

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

To: RAB Members, Interested Parties
 From: Adriane James, U.S. Army Corps Government Co-Chair
 Sandra Chaloux, CEC, Inc., RAB Facilitator
 Re: October 6, 2005 RAB Meeting Summary

<p>RAB Members Present: Adriane James Bruce Johnson Kevin Mattonen Marian “Bea” Rogers David Saunders Carl Serrette Rob Thomson Michael Isper Bob Williams Kemp Littlefield Cherie Walton Stephen Wright for Tom O’Grady</p>	<p>Affiliation: USACE, Govt. Co-Chair Respass Beach Cedar Crest Hall Community Co-Chair Bennett’s Creek Burbage Grant EPA VDOT Dominion Lockheed Martin Reactives Management Corporation City of Suffolk</p>
<p>RAB Facilitator Present: Sandra Chaloux</p>	<p>CEC, Inc.</p>
<p>RAB Members Absent: John Bucklin Tim Fink Tom O’Grady Debbie Miller</p>	<p>GE TCC City of Suffolk VDEQ</p>

Introduction and Welcome/Call to Order

(Sandra Chaloux – CEC, Inc.)

The meeting was called to order and the meeting attendees introduced themselves. No corrections were noted on the August RAB meeting summary.

RAB Business

Government Co Chair Comments (Adriane James)

Adriane told the RAB that she was glad to be back. She missed the last 2 RAB meetings.

Community Co Chair Comments (Bea Rogers)

Bea told the RAB that she is eager to have HRSD (Hampton Roads Sanitation District) represented on the board but we haven’t been successful in getting a representative to attend our meetings. Bea said that her concern is that HRSD has part of the FNOD property too, adjacent to where the Corps is working, and should know what is going on. Bea also said she is still concerned about the Track K dump and what’s going to be done there as far as treatment is concerned. She said that if all FNOD property was going to be cleaned up to residential standards, then this area should be cleaned to the same standard so that future homes could be built there. (**Note:** The Corps and EPA addressed this later in the meeting, saying that the Track K Dump would meet the same residential standards even though formal risk analysis was conducted to make that determination.)

Landowner Updates

VDOT – Mike Isper told the RAB that VDOT sent out a Request for Proposal to some construction and engineering firms at the end of the August for the third crossing. He

said that VDOT would not be evaluating the proposals until mid-2006. The third crossing is a connector from the Norfolk area to the Monitor-Merrimac Bridge Tunnel at I-664. Mike said that actual construction work may be several years off but may involve some right-of-way work in the northern part of the FNOD site near where the Corps has put the revetment wall on the James River beachfront.

Dominion – No new update. Bob said he was anxious to hear about the latest findings of the land around the Horseshoe Pond and whether the pond has refilled, and the ecosystem has reestablishing itself yet. Cheryl said the Corps would be discussing this later in the meeting.

RAB Meeting Schedule – Adriane discussed revising the RAB meeting schedule and possibly reducing the number of RAB meetings, but not until after June 2006. She asked the RAB what they thought. Adriane suggested meeting quarterly. She said she would make sure the RAB would get the same amount of information. Most of the RAB members polled said that they were O.K. meeting quarterly. Bea suggested that wintertime would be the best time to reduce meetings. Bruce suggested clustering the meetings around project planning, contracting, and site activities versus every 3 months.

Rick pointed out that even though the Corps does more field work in the summer, the activity and the amount of information that's coming to the RAB is not tied directly to those months. The information that is obtained from the field work is often six or seven months later. It can actually be Spring when the majority of the things are coming to fruition that the Corps wants to bring to the RAB. Certainly, if the Corps is doing the work in the summer, the work plans that the Corps wants to present and discuss are going to be in the Fall and Spring. Cheryl pointed out that the majority of the field work this year hasn't been in the summer. There was no field work completed at FNOD in June, July or August. She said most contractors prefer to do work in the fall when its cooler, the bugs are gone, and the foliage is down. Cheryl asked the RAB what activities they would like to cluster the meetings around: the development of work plans so you can have input; the field investigations; or the results of the field investigations. Bea said that it would also be important to meet before the Proposed Plan for a site. Adriane said that she just wanted the RAB to think about it and that they wouldn't make any concrete decisions at this meeting. Rob Thomson said that all his other sites have quarterly RAB meetings. They seem to work well. "I can try to work anything out that works with you folks." Bea pointed out that if the RAB was going to reduce the number of meetings, it would be more critical for the RAB members to attend rather than missing any single meeting. Sandra asked the RAB which months are worse for them to meet.

Cherie said November and December are the worst for her. Dave Saunders said December and August. Adriane said that she was not talking about changing the day the RAB meets. If possible, they would still meet the first Thursday of the given month. Adriane reiterated that the change would not happen in the next 6 months. Adriane said that maybe instead of meeting, the RAB would end up with an additional newsletter so that the Corps can still communicate with them. Bea asked if the Corps planned on having more frequent meetings with the landowners on a separate basis. Adriane said no. That is not the intent. The Corps is only meeting with the landowners when they are working on something like a land use control agreement with them.

Sandra informed the RAB that they will not be able to use the Bon Secours meeting room in 2006. Kemp Littlefield offered for Sandra to see a meeting room in the Lockheed Martin building down the street as a possibility the next morning. RAB members were also provided copies of the new FNOD Munitions Safety brochure that will be provided to landowners or perspective landowners of FNOD property by the City and the Corps.

Site Tour

Sandra asked the RAB members if they are still interested in doing a site tour for the FNOD project in December. All the RAB members present indicated that they were interested in going on the site tour. The site tour is scheduled for December 2 at 10 a.m., the morning following the next RAB meeting. If the weather is inclement that day, the site tour will be postponed until February following the next RAB meeting. The site tours usually take about one hour. RAB members should call CEC's 800 number to check on the status of RAB meetings and the site tour if the weather is inclement. (800-232-7074 ext. 15). Sandra will leave an outgoing message on her voicemail to let the RAB members know if the RAB meetings or site tour are still on.

Army Corps Update (Cheryl Fromme –USACE & Rick Aiken -Waller)

Environmental Study Update

Track K Proposed Plan Review (Rick Aiken –Waller)

Rick provided some background on the site and showed the location of the Track K Dump on the map (north-central portion of FNOD property). This site has also been referred to as the Tire Pile Paint Can Area and was designated as Source Area 6 on EPA's National Priority Listing of FNOD in 1999. The Corps and site regulators have reviewed historic aerial photographs of the site. Rick showed the significant ground scarring at the site in photos from 1954 and 1958. A 1964 aerial photo showed a dump site. More aerial photos from the 1970s to early 1990s show that tires, paint cans and other debris were disposed of at the site. The Corps removed the tires and paint cans from the site in 2001 to investigate the soil underneath. The Corps conducted soil sampling at the site in June 2001 and February 2002. The Corps then conducted a screening level risk assessment to determine if further action was needed at the site. The Corps then determined that additional soil sampling and a more extensive risk assessment were needed. The Corps collected supplemental soil sampling at the Track K site in February 2004. The contaminants of potential concern at the site are dieldrin and dioxin furans. Even though the soil concentrations of these weren't that high, they did warrant a more extensive risk assessment to determine if any other actions were needed. The Corps' contractor HGL completed the human health and ecological risk assessment parts of the Remedial Investigation. HGL evaluated the potential for human health effects from the site (including children in a residential scenario), and potential effects on animals and have concluded that no additional action is required at the Track K site. Robert Fares (HydroGeoLogic -HGL) then presented the results of the human health and screening level ecological risk assessments which his company conducted at the Track K site.

Track K Baseline Risk Assessment (Robert Fares-HGL)

The purpose of the effort was to evaluate the potential risk posed to humans and the environment by chemicals present at the site. Robert said that they did a full chemical analysis of the soils on site to make sure that they were including every chemical that might pose a risk to either humans or ecological receptors. The assumptions that HGL used in EPA's risk assessment formulas in terms of exposure err on the side of protective health. EPA's toxicity values are also very conservative.

Robert explained the approach HGL used for the Human Health Risk Assessment which includes identifying potential receptors (people who could be exposed) at the site and identifying the potential for complete exposure pathways (ways people could be exposed). If the chemical isn't available for contact, for ingestion, or inhalation, then there is not a completed exposure pathway. HGL also identified chemicals of potential concern based on their preliminary analysis of the chemicals in the soil. They quantified exposure and assessed the toxicity of various chemicals that were selected for the risk analysis. HGL then characterized the risk based on those exposures and evaluated any uncertainty for the risk assessment.

Exposure - For the receptors we have two sets of receptors (people). One is current receptors, people that might be exposed to elements/contaminants in the soil at the present time and also future receptors. For current receptors, HGL evaluated potential exposure to industrial workers (adults) and trespassers/visitors (adults and adolescents) who may go to the site. But for future land use scenarios, it's possible that construction activities on the site, development of residences, development of other structures on the site would require that soil, subsurface soil, would be brought to the top during construction activities. For future receptors, HGL evaluated adult industrial and construction workers, adult and adolescent trespasser/visitors, and residents both children and adults.

HGL conducted the risk analysis to look at both current and future land use scenarios. For the current land use, HGL evaluated potential exposure from direct contact with surface soil either through ingestion or dermal contact and from inhalation (soil-to-air pathways). That literally means airborne particles and volatilized gases coming from the surface soils. For future land use, they considered direct contact with combined subsurface soil and surface soil and inhalation. For inhalation in this case, HGL assumed additional airborne particles from truck traffic during construction at the site.

In order to focus the risk assessment on those chemicals that could pose a potential risk for current land use, HGL compared the maximum detected concentrations of each chemical on the site to their respective screening values based on EPA Region III screening level risk-based concentrations (RBCs). Based on this comparison, HGL determined that none of the Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs) at the site posed a risk from inhalation from current land use. However, HGL identified the following COPCs that could pose a risk from direct contact with the soil that needed to be evaluated further: dioxins/furans, aluminum, arsenic, chloromethane, dieldrin, iron, pentane, and vanadium.

For the future land use scenario, because of the potential mixture of subsurface and surface soils, HGL evaluated a new menu of chemicals for direct contact with soil (dioxins/furans; 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2-naphthylamine; aluminum; arsenic; chloromethane; chromium; dieldrin; iron; pentane; and vanadium) and for inhalation (5,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2-naphthylamine; aluminum; beryllium; chromium; cobalt; lead; manganese; and pentane) but the inhalation was limited to construction workers only. HGL did not evaluate trespassers or visitors to the site in this scenario, because they assumed that there would not be the potential for trespassers or visitors to the site during construction activities. These areas would likely be roped off.

The exposure assumptions that HGL used were pretty conservative. For industrial worker, HGL assumed daily work-related exposure for 25 years. (Note: The census information indicates that workers really spend about 9 years on a job on average.) For trespasser/visitors, HGL assumed infrequent exposure for an extended period of time. (1 day a week for 24 years or 52 days a year for 24 years). For the construction worker, HGL assumed intensive exposure for a one-year duration. For resident, HGL assumed daily exposure for a child for 6 years, daily exposure for an adult for 24 years, and daily exposure for 30 years (age-adjusted for childhood and adult exposures).

HGL then conducted a toxicity assessment to quantify the chemical's toxicity. Toxicity of a chemical is evaluated from two perspectives (cancer inducing and non-cancer related health hazards). Exposure to some chemicals can induce cancer. These chemicals are considered non-threshold because it is believed that cancer has the potential to be induced from any dose. For those chemicals, the potential for cancer induction is quantified by a slope factor, and the slope factor represents an upper bound probability of a result based on lifetime of exposure.

The second type of toxicity evaluated relates to exposure to systemic toxicants. Exposure to these chemicals can have effects on different organ systems. For these chemicals, EPA believes that there's a threshold dose below which no effect occurs and above which there is an effect. Non-cancer health hazards are quantified by a reference dose (RfD). Slope factors and RfDs are developed by EPA. The reference dose is based on a No Observed Adverse Effect Levels (NOAELs). And if EPA can't find info (published health effects studies) on a contaminants NOAELs, then EPA uses studies that reflect the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Levels. EPA uses NOAELs and LOAELs to derive reference doses. These reference doses also include uncertainty factors that add to the conservatism of the numbers, and the conservatism tends to err on the side of human and ecological safety.

The last step is the risk characterization. Excess cancer risks, are expressed as a probability, and they're summed across all the chemicals of potential concern and all exposure pathways to provide a cumulative risk to an individual. Cancer risks are not evaluated for ecological receptors because there is extremely limited data to do that currently. EPA's target risk range, or safe range, is 10^{-6} to 10^{-4} . This means a probability of one chance in a million to one chance in 10,000 of developing cancer based on a lifetime of exposure to those chemicals.

Non-cancer hazards are expressed as a hazard quotient. The EPA-derived formula is calculated by taking the proportion of the exposure, referred to as the intake, divided by the reference dose to determine the hazard quotient. Hazard quotients are summed across all Chemicals of Potential Concern and all exposure pathways to derive a hazard index.

It is important to note that different chemicals can have different modes of action or can affect different organ systems. If the hazard quotient is greater than 1, there is a potential hazard. When hazard indices are greater than one, HGL reevaluates them to look at what the cumulative hazard is to the various target organs in the system. If the hazard to the target organs is less than one, we're in a safe mode, even if the cumulative hazard index of all the chemicals, is greater than one. When the target organ hazard index is greater than 10, there is a definitive hazard.

The risk characterization for the Track K site under current land use conditions show that the calculated cancer risk and hazard indices to the industrial worker and adult or adolescent trespasser/visitor are within EPA's acceptable range. David Saunders asked Mr. Fares to explain what he meant by exposure. Mr Fares said that the exposures that HGL considered for these analyses were incidental ingestion of chemicals from the soil that could result from hands in the dirt, working and then licking those hands, or dermal contact. Dermal contact if you had the soil on your hands or on your sweaty arms. The sweat adds to the absorption potential of the chemical to get into your blood stream. So HGL looked at all of that as well as inhalation. For inhalation, HGL evaluated exposure from either airborne particles caused by kids rough housing, playing ball, or from the offgassing of the volatile organic components in the surface soils. In addition, for the construction worker, HGL evaluated exposure from contaminants in subsurface soils.

David asked if HGL evaluated the scenario of a trespasser eating wild blackberries from that soil. Mr. Fares said no. There really isn't enough published information about how plants uptake chemicals at this time. Mr. Fares went on to explain that a lot of plants, if they're going to absorb chemicals from the soil, generally absorb them through the root system or they absorb them through the leaf portion as dust settles during wet deposition events like rain events. But in terms of the transfer of chemicals from those parts of the plants to the fruit of the plants, he said would probably be minimal. Currently there is not sufficient data (published studies about this) for HGL to use to evaluate that.

For Future Land Use exposure scenarios, HGL reviewed the Target Organ Hazard Indices for the child resident. All of the target values are less than one. So they are protected. There's nothing that's really potentially harmful to a child resident; and likewise, for the construction worker.

For the human health risk assessment, HGL concluded that:

- All the target organ hazard indices were less than one and had no potential for adverse non-cancer effects
- All cancer risks were within or less than EPA target risk range
- No further action is necessary to protect human health

Bruce asked if the risk assessment considered groundwater at the site that may be used for irrigation. Cheryl pointed out that they didn't have groundwater contamination at this site. She said that there was one surface soil sample detection above industrial Risk Based Concentrations (RBCs), several surface soil samples above residential (RBCs), and a few below. All the subsurface soil samples were non-detect. Bob Williams asked if the Corps anticipated institutional controls that would forbid the use of groundwater on the property. Rick Aiken said no unless the sitewide groundwater model suggests that groundwater contamination from another site has migrated to this site. Cheryl pointed out that the Corps does understand the potential for residential development at this site and the RAB's concerns as well as EPA's concerns. Therefore the Corps is striving to address all sites so that there are no future site restrictions or land use controls needed. Rick said that every FNOD site is being evaluated for future residential use. Bea said that she did feel better about the site now.

Track K Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) (Robert Fares –HGL)

This is the initial conservative ecological risk screening. The purpose of it is to identify the assessment and measurement endpoints for evaluation. HGL selected a range of ecological receptors that could potentially be at the site to evaluate such as terrestrial plants, soil invertebrates, omnivorous mammals (white-footed mouse), insectivorous birds (American Robin, carnivorous birds (red-tailed hawk), and carnivorous mammals (red fox). HGL compared soil benchmark concentrations to wildlife NOAELS and LOAELs to determine animal and plant toxicity. HGL used the maximum detected concentration of soil at the site to compare against those soil benchmarks. If there was a non-detect for a contaminant, HGL used the maximum reporting limit, which is the laboratory detection limit for those chemicals. That is extremely conservative.

For the initial screening, we identified vanadium, zinc, and dieldrin as chemicals that would require further analysis for potential effects to wildlife. The initial screening demonstrated minimal potential for adverse effects to plants and invertebrates. HGL then used the central tendency evaluation, which uses more realistic exposure assumptions for various ecological receptors. Specifically HGL used the mean body weight and ingestion rate of the chemical in the soil instead of the maximum. HGL also took into account the foraging area into the calculation. For example, the red-tailed hawk will not feed exclusively at this .6 acre site. The red-tailed hawk has a far greater habitat range and is expected to hunt across a much larger area of land for its food. HGL used the 95th percent upper confidence level instead of maximum concentrations. He explained that there was only a 5% chance that exposure to a chemical at the site will be greater than the 95th percent upper confidence limit value.

The ecological quotients for vanadium were less than 1. For zinc there was an ecological quotient of 1.7 for the robin. But HGL feels that the ecological quotient was based on Zinc Sulfate, which is more bioavailable than zinc at the site. HGL believes that the zinc at the site is likely zinc oxide, based on the prior presence of tires and paint cans. HGL used zinc sulfate in its risk calculations instead of zinc oxide because there are no published threshold values for zinc oxide. All the studies that have been conducted on

zinc were done with zinc sulfate. Zinc sulfate gets into the blood system much more readily than zinc oxide posing more of a risk. The ecological quotient for dieldrin and the robin was greater than 1 in a limited part of the site. Overall HGL has concluded that the chemicals present at the site have minimal potential to adversely affect plants, invertebrates, and wildlife. No further action is necessary for protection of the environment.

Kevin Mattonen asked Mr. Fares to further explain the ecological quotient for the robin. Kevin said that it appeared or could be perceived that HGL changed the assumptions to fit the outcome. Mr. Fares explained that the driver here for ecological risk was 1.7 for a robin based on the assumption that the robin was going to get its entire diet from that portion of a .6 acre site with the highest soil concentration (1 or 2 sample locations) and not from the entire site. So this hazard number does not represent a realistic level of hazard. Cheryl pointed out that an ecological quotient of 10 or more poses a real concern or action level.

Rick summed up by saying that as a result of these risk assessments, the Corps is proposing no further action at the Track K site. This is documented in the draft Proposed Plan which is being reviewed by EPA and VDEQ. The Corps had copies of the draft Proposed Plan document at the meeting for the RAB members. The Proposed Plan Public Meeting for the Track K site was scheduled for December 1. (**Note:** This Proposed Plan public meeting has since been rescheduled for the first quarter of 2006 to allow EPA legal staff more time to review the document.) A meeting notice will be published in the local newspaper. Sandra pointed out that usually the Corps hosts public meetings for Proposed Plans to kick off the 30 to 45 day public comment period. Typically these meetings are held from 6 to 7 p.m. in the same meeting room as the RAB meetings on the same night as the RAB. The RAB meeting starts immediately following the public meeting.

AOC 10 Track G Environmental Study Update (Cheryl Fromme-USACE)

Cheryl showed the RAB the AOC 10 Track G site location along with aerial photos of the site from 1948, 1954 and 1958. The site is named Track G because it was the location of the Track G magazine line in the 1940s and 1950s. She showed an unidentified structure on the site in the 1948 photo. The structure was gone in the 1954 photo. However, the site appears to be used as an open storage area in 1954. Cheryl showed the RAB the dark-toned material in a mound at the site and some ground scaring in the 1958 photo. Rick pointed out that Track G is one of the 20 plus AOCs that the Corps and the regulators have decided to review further based on historical data, photos, ground scars, etc. Cheryl told the RAB that the Track G site consists of former primer and fuse magazine lines. The team identified several areas that need to be looked at based on the aerial photos such as the former structures, ground scars, and the tetryl platform. The Corps has developed a work plan for this investigation that has been reviewed by EPA and VDEQ. The Corps is in the process of finalizing the work plan. She hopes that the field activities at this site can begin in the fall including soil and groundwater sampling. The Corps has identified 10 soil sample locations. The field crew will collect both surface and subsurface soil samples at each location-20 samples altogether. The Corps' contractor, HGL, will also install three temporary monitoring wells to look at groundwater. Cheryl said the Corps is using the groundwater model to assist them in locating the optimal well locations. The Corps will be sampling for volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, metals, explosives, pesticides, and PCBs. Cheryl showed the RAB the Track G site map with the proposed sampling locations. This investigation will be done in conjunction with field work at AOC 11.

AOC 11 Track H & I Environmental Study Update (Cheryl Fromme-USACE)

This site is larger in size and closer to the James River Beachfront and consists of the former Track H & I. This site consists of former powder and ammunition magazines.

Cheryl said that this site has more areas of interest based on the aerial photos. She showed the RAB aerial photos of AOC 11 from 1948, 1954, and 1958. The team has actually reviewed 12 different historical aerial photos of the site. Cheryl said that the features of interest are various building structures, ground scars, an old drainage ditch, surface water runoff from the drainage ditch, a vertical tank that can be seen in one of the aerials. The Corps has completed a work plan for the site and hopes to begin field activities this fall in conjunction with AOC 10. The Corps will be sampling for the same type of contaminants at AOC 11 as AOC 10. Cheryl showed the RAB the AOC 11 site map with the proposed sampling locations. The Corps will collect 2 soil samples (surface and subsurface) from 27 sample locations. The Corps will also install 5 temporary monitoring wells and will also sample groundwater from an existing well which is down-gradient at the JRB (Monitoring Well 6).

TCC Lake (Cheryl Fromme-USACE)

Cheryl pointed out that there is an ongoing study at the nearby TCC Lake. The Corps has completed the geophysical study there and presented the results to the RAB. Currently, the Corps is working on a baseline risk ecological risk assessment and human health risk assessment there. Cheryl said that the Corps may be ready to present the results of these studies by the February 2006 RAB. SAIC collected some additional sediment samples and fish data at the TCC Lake in June to complete the risk assessments.

Arsenic Investigation

Bob Williams asked for an update on the Arsenic investigation on the land between the Horseshoe Pond and the GE property. Cheryl said that the Corps has just awarded a contract to install five additional monitoring wells to further evaluate this area. She showed the RAB a site map with some tentative monitoring well locations. The Corps is developing a work plan to determine what the data quality objectives will be and where monitoring well locations need to go. The Corps also plans to sample eight existing monitoring wells which are combination GE monitoring wells as well as Horseshoe Pond monitoring wells. The main goal is to answer for certain whether or not the dissolved arsenic in the groundwater is occurring naturally or the result of a source out there. The Corps will sample for metals and a few other parameters to evaluate geochemistry such as dissolved oxygen. Cheryl said that the Corps will work with EPA and VDEQ to ensure that they can adequately answer questions about the arsenic. Cheryl said that the Corps is not going back in the Horseshoe Pond area because they are comfortable that it is not contributing or affected by the arsenic based on prior sampling that has been conducted there.

Horseshoe Pond

Cliff Walden said that he visited the Horseshoe Pond the day before the meeting and that it has gotten back to normal, with the wildlife and the water level back. Cliff said the pond filled up pretty quickly following the munitions investigation there. The roads leading to the Horseshoe pond are also already overgrown.

Munitions Response Update (Rick Aiken –Waller)

Mechanical Sifter

The mechanical sifter began running on September 6. The safety distance maintained around the sifter when it is being operated is 234 feet. The field crew is now able to sift through the debris at 2 times the speed than they were able to sift manually. Rick showed the RAB a brief video to show the RAB how the sifter operates. The crew hopes to increase the sifting speed by 4 times the manual rate once they get better acquainted with the equipment.

Nansemond River Beachfront (NRB)

The Corps has been working on a strategy to investigate munitions concerns and environmental contaminant concerns at the NRB. Rick showed an aerial photo map of the

site. The Corps will excavate three discarded military munitions pits along the beach. The field crew will complete a surface clearance for munitions out to Mean Low water where possible and in front of and behind the retaining wall. The field crew will excavate three trenches back to virgin soil and characterize what kind of ordnance and chemical issues are there. Then the Corps will determine the next step. Rick said that the field crew will get started with field work at the NRB before Christmas. The trenches will be four to five feet wide and four feet deep.

GE Main Burning Ground & Welner Drive

Rick showed the GE Investigation grid map. There are approximately 21 grids left to clear on the GE Main Burning Ground south of Welner Drive and 2 grids remaining to the north of Welner Drive on TCC(unless any munitions items are found in any of these grids).

Recent Munitions Findings

Over the prior two months, the Corps found only 2 DMM items at the Main Burning Ground. Over the past year to date, the Corps has removed 24 DMM items at FNOD. Rick showed photos of some of the recent munitions items that have been found on site (20mm, 40mm, and a M48 Fuze).

Land Use Control Agreements

The Corps has signed Land Use Control agreements with TCC/VCCS and the City of Suffolk. The Corps is in final negotiations with GE.

Public Comments

None noted.

Agenda items for the next RAB meeting (December 1, 2005):

- RAB meeting schedule for 2006
- Site Management Plan & GIS disk
- Marine Corps Power Generation Plant update
- Pesticide Drum Area update
- James River Beachfront update
- Report on Hyperspectral survey option
- Arsenic Investigation Update

Meeting Adjourned around 8:45 p.m.

<p>Others Present: Rick Aiken Jonathan Rihs Robert Fares Gerald Rogers Cheryl Fromme Michael Winningham Cliff Walden Art Collins Bill Hudson Shana Duggins</p>	<p>Affiliation: J.M Waller & Associates HGL HGL USACE PAO USACE Engineering Zapata Engineering Zapata Engineering HRPDC EPA Community Involvement Army Corps Contractor</p>
---	--