

MEETING SUMMARY

CH2MHILL

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

July 14 and 15, 2004

Attendees:

Bob Schirmer/NAVFACENGCOM
Valerie Walker/CNRMA
Todd Richardson/US EPA Region III
Debbie Miller/VDEQ
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL
Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL

Tier II Link: Bob Schirmer/NAVFACENGCOM

Guests: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL (Site 4 Remedial Design Topic)
Dave Leadenham/AGVIQ (Site 4 Remedial Design Topic)
Phil Wayland/CH2M HILL (Enterprise System Topic)

Copies: Cate Pelech/CH2M HILL

From: Kim Henderson/CH2M HILL

Date: September 2, 2004

Location: CH2M HILL, Virginia Beach, VA

Wednesday, July 14, 2004 Minutes 0900 Check In.

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:

Meeting Manager: Bob Schirmer

Timekeeper/Gatekeeper: Todd Richardson

Host: Bill Friedmann / Kim Henderson

Goalkeeper: Bob Schirmer

Facilitator: Debbie Miller

Recorder: Kim Henderson

Reading of the Ground Rules.

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

Review Agenda:

Revisions will be made to the agenda as needed.

Review Previous Meeting Minutes:

Discussion on comments to the Draft May 2004 Meeting Minutes was added to the Parking Lot for Day 2.

Review Action Items:

The team reviewed Action Items and carryover items from the May 2004 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 – Provide an original signature page for the FFA to the Navy and VDEQ.

Action Todd – Provide a no comment email or letter for the SI, SSA, and SMP Reports.

Review Previous Parking Lot Items:

Indoor air vapor intrusion EPA/DoD – briefly discussed during Action Items and kept in the Parking Lot.

An updated contact list was provided to the team to reflect recent changes in email addresses. Todd requested to add a mail code to his address and the list will be revised accordingly.

II. SI/SSA NFA Consensus

The purpose of the agenda item was to sign the Concurrence for No Further Action Signature Pages for the Site Investigation (SI) at Site 8 and AOC 1 and the Site Screening Assessment (SSA) AOCs 13, 14, and K. The team signed the signature pages, copies were produced, and provided to the team. The original signature page was provided to Bob for inclusion in the Administrative Record. Kim will send the final CDs for the SI and SSA Reports, including the signature page, to the team.

III. BERA Tech Memo

Objective: Provide the team with an overview of the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) Phase I Technical Memorandum (Tech Memo) for Blows Creek contents and the recommendations for Phase II so that a work plan can be initiated. A presentation handout was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: The Phase I BERA was in actuality a Screening Ecological Risk Assessment (SERA) because a BERA involves tissue sampling. The objectives of the Phase I BERA were to determine the extent of chemical contamination which have an adverse impact to ecological receptors and to determine if additional sampling (subsurface sediment, tissue, and/or additional surface sediment) is required.

The analytical data trends and food web model results for mercury were discussed. There are two areas of the investigation which showed elevated mercury; the upper reaches of Blows Creek and the mouth of Blows Creek as it meets the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. The potential sources of mercury at the mouth of Blows Creek include Site 4 and the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. For the upper reaches of Blows Creek, the Cradock district or an unidentified Navy source may be potential contributors. Todd inquired about the source of mercury in the upper reaches and whether we would benefit from collecting a sample upstream of sample location 1. Bill explained that there are no obvious sources of mercury and sample location 1 was

chosen as a location because it encompasses the runoff from the Cradock district that include residential, farming, and commercial buildings. Tissue sampling will help to determine the toxicity of mercury in Blows Creek and whether or not we will need to deal with the mercury.

Bob inquired about the existing data in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River for mercury. Bill explained that the data was located too far away to use effectively and we are proposing to collect additional surface sediment data in transects outside the mouth of Blows Creek in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River to evaluate the potential impact.

Recommendations for Phase II sampling include:

- Tissue sampling in Blows Creek
- Surface sediment sampling to fully evaluate the potential source from the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River

Bill explained that the fish tissue sampling needs to be conducted in the summer/fall, during a limited time frame so as the Phase I results were presented in a tech memo format to expedite the process so field work can be conducted in 2004. The species chosen will need to be determined by ecologists, possibly mummichog if available throughout the length of the creek. A reconnaissance trip will be performed to determine in field conditions for the transects and availability of mummichog.

Action Bill – Find out what the best time frame is for collecting fish tissue.

Subsurface sediment sampling was not recommended and the explanations were provided in the tech memo. Todd asked the basis for the determination and Bill explained that there is an incomplete pathway for burrowing organisms and physical disturbance. The team discussed the potential path forward if resistance is encountered on the subsurface sediment recommendation. The team expressed possibly moving forward with the tissue sampling and surface sediment sampling regardless to continue the process.

Two proposed transect scenarios were presented, a 1980 historical aerial photograph indicates a channel from Blows Creek to the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River and if the channel exists, the northernmost transect will follow the channel. The Site 20 "no dig area", located in the vicinity of the proposed transects, will be avoided. Todd inquired whether we will need a dig permit for sample collection. CNRMA is working on the implementation of a dig permit and the current issues were discussed.

Action Valerie – Look into dig permit process and utility clearance procedures for SJCA.

Path Forward:

- Discuss the results with BTAG
- Set a goal for comments and discussion on the Phase I Tech Memo
- Present the recommendations in a Phase II Tech Memo Work Plan
- Conduct Phase II investigation in 2004

Action Team – Ask BTAG counterparts for review of the Phase I BERA Tech Memo by July 30.

IV. Site 2 Remedial Options and ERI Field Investigations

Objective: Discuss the potential remedial alternatives for Site 2 to direct the next phase of the Expanded Remedial Investigation (ERI). Additionally, to get the team to start thinking about

what land use controls/institutional controls (LUCs/ICs) they envision at the site, and their thoughts on strategy. A presentation handout was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: A review of the media specific risks, RI/ERI recommendations, and the possible remedial alternatives were provided. The following provides a summary per media:

Waste: Wastes include burnt/stained soil, debris, abrasive blast media, and petroleum to 7' below ground surface. Potential remedial alternatives include soil cover and removal. If removal is preferred, further delineation is required (particularly beneath the parking lot). This could be implemented as part of the Phase II ERI.

Soil: Potential human health and ecological risks were identified as part of the RI. The former Site 17 area also poses potential human health and ecological risks to be considered as part of Site 2. Presumptive remedies include soil cover and removal.

The team discussed removal and Bob indicated that approximately 1 acre area is a general rule of thumb for removal. Site 2 is approximately 1.5 acres. Bob expressed concerns for removal based on wastes extending to beneath the groundwater table.

The petroleum impact areas were discussed by the team. Bill indicated that the source was potentially above ground storage tanks. Bob asked if there was free product. Bill explained that a monitoring well was recently installed but the groundwater sampling was conducted by low-flow purging. Debbie indicated that there is a petroleum exclusion under CERCLA but when co-mingled waste exists, similar to Site 2, it may be handled under CERCLA.

Shallow Groundwater: Based on the groundwater flow data, the RI recommended that additional groundwater investigation be conducted to determine potential site risks. The ERI results indicated elevated chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and a Phase II ERI will be conducted and includes further VOC delineation, hydraulic characteristics evaluation, investigation of potential impact to deep groundwater, and evaluation of human health and ecological risks.

Bill spoke to Tom Simpkin/CH2M HILL and he recommended that a pilot study/treatment not be conducted based on the inability to effectively treat groundwater in mixed waste. Therefore, potential remedial alternatives include removal of waste followed by groundwater remediation or isolation by a cap and barrier wall.

Deep Groundwater: The RI identified no risk to deep groundwater, however, similar to shallow groundwater, the monitoring wells were generally located upgradient. Because deep groundwater is typically not impacted at SJCA and a new deep groundwater monitoring well will be installed as part of the Phase II ERI, the following consensus was reached:

Consensus: For Site 2 deep groundwater, if full suite analysis of new deep groundwater monitoring well installed at shallow groundwater VOC hot spot (near MW07S) indicates no impact to the deep groundwater, then no further monitoring of the deep groundwater will be conducted. However, further evaluation of the deep groundwater aquifer will be determined once the data is available.

Bill indicated that the deep monitoring well will be double-cased and carefully installed to prevent vertical contamination.

Surface Water: Potential ecological risks were identified as part of the RI. Because elevated concentrations of VOCs were found, the ERI included storm sewer and surface water sampling and the sources were determined to be Site 21 groundwater through the storm sewer and Site 2 groundwater. The potential transport of other media to surface water will be eliminated through remedial alternatives.

It was noted that the Site 2 inlet receives input from over 20 acres at SJCA and St. Juliens Creek.

Sediment: Potential human health and ecological risks were identified as part of the RI. The ERI included sediment sampling in St. Juliens Creek to evaluate the potential impact from Site 2. A localized impact was identified at the outfall. The Phase II ERI will include bioassay testing to characterize toxicity of inlet sediments to benthic organisms, further consideration of potential effects to avian piscivores from mercury, and further evaluation of groundwater VOCs impact to sediment adjacent to the hot spot. Potential remedial alternatives (will be based on results of Phase II ERI) include complete removal of inlet and outfall sediment, limited removal of inlet and outfall sediment, and elimination of transport from waste, soil, and potentially groundwater.

The team discussed a stepped approach for Site 2 remediation and how this would effect having a remedy-in-place by 2007. To remove the waste, a stormwater diversion to St. Juliens Creek would be necessary.

Bob asked whether there was a geophysical method we could use for delineating the waste.

Action Bill – Look into geophysics for waste delineation at Site 2.

Path Forward: Submit the Site 2 Tech Memo Work Plan for the Phase II Expanded RI for team review, incorporating the elements of this discussion.

V. Site 4 Remedial Design

Objective: To update the team on the remedial design (RD), discuss comments and schedule, and provide an introduction to AGVIQ. Bill introduced guests: Janna Staszak/CH2M HILL engineer and Dave Leadenham/AGVIQ Program Manager. A presentation handout was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: Bill presented the RD status for Site 4. The 35% RD was submitted May 14, 2004. Submittal of the 90% design was originally scheduled for August and the 100% design was originally scheduled for October. Comment resolution will likely push these dates forward. Construction will likely start in early 2005 due to funding and weather.

Comment status:

Navy - comments received

CNRMA - comments received

VDEQ - Debbie indicated that she will provide minor comments Friday

EPA - no comments

Water Media Managers - comments received

VMRC - Valerie is following up for wetlands impact, do we also need to check with Natural Resources?

ROICC - comments not received

Dave indicated that it may be more effective to meet with the ROICC and discuss the design and he would contact them. The following day, Dave contacted the ROICC and comments were received.

Action Bob – Check on AROICC contact name for Site 4 by July 19.

Janna had some questions regarding Bob's comments and they planned a meeting for the next morning prior to partnering.

Bob wanted to discuss some general concerns with the RD, he indicated that we haven't taken full advantage of the design/build, as this submittal was much more than expected at 35%. He thinks this could have been the 90% submittal. The only aspect of the design that needed to be 100% was the erosion and sediment control. He is unsure whether we have shown time and money savings. Dave indicated that the cost savings will take place as part of the implementation/work plan/build. Bob indicated that it will be difficult to explain to the ROICC that this is a design/build with the level of effort already provided. Dave said that the level of detail in the design was due to concerns with the reviewers not typically used to the design/build process. Debbie also expressed that she wasn't anticipating a full review of a 35% design, expecting the 90% design to cover the details.

Dave introduced the AGVIQ/CH2M HILL Joint Venture (JV) to the team. The JV helps LANTDIV to achieve small business goals as part of a 9-year program with unlimited contract capacity. The parent company of AGVIQ, Tikigaq, is a village corporation under the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act. The village corporation is owned by shareholders, including eskimos living in Point Hope that reap the benefits from the corporation. Point Hope goods and services are subsidized by the profits.

Wetlands discussion – Bob provided Bill with contact information for Nancy Bland (LANTDIV Natural Resources) and she was contacted. Bill has yet to receive a response. Contact needs to be initiated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) to verify our wetlands delineation. Nancy Bland was formerly employed by the ACOE and can help with contact information. In the RD, we need to clarify how many acres of wetlands we will be effecting and how we plan to give it back.

Action Bill – Contact Nancy Bland (LANTDIV Natural Resources) for verification of wetlands delineation and for contacting the ACOE for Site 4 RD.

Path Forward: Address comments received on the Site 4 RD and submit next phase of design.

VI. VOC Pilot Options for Sites 2 and 21

Todd discussed a soy based product injection that offers rapid degradation but has a small radius of influence. He would like to obtain more specific information and check with his technology office to see if it is an approved method. He provided the team with the EPA technology web site: www.trainex.org

Bill presented the emails he has received from Tom Simpkin/CH2M HILL and discussed his recommendations (see Section IV on Site 2 groundwater for details on addressing groundwater).

Bob mentioned that a pilot test by a University/or similar study may not meet our remedy-in-place goal for 2007.

VII. Institutional Controls and Signs

Objective: To plan for institutional and engineering controls to be implemented at IR sites posing potential human health risks. Valerie presented the potential land use controls to be implemented at SJCA. A presentation handout was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: Valerie discussed the difference between engineering and institutional controls. The term land use controls (LUCs) encompasses both. Engineering controls include physical means of controlling access (i.e., signs and fencing). Institutional controls are legal and administrative restrictions on land use (i.e., notices in public land records, site inspections, deed notices/restrictions). Debbie noted that in Virginia, deed notices are not a permanent institutional control and that they may be changed by the landowner.

Five IR sites were identified at SJCA for signs: Sites 2, 4, 5, 19, and 21. As part of the RD, Site 4 will also be fenced. Bill will produce maps to indicate potential sign placement at the sites. The team discussed the requirements, to include signs at access points and then every 100 feet.

Action Bill - Develop fence and sign locations for Sites 2, 4, 5, 19, and 21 on figures for discussion at the next meeting.

The team discussed the recent maps provided to PWC, indicating the IR sites and restricted use areas.

Action Bill – Send pdf maps of the soil/groundwater restriction areas to team.

Action Bob – Check with Dawn to verify the property boundary for SJCA.

The team went over the concern for identifying sites as "no further action" and whether it is an appropriate classification for providing to the base activities, such as PWC. They may misinterpret the no further action classification and take no precautions prior to any construction. To be conservative, the team discussed including all the IR sites at SJCA, regardless of status. However, the map would not include the RCRA sites and general precautions should be taken on military bases, regardless of whether working in IR site areas or not. How NFA sites should be treated at SJCA was placed in the parking lot for further discussion. Bill showed the different themes included in the current GIS (restricted use by media, NFA sites). An update will be provided in the near future.

Action Bill – Submit a GIS update to the team, including IR site status, boundaries, and restricted use areas (include Site 20 as restricted based on potential contact with ordnance).

Action Bob – Make sure that Mark Barnes gets updated GIS layers.

Valerie went over some of the administrative controls in place; periodic quarterly inspections, GIS web site, dig permit requirement, and routine Operations and Maintenance (O&M). Future LUCs will be considered per site if required, identified in the Base Master Plans, and recorded in public land records. Groundwater monitoring plans, annual inspections, and 5-year reviews will also be implemented as appropriate and we need to ensure Records of Decision (RODs) or Decision Documents (DDs) state the LUC requirements.

The following LUC Objectives for Site 4 were presented:

- Prohibit residential/recreational use
- Prohibit public access

- Prohibit actions that would disturb landfill cover
- Maintain cap and drainage
- Install fence and gate with signs
- Install stormwater control and erosion/sediment control
- Provide the general public with notice of land use restrictions
- Revise Base Master Plans and maps to identify restrictions and update site dimensions
- Conduct annual inspections

Bob asked whether a gravel access road is required for Site 4. The team discussed the benefits and it will be considered as part of the RD.

Todd questioned whether there is adequate coordination with Base PWC. Bob and Valerie indicated that they are becoming one organization.

Path Forward:

Sign locations and implementation will be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

Action Bob – Provide funding for IR signs, Site 4 LUC RD, and Site 4 marsh sediment delineation to CH2M HILL.

1700 Meeting Adjourned.

Thursday, July 15, 2004 Minutes

0830 Check In.

VIII. Reviewed Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

The team discussed and made minor amendments to the Draft May 2004 Meeting Minutes.

Consensus: May 2004 Draft Meeting Minutes accepted as final with amendments. The minutes will be finalized and placed on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

IX. Tier II Update

The Tier II update was provided by Bob Schirmer/LANTDIV:

- The MCL issue is still unresolved and is under consideration by Tiers II and III. Robert Weld/VDEQ, Paul Rakowski/LANTDIV, and Paul Leonard/EPA are meeting to discuss the MCLs in the near future.
- An Ecological Risk Management paper was written by LANTDIV and provided to Tier II for review. The paper outlines how to handle ecological comments in the future and focuses the Tier I team discussions on critical comments. The critical comments are recommended to be addressed by the Tier I team, the Navy would respond to any non-critical comments. Tier II would also like BTAG to state whether they generally agree or disagree with the recommendations of the report.
- The next Tier II Meeting is September 14, 2004 - update goals and web site.
- Bill asked if Tier II reviewed and discussed feedback from Joint Meeting. Bob indicated that they has and there were generally favorable results.

X. Enterprise System

Objective: To present the team with the updated Enterprise System and provide basic training on online commenting. Bill introduced guest: Phil Wayland/CH2M HILL. An updated document review and commenting manual was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: Phil went through each aspect of the web site as follows;

- Home Page
- Calendar Alerts
- Project Management Web Site
 - Bob asked how a user would know when the information was last updated and requested possibly a line item at the bottom of each page "Last Updated...Date...".
- Administrative Records
 - Phil explained that the Administrative Record was going online in the next couple of weeks and explained the process between Bonnie Capito/LANTDIV and Becky Singleton/CH2M HILL. The team discussed whether the library will be updated with CDs or hard copies or if it was acceptable to provide a binder with a web site address that contains the Administrative Record.
 - Action Bob** – Check with Bonnie on adding SJCA documents to the Administrative Record.
- Project Files
- Web GIS
 - Phil went over the limitations of the Web GIS and Bill went through the GIS to show the features available.
- Document Review
 - Phil explained the document review process and how to comment online, upload comments, download comments, and approve documents. Some features of the uploading and downloading process didn't function properly because the online commenting file was not run. Kim will send the file to the team to run prior to online commenting.
- Public Web Site
 - Bill sent an email to John Ballinger to contact the RAB members and let them know that the public web site has been updated and is back online. The RAB agendas and meeting minutes have been posted in pdf.

Path Forward: Begin utilizing the online commenting feature for document review.

V. Site Management Plan

Objective: Provide an overview of the update and significant changes to the Site Management Plan (SMP) for FY 2005, discuss comments, and reach consensus to finalize the SMP. A presentation handout was provided to the team.

Overview of Discussion: Kim provided an outline of the SMP and went through the significant changes:

- CERCLA Process
- Descriptions of Sites (the sites were separated into the four FFA categories)
- Proposed Activities
- Remedial Actions and Removal Actions
- Schedules

The updates for the final SMP include revising the text to reflect the signed FFA, general update of site status and the associated figures and tables, and incorporate Debbie's comments. Valerie submitted a no comment email. Todd will send a no comment email/letter. Bob requested we adjust the schedules to reflect future Navy funding (NORM tables).

The team discussed creating a new subsection which documents changes to the site status since the FFA. Debbie recalled the FFA stating a time frame for action for the PSA/SSA sites.

Action Bill/Kim - Look into the timeframe for action for FFA Appendix B Sites.

Valerie asked Todd if EPA was publishing the FFA public notice.

Action Todd - Check with EPA about FFA public notice.

Kim looked into the FFA requirements for the SMP. Draft Amended SMPs must be submitted by June 15 each year followed by a 30 day review and comment period.

Path Forward: Incorporate comments received and finalize the SMP in early August.

XI. Roundtable

Trustees

Bob provided the trustee information, with the exception of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The ecological risk assessments should be provided to trustees (CERCLA POCs) for a 30-day comment period. This can be implemented through the Enterprise System web site.

Action Kim – Check with Dawn on trustee web page status and implement for SJCA.

Site 4 Marsh Sediment

Objective: Provide an overview of the Site 4 marsh sediment risks identified in the RI and discuss a path forward.

Overview of Discussion: Team previously discussed addressing Site 4 marsh sediments as part of the Blows Creek BERA. Bill and Kim looked into the potential risks and determined that it may be easiest to address the marsh sediment while the equipment and materials are on site and prevent future disturbance of the wetlands.

Potential human health and ecological risks were identified in sediment as part of the RI (a figure was provided to the team). Sediment at Site 4 includes the drainages and marsh sediment. The Selected Remedy will mitigate risk in the drainages and debris will be removed from the marsh sediment area. Bob inquired whether we have a good idea of where the debris is located and how much is located in the marsh sediment area. Bill explained that there is scattered debris and while removing it, the surrounding sediment will be removed. The potential impact to the wetlands was discussed. Temporary access points to the wetlands will be constructed. Bob indicated that we need to provide information on the anticipated wetlands impacted and how and when they will be re-established. The wetlands restoration will be included as part of the work plan.

Action Bill – Verify with Nancy Bland and ACOE the requirements for restoration of wetlands following the Site 4 build.

A qualitative look at the risks in marsh sediment indicate one location (SD04) with elevated concentrations. A potential path forward is to determine if removal of individual marsh sediment

sample(s) will eliminate overall risk or reduce to a level warranting risk management. The team agreed that this should be looked into for samples SD04, SD06, and SD07.

Bob expressed concern that the extent of contamination is unknown and recommended we follow a similar approach as the NNSY Paradise Creek investigation (transects). Additionally, the team did not feel that we could just conduct a limited removal of these sample locations and effectively remove risk since no PRGs have been developed. Kim indicated that clean-up goals options would be toxicity sampling or existing reference data.

Todd inquired how this effects the ROD under current review because we haven't officially separated the marsh sediment into a separate OU but defaulted to the BERA instead. The team discussed changing the site boundary, separating marsh sediment as a separate OU, or investigating it as part of the BERA. Changing the site boundary was not recommended. Debbie recommended changing the language in the ROD to state exactly what we are planning for the marsh sediment; i.e. marsh sediment located in the southern portion of the site will be investigated separately and/or addressed in conjunction with the BERA.

Debbie expressed concern that the purpose of the BERA was to address the sediment in Blows Creek and potential contribution from IR sites. Bill explained that he has expressed these concerns in the past, as the BERA includes primarily channel sediment, and he will look into it further.

Path Forward:

- Determine marsh sediment risks from existing data.
- **Action Bill** - Check with Mike Elias, Steve Petron, and Ed Corl about the geographic extent of the Blows Creek BERA and whether it will include marsh sediment.
- Further discuss at the September meeting.

XII. SASR and FY04 Team Goals Update

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

Action Bob - Verify that Site 2 sediment tech memo was provided to Ed Corl for review.

Action Team - Provide comments/consensus to mobilize for Sites 2, 19, and 21 investigations based on the tech memo work plans.

FY04 Team Goals: The FY04 Goals were updated, included as an attachment, and will be posted on the Virginia/Maryland Joint IR Teams web site.

XIII. Future Meetings Schedule

September 1-2, 2004	Chestnut Hill, PA
October 20-21, 2004	Portsmouth, VA with RAB
December 7-8, 2004	Richmond, VA

XIV. Agenda Building

July Meeting Agenda

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Time</u>
Site 5 Tox/PRG Development	Bill	1 hr
Sites 2, 19, and 21	Kim	30 min
Site 3 PRAP	Bill/Kim	30 min

Site 4 (RD/Marsh Sediment/ROD)	Bill	1 hr
Blows Creek BERA Work Plan	Bill	45 min
FY05 Goals	Bob	30 min
RAB Agenda Building	Team	30 min
Signs for IR Sites	Team	30 min
Roundtable	Team	30 min
Standard Administrative Items	Team	2-3 hrs

Next meeting: September 1st & 2nd, 2004

Location: Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania

Start time: 8:30 AM

End time: 4:00 PM

Chair: Valerie Walker

Host: Todd Richardson

Timekeeper: Debbie Miller

Goal Keeper: Bob Schirmer

Recorder: Kim Henderson

Facilitator: Bill Friedmann

Tier II: Bob Schirmer

Guests: BTAG?

Pre-meeting Agenda Conference Call: 10:00 AM on August 19, 2004

XV. Meeting Evaluation

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

1500 Meeting Adjourned.

Parking Lot

- Indoor air vapor guidance
- How to handle NFA for access controls on maps