

**MEETING MINUTES, FORMER NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT (FNOD)  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)**

To: Restoration Advisory Board members, Interested Parties  
 From: Sandra Chaloux, CEC, Inc.  
 Ken Hafner, U.S. Army Corps Project Manager and RAB Co-Chair  
 Re: Minutes of April 3, 2001 RAB Meeting

<p><b>RAB Members Present:</b>          Robert Thompson          Eric Salopek          Tim Fink          Bruce Johnson          David Saunders          Ed Wallingford          Cherie Walton          Marian "Bea" Rogers          Thomas Decker          Stephen Cline          Dave Taylor          Jim Bennett          Tom O'Grady          Ken Hafner          Keri Robertson</p> <p><b>RAB Members Absent:</b>          Fred Bright          Ted Shennan</p>	<p><b>Affiliation:</b>          EPA          VDEQ          TCC          Respass Beach          Bennett's Creek          VDOT – Central Office          Reactives Management Corporation          RAB Community Co-Chair          Community          General Electric          Suffolk Fire Department          Dominion Lands          City of Suffolk          USACE, Project manager, Gov't. Co-Chair          USACE – Engineering Support</p> <p>Nansemond Indian Tribe          Continental Properties</p>
---	--

7:15 p.m.      **Introduction and Welcome/Call to Order/General RAB Discussion**  
 (Sandra Chaloux – CEC)

The meeting was called to order and RAB members and guests introduced themselves and indicated why they attended the meeting. Sandra reviewed changes to the agenda order and asked that questions be held until after the Corps' presentation. No corrections were noted to the February 6 meeting summary.

Sandra provided a brief review of the purpose and goals of the RAB for the benefit of the new members. RAB members are expected to serve as a liaison to the community, getting the project information out into the community at large and bringing concerns/comments back to the RAB.

Sandra explained that she was finalizing the Community Relations Plan for the project and asked the board to identify key community concerns that should be included in the CRP revision. She also disseminated a copy of the outreach portion of the plan for comments by the RAB.

*Comments by Community RAB Members*

Bea Rogers thought that there needed to be project information posted on the community bulletin board on the city cable channel. She also suggested that clubs/groups and homeowners associations (such as Harbour View) need to be made aware that the FNOD project team and RAB members are available to give presentations about the restoration efforts. Ken spoke to the local Ruritan Club. There were 30 people in attendance. David Saunders said he received some positive feedback from several people who attended.

Ed Wallingford complimented the Corps on the good job they have done in reflagging areas. Visibility of site controls such as fencing during the cleanup effort has been very good.

Tim Fink said the UXB (a Corps contractor) is working on Pit 12. He said the Corps is working with TCC to get the word out about having to temporarily close the road to the campus and that it had been very positive.

Cherie Walton said that she couldn't think of anything that the Corps hasn't already tried in terms of community relations. The new Web site might be something good to improve information flow to the community.

Thomas Decker said he would like to see more summary data available in the information repository rather than 30 technical documents. Similar information could be placed on the Web site when it is up and running. He also said that items such as the newsletter should really help.

Bruce Johnson has been trying to get information to the people in Respass Beach, but he said that it is sometimes difficult to drum up interest.

David Saunders would like the team to send more information to the newspapers on the project's progress. He would like to see a steady feed of project information to the newspapers. He also reiterated that Ken did a good job with the Ruritan Club presentation.

Sandra asked the RAB if they would be able to meet on another night due to a conflict with the EPA representative's schedule. Bea suggested Monday or Thursday contingent on the TCC school schedule. After a show of hands, the first Monday was the preferred date for the RAB meetings. If first Monday is not available, Sandra will look into the possibility of the first Thursday for a meeting day.

7:40 p.m.

**Corps Project Update** (*Ken Hafner – USACE*)

Ken introduced the Corps team and presented an outline of the topics for the meeting.

*Areas of Concern (AOC) List* (*Keri Robertson – USACE*)

Keri stated they were still working on updating the AOC list. She indicated that the Chemistry/Photo Lab had been removed from the AOC list due to the lack of visible problem areas. Steps have been taken in the building to address prior concerns. She said there has been no confirmation of the buildings having basements, as was suggested for the magazines, and that they can probably be removed from consideration. AOCs that still need to be investigated include the power, steam and water plants, the swimming pools for officers and the enlisted, and the labs by the Nansmond River. Additional AOCs will be identified through further investigation. The primary means of

identification comes from UXB field reports. The Corps will look into any items that could be potentially troublesome.

#### *Athletic Fields*

Keri told the group that samples from pits 15 and 19 have shown contaminants such as PAHs and heavy organics which fits with the asphalt detected in the sand. The Corps is working with the Huntsville District to complete the process of digging the pits as soon as possible. Keri said work on Pit 12 has turned up more ordnance and would take longer to complete than expected, with possible consequences for roads leading to the college. Ken said assessments of safety distances during the removal process indicated Pit 12 affects the first right hand turn to the parking area and will probably require closing the road temporarily. The cleanup process for Pit 18, which will follow Pit 12, will affect the main road leading into the college. Ken indicated that the road would probably have to be closed while work on Pit 18 proceeds. The Corps is reviewing alternatives to make this as painless as possible for the college. Once there is a plan, there will be plenty of notice to the college.

A discussion took place on ways to minimize disruptions arising from the project. Ken said several alternatives were being explored, including crews working on Sundays, when traffic is lighter. Bea suggested waiting on the Pit 18 cleanup until summer to avoid the busier months on campus. Ken said it was crucial to finish work on the pits as soon as possible, but emphasized ideas for reducing the potential for disruptions were being explored. Keri gave some background on the Pit 12 and Pit 18 projects for clarification of those how were not familiar with the project.

#### *Progress since February*

Property Boundary/Site Map: Keri introduced a revised draft property owner's boundary map, which will be mailed out to the RAB. She requested feedback by April 13 so that the map can be finalized and entered into the GS.

Remedial Investigation (RI) Main Burning Ground/Steam-out Pond Area and Horseshoe Pond Area: Keri said the USACE has scheduled a conference call with relevant regulators regarding the RI Main Burning Ground/Steam-out Pond Area and Horseshoe Pond Area to review comments and responses to the work plan so the project team can move forward with the investigation. She also indicated that Roy F. Weston, (a Corps contractor), has removed the purge water drums from the Main Burning Ground Area.

James River Beachfront: Keri said there had been a lot of activity related to the James River Beachfront, and documents are at varying stages of document preparation and review.

Background Study: The Corps is reviewing response to comments. Regulators have reviewed the draft report and provided comments. The Corps is reviewing the contractor's responses to comments in order to finalize the draft document, and will be sending the responses to the regulators soon.

Action Memorandum: The Action Memorandum is being prepared to satisfy CERCLA and FUDS requirements and will include an outline of work at the site and the responses to the comments on the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA).

Risk-Based Criteria: The Corps is working on responses to the regulatory agency's comments for the risk-based criteria.

Programmatic Agreement: The Programmatic Agreement has been sent out for signatures. The permit for the burial removal is also close to completion. Once this is finalized, the Corps will also place a public notice and hold a 30-day comment period prior to removal of the remains near the James River Beachfront. The Corps will be working with the James River Institute for the archeological work to remove the remains.

Ecological Baseline Study Draft Report: The Corps has received all comments from the regulatory agencies. Responses to those comments should go out next week.

A RAB member asked if the draft report has been issued on the Horseshoe Pond and when comments and a follow-up report were expected. Keri said that the draft report has been issued and the final report won't be finished until the next phase of the investigative is completed. She hopes that work will begin by the end of this year and estimates the final report will be issued in the summer of 2002.

*Well sampling update/findings (George Mears - USACE)*

George introduced himself to the group. He explained that homeowners on private wells have the responsibility to have their wells checked periodically, every few years, because things do change. Area homeowners can call the City of Suffolk Public Works Department Water Quality Laboratory, which will analyze a private well water sample for \$25, covering the basics of fecal coliform bacteria, nitrates and—if requested—fluoride. More extensive analysis is available to citizens, but this can be prohibitively expensive, running anywhere between \$600 and \$1,000, depending on the number and type of constituents being tested for. However, the Army Corps has conducted limited well water sampling in the recent past where a full range of contaminants was tested for and this information is available to residents.

The Corps conducted two sampling efforts from six private wells in Respass Beach. The initial testing was conducted by the Corps and EPA in November 1997. The follow-up sampling effort was conducted in February 1998. The homeowners who participated received a copy of the results. Information on these sampling events minus the actual addresses will be available in the information repository. The Corps tested for all contaminants that could be associated with the FNOD Site such as explosives, volatiles, semi-volatiles and pesticides. While there have been two findings of a constituent that could be related to a chemical warfare agent at the James River Beachfront, the low confidence in the detection, the lack of any corroborating evidence that would normally be expected if the detection was real, and the immobile nature of the substance itself, all argued against the need for specifically testing for chemical warfare agents at Respass Beach; however, many of these chemicals would have been picked up in the analyses that were performed. The tests indicated that bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was the only compound detected at a level that could pose a possible threat to human health. It was found in two of the six wells.

George indicated that a serious general public health threat from the presence of bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is unlikely. The levels of the compound in 98-TCC-RW-2 may be attributable to a number of causes, including laboratory contamination or sources not connected with the TCC former NOD site. This chemical is very common in the environment because it is a very commonly used plasticizer that persists in soils. Where it exists in soils, it is not likely to move far in groundwater. Where PVC is used, it is far more common that the presence of bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is related to the installation of the well itself. Of course, if this is due to lab contamination, there would be no

problem with the well the sample came from. However, he said the compound cannot be excluded from consideration as a COC because of the “screening level” nature of the investigation. George also said bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate had turned up in other background samples. He stressed that as this is the only known contaminant beyond those already known to be characteristic of the area groundwater system, all future private well sampling events will continue to be tested for this chemical.

To gather more information and to further investigate the relationships of any findings at Respass Beach, George outlined future efforts to gather additional information around the FNOD, including drilling a new monitoring well cluster just to the east of TCC Lake and on the east side of Streeter Creek. He also described plans to sample more wells within the Respass Beach community. George encouraged homeowners interested in participating in this future private well sampling to contact Sandra Chaloux or an RAB member to volunteer for the sampling program. Final location choices will be made based on well location and depth, and to wells serving multiple residences, so as to benefit the greatest number of residents while providing researchers the most representative information; however, the Corps will give first consideration to those homeowners who want to have their well tested. Homeowners who participate will receive a courtesy copy of the analysis results of their well water.

The Corps has previously tested the production wells within FNOD—the TCC production wells. A RAB member mentioned that VDOT also has a well located at the VDOT Maintenance Site and that the State had this well tested, finding no problems. VDOT would be happy to make this well available for future testing efforts. George noted that this well appeared to be in a good location to provide potentially valuable information and the Corps may well take up that offer.

A RAB member asked what the projected timeline was for completion of the future testing. George expects the sampling and evaluation to be done in two to three months after locating a site for the cluster well on the east side of Streeter Creek—in the Respass Beach area. The private well sampling would be conducted as part of the same work plan that includes sampling of the new cluster well set.

A RAB member asked how many of the wells that were tested were deep wells. According to George, at least one of the six tested was a deep well.

A RAB member asked if there was any way that contaminants could migrate across the River from the Newport News Shipyard Industrial Site. George suggested that the possibility of that was extremely remote because one would expect the river to take such contamination reaching the river on the Newport News side out to sea while highly diluting it at the same time.

Another RAB member asked if anything had been done regarding the residential area south of the site. Bea answered that the area south of the FNOD receives city water and would not be affected by contaminants from the site. RAB members expressed concerns about many of the irrigation wells in the residential areas south of the FNOD facility. George said migration of such compounds in that direction would run contrary to all studies that have been done to date. Also, citizens shouldn't have to be instructed that it isn't safe to be consuming water from irrigation wells. The levels of contaminants that could potentially reach shallow irrigation wells—if the flow was in the proper direction to reach these wells—would be well below any level that could be problematic if the

water was only used for irrigation. That being said, George also added that the USACE would certainly test wells in this area if evidence suggested that any dangerous compounds were turning up that could potentially be related to FNOD.

The same member asked about analysis of the site for chemical warfare materials. George emphasized that no confirmed chemical warfare material have been detected in either FNOD surface or subsurface soils. Other categories of compounds – including VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, explosives and metals – were detected at varying levels in the FNOD vicinity. However, at Respass Beach, any such chemicals—with the exclusion of bis(2-ethylhexyl)phalate –were ultimately screened out as potential COCs by an exclusion process that compared the detected levels of any potential COC to published regulatory concentration criteria including:

- National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs)
- National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Action Levels for copper and lead
- EPA Region III Risk-Based Concentration (RBC) tables
- National Research Council Recommended Daily Allowances (RDAs) for nutrient metals: calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium and zinc

*Public Affairs Work Group (Diana Bailey – USACE)*

Diana discussed the development of the Public Affairs Work Group to assist with the communications efforts for the FNOD project. At the first two meetings, the group identified key issues including:

- Questions we are not addressing for the public
- The best way to distribute project information
- Web page availability
- News release procedure
- The need for exhibits
- The status of the Community Relations Plans
- The readability and frequency of the newsletters and fact sheets

Some of the group's initiatives and recommendations are:

- *RAB Format and Support:* A RAB orientation book for new members; mentors for the new RAB members; increased community activities;
- *News Coverage:* Need to seek increased news coverage and news release. These releases will be reviewed by all appropriate agencies.

Diana then reviewed the Community Relations plan, which outlines key goals of the community outreach including RAB support, news release distribution, and public notices of RAB meetings.

RAB members discussed the best strategy for submitting notices to area newspapers (and to which newspapers) and cable access channels. Sandra noted that budget limitations may force choices among the media outlets. One RAB members suggested the Suffolk Sun newspaper. Some other board members questioned whether the readership level of the Sun and the viewer levels on public access channels are high enough to justify the expense of submitting notices to them; others believed enough people watch the channels to make them a worthy vehicle for disseminating information.

Several other suggestions were presented to the RAB. Among them:

- Maintenance of a mailing list

- Increasing publication of a project newsletter to a quarterly basis
- Creation of a speaker's bureau, which would be available to local civic groups
- Updating and maintaining the information repository in the library
- Holding public information sessions either semi-annually or as needed

The Community Relations Plan is being reviewed by the Work Group members, who will have changes to Sandra by the end of the week, so a new CRP can be distributed at the next RAB meeting. Sandra also invited the RAB members to submit their comments on the CRP to her by Friday as well.

Using other communication tools such as project displays, fact sheets, email distribution, cable access. The Work Group also would like to use the newsletters of surrounding communities, companies and civic groups to get the word out about the project. Diana stressed the importance of consistent communication coming from all of the RAB members. The Work Group is willing to assist any RAB member in preparing materials to disseminate to their respective community groups.

RAB members and community attendees witnessed a demonstration of the USACE's Norfolk District Web site. The Nansemond project is now listed under current projects and is now the beginning of the project Web site. The web address is [www.nao.usace.army.mil/projects/Nansemond/welcome.html](http://www.nao.usace.army.mil/projects/Nansemond/welcome.html).

Right now, information on the Web site includes an explanation of the CERCLA process, the project fact sheets, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), project history, locator map, newsletter, photo album, list of the project team and their contact information and a list of the RAB members. Diana asked if RAB members would like to have contact information for them, via either telephone, fax or email, made available on the site. None of the RAB members raised any objections to making their contact information available on the Web site. The site also reviewed project success stories. The project team would like the RAB to review the site and give their feedback to the group during the next RAB meeting. One RAB member recommended that the project team register the site with Internet search engines so that the site is easy to find.

8:30 p.m.

**Public Comment/Question and Answer Period**

Sandra asked if the landowners (Dominion and GE) had anything new to add to the RAB meeting. They did not.

An audience member raised questions about certain areas close to the hiking trail near the Horseshoe Pond being off limits. Project team members said the area would be roped off for the foreseeable future as excavation work continues. In response to a follow-up question on timing, project team members said they couldn't say when the work would definitely be finished.

8:45 p.m.

**Establish Action Items/Set Agenda and Date for Next RAB Meeting**

The next RAB meeting was set for June 7, 2001. The **agenda items** for the next RAB meeting include the following:

- Update on Institutional Controls Work Group
- Status of potential ordnance items near the I-664 bridge
- Study findings of ASTDR
- Update on testing new well sites in Respass Beach

9:10 p.m.

**Meeting Adjourned**

<b>Guests Present:</b>	<b>Affiliation:</b>
George Mears	USACE, Norfolk District
Dave Sheets	USACE, Huntsville
Bill Hudson	USEPA, Hazardous Sites
Harry C. Wheeler Jr.	Gannett Fleming
Fred Slade	Citizen
Brett Waller	VDOT
Lynn Chandler	Elizabeth River Soccer
George Walton	Virginia Community College System
Jaki Kool	HCL
Tom Hoffman	HCL
Gary Colvin	City of Suffolk
Susan Starkey	Elizabeth River Soccer
Tom O'Grady	City of Suffolk
Sandra Chaloux	CEC, Inc.