non-tidal emergent wetland which would have significant water quality and habitat benefits. He expressed concern over the presence of phragmites, indicating that it would take over and asked that the removal of the phragmites (by spraying in the fall) be considered in the EE/CA, but acknowledged that even a phragmites wetland would result in better water quality than backfilling the excavation. Ed indicated that he is also in favor of the approach for creating the wetland and moving forward to closing out Site 5. John also suggested implementing a no mow zone around the wetland to prevent it from being mowed down during dry periods. Agnes indicated that the Navy now has a "Back to Nature" initiative to reduce landscaping costs, so it should not be a problem. Agnes asked that the different types of plantings and wetland be considered in the EE/CA.

Janna reviewed the evaluations that are ongoing or planned to help with the development of the wetland creation alternative for the EE/CA:

- A water budget analysis will be finalized to determine the amount of surface water that will reach the wetland.
- A hydrologic analysis will be finalized to determine the inflow of the groundwater into the wetland.
- Water quality modeling will be performed to assess the potential impact of groundwater contaminants on the wetland soil and vegetation.
- A human health risk screening will be performed to evaluate the groundwater to surface water pathway (preliminary results indicate there are no exceedances of risk-based criteria [RBCs] or background upper tolerance levels [UTLs]).

John asked if a conceptual plan for the wetland would be included in the EE/CA. Janna responded that it would in order to enable costing of the option. John suggested the design of the wetland can be creative to achieve various depths while maintaining the same footprint. Janna indicated that it would be considered, but that additional excavation or regrading will be avoided as much as possible due to the potential for munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) at the site. Janna indicated that weekly water level readings are being conducted to help determine the appropriate wetland depth. John said that standing water is required for an emergent wetland; a shallower excavation could not support an emergent wetland.

The team discussed the Port Authority's potential plan for tidal wetland creation in the Site 5 area. If a wetland is created during the removal action, it may later be excavated for the creation of a tidal wetland. Ed indicated that creating a wetland during the removal action would result in an easy transition for the Port Authority's tidal wetland. John stated that if the Navy takes credit for the 4.3 acres of wetland, the Port Authority may not be able to take enhancement credit for it down the road, even if they increase the quality. In addition, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) approval would be needed to dig up the non-tidal wetland. Ed asked if the Navy could begin conversations with the Port Authority.

Agnes indicated that the Port Authority has submitted a letter to the Navy but it has not reached the team level and the schedule is too far out.

The team concluded that based on the long term benefits of wetland creation, the wetland should be evaluated further in the EE/CA. The EE/CA will need to be provided to BTAG for review.

IV. Site 2 – Path Forward

Objective: Review site status and shallow groundwater data; discuss preliminary Tiger Team thoughts and recommendations; prepare for path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the site status, the preliminary Tiger Team thoughts, the deep groundwater tech memo, and discussed the path forward.

The Draft ERI was submitted in October 2005 and is out for review. The Navy has \$1.3 million slated for a treatability study at Site 2. As a result, a Navy Tiger Team reviewed the site data in October 2005, and is preparing a report of their recommendations.

Kim reviewed the shallow groundwater data. The volatile organic compound (VOC) plume covers approximately 17,240 square feet and consists of trichloroethylene (TCE) ranging from 50 to 330,000 parts per billion (ppb), which suggests the presence of pure phase TCE or dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL). TCE degradation products have also been detected within the plume. There are also maximum contaminant limit (MCL) exceedances of several VOCs, arsenic, and heptachlor epoxide. Potential human health risk exists from VOCs, semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), explosives, and metals.

Kim reviewed the preliminary Tiger Team thoughts on Site 2. The Tiger Team indicated that they do not see a need for an aggressive DNAPL treatment based on the following:

- There was no identified exposure point concentration (EPC) threat to surface water since concentrations are below Virginia Water Quality Standards.
- The physical and chemical properties of DNAPL make it difficult to locate and characterize the effectiveness of treatment to meet MCLs. Finding untreated zones is like "finding a needle in a haystack".
- There are no documented, peer-reviewed case studies of DNAPL source zone depletion beneath the water table where MCLs have been achieved and sustained (EPA, 2004).
- The benefits of partial source reduction are controversial, with some studies suggesting that nearly complete removal of DNAPL is required before measurable reduction in mass discharge is observed (Sale and McWhorter, 2001) and others suggest that mass discharge is expected to decline as DNAPL mass is depleted (Falta, 2003).
- Aggressive treatment would be a high cost with potentially little reduction in contamination. Natural attenuation could achieve similar results over the same time.

John indicated that it is not surprising that TCE levels are not high in the sediment and surface water; TCE would not likely be detected in these media. He recommended sampling the pore water to accurately determine whether or not the TCE is present and causing an impact to the inlet. John also asked that the shallow groundwater data be compared to surface water criteria.

Kim reviewed the Tiger Team's evaluation of thermal treatment. Advantages of thermal treatment include the following:

- It changes the physical and chemical properties of the cVOCs such that they can become mobile
- It can be applied in heterogeneous formations with successful propagation of the heat

Disadvantages of thermal treatment include the following:

- Mobilized cVOCs may potentially be moved into nearby sensitive environments such as the Yorktown Confining Unit and/or adjacent wetland
- There is uncertainty in controlling heat in the subsurface to reach cVOCs
- Energy for heating can be expensive
- The high water table at the site may require a cap to contain the heat
- Mature tree stands and wetland plants may be negatively impacted
- There is no peer reviewed data to support achievement
- Extirpation of microorganisms will eliminate any MNA of residuals

Kim indicated that the preliminary recommendation of the Tiger Team is sequestration and biodegradation of the DNAPL source by injecting vegetable oil. Short term effects are the physical and chemical sequestration of the DNAPL. Long-term effects are the enhanced biodegradation of dissolved contaminants by acting as a slow-release electron donor. Advantages of the method include immobilization of contamination while providing treatment for an extended period of time, low cost, no negative environmental impact, and no secondary treatment may be needed. John asked what will keep the vegetable oil in the ground, rather than discharging to the surface. Agnes recommended compiling a list of questions for the Tiger Team based on their preliminary recommendation. Todd and Jim both indicated that they would like the opportunity to review the report.

Todd asked if a net ecological benefits analysis (NEBA) would be appropriate for the site to evaluate the alternatives. Ed believes that with the amount of toxicity present, something needs to be done at the site and that the Navy agrees that the DNAPL in groundwater needs to be addressed; but that electrical resistance heating (ERH) may not be the best alternative. Jim indicated that he still has not been dissuaded from ERH. Ed asked if zero valent iron (ZVI) was considered; Kim responded that Nancy Ruiz (Navy expert in ZVI) was at the meeting and it was not mentioned as a potential alternative. Ed asked about creating a preferential path through a ZVI curtain. John asked if pumping the TCE out through a well would be an option. Kim and Ed indicated that the Navy has moved away from pump and treat alternatives.

Kim reviewed the TCE concentration detected in deep groundwater. A Technical Memorandum Work Plan has been prepared to provide an approach for investigating the source of TCE in deep groundwater. Field activities include a well yield test to determine the production capacity of the well, an aquifer pumping test to determine if the Yorktown Confining Unit is leaking, and resampling of the well before and after the pump test.

Kim reviewed the path forward for Site 2. The Draft ERI review period was extended to January 15, 2006. The Draft Technical Memorandum Work Plan was submitted December 16, 2005 and comments are due February 16, 2006. Tiger Team recommendations and the

Expanded RI comments will be used to determine the path forward for the site at the next meeting.

Action Kim – Contact the team when the Site 2 pump test is scheduled.

John requested that the team consider enhancement/creation of wetlands at Site 2.

V. Tier II Update

Bruce Frizell provided the Tier II update:

- Tier II would like to know of any ecological issues teams are dealing with.
- The VDEQ groundwater MCL flexibility checklist provided is only a tool and is not a requirement.
- Success stories should be included with goals as an attachment to the table or published on the web site.
- The team should notify Tier II of any technical training they would like to have.

Action Kim/Janna – Add success stories to goals and post on web site.

VI. SJCA Deliverables

Objective: Revise and finalize the SJCA Team Deliverables.

Overview: The team reviewed and revised the SJCA Team deliverables to fit the newly established team.

Action Team – Review roles/responsibilities in Team Deliverables. Send revisions to Kim.

The Team Deliverables (Roles and Responsibilities) was added to the Parking Lot.

VII. Team Building Activity

Objective: Become a more effective team.

Overview: Todd led a team discussion on the influence of Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) on conflict resolution.

Wednesday, December 21, 2005

0830 Check In.

Review Agenda:

No revisions were made to the agenda.

VIII. Site 4

Objective: Discuss the status of and comments on the Construction Closeout Report, determine a plan for voluntary groundwater monitoring, and review upcoming submittals.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed.

Construction Update: Since the October partnering meeting, Investigative Derived Waste (IDW) disposal, sign installation, and partial removal of the erosion and sediment controls has been completed. Kim showed the team current photos of the site.

Construction Completion Report Comments: NAVFAC and EPA had no comments. VDEQ had three comments:

Comment: Reference to pre-confirmation sampling discussion date was incorrect.
Resolution: It will be changed from May 2005 to March 2005.

Comment: Should risk management rationale for the mercury exceedance of the background level should be included?

Resolution: The text indicates that the sample will be incorporated in the BERA for Blows Creek. Jim agreed no changes needed to be made to the text.

Comment: The CCR does not include all the land use controls (LUCs) listed in the ROD.

Resolution: The text will be revised to reference the LUC remedial design.

ROD Amendment Technical Memorandum: The Draft ROD Amendment Tech Memo, which addresses the western cover extension and compensatory wetland mitigation, will be submitted by December 31, 2005, comments due by January 31, 2006.

Voluntary Groundwater Performance Monitoring: Kim reviewed the purpose of the voluntary groundwater performance monitoring for Site 4: to monitor the effectiveness of the soil cover and evaluate the site's impact on groundwater quality to ensure no potential future releases will pose unacceptable risk. Jim indicated that he sees the monitoring serving to confirm conditions have not changed, rather than monitoring for potential releases. The team agreed. Todd and Jim checked with their respective agencies and confirmed that there is no requirement for monitoring at Site 4 and that the team can determine the details for future monitoring.

The proposed monitoring included 4 monitoring wells (1 upgradient and 3 downgradient) for the MCL exceedances and human health risk drivers in soil (arsenic, iron, cadmium, lead, thallium). The duration is quarterly for one year, review data, and reevaluate monitoring frequency. Data evaluation would be conducted by statistical trends analysis. Kim discussed the data requirements for conducting statistics with CH2M HILL statistician Larry Hilscher. Based on the proposed monitoring, we will have just enough data to conduct an ANOVA comparison to background to determine whether any downgradient concentrations exceed upgradient and if so, which downgradient wells appear to be the culprit; and a trend analysis to determine whether concentrations are significantly increasing or decreasing.

The team discussed and developed the following consensus statement for future voluntary groundwater performance monitoring at Site 4. The work plan will be based on this statement.

Consensus: The team agrees to conduct voluntary post-ROD groundwater monitoring at Site 4 to evaluate the site's impact on groundwater quality to confirm no potential future releases will pose unacceptable risk. Three downgradient and one upgradient monitoring wells will be monitored for former contaminants of potential concern (arsenic, iron,

cadmium, lead, and thallium). Monitoring will be conducted quarterly for at least two years. Monitoring will be discontinued if no significant increasing trend of concentrations based on all data collected to-date and comparison to background conditions. If conditions above are not met after two years, the monitoring plan will be re-evaluated.

Jim indicated that he did not think VDEQ could agree to an exit strategy that allows for potential MCL exceedances (monitored or projected trend) so the consensus statement was not tied to MCLs. According to current VDEQ policy, sites can not be delisted if there are MCL exceedances. If MCL exceedances are detected, the groundwater flexibilities may need to be used to determine whether or not monitoring can be discontinued.

Upcoming Submittals: Kim reminded the team of the documents that will be submitted in the near future. The Final Construction Closeout Report and Draft Post-ROD Modifications Memo will be submitted by December 31, 2005. Pending FY 2006 funding, the Revised Final Maintenance and Performance Plan and Remedial Design for LUCs, Interim Remedial Action Completion Report, and Voluntary Groundwater Performance Monitoring Plan will be submitted.

Task Order 005 Modification: Kim asked Agnes to look into the status of the modification to Joint Venture Task Order 005. Runoff from Site 3 is pooling at the toe of the Site 4 landfill slope at the northeast corner of the site. The modification is supposed to repair the drainage problem from Site 3. The pooled water presents a stability and erosion concern for the Site 4 slope.

Action Janna - Send email to Agnes with photos and explanation of drainage problem from Site 3 (Mod to Task Order 005).

IX. Site 19 Action Memorandum

Objective: Review the non-time-critical removal action (NTCRA) areas and discuss the upcoming schedule.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation and a revised schedule were distributed. Kim reviewed the areas of the removal action for Site 19. The metallic slag area (2,688 SF) will be excavated to a depth of 18 inches and the elevated subsurface polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) area (1,064 SF) will be excavated to a depth of 4 feet. Kim then reviewed the schedule for Site 19. The Action Memorandum was submitted to the Navy for signature on December 9, 2005.

Action Agnes - Get Site 19 Action Memorandum signed.

The draft work plan for construction activities will be submitted in mid-January 2006. A 30-day review is requested due to nature of the contract and simplicity of the removal action. The removal action will be conducted in March 2006, and the site will be closed out by the end of September 2006.

X. Site 21 Field Investigation

Objective: Update the team on the status of the field investigation, including the activities, the preliminary results, and the path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Handouts of the presentation were distributed. Kim reviewed the history/status of the site and discussed the Supplemental Site Investigation (SSI) activities conducted in 2005 to resample arsenic and further delineate the shallow groundwater cVOC plume.

Action Jim – Look up RDX.

Field activities were conducted October 31, 2005 through November 10, 2005. To further refine the plume boundaries in preparation for treatment, 27 temporary wells were installed within and around the current estimated plume boundaries. Based on the preliminary VOC concentrations from the temporary wells, two permanent monitoring wells were installed. One monitoring well was installed in a new hotspot location (MW12S) and one monitoring well was installed in Building 1556 (MW13S). Groundwater samples were also collected from all of the existing shallow monitoring wells for VOCs analysis to provide a complete set of data to prepare for the Treatability Study. A groundwater sample was also collected from MW01D to confirm previous MCL exceedances of arsenic. Kim showed the team a figure of all of the well locations and unvalidated TCE data received to-date.

Kim reviewed the current site conditions. TCE has been detected at concentrations ranging from 6J to 4,800 ppb, along with breakdown products. Elevated concentrations are limited to the surficial aquifer, which is 5 to 19 feet below ground surface. Groundwater flow is to the southwest at the site. The TCE plume extends under the southeast corner of Building 1556, with concentrations ranging from 3,000 to 4,800 ppb. A vapor intrusion analysis will be performed based on the newly detected concentrations and conditions (higher concentrations, smaller area). Temporary well TW122 defines the easternmost area of the cVOC plume. Benzene concentrations at MW09S range from 9 to 75 ppb. Elevated concentrations of arsenic detected previously in the deep groundwater at MW01D was not repeated (72 ppb in August 2003, 5.3U ppb in December 2004, and 3.1 ppb in November 2005).

Kim discussed the path forward for Site 21. The validated data from the field investigation will be received in January 2006. The Draft SSI Report will be submitted in February 2006. Based on the preliminary data, the SSI will recommend a Treatability Study for the injection of emulsified oil. The Storm Sewer Video Survey will be conducted in the summer of 2006 (pending funding). If leaks are found, they will need to be repaired prior to any remediation activities. The results will be presented in the SSI or in an addendum. The team goal for the Draft Treatability Study Work Plan is September 30, 2006. The Treatability Study is anticipated for January 2007.

XI. Roundtable

Kim indicated that the basewide monitoring repairs have been completed and the monitoring wells at no further action (NFA) Sites 3 and 8 have been abandoned.

XII. 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:

Document	Comments due
Expanded RI - Site 2	1/15/2006
Deep Groundwater Tech Memo - Site 2	2/16/2006
ROD Amendment Tech Memo	1/31/2006
Draft Final Site 5 ERI (HHRA Revision)	Over due
Draft EE/CA	4/15/2006
Draft Work Plan - Site 19	2/15/2006
Draft Supplemental Site Investigation - Site 21	4/15/2006
Draft CIP	Over due
Draft BERA	3/30/2006

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.

XIII. Agenda Building**February Meeting Agenda**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
Site 2	C, D- Determine the path forward for Site 2 (all media)	Kim	2 hr
Site 4 ROD Amendment Tech Memo	C - Discuss Comments		0.5 hr
SJCA Team Deliverables	D - Finalize the deliverables	Kim	1 hr
Site 5 EE/CA	C - Discuss alternatives, schedule	Janna	1 hr
Site 19 Removal Action	C - Discuss comments on draft work plan; waste characterization sampling	Janna	0.5 hr
Site 21 Supplemental Site Investigation	I - Present validated data from SSI/vapor intrusion	Kim	1 hr
Blows Creek BERA	I - Present the BERA conclusions	Kim	1 hr
Team Building	I, C - Learn to function as a better team	Agnes	0.5 hr

Next meeting: February 1 - 2, 2006
Location: VDEQ, Richmond, Virginia
Lodging: TBD, Richmond, Virginia
Start time: 9:00 AM
Finish time: 4:00 PM

Chair: Todd Richardson
Host: Jim Cutler
Timekeeper: Kim Henderson
Goal Keeper: Agnes Sullivan
Recorder: Janna Staszak
Facilitator: Agnes Sullivan
Tier II: Durwood Willis
Guests: None

Action Jim - Reserve a conference room for Richmond partnering meeting February 1 and 2, 2006.

Action Jim - Schedule Durwood for the Tier II update in Richmond.

Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call: 10:00 AM on January 23, 2006
Call-in number: 1-888-232-0362 (Host Code: 100890 Participant Code: 191819)

XIV. Future Meetings Schedule

March 22 - 23, 2006	Philadelphia, PA
May 17 - 18, 2006	Norfolk, VA (Marriot?)

XV. Meeting Evaluation

Todd 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

To remain in parking lot:

- Team Deliverables - roles and responsibilities by entity
- October 2005 Draft Meeting Minutes - Jim recommended one minor revision to the Site 4 discussion, Todd still needs to review
- Indoor air vapor intrusion - pending guidance