

MEETING SUMMARY

CH2MHILL

Final Minutes from February 2004 Partnering Meeting - St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team

February 9 & 10, 2004

Attendees:

Stephen Garth/NAV FACENCOM
Valerie Walker/CNRMA
Todd Richardson/USEPA Region III
Debbie Miller/VDEQ
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL

Tier II Link:

Durwood Willis/VDEQ

Guests: N/A

Copies: Cate Pelech/CH2M HILL

From: Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL

Date: March 22, 2004

Location:

VDEQ Office Richmond, VA

MINUTES

Monday, February 9, 2004

1300 Check In.

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager: Stephen Garth

Timekeeper/Gatekeeper: Valerie Walker

Host: Debbie Miller

Goalkeeper: Stephen Garth

Facilitator: Bill Friedmann

Recorder: Kim Henderson

Reading of the Ground Rules.

Review/Revise Agenda.

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

Review Action Items:

The team reviewed Action Items from the December 2003 meeting and any carryover items. The Action Items were added to a separate spreadsheet, tracked at the meeting, and are included as an attachment.

Action Bill – Check whether Task Order-020 under AGVIQ JV1 contains scope for wetland delineation.

Review previous Meeting Minutes:

Discussion on comments to the Draft December 2003 Meeting Minutes was added to the Parking Lot for Day 2.

Stephen has a new email address: david.garth@navy.mil

II. Watershed Contaminated Source Document (WCSD)

Bill provided an update on the Draft WCSD. A presentation handout was provided. Bill explained the purpose and intent of what the WCSD is, and more importantly, what it is not.

Todd received a WCSD for NSN and was not required to submit the document to technical support for review. The only comment received was for a BERA-like document that referenced the WCSD as justification for no further investigation, which was not considered appropriate.

The following topics were discussed:

Scope: The Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River watershed for SJCA and NNSY. The sub-watersheds Paradise Creek, Blows Creek and St. Juliens Creek were also included. Todd asked how the extent was determined. Bill explained it was necessary to create a radius for the database search subcontractors and the radius was created to encompass the extent indicating the most potential impact to the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. Areas north and south of the selected radius are less industrious and therefore considered less likely to contribute significant contaminants to the watershed.

Literature/Database Search: The search was conducted by Environmental Data Resources (EDR). EDR provides a the names and locations registered facilities which are listed in the various state and federal regulatory databases (RCRA, CERCLA, UST, etc.). A watershed visit was conducted to verify listed sites and identify other potential sites. The resulting data will be included on a CD in an appendix of the WCSD.

Analytical Data Review: Data collected from the watersheds were compiled from 1990 and above, the useability was determined, a comparison to ecological values (ER-Ms) was conducted, and trends in the distribution were identified.

Conceptual Site Model (CSM): The CSM by USEPA for the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River was utilized and identifies transport mechanisms for contamination. **Results:** Land-use of the watershed was primarily residential and commercial/industrial. Potential sources were identified by water (i.e., shipping and marinas), land (i.e., outfalls), and air (i.e., emissions). Stormwater runoff was most likely the largest contributor. Figures indicating the distribution of select compounds were provided in the presentation and discussed. Multiple chemicals (PAHs, pesticides, and metals) have had adverse impacts to the watershed by various mechanisms.

The draft WCSD report is in senior review and is expected to be submitted in the next few weeks. Although the WCSD is an internal Navy document and does not require regulatory review, VDEQ and USEPA will receive the document and comments will be invited.

II. Site 3 Update

Bill presented a summary of the Site 3 Removal Action and Construction Closeout Report. A presentation handout was provided. The complete removal (9,497 cubic yards) of Site 3 and backfilling (10,510 cubic yards) was completed in December 2003. Final grading and seeding are to be completed in Spring 2004, the delay is due to the wet weather and ROICC approval was received.

The Draft Construction Closeout Report was submitted February 4, 2004. Changes from the original scope were the overestimation of volume and schedule, the lack of need to screen clay material, and the ability to use drier removed soil to absorb moisture from the pond sediment.

Reasons for the successful removal action were weather, flexibility in schedule, cooperation from all parties, addressing concerns proactively, and site visits. No OSHA reportable incidents occurred.

The next steps for Site 3 are to finalize the Construction Closeout Report, prepare a Confirmation Sample document (including statistical comparison of site to background data) to demonstrate that the risk has been removed at Site 3, and NFA PRAP and ROD.

III. BERA Update

Bill provided the team with an update of the BERA status. The Draft BERA Report is near completion. The food web model is in progress and the results will indicate what type of tissue will need to be sampled, if necessary. A preliminary concern for mercury was identified. Potential next steps will be discussed with Ed, Simeon, and Bruce.

The Phase I Work Plan indicated that the Phase II investigation may include subsurface sediment sampling and tissue sampling. Subsurface sediment is a tentative topic for discussion for TEARS. Subsurface cores were collected for descriptive purposes only during Phase I and there was no indication of contamination (with the exception of one sample) and no habitat/critters were found below first few inches. By the next partnering

meeting, a preliminary path forward for Phase II should be established and will be presented to the team.

Meeting Adjourned

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

0900 Check In.

IV. Reviewed Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

The team discussed and made minor amendments to the Draft December 2003 Meeting Minutes.

Consensus: December 2003 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final with amendments. The minutes will be finalized and placed on the Joint VA/MD Partnering Team website.

V. Tier II Update

The Tier II update was provided by Durwood Willis/VDEQ:

- The Tier I/II Joint Meeting: Tier II has goals to arrange joint meetings every 1 to 2 years. Paula Gilbertson (EFACHES) recommended that the agenda building for this year's meeting involve Tier I and Tier II members. The meeting will be held April 27th through the 28th at the Bolger Center in Potomac, Maryland. Teams should arrive April 26th for dinner (included) and the meeting will start the morning of April 27th and finish mid-day on April 28th. Questions should be provided to Bill, the next agenda call will be in a few weeks. Topics have been agreed upon and speakers are being identified. Example agenda topics include post ROD authority and perchlorate. There is some discussion on whether or not there will be concurrent sessions held. Someone from each team will be asked to present a brief summary of activities at each base. The website for the Bolger Center is: <http://www.bolgercenter.com/>
- Groundwater MCL issues meeting took place with VDEQ/EPA/Navy on November 6, 2003 and draft technical guidance was produced and is still under Navy review. If there is a situation where teams truly believe that it is not necessary for MCLs to be met, the paper provides options. VDEQ and USEPA plan to establish certain criteria to determine useability of the aquifer, similar to an aquifer classification system.
- Partnering training is in Richmond March 30th and 31st.
- Bill had an action item to provide Bob Schirmer the Tier I expectations of Tier II. Instead, the team brought up a few concerns to Durwood. Primarily that the Tier II link is not always known and there is a delay with their minutes being posted on the Joint website.

Action Kim - Send Durwood an email regarding meeting schedule so he can provide us with the Tier II links.

Bill provided Durwood a summary of current activities at SJCA and the meeting agenda.

Durwood asked the team if there were any sites where re-use (i.e. parking lot) has occurred. VDEQ has been asked to track the acres cleaned up at each base and if there was a re-use established and what types of re-use. There are no sites that have been re-used at SJCA.

Valerie indicated to Durwood that the SJCA team really works well together, have not had any of the issues that other teams have had recently regardless of the entrance of several new members, and that sometimes SJCA may be perceived incorrectly as a small base with little activity. St. J's Rocks!

VI. SI/SSA Data

Action Bill/Kim – Make sure Draft SSA was submitted to John McCloskey at US Fish and Wildlife.

Bill presented a summary of the results and recommendations of the Site Investigations and Site Screening Assessments conducted in August 2003. Handouts of the presentation were provided to the team.

AOCs/Sites Recommended for No Further Action:

AOC 1: PAHs exceeded Dragston-Augusta Background UTLs but did not exceed Dredge Fill Background UTLs. No COPCs were identified in the HHRS. The ERS identified a potential for PAHs in site soils to be transported via surficial runoff to Blows Creek but after data evaluation recommends no further evaluation of potential ecological effects. In addition, PAHs are being evaluated near AOC 1 as part of the Blows Creek BERA.

AOC 13: PAHs exceeded Background UTLs in one surface soil location. No COPCs were identified during the HHRS and minimal habitat with no pathways were identified in the ERS.

AOC 14: PAHs, pesticides, and metals exceeded Background UTLs. No unacceptable risks to humans from exposure to site soils was identified during the HHRS. The ERS identified a potential for chemicals in site soils to be transported via surficial runoff to the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River but due to transport distance and dilution, there is minimal potential for adverse effects to benthic organisms.

AOC K: Mercury (0.032 mg/kg) slightly exceeded the Background UTL (0.030 mg/kg) at one surface soil location but was not identified as a COPC in the HHRS. The ERS identified a potential for mercury in site soils to be transported via surficial runoff to St. Juliens Creek but based on the similarity with background recommends no further evaluation.

Site 8: Pesticides exceeded draft Background UTLs in one sample. No COPCs were identified during the HHRS. The ERS identified a potential for pesticides and metals in

groundwater to be transported to Blows Creek but due to transport distance and dilution, there is minimal potential for adverse effects to aquatic life.

Sites Recommended for Further Investigation:

Site 19: PAHs and metals in surface and subsurface soils exceeded Background UTLs primarily around the building footprint. In sediment, SVOCs, pesticides, and metals were detected at comparable concentrations to SJCA reference data and Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River data. Unacceptable risks to humans from exposure to site surface soils were identified during the HHRS based on one surface soil hotspot (SS11). The ERS evaluated the two sediment samples collected in the marsh of the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. Potential adverse effects to benthic dwelling organisms and potential risks to aquatic based wildlife were identified. However, compounds detected in Site 19 sediment are frequently detected in urban water bodies and may be part related to historic site activities but more likely reflects input from a variety of sources. Next steps may include additional investigation of surface and subsurface soil and groundwater.

On February 6, 2004, Bill and Debbie conducted a site visit and noted one elevated drain and a flush-mounted manhole-like drain on the western side of the site. It appears that the elevated drain may have been part of a building floor. Based on drainage map and knowledge of outfalls in Blows Creek, the drains discharges to Blows Creek. Debbie indicated that the drain may be a location where a future sample may be considered.

Site 21: Several VOCs, SVOCs, and metals exceeded draft Background UTLs for groundwater. VOCs and arsenic concentrations exceeded MCLs. RDX was detected in one sample. The HHRS recommended additional investigation to determine if exposure to site-related concentrations of metals in deep groundwater and VOCs and RDX in shallow groundwater could result in unacceptable risks to human health. The ERS identified a potential for chemicals in groundwater to be transported to St. Juliens Creek via the Site 2 inlet but due to transport distance and dilution, there is minimal potential for adverse effects to aquatic life. Next steps may include further delineation of the TCE plume, confirm or deny metals exceedances in deep groundwater, and discuss the potential evaluation of soil.

The team would like to conduct a site visit during the next local meeting. The SI will be submitted in February 2004 and joint scoping for the path forward will be included as a topic for the next meeting in March.

XI. Sites 2 and 5 / Site 21

Bill presented a summary of the preliminary (unvalidated) results of the Expanded Remedial Investigation activities conducted at Sites 2 and 5 in December 2003. Handouts of the presentation were provided to the team. A summary of the discussion per site and media took place as follows:

Site 5 Surface Soil:

PAHs were detected above ecological screening values but generally below Background UTLs. Pesticides and metals were detected at elevated concentrations across the site with the highest pesticides occurring in the southernmost areas. The team discussed pesticide use at SJCA and how they are applied. It may be possible that pesticides have remained in the southern tree stand because the area is undisturbed.

Action Kim – Look into historical pesticide use at SJCA.

The next steps include a reevaluation of human health and ecological risk and possible statistical comparisons of site concentrations to Dredge Fill Background UTLs. Remedial alternatives will be evaluated in the FS and the team discussed the complexity of determining the next steps.

Site 5 Groundwater:

Only beryllium (5.8 and 7.5 ug/l) exceeded the MCL (4 ug/l). Although beryllium has been detected above the MCL over several rounds of sampling in the RI, beryllium was not identified as a human health risk driver.

Site 2 Groundwater:

There were significant detections of VOCs in one monitoring well to the west of the inlet (MW07S). TCE was detected at 82,000 ug/l, cis-1,2 DCE was detected at 34,000 ug/l, and vinyl chloride was detected at 3,600 ug/l. No pesticides were detected at MW06S where elevated pesticides were identified during the RI. Explosives were not detected. Several metals were detected but only arsenic exceeded the MCL in the sample collected from one monitoring well. Potential next steps include additional delineation of VOCs in groundwater.

Site 2 Surface Water/Stormwater:

In stormwater, VOCs were found on the northern edge of the Site 21 plume, south of the Site 21 plume, and in the connecting stormwater line under the SIMA parking lot. VOCs concentrations are significantly lower or not detected north of the Site 21 plume and stormwater northwest of the SIMA parking lot from DRMO.

In surface water, both culvert outfalls contained elevated VOCs. The stormwater system from Site 21 and the elevated VOCs found in the Site 2 groundwater appear to be impacting the inlet surface water. Potential next steps include further delineation and remediation of VOCs in groundwater at Sites 2 and 21.

Site 2 Sediment:

Due to the Sites 2 and 5 sampling taking place in December with the holiday season, the sediment sampling was delayed until January and the preliminary data has not been received. The results will be presented at the next meeting.

XII. Roundtable

FFA – The team discussed adding the potential NFA sites from the SI/SSA to the Final FFA. Dawn had recommended this to Bill and the team discussed whether it would be easier to add the sites now or in a future FFA revision.

Action Todd, Valerie, Debbie, Stephen – Check with legal departments on FFA wording changes.

Action Stephen – Check with Dawn about significance of adding the SI/SSA NFA sites to the FFA.

Draft Final Site 4 FS – Awaiting comments. Todd will submit comments in a couple of days and Stephen will submit comments by the end of the month.

XIII. SASR Update and FY04 Team Goals Update

Team Goals for FY04: The FY04 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Joint web site.

SASR Update: The SASR was updated and is included as an attachment.

XIV. Future Meetings Schedule

March 17-18, 2004	Philadelphia, PA
April 27-28, 2004	Bolger Center in MD
May 6, 2004	RAB Meeting in Chesapeake, VA with RAB
May 18-19, 2004	Richmond, VA
July 14-15, 2004	Virginia Beach, VA
September 1-2, 2004	Chestnut Hill, PA
October 20-21, 2004	Virginia Beach, VA with RAB
December 7-8, 2004	Richmond, VA

Action Valerie – Check the Community Relations Plan for RAB frequency.

Action Kim – Email Dawn the meeting schedule for concurrence prior to emailing Durwood.

XV. Agenda Building

February Meeting Agenda

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
Sites 2, 5, 19, 21 Path Forward	Bill/Kim	2.5 hrs
Site 2 Sediment	Bill	1 hr
BERA Results	Bill	1 hr
RAB Agenda	Team	30 min.
Partnering Exercise	Team	1 hr
Comments (Site 3, SSA, SI)	Team	30 min.
Site 4 PRAP	Team	30 min.

Next meeting: March 17th & 18th, 2004

Location: The Four Seasons Hotel in Philadelphia and meeting at CH2M HILL Office

Start time: 8:30 AM Day 1 and TBD Day 2

End time: 4:00 - 5:00 PM both days

Chair: Debbie Miller

Host: Todd Richardson

Timekeeper: Bill Friedmann

Goal Keeper: Stephen Garth

Recorder: Kim Henderson

Facilitator: Valerie Walker

Tier II: Mark Stevens

Guests: N/A

Pre-meeting Conference Call: 10 AM on March 10, 2004

XVI. Meeting Evaluation

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

Meeting Adjourned.

Parking Lot

No items were left in the parking lot at the end of the meeting.