Final Minutes from August 2001 Partnering Meeting - St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team

August 29 & 30, 2001

Attendees:
Dawn Hayes/LANTDIV
Todd Richardson/USEPA
Jeff Harlow/NAVY
Wandy Browne/The Management Edge
Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Guests: Bob Schirmer/Tier II
Ed Corl/LANTDIV (ECO)

From: Bill Friedmann/CH2M HILL

Date: September 18, 2001

LOCATION

Ramada Inn, Kill Devil Hill, NC

MINUTES

Wednesday, August 29, 2001
8:15 Check In

Roles and Responsibilities for this meeting:
Meeting Manager – Dawn Hayes
Timekeeper/gatekeeper – Jeff Harlow
Host – Dawn Hayes
Goalkeeper - Dawn Hayes
Facilitator - Wandy Browne
Recorder – Bill Friedmann

Reading of Ground Rules
Reading of Meeting Roles and Responsibilities

Parking Lot
- Site walk with Archie Pinkerton, a former employee who worked at St. Juliens base since 1939 and may be able to assist with base history.
- Roles and responsibilities by team members

- Video tape on ecological assessments and others support to be used at RABs.

Review of July Action Items (See Action Items at end of minutes - St. Juliens Creek Partnering Team)

The agenda was reviewed.

I. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

Review of the July 2001 minutes (See redline for Final Minutes from July 2001).???

If soil types are similar between the 6-24" soil horizon, a greater soil interval (greater than 6") may be collected with prior BTAG approval.

II. Round Table

Background Comments: (on-board review). Team discusses the EPA comments.
Comment 1: The approach outlined in Section 4.3 is fine as is. However, the Executive Summary and Section 5.0 should be consistent with Section 4.3.
Response to Comment 1: After submittal, Donna/Dawn discussed and e-mailed a better detailed section. We will now update the Executive Summary to reflect the updated section.

Comment 2: In addition to soil and groundwater, the document should present the approach that is being used to evaluate sediments.
Response to Comment 2: Surface water/sediment samples were not collected for background. Background/reference samples are collected for each site where there is an ecological concern. Sediment sampling may be included at future date. The team was notified that the Navy will come out with guidance regarding the appropriate circumstances to collect sediment and surface water.

Comment 3: The document should include an approach for site screening from ecological perspective. The current approach evaluates soils against human health risk-based standards and groundwater against human health based maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). Ecological issues are not addressed.
Response to Comment 3: The team agreed that background data would be applied in the uncertainty section of an RI/ERA. Until further guidance is released regarding the use of background data in an ERA, background data will be screened as part of the ecological risk assessment after the risk is presented. For site screening, a qualitative evaluation of ecological issues for pathways and receptors will be addressed.

Action Todd – discuss with Simeon general preference for sampling depths.

Discussion on ecological evaluation at sites. With respect to pre-RI sites, ecological evaluation will be handled on a case by case basis, to ensure flexibility.

Action Donna – Contact Devlin on background comments

The question was raised by the Tier II link whether dioxins were sampled as part of the background investigation Dioxins were not sampled as part of the background investigation; this issue may need to be addressed based on site findings. The team discussed how to use and evaluate the dioxin data. Jeff – Yorktown has background dioxin data.

Action Ed – give presentation to partnering team about dioxins and how to use/evaluate dioxins.

With regards to all data, BTAG is looking at all sites associated with a water sheds more closely to see the cumulative affect of sites on a water shed. This may have implications on Blows Creek since it may impacted by Site 19.

Team briefly discussed the actions to be taken for the RI sites; ROD Site 3 removal, site 4 cover, site 5 combined removal/cap. The FY02 Goals will be adjusted. The team briefly discussed the ROD for sites 3 and 6. Maybe prepare a focused feasibility study for sites 3 & 6..

Site 17 additional sampling - The team was informed that Building 278/279 will be demolished in February FY02.

Action Jeff – follow up on regional involvement in demo at SJCA (Site 17).

The Tier II link inquired whether the EPA was happy with transition from CDM Federal to CH2M HILL. The EPA is pleased with the transition.

The team discussed the involvement of CDM Federal (Lynne France) at future partnering meetings. The team came to a consensus that Lynne participate as a guest on the team as a technical expert with historical knowledge as opposed to an adjunct.
Consensus – Lynne France (CDM Federal) will be a partnering team guest and exited during a future meeting.

III. SASR

The SASR is review and updated. For the FS, Sites 3 and 6 will be split out from Sites 4 and 5 in order to create a focused feasibility study with presumptive removal alternative. The focused FS will allow the production of a ROD quicker.

IV. Expedite ROD

The team reviewed and produced a schedule for expediting the ROD in FY02. The team is considering not doing an EE/CA but will develop the PRAP and ROD based on removal as the preferred alternative. During the discussion of the schedule, it was determined that the legal review includes not only Navy, but DEQ and EPA legal review. Public notice can occur in the middle of the public comment period.

The team discussed writing of the ROD during the preparation of and legal review of the PRAP (and incorporating legal comments from the PRAP). The question was raised whether a PRAP and ROD have been submitted at the same time and the likelihood of that occurring in this case. CH2M HILL will attempt to submit both the PRAP and the ROD around the same time.

Action Todd – Identify the process for ROD/Closeout if the site is in an RI then goes through EE/CA can we go through removal? Do we need a PRAP? Public Comment? NFA ROD? Or can we close out via EE/CA close out report?

V. Tier II Update

Bob Schirmer discusses Tier II issues. The Tier II meeting is scheduled for September 5-6, 2001. Get quarterly goals to web for FY02. The Tier II link for St. Juliens Creek is Doug Dronfield of CH2M HILL.

The Tier II meeting will include the discussion of laboratory approvals. Stacie Driscoll of the EPA sent out a proposed procedure for approving labs for site work. Prior to field work the name of the lab selected would be provided to the partnering team. The EPA representative would forward the name of the selected laboratory onto Mary Ellen Shcultz of the EPA.. The Navy is currently addressing this issue with EPA. Tier I will inform the EPA what laboratory would be selected, for what analysis, and for what site.

Large water body issues – The Tier II meeting will discuss two papers on large water body sampling. Eric Johnson, Bruce Pluta, and Stacie Driscoll developed a draft plan for large water bodies. Another paper by Doug Dronfield on large water body sampling will be written. There is currently differences between the Navy and the EPA regarding when and under what circumstances large water body sampling should be conducted.

The team discussed what the approach should be when it is known that a site is linked to water body, where does the investigation stop. The approach should be determined on a case by case issue. An approach would be to identify the chemicals which are contributing from Navy sources. If that is not possible, then it becomes difficult to determine where to delineate or where to stop the investigation. This becomes an issue in terms of funding, because Navy funds can only be spent on contamination related to Navy activities. The Tier II meeting will also have a discussion on how storm drains relate to large water bodies.

For the next SJCA partnering meeting (October), the Tier II link will be Bruce Frizzle. **Action Bill** – change the SJCA partnering team meeting and RAB date to October 17-18..

Eco issues – there will be a draft paper by the eco-sub group which discusses pre-RI sites. Stephen Petron is developing a soil sampling paper. There is a question whether the paper will address the appropriate sample depths for background samples which can be used for eco.

The Tier I/II joint meeting is scheduled for 2002 with the location to be determined. The location will either be between Virginia Beach or Charlottesville. If the Tier I team has any suggestions for topics for the Tier I/II meeting, please inform the Tier II link.

Action Bill – remove sites under the SIMA building on the large fold out maps.

VI. Site Management Plan Update

An update of the Site Management Plan (SMP) is given. CH2M HILL will update the five year SMP. The team agrees with the priorities of the sites to be addressed. The EPA informed the team that EPA Region III is not signing any FFAs right now, although there are other regions are signing FFAs based on model language agreement.

Action Hill – Check on unresolved sites for the SSA/SMP. The unresolved locations will be in the SMP.

VII. FY02 Funding/Goals

There will be $1,077,843 of funding for St. Juliens Creek for FY02. The team begins discussing the goals for FY02.

FY02 Goals:

No.	Goal	Quarter
1	Develop Ecological Risk Approach Matrix for Sites 2-6	1st FY02
2	Final RI/FS Site 2	2nd FY02
3	Final RI/FS Sites 3 & 6	3rd FY02
4	Final RI/FS Sites 4 & 5	4th FY02
5	Final SSA Report & Closeouts of NFA Sites	2nd FY02
6	Finalize Removal Action Work Plan for Sites 3 & 6	3rd FY02
7	Signed ROD for Sites 3 & 6	4th FY02
8	Complete Team Deliverables	2nd FY02
9	Draft FFA	4th FY02
10	Final Background Report	1st FY02
11	Work Plan for SI for Various Sites	3rd FY02
12	Draft PRAP and Draft ROD for Site 2	4th FY02

There is further discussion on funding. The ROD for Sites 3 & 6 will be an EJOCK award with Horn Engineering, no IT or OHM award. This may mean that there is no need for a remedial design, just a work plan.

There was a brief review of the agenda for the next day. The Navy was interested in getting input from the team on what they would like to see covered during the ECO update scheduled for Thursday.

VIII. Partnering Activity (Roles and Responsibilities)

The partnering team discussed the roles and responsibilities for each of its members. **Consensus – team approves/adopts Roles and Responsibilities** (located at back of meeting minutes).

Deliverables Left:

- Membership and alternates
- Conflict Resolution Procedure
- Roles and Responsibilities of all Team Members

Optional:

- Roles and Responsibilities of Tier II Link (Team consensus that this item is not needed)
- Roles and Responsibilities of Adjunct

Meeting Adjourns for the day.

Thursday, August 30, 2001

The Navy provides an FTP site for downloading larger partnering presentations for viewing: www.lantops-ir.org Login: anonymous. The default directory is the correct folder for uploading and downloading files.

Check In

IX. ECO Presentations

Conference call with SJCA team. Those conferencing in: Devlin Harris (VDEQ), Michael Elias (CH2M HILL), and Simeon Hahn (EPA Region III). The call is to discuss status of ERA and issues related to Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6.

An overview of the work to date was presented by Mike Elias of CH2M HILL. The risk were reviewed by media.

Soil - Sites 2-6 – potential risk from PAHs, pesticides, and a few PCBs to higher trophic organisms. There are risks for soil at all sites except for site 4. The recommendation is for a presumptive remedy to address ecological risk and not do any more in depth ecological investigation. The concentrations driving the risk are very localized with peak concentrations. Impacts to plants are limited.

Sediment and surface water Sites 2 - 6 – For Site 3, there is no real impact to terrestrial invertebrates. For Sites 2, 4, 5, 6 – pesticides and PAHs are impacting benthic organisms. The recommendation is to walk drainages and look at the chemical data and habitats. It is suspected that there is limited aquatic habitat except at Site 2. Mercury is driving the risks at several locations for piscivorous birds (Heron)..

Some questions from EPA; does the surface water or sediment data show that contamination is limited to ditches or does it show that the ditches are migration pathways to Blows and St. Juliens Creeks. It would be beneficial to walk the drainage ditches. According to CH2M HILL, the chemicals are site related and more excedences occur down drainage, but generally decrease away from source. The EPA would like the site conceptual models completed prior to the site visit. The information which would be valuable prior to the site visit would include in outline form; conceptual model, problem formulation, risk concentration table, chemical tables, data trends, transport pathways, exposure, COPCs, and toxicological affects. Previous site model were a little conceptual and not as site specific.

A question by the EPA was whether the concentrations being looked at were maximum concentrations or mean. The response was that both maximum and mean exposure are being used. There was a general discussion on producing an interim deliverable before the site visit. The deliverable will include maps, extent, initial conclusions, maybe some presumptive remedies.

The EPA expressed its desire to look at ecological issues associated with St. Juliens and Blows Creeks and not just ditches associated to the sites. To this point, the focus has been on contamination related to the sites. The Navy stated that they are committed to looking qualitatively at the creeks and water bodies.

The Navy asked CH2M HILL that in the next week to week and a half, if a deliverable could be produced and distributed to EPA and Navy. The tentative deadline would be Sept. 10th. CH2M HILL believed an interim deliverable could be delivered in two weeks. Prior to the interim deliverable, there will be a conference call between EPA, Navy, and CH2M HILL to discuss in greater detail the contents of the interim deliverable. A conference call is set up to discuss the interim deliverable for Thursday, September 13th at 10:00 am.

The conference call regarding the ecological issues concludes. While representatives from the EPA and VDEQ are still on the call, the team discusses collectively, the response to comments for the background report, watershed issues, and sampling depths to be used in ecological risk assessments.

Background Report Comment: Comment 1 regarded the collection of background sediment samples. The response to the comment was read to Simeon which stated that sediment samples were not collected, but may be collected at future date on a site by site basis. According to EPA (Simeon), the comment is not intended to be a requirement for the background report, but rather a suggestion and something to keep in mind. The contaminants are probably known, but we need to build it in to the conceptual model.

Comment 2: related to the approach that is being used to evaluate sediments. The response read to EPA was that until further guidance is released on how to use background for ecological use, the use of background data in risk assessment will be

addressed in the uncertainty section of the risk assessment.. In a site screening process, background data is evaluated with site data.

Watersheds: when looking at watersheds, the cumulative affects of sites must be considered. In the case of Blows Creek, Site 19 is currently not evaluated. It is suggested that a watershed be evaluated with all available data. When additional data is available, the impact of the site on the watershed can be reviewed.

Sample Depths: The topic of sampling depths for the purposes of ecological risks is discussed with EPA. Generally, sampling would occur between 6 and 24 inches with samples being collected every 6 inches, unless there is a specific reason/horizon. The first step would be to look at the conceptual site model. There will be flexibility allowed. The topic of eco sampling depths will be discussed by Tier II.

X. Trenching and actions

CH2M HILL presents a summary of trenching activities and actions taken at Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6. Those conferencing in: Simeon Hahn (EPA Region III), Devlin Harris (VDEQ), and Michael Elias (CH2M HILL).

VDEQ raised the question of what is the intended future use of the facility. In the long run, it would be easier to clean/remove than use institutional controls (ICs). The property may either go to base realignment and closure (BRAC) or the property may be leased. The VDEQ also informed the team that there will be new landfill regulations which will take affect on October 1, 2001.

There is a general discussion on clean up levels, SSLs and PRGs. What is the order of the process? Where do we clean up to the risk level? The level will depend on the team, but the most conservative levels can always be used.

Action Bill/Donna – Talk to Holly Rosnick about presentation/explanation of PRGs. Dawn – look at COPCs. See if they work, then if we have to, look at SSLs.

SUMMARY - The trenching activities were summarized to give Simeon an opportunity to review additional investigative activities that were conducted at the site which are currently being evaluated for ecological risk. FS alternatives for Site 2 included complete removal and soil cover. Alternatives for site 3 included removal and soil cover. Alternatives for site 5 included cover, removal, or combination (consolidation) of both. The team generally preferred removal action, but would like to review final costs estimates. The team also discussed the impact presumptive remedies would have on the extent of eco risks assessments. Further discussions indicated a need to review cleanup levels and decide if and when site-specific PRGs need to be established. This information will be presented at the next partnering meeting as an agenda item. Background numbers will also be consider when discussing the use of PRGs.

Action Todd – Speak with Simeon regarding SSA review.

Action Bill – Speak to Howard regarding putting the background and SSA on CD. Also check on putting the documents on admin record. (The CD will have draft, comments, response to comments, final).

Action Donna – Get regional sediment information to include in the background.

XI. Agenda Building for Next Meeting/Scheduling of Meetings

Agenda Items for October 2001 Meeting

Item	Lead	Goal	Time
Standard Meeting Admin /Goals check in/out	Team	Effective meeting management	3 hours
Dioxin Presentation	Ed	To give general & site specific presentation	1 hour
Joint Scoping of unresolved SSA/SMP Sites (Sites 1, 8, 19, 21 and AOC1)	Bill	Next steps evaluation	1.5
Partnering Team deliverable	Team	Continue working on deliverables	2 hours
Roundtable (SSA and Background)	Team	Discuss items not scheduled on the Agenda	1 hour
Schedule Out 02 Partnering Meetings	Team	Schedule meetings for 2002	30minutes
RAB Preparation	Team	Prepare presentations for the SJCA RAB	2 hours
Tier II Update	Bruce	Informational	30 minutes
SASR Update	Bill/Donna	Update team	30 minutes
RI/FS/PRGs for Sites 2-6	Bill/Donna	Informational/Overview	1.5 hours
Update on ECO	Mike	Summarize Findings of interim deliverables and site visit.	30 minutes

Next meeting – October 17th & 18th, Renaissance Portsmouth, Portsmouth, VA
Start time: Wednesday, October 18th, 8:30 AM
End time: Thursday, October 19th, 3:00 PM

Pre-meeting Conference Call: October 3, 2001 10:00 AM

Chair: Devlin Harris

Host: Navy
Timekeeper: Donna Caldwell
Goal Keeper: Dawn Hayes
Recorder: Bill Friedmann
Tier II: Bruce Frizzel
Guests:

Future Meetings
November 27 & 28 Cacapon State Park, WV
January 10 & 11 Portsmouth, VA

RAB Meeting Agenda

Item	Lead	Goal	Time
Trenching Update (chemical data) for Sites 2, 3, 5, 6	Bill	Discuss chemical results from the July trenching activities	
Present Teams 02 Goals Presentation	Dawn	Inform what the are the SJCA goals for 2002	
Update SSA Closure Report	Donna	To discuss what has changed since the last presentation and give results of the joint scoping	

Team Goals
FY02 Goals:

No.	Goal	Date
1	Develop Ecological Risk Approach Matrix for all sites	6/29/01
2	Final Acceptance for process for documenting NFA Determination on Sites Presented in SMP **(Accomplished 3/20/01)**	
3	Final RI/FS Site 2	12/01
4	Final RI/FS Sites 3/4/5/6	11/01
5	Final Site 17 Technical Memorandum	8/01
6	Final SSA Report	9/01
7	Finalize Remedial Design for Sites 3/4/5/6 (Assessment of Needs)	FY02
8	Sign ROD for Sites 3/4/5/6	FY02
9	Sign ROD for Site 2	6/02
10	Closeout SSA Sites Requiring NFA	FY01
11	Complete Team Deliverables	2/02
12	Draft FFA	1/02
13	Final Background Report	8/01

Consensus – Team reaches consensus on goals.

St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team
July 2001 Meeting Action Items

Date	No.	Name	Description	Due Date
07/12/01 Complete	1	Bill/Donna	Get poster board of SJCA & fold out (Size D) drawing for partnering notebook and RAB.	08/01
07/12/01 Complete	2	Dawn	Check for FTP location for presentation postings. (Not allowed, but still working on it. Follow up with H. Simmons)	08/01
07/12/01 Complete	3	Donna	Get Dawn's RCRA management paper.	08/01
07/12/01 Complete	4	Todd	Check on review comments for Background Report from EPA technical support and identify if schedule date needs to be updated.	08/01
07/12/01 Complete	5	Devlin/Todd	Send email approval for Site 17 and Trenching Work Plan.	08/01
07/12/01 Complete	6	Todd/Donna	For Site 10, if Cr and Fe fall out through HHRA then NFA for the site	08/01
Previous Carryover Action Items				
5/29/01 OBE	1	Dawn/ Todd	Find 1983 PA Document NUS	7/12/01
4/26/01 Carryover	5	Dawn	Get Simeon and Team information on the BERA approach and schedule	
4/26/01 Complete	6	Bill	Check with Holly Rosnick (CH2M HILL) on dioxin considerations for the HHRA	

St. Juliens Creek Annex Partnering Team Roles and Responsibilities

The following are the Roles and Responsibilities of the team members as discussed and agreed upon.

VDEQ

1. Coordinate and prepare comments on documents.
2. Advise team members of changes in regulations.
3. Review documents in a timely manner.
4. Provide technical regulatory oversight and support so that remediation is consistent with National Contingency Plan (NCP).
5. Resolve issues within agency with regards to my facilities.
6. Provide criteria for cleanup and ARARs.
7. Meet Defense Statement Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) commitments.
8. Attend Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meetings.
9. Work in partnership.
10. Coordinate and communicate with Regional VDEQ offices.

U.S. EPA

1. Coordinate and prepare comments on documents.
2. Review documents in a timely manner.
3. Provide approval and concurrence, where required.
4. Assist in finalizing decision documents.
5. Maintains copies of final documents.
6. Attend RAB and other Public Meetings.
7. Consider community concerns in decision making process.
8. Help identify new community or "stakeholder" members.
9. Advise team members of upcoming regulatory requirements and any changes to those regulations.
10. Maintain effective/open communication with team members.
11. Attend team meetings.
12. Prepare for meetings and actively participate in each meeting.
13. Provide leadership on policy issue resolution.
14. Support team decisions at my Agency.
15. Resolve disputes and reach consensus at Tier I level.
16. Assist team to identify ARARs.
17. Coordinate the development of probable remedies.
18. Resolve issues and concerns within the Federal Facility Branch that may apply to St. Juliens Creek Annex.
19. Provide technical and regulatory oversight of the project.
20. Keep work on schedule.
21. Identify resource needs for coordinated oversight.
22. Assist in RCRA (corrective action and closure) issues.
23. Ensure regulatory compliance.

Navy

1. Execute community relations.
2. Conduct field oversight and assist contractor when they are on-site.
3. Co-chair the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB).
4. Maintain local administrative records in repository.
5. Sign decision documents, including permits.
6. Identify probable land uses.
7. Prevent or control new sources of contamination.
8. Ensure budgetary requests are properly submitted.
9. Protect natural resources.
10. Be responsible for emergency response.
11. Provide oversight and coordination of base mission and projects.
12. Ensure that contract submittals are timely & complete and schedules are met.
13. Provide long-term maintenance.
14. Identify ER,N salary support.
15. Keep chain of command informed.
16. Create and distribute administrative record.
17. Manage ER,N program (budgeting).
18. Solicit and respond to comments.
19. Implement team's decision.
20. Provide support (lead the effort where assigned) for regulatory agreements.
21. Develop and maintain Site Management Plan/ Management Action Plan.
22. Determine ER,N eligibility.
23. Ensure compliance with NCP and ARARs.
24. Author decision documents.
25. Maintain execution plan.
26. Respond to regulatory inquiries on hazardous waste sites.
27. Ensure decisions are implemented.
28. Ensure site close-outs.
29. Provide information to appropriate database.
30. Review hazardous waste docket.
31. Maintain consistency in overall program execution and quality of products.
32. Coordinate with other Service Centers.

Contractors

1. Keep partnering team members informed of the status of all activities.
2. Maintain a professional attitude towards all partnering team members; be responsive to each team member's individual needs.
3. Fully coordinate work tasks with the appropriate partnering team member, coordinate field work with base RPM prior to mobilization.
4. Maintain flexibility; respond to changes rapidly and effectively.
5. Be knowledgeable of pertinent regulations/guidance.
6. Be knowledgeable of, and willing to use, innovative technologies.
7. Advise partnering team of ways to do work better/faster/cheaper.
8. Advise partnering team of financial and technical impacts of their recommendations.
9. Suggest technical ways to meet all partnering team member requirements.
10. Assist SJCA with community relations activities.
11. Conduct work tasks and prepare deliverables as directed by the partnering team in a cost-effective, timely manner.
12. Assist in planning and executing environmental activities at the base.
13. Advise partnering team members of schedule adjustments with recommendations to get back on schedule, or adjust the baseline. Also notify partnering team of 'unexpected conditions' or when assigned tasks will not meet goals.
14. Ensure qualified people work on SJCA IRP work tasks (field/office work).
15. Ensure proper health & safety issues are addressed prior to field activities.
16. Provide adequate quantity/quality of field equipment.
17. Ensure quality control/quality assurance on all deliverables.
18. Coordinate and monitor work tasks performed by subcontractors.