

**MEETING SUMMARY, FORMER NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT (FNOD)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
5 June 2008 RAB Meeting Summary**

To: RAB Members, Interested Parties
 From: Adriane James, U.S. Army Corps FNOD RAB Government Co-Chair
 Patsy Hosner, RAB Support Contractor
 Re: 5 June 2008 RAB Meeting Summary

RAB Members Present	Affiliation
Adriane James	U.S. Army Corps, Government Co-Chair
Steve Mihalko	VDEQ
Katie Moore	Burbage Grant
Rob Thomson	EPA
Cherie Walton	Reactives Management Corporation
Bob Williams	Dominion
Bruce Johnson	Respass Beach
Suresh Kikkeri	U.S. Army Corps, Project Manager
George Mears	U.S. Army Corps Norfolk District, Design Team Lead
Butch Wardlaw	RAB Facilitator (The Wardlaw Group)
Patsy Hosner	RAB Support (The Wardlaw Group)
RAB Members Absent	Affiliation
Marian "Bea" Rogers	Community Co-Chair
Dave Saunders	Bennett's Creek
Frank Dunn	TCC, VP of Administration
John Bucklin	General Electric
*Kemp Littlefield	Lockheed Martin
Victor D'Ortona	Ashley Capital
David Wilson	VDOT
Thomas O'Grady	City of Suffolk (Suffolk Economic Development Office)
Others Present	Affiliation
Jeff Brewer	U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore
Myles West	U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore
Jerry Rogers	USACE, Norfolk
Rick Aiken	J.M. Waller & Associates
Marc Randrianarivelo	U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore
Hamid Rafiee	U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore
Greg Daloisio	Weston
Mike Green	Weston
Pat Dorian	Weston
Marco Ceppi	The Wardlaw Group

*Resigned from the RAB due to recent transfer to FL. His replacement has since been identified.

Introduction and Welcome

Call to Order – *Butch Wardlaw (The Wardlaw Group), Facilitator*

The meeting was called to order. Adriane James (Government Co-Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Butch Wardlaw and Patsy Hosner (The Wardlaw Group) as our new RAB support contractors. Adriane turned the meeting over to Butch, who added his personal welcome, thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve as meeting facilitator, and reviewed administrative information for the RAB meeting. Butch also explained Patsy's role as the Wardlaw Group's point person for RAB meeting support.

He asked the attendees to notify him or Patsy if there was anything either could do to make the meeting better. Butch reviewed the handouts and asked the attendees to introduce themselves.

The RAB reviewed and approved the March Meeting Summary. George Mears (U.S. Army Corps Norfolk District, FNOD Design Team Lead) said he will post the minutes on the website.

RAB Business

Government and Community Co-Chair Comments – *Adriane James (Government Co-Chair). (Bea Rogers, Community Co-Chair, scheduled medical absence)*

Adriane (Government Co-Chair) said the Corps' new Public Affairs contractor, the Wardlaw Group, was onboard now that the District's contract with them is in place. She said that the Norfolk District is working with the Baltimore District on funding issues and is continuing to work through the transformation process in our new roles and alignment under the Baltimore District. Adriane attended a FUDS focus meeting for North Atlantic Division (NAD) in Boston where the FY09 Work Plan was discussed. She felt the Norfolk District will receive about the same amount the funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 as they did in FY 2008. Adriane said the Corps may be able to close some sites, so the Corps could be able to direct funding to one of the other FUDS in Virginia. FY 09 begins on 1 October 2008 and runs through 30 September 2009.

Adriane discussed the FUDS District realignment. In the past there were separate FUDS Project Management Districts for Norfolk, Baltimore, New England, and New York Districts. Now New York is now working under the New England District and Norfolk is working under the Baltimore District. Adriane is working closely with Baltimore to make sure that the concerns in Virginia are addressed. Baltimore understands the priority of the sites in Virginia and realizes that Norfolk doesn't want to stop any of our projects in mid-stream and Baltimore will try to keep things going. Gerry Rogers added that the program changes were intended to consolidate and streamline the FUDS remediation process.

Landowner Updates – Butch asked the landowner representatives for updates.

Dominion – Bob Williams

Bob stated that Dominion points-of-contact are working with the Corps to renew the property access agreement. George added that the Corps is reviewing the documents.

Tidewater Community College (TCC)

TCC was not represented, but George stated that they were in discussion with the Corps to renew their access agreement as well.

GE

GE was not represented and there was no report.

Lockheed Martin

George said Kemp Littlefield is moving and is leaving the RAB. George had not received the name of Kemp's replacement before this RAB meeting.

RAB members from *Ashley Capital* and the *Suffolk Economic Development Office* were not present.

There were no other landowner updates or RAB business to report.

FNOD Technical Update

Army Corps Update – George Mears

George began with an overview of the technical presentation. He asked that RAB members review the RAB contact list and provide corrections as needed. This RAB contact list will not be posted online and the

old one which is will be taken off the website. He said that if RAB members needed contact information for anyone who is not on the list, they could call any member of the Corps FNOD team to get that information.

George discussed the FNOD area poster. It had been used to show POUs (prospective operating units) and OUs (operating units), areas of concern (AOCs), the six original Source Areas, and parcel property boundaries. The Nansmond River Beachfront (NRB) used to refer to a single AOC (AOC 1), but as additional AOCs nearby were investigated, the PDT has decided to perform a Remedial Investigation on a larger NRB Area that includes five individual AOCs, at least two of which are known to contain contamination at levels that require further evaluation. Historically, at FNOD, the PDT (including the regulatory agencies) has found it less confusing to continue to refer to the various investigational areas using their original AOC designations, without changing AOCs into Source Areas (or Prospective Operating Units into Operating Units) as additional evidence of environmental releases of hazardous material is determined. Accordingly, a revision to the current FNOD area diagram was presented to the RAB that eliminates the OU and POU associations, but ties the respective AOCs and Source Areas to their FUDS database Project Numbers. This revision will thus tie some widely separated areas being investigated to the project numbers under which the work is being funded. Thus, you should note that the terms POU and OU have been dropped but FUDS project numbers are now displayed next to AOC (A) and Source Area (S) numbers. On the legend to the right of the storyboard, AOCs and Source Areas are listed in numerical order (1-23), along with the descriptive titles, such as Track K Explosive Magazine Line for AOC 14. The Source Areas are listed similarly (1-6), as are the Other Areas of Interest (1-7)—areas that early reviewers decided to look at but where no evidence of prior problems existed to justify a higher concern when the sites were established some twenty years ago. Source Areas will be shown on the diagram with an “S” in yellow that should be readily identifiable. The other change on the new diagram is that bold lines have been added to designate three sectors that will be handled as separate groundwater management sectors.

The Corps is looking into getting a new aerial photo that reflects the large amount of new construction that has taken place in recent years. The Corps will need to acquire this updated photography before the current FNOD diagram can be replaced so there is still time to make other changes. George asked the RAB to provide him with ideas for improving the aerial photo graphic before the new figure is finalized.

George then introduced the other speakers participating in the technical updates.

Outreach Update – George Mears

George began by saying that Katie Moore (Burbage Grant) and Bea Rogers had given him the information on contacting the Burbage Grant Home Owners Association (HOA). George has contacted Pete Celeste and Pete was very receptive to receiving information about FNOD. George sent him copies of last FNOD UPDATE and past two RAB Meeting Summaries. George told Pete to use the information as needed for his newsletter.

George invited anyone who is associated with an HOA to provide him with information on a point-of-contact (POC). He will send the POCs the same FNOD information and update the contact / mailing list. George asked the RAB to send any updates or corrections to the mailing list to him.

George said the Corp submitted two documents to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the week, the Revised Draft TNT and the TNT Area Draft Work & Sampling and Analysis Plan for Supplemental Site Characterization for the Feasibility Study. The Corps delayed shipping the Revised Draft TNT RI (completed in early April) until the Draft TNT FS Workplan could be shipped out with it to allow concurrent review as requested by EPA.

MMRP Update – Jeff Brewer (U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore)

Jeff addressed MMRP (Military Munitions Response Program) MEC (Munitions and Explosives of Concern) progress over past three months. When the Corps set up the initial grids for the NRB investigation, they established 15 grids. As the investigation progressed, 5 more grids were added. Some

of these are really only portions of grids, created only to meet the requirement that the area investigated must include a minimum distance beyond the outermost discovery of any munition item.

During the past three months, Weston has completed 11 of the grids. They have found some munitions debris (inert), and several Discarded Military Munition (DMM) items, including two 40mm high energy rounds and seven 20mm high energy rounds. The Team has also found a lot of scrap metal and a British fuse. These items were destroyed by demolition on 15 May, marking the first time explosive demilitarization has had to be used in response to items found at the NRB since Baltimore/Weston commenced field operations here. It is noted that our previous FNOD Munitions contractor had to destroy almost 30 pounds of bulk TNT and several DMM items following the excavation of some evaluation trenches during the summer of 2006 when scoping the anticipated level of effort that would be required to perform the current NRB munitions clearance project.

Jeff stated that the grid map shown at the RAB was last updated on 15 May. He described how the Baltimore/Weston MMRP Team is now approaching the area of the three NRB Area trenches dug in 2006 to evaluate the level of effort needed to investigate the entire NRB area. Bulk TNT had been found in one of these trenches and several ordnance items were also found in this area. Jeff said the Corps intends to investigate the grid where the TNT was discovered after clearing all the surrounding grids first so as not to be dragging known contamination into surrounding grids which could still be clean. Weston will need to use heavy equipment to remove the bank during this process but will perform erosion control during the process. Once they finish the area surrounding the trenches, the intent is to continue the investigation toward the college.

Jeff reported that Weston now has a site trailer/office on the property. They worked with Tidewater Community College (TCC) to get permission for the trailer. Jeff showed photos of the trailer and Weston using smaller heavy equipment. He showed the RAB photos of the site. They are not clear-cutting the trees because they want to leave as many large trees as possible to help with erosion and sediment control. The intent continues to be performing as minimally intrusive work as is required to protect the land as much as possible. He also showed some erosion control measures from where they put in a 42-inch sewer pipe about a year and a half ago. There are more of those controls in place.

Jeff showed photos of the British fuse and the 40mm high explosive (HE) projectile. He explained the process for recovering and disposing of these munitions. To date, they have only disposed of these items once – on 15 May. Jeff showed photos of how they destroyed the munitions materials. They use as little explosive material as possible to detonate the energetic munitions items. Weston hopes to address the TNT in the same way, but will probably need to use several small shots if the amount of TNT is significant.

Jeff concluded by saying that everything is running smoothly. They are a little behind the timeline due to having to clear large amounts of building debris, small pieces of metal on the ground, bad weather, and similar issues.

FNOD Munitions Response and VDHR Sites – Pat Doran and Greg Daliosio (Weston)

Pat discussed the proposed protective measures for the trench shoreline area near the area Jeff Brewer discussed. Pat said Weston was tasked to review a report written by SAIC, which completed a detailed study of the shoreline area and provided options for protective measures in the area. Pat stated that some of the slides he was using were extracted from that document. He showed photos of the stormwater pipe, the NRB TNT trench area, and the NRB shoreline area. Weston focused their efforts on the stormwater pipe and the area behind (to the NW) it for the shoreline stabilization study. Pat showed the northern-most trench, discussed its current condition, and also showed some of the erosion control measures being used. Some of this area can't be worked until protective measures are in place. Nearer to the beach, another area is also eroding and may be in need of protection.

Next Pat discussed the proposed shoreline modifications using diagrams from the earlier SAIC study to show where Weston proposes to move proposed shoreline structures closer in and making them higher. As

this is an evolving plan, investigators continue to discuss tying the ends into some of the existing shoreline structure to create one continuous barrier. SAIC's original plan was to make the structure long enough to wrap around the back of the Ashley Capital building, but the area requiring excavation suggests that the shore protection structure could be much shorter. That being said, the shoreline structure being proposed now remains only Phase I of a later final design which could be much closer to the original plan. At this time, Weston is only constructing what is needed to support the immediate work. The structure, made from material that can be moved and reconfigured, can easily be extended later as needed. The Corps is committed to implementing all protective measures. The structure should be completed by mid-August and the entire job by mid-September.

Suresh Kikkeri (U.S. Army Corps, FNOD Project Manager) discussed contractual issues associated with the project.

In answering questions from RAB members, George stated the Corps is trying to limit intrusive measures as much as possible. No digging is being done below the frost-depth (approximately 30 inches) since munitions below this depth will not work their way to the surface and, if where any munitions are located, any future excavation work will require munitions avoidance Construction Support anyway. The munitions debris found to date does not have to be handled as explosives and can be removed by any debris contractor. The area has been characterized as totally inert so far but the team is gradually working towards areas where munitions and bulk TNT were found in 2006.

George discussed the *TNT Area (Source Area 1)*. The Corps has finished the supplemental work plan designed to support the field work still needed for the Feasibility Study (FS). The original Remedial Investigation (RI) was derived from several previous studies but it revealed both some data gaps and a few logic and organization problems. Regulators generated many review comments and asked the Corps to address these in a Revised Draft RI document which was completed in April and forwarded to the review agencies along with the new fieldwork plan.

The Corps knew that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also known as Superfund) process would not stop with an RI phase because bulk TNT, a hazardous waste, and other contaminants were found here in amounts that exceeded risk screening criteria for both human health and ecology. Since the Corps and the regulators knew that this was the case, EPA and the State permitted finalizing the RI with the present level of information as long as all data gaps would be addressed as part of coming up with the design criteria during the Feasibility Study phase. The regulators will now perform a dual review of both the RI and FS documents. EPA has suggested this will take at least two months and possibly longer.

George briefly discussed the background of the TNT Area. A 2.5 ton block of TNT was found in 1988. Some of the TNT was fairly pure but since it didn't dry out, the chances of detonation were limited. The Corps removed the TNT, but the soil contamination remained, as did some significant issues with high levels of lead. Previous investigations had already identified a subsurface groundwater contaminant plume moving slowly towards the river.

The original TNT Area Draft RI was briefed to the RAB in December 2007 as the draft was undergoing review and the Chemicals of Concern (COC) were identified as TNT, dinitrotoluene or DNT (a byproduct of TNT and a carcinogen), Polycyclic Aromatics Hydrocarbons (e.g., benzo(a)pyrene), and metals (arsenic and lead). The RI confirmed that the plume was collapsing but that DNT, a more toxic breakdown product of TNT, was also increasing as a result. Ecological and human health risk assessments were completed and the primary risk was to groundwater. Tidewater Community (TCC) abandoned their groundwater wells when TNT was first discovered in the water. The college has been using municipal water for drinking water since. However, this does not eliminate the need to study all options for eliminating the contaminant plume.

George discussed where the TNT Area is in the Superfund process.

Step 1, Discovery occurred when youth using the nearby soccer fields found some surface crystals and decided to throw a few into a barbecue pit and found that they sparked and smoked. Some parents made some phone calls and this triggered Step 2, a Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection during which potentially explosive contamination was determined to be present in the area. The initial removal action was performed in the 1989 to 1990 timeframe. Step 3 is the combined RI/FS (risk assessment and feasibility study). The RI portion of the RI/FS is being reviewed but the FS has now been initiated.

Step 4 is the development of a Proposed Plan following the RI/FS to make a recommendation on how the site should be handled. These recommendations will be briefed to the public at a Public Meeting after which public comments will be requested. When scheduled, this Public Meeting will be advertised in the newspaper. All RAB members are routinely invited but the meeting is open to any interested individuals. The meeting will be followed by a 30-day public comment period. The Corps will review any and all such questions and concerns from the public in a Responsiveness Summary, which will be included in the approved final plan.

Step 5 is the Final FS, which includes the approved recommendation after all public comments to the Proposed Plan are addressed. The Corps will then produce a draft Record of Decision (ROD) (Step 6) which, when approved by EPA, will become final and spell out what will happen to the site. If it is determined that No Further Action (NOFA) is needed, the CERCLA process stops here. In the case of this TNT site, the Corps knows that more work will be needed, so they plan to continue into Step 7, Remedial Design and then Step 8, Remedial Action.

Once the Remedial Design is approved and the Remedial Action is complete, the area will be sampled to make sure the required limits are reached. If so, the area will be still be sampled again every five years to make sure that the Remedial Actions remain protective of the environment. This review of the Remedial Action is Step 9, ROD Review.

George asked for questions and there were none.

Regarding the current TNT Area investigation, we have commenced the FS portion of Step 3 and the next step is to perform the field work to close the data gaps and gather more design data, including the analytical parameters to support remediation recommendations, as soon as the field work plan just submitted is approved. Jeff Zoeckler has already gotten in touch with a professor with Virginia Tech about doing a Soil and Groundwater Treatability study. The study would include modeling, some explosives studies, and a microcosm study to see what bacteria are present and which might have to be added to the project soils to enhance treatment through degradation.

The Corps has proposed soil and ground water sampling to address the remaining data gaps, including soil testing for Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) at 50 locations, explosives testing at nine locations, metals at 30 locations, pesticides at 16 locations, and dioxins/furans at seven locations.

Groundwater will be sampled using a combination of 14 existing area monitoring wells and an additional 11 new wells proposed in the Field Sampling Plan under review. All locations and analyses were selected to address data gaps and to complete a robust monitoring well network. The Corps proposes to test groundwater for explosives, metals (total and dissolved), and PAHs at all locations and dioxins at six locations. George showed the existing and proposed monitoring wells on a map, along with which wells were shallow and deep. The shallow wells are typically from 10 to 20 feet in depth; the deep wells at and below approximately 30 feet.

While reviewing the map, one RAB member asked why the Corps decided to locate the wells so far out. George explained that the Corps already knows that a plume exists but needs go out far enough to where it hasn't reached yet. It is important now to go far enough beyond the known plume to know that the entire plume is contained within a known area so that treatment options can be evaluated. Suresh stated that a

future detection at one of these outlying wells would tell us that the plume is still moving and when it reached a location where groundwater contamination didn't previously exist.

George said that more recent sampling has confirmed that the plume is collapsing, most probably due to removing much of the source material. Since the plume is not constantly being fed, it is very likely that natural attenuation is causing the collapse. However, as conditions within the plume change, it is not uncommon that different geochemical environmental factors are required to ensure degradation does not stall out or even reverse. These issues must be evaluated before the proper remediation alternatives can be properly evaluated. Field work must await approval of the field work plan but is expected by late summer or early fall.

Next George discussed the *Horse Shoe Pond (HSP) Area* (Source Area 4). The Corps began working in the Horseshoe Shaped Pond (HSP) and the Main Burning Ground (MBG) / Steam-Out Pond source areas around 2000. EPA had conducted preliminary investigations at HSP in 1997 and several additional magnetic anomalies were later identified. In 2004, the HSP was dewatered and these anomalies were determined not to be explosives related. Over the years, several rounds of sampling in and around the pond were also performed and the data was incorporated into a Draft Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) and RI/SRI Report in 2005. The contractor's combined investigation report grew into a massive two volume report but, as this was under review, still more areas of contamination related to munitions disposal pits were being uncovered throughout the MBG area, invalidating much of the previous work. In 2006, the PDT decided to separate the HSP Area RI report from the combined report and incorporate revisions to in order to complete a Revised HSP RI report while the MBG investigation continued.

An EPA review of the HSP BERA indicated revealed that some of the assumptions were overly conservative and that these may be contributing to an exaggerated level of risk generated by calculations. In 2007, following the recommendation of EPA, the FNOD Project Delivery Team (PDT) agreed to more realistic assumptions and to revise the HSP BERA accordingly. The resulting revised HSP RI and BERA were resubmitted to EPA and DEQ in mid April and the PDT is awaiting review comments. A RAB member asked what kind of timeline there is on the draft Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA). George answered that it was submitted at the same time as the RI. It is a completely new document and the regulators have two months to review it.

Another RAB member asked if the Corps has done any added investigation of the source of the arsenic near the former GE fence. George said that the plume is a well defined bull's eye already and, while there were no elevated concentrations close to the Nansemond River soils, any plume travel that occurs would be in this direction. However, there is no justification to initiate any more study here until the NRB RI is initiated in FY09. We know we have levels of contamination that can only be properly evaluated under an RI phase. A question was asked about whether the arsenic is man-made. George said that whether or not it's man-made, DoD altered the local geochemistry by burying tons of organic matter (brush, trees, and debris) which the Corps believes made the groundwater more acidic, forcing naturally occurring arsenic in soils to go into solution at this location.

A RAB member asked if the area can be aerated. George said that lime could be added to change the pH but waiting could allow the geochemistry to resolve itself naturally if, in fact, there is no arsenic source or release involved. However, without conducting a full remedial investigation, these ideas are only speculation. The Arsenic Investigation Area will be fully evaluated as part of the FY09 RI for the entire Nansemond River Beachfront (NRB) area.

A RAB member asked when the Horseshoe Shaped Pond RI was turned in. George answered 11 April and that regulatory comments had been requested by 16 June. The RAB member then asked George to talk about the next steps. George discussed having to generate Corps responses to each regulatory comment and, once we reach consensus on the responses with the regulators, we would direct the Contractor to prepare a Final report that incorporates all the approved changes. Typically, our regulators agree with 90 to 95 percent of the Corps' responses. The rest are resolved during a conference call involving the

appropriate parties. Once the RI is final, and if no remediation is required, the Corps can skip the Feasibility Study and move next to preparing a Proposed Plan. The Proposed Plan is briefed to the public followed by a 30-day Public comment period. Once all the issues and comments are addressed the Corps will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) which becomes final following EPA approval.

Suresh added that the most important thing in the CERCLA process is to find out what the RI will uncover and what recommendations it includes. He said the investigation will reveal whether it requires further investigation or if there is no problem and no need for further evaluation. He also noted that the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment is part of the RI and designed to support decisions and recommendations included in the RI.

Contracting and 2008 Budget Update – Suresh Kikkeri (U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore, Project Manager) and Hamid Raftee (U.S. Army Corps, Baltimore)

Suresh discussed the contracting actions that have taken place over the last quarter and the Corps' plans between now and 30 June.

First he discussed the contracts that have been awarded. The first one is one to support an Expanded SI at J-Lake. The Site Inspection that was completed earlier left unanswered questions based on data results that were inconclusive. The Corps will undertake additional field work to address these data gaps and support a decision regarding whether an RI is required or whether a recommendation of No Further Action is appropriate.

The second contract was to reevaluate FNOD Background levels for metals, PAHs, and pesticides based on several additional years of data collection beyond what was available when the original Background investigation was finalized in 2004. They identified what kind of additional background information is necessary. That contract is in place and the work is in progress.

The GE Pond contract was awarded to wrap up several investigations into a consolidated report similar to those prepared for J-Lake and TCC Lake AOCs. The work here is already done and the additional data is already available. It just needs to be put together, analyzed, and a recommendation made.

The NRB MMRP contract was expanded in March to include collecting more samples and analyzing munitions concentrations in the NRB area during the current MMRP investigation. This information will be needed to support the hazardous waste RI planned for the NRB that the Corps hopes to award during October.

The total 3rd Quarter contract amounts awarded totaled \$490,046.28. These contracts were all awarded by March 30.

There are three more contracts planned to begin between now and 30 June. The NRB Shoreline Stabilization task was what was discussed tonight by Pat Dorian. The Corps plans to award that work before 30 June.

TNT Area fieldwork to address the RI data gaps should be awarded by 30 June. Similarly, the supplemental fieldwork to address the remaining data gaps at the Main Burning Ground will be awarded as soon as the Corps and the regulatory agencies can reach agreement on an appropriate work plan. This should be resolved before our next RAB.

The total estimated funding requirement for contract work to be awarded by the end of FY08 (by September 30) is approximately \$350,000.

A RAB member asked if these contracts will cover work until it is finished or just until the end of the fiscal year and then require additional funding. Suresh said that funding for the NRB Shoreline Stabilization is only expected to support work done this FY but that the work should be completed by mid-August anyway. The TNT Area and Main Burning Ground data gap work should be completely funded but this too should

be completed within the next three to four months. The additional TNT Area and Main Burning Ground field work is not extensive and limited to data needs that were in excess of the initial investigation assumptions. The Corps is in full agreement that the original scope did not address all the needs identified when the respective work plans were completed.

Public Comment/Q&A Period

Question: *What are the plans for the nearshore / off shore areas near the Horseshoe Shaped Pond?*

Answer: The offshore area investigations have been completed for all of FNOD and the areas have been delisted by EPA. The nearshore areas are another matter. These include all of the coastal areas and sectors of this investigation which can't be completed until the investigations along the adjacent land are complete. This means that the nearshore investigation along the NRB will not be initiated until the moat of the NRB RI is complete. The planning for the NRB RI will be added to the September RAB agenda.

Question: *Does the Corps have any plans for addressing the erosion that's occurring on the James River beachfront? Is it affecting any of our previous remedial actions?*

Answer: Funding was identified for a study of JRB Area erosion and stabilization needs as part of the JRB FS in FY08 until it was determined that the Contractor would have to prepare a complete revision to the draft JRB RI submitted in May 2006. This required a new FY07 contract to perform additional field work. While this was completed in early FY08, the Contractor has yet to complete a revised Draft RI document for review. When it became evident that the JRB RI could not be finalized in FY08, the follow-on FS funding for stabilization evaluation was diverted to address other FY08 FNOD requirements. The PDT will attempt to partially fund an erosion assessment study at the JRB prior to the end of the FY, with any required remedial plans to follow in FY09. We recently received a preliminary draft of the Revised Draft JRB RI and if the Corps accepts this, a hard copy draft should be available for distribution soon.

Question: *Were there any comments on the Pesticide Drum Area responsiveness summary?*

Answer: No comments were submitted. The Corps expects the Final Decision Document to be signed within the next week and then the Corps will ask DEQ for a letter of concurrence.

New Business

There was no new business.

Date for next RAB Meeting: The next meeting is 4 September at 6:15 p.m. at the Suffolk Courtyard by Marriott.

Agenda items for next RAB Meeting

- Update on the Horse Shoe Pond Area
- Erosion occurring on the James River beachfront.
- Discuss scheduling of FNOD RAB member and public site visit during the winter season.

Action Items

Fact sheet(s): Consider the development of a one page fact sheet for each individual area (Horseshoe Shaped Pond, Main Burning Ground, NRB, etc.) – Corps Technical Team

RAB member list: Please review and send any changes to George – RAB Members

RAB members are requested to provide any new HOA contact information to George