

**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 June 7, 2001 RAB Meeting

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

7:10 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. No corrections were noted to the April 3, 2001 meeting summary. Sandra previewed the agenda.

7:15 p.m. **Corps Project Update** *(Ken Hafner – USACE)*
 Ken introduced himself and said that he had many accomplishments to share with the group.

Soccer Fields

Ken explained that there was no ordnance or HTRW found in pits 15 and 19, so the holes were covered, graded and seeded. Pit 12 was cleared of all ordnance and was covered. There is a little water in that area, so the Corps is going to add more topsoil and seeding. Pit 18 has not been completed yet. The contract with UXB is expiring, so they will not begin work at Pit 18 until they mobilize a new contractor in August. The Corps is reviewing how to re-route traffic during the Pit 18 work with Tim Fink. The Corps and the new contractor will work with Tidewater Community College on their requirements and preferences. Keri Robertson from the Corps met with Gerald Bright, head of security for TCC, to review the possible reroute options. They are considering using the General

Electric entrance as an alternate. The Corps will have an intensive public information effort before and during the effort to communicate the changes to the community.

Track K (Tire Pile & Paint Cans)

The tire pile and paint cans have been removed. The next step is to complete confirmation samples.

Off Shore Ordnance Removal

The Off Shore Ordnance Removal for the unknown item in the James River is scheduled to begin on June 11. The Navy's EOD team will be conducting the dive for the project team. The Corps purchased a small amount of equipment for the Navy in exchange for them handling the removal. The unknown item will not be taken out at the James River Beachfront, but will be removed near the Tidewater Community College Lake because there is more water at that location. The Corps will use a survey boat equipped with SONAR to locate the item, and the Navy will dive and locate the item on Monday. The actual removal process will begin by Tuesday, June 12.

James River Beachfront Burial Removal

The removal of the remains at the James River Beachfront is on schedule. It began on Monday, June 4. Cultural Resources Inc. (Corps archeological consultant) began their work on Tuesday, June 5. Fred Bright from the Nansemond Tribe and Tim Thompson, the Corps archaeologist, were at the site, and both were interviewed by WVEC-TV. The work will be complete by Friday, June 8.

Ken introduced Tim Thompson to give the group a report on current site work. In addition to the original remains, Tim stated that they found a single coffin burial. The half of the coffin that wasn't affected by the erosion ditch and the police investigation is in good shape. The remains have been sent to Radford University for analysis.

Tim reported that the Programmatic Agreement document is complete and that the Corps plans to post it on the project Web site (www.nao.usace.army.mil/projects/Nansemond/welcome.html). The document also will be provided to RAB members. This document is an agreement with the Corps, the EPA and the State Historic Preservation Office that demonstrates the project's compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Institutional Controls

Ken reported that the existing SAIC contract is expired. A new contract, which is being reviewed, will allow SAIC to continue and complete the Institutional Controls issue. The contract should be resolved by the end of June. A stakeholder meeting will be held soon after to continue work on institutional controls.

Public Notices

Ken stated that the Corps has published several public notices in the local newspapers on items such as the tire pile and the burial removal. These notices also have been posted on the Web site.

Budget

Ken said that the FNOD project competes with other national and divisional projects. The Corps submitted and received preliminary approval on the 2002 project budget for a

similar amount of funding as this year. The budget won't receive final approval until the U.S. Congress has completed the entire budget process in October 2001.

Web site

Several new things have been added to the Web site (www.nao.usace.army.mil/projects/Nansemond/welcome.html) including a comprehensive list of questions and answers.

Community Relations Plan (CRP)

The CRP is complete. Copies were distributed to the EPA and the DEQ, and a copy will be placed in the Information Repository. The Corps also plans to post the CRP on the Web site. Bea Rogers asked that the RAB members receive their own copies of the CRP as well.

Rites of Entry

The Corps has been granted all proper Rites of Entry. These are in place for the next three years for future site work.

James River Beachfront

The Work Plan and the Health and Safety Plan need final approval from the regulatory agencies. Ken anticipates a July 1 mobilization date. By then, the burial will be removed. After the work is complete at the James River Beachfront, the project will then begin at the Nansemond Beachfront.

ATSDR

The ATSDR study/report is not complete, because the Corps owes them some data. Ken expects to give the RAB a positive report on this in at the next RAB meeting.

Residential Well Sampling (George Mears - USACE)

Ken introduced George Mears to the group. George reported that the Respass Beach Homeowners Association has not met since the April RAB meeting, and this has made it difficult to get the word out that the Corps is looking for homeowners willing to let the Corps test their residential well water at no cost to the homeowner. The value of the analyses planned would cost an individual well owner about \$1,500 if each homeowner had to pay for this analysis -so this is a valuable offer. Each well owner will receive a complete copy of the lab results for his or her well. Without volunteers, the process of coming up with a residential well sampling program that adequately covers the Respass Beach area has already added a couple of months to the process.

He reported that, currently, they have identified four potential volunteers for well testing. The Corps is still looking for 3 to 4 more, including a volunteer further back on Streeter Creek and one on the central well serving about a dozen homes in the Bay Circle area. Concurrently, the Corps is also scouting two other FNOD area new monitoring well sites. The locations of the residential wells will have to be determined before a Sampling and Analysis Plan can be completed and submitted to EPA for review and approval. George expects that these new wells could be installed by the end of August if no significant obstacles are encountered and that sampling (both new well and residential well) would begin within two weeks of new well installation. Barring holdups, results from the testing should be available by the October RAB meeting.

Bea Rogers asked if VDOT is making a well available for sampling. George said that he would contact RAB member Ed Wallingford to discuss further.

Thomas Decker asked if the Corps was sampling for CERCLA items only or others such as TNT degradives. George said that the testing is the full suite including explosives, volatiles, semi-volatiles and metals.

Bea commented that Bruce Johnson's parents, Andrew and Clarice, would know if anyone in Respass Beach would be interested.

A community member asked if the Corps still needs volunteers in the area north of Streeter Creek. George responded that they still need volunteers in that area as well as in Bay Circle.

8 p.m.

SAIC Ecological Study Update (Greg Tracey, SAIC)

The offshore ecological study has been reviewed by the regulators and has been very well received. The report has not been finalized yet. The bottom line is that SAIC has not seen anything that is a concern.

Ken introduced Greg Tracey from SAIC to discuss the project's ecological study. Last year, Greg reviewed the process with the RAB and he now has the data to share with the group.

Greg began with a brief background of the situation SAIC found at FNOD, including former burn pits, metal debris and erosion. He reviewed a process called an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). This reviews the risk to the animals such as crabs, fish and birds, in the Nansemond area. For an ERA data evaluation, a few questions need to be answered including:

- Where are the chemicals going?
- What is the sediment accumulation?
- Where are the animals attracted?
- Is there metal debris?
- What is the typography?
- What are the habitats of the wildlife?

The team then takes samples for chemical analysis and compares them to existing benchmarks. Risk is then calculated based on the benchmarks. For this project, the team had to start from scratch, because there was no existing data on the site.

Greg then reviewed the areas in and around the James River where sediment samples were taken and toxicity tests were completed. Greg said the sediment test could show the layers, or horizons, in the sediment and indicate how they were formed.

The team also did a magnetometer test to determine the presence of metallic items such as the buried pipeline east of the I-664 Bridge.

From the data, the team was able to determine the habitats and types of animals near the FNOD site including clams, worms, blue muscles, blue crabs, croaker, raccoons and heron.

Greg said that the team performed a full suite of testing for chemicals such as metals, organics, PCBs, pesticides and others. The team found a very clean environment. Greg found that any effects found on the riverbed's sediment core samples were not related to actions at Nansemond and that any impact on the food chain from FNOD was negligible.

He said that there were a few data gaps including the former pier, Streeter Creek and inland lakes. They also were unable to take deep sediment core samples of the inshore areas because the water was not deep enough for their equipment to get to those areas.

One community member asked if there was any additional information on the chemical content in Streeter Creek as was discussed at February's public meeting. Rob said that the only chemical he was aware of in the tributary was lead which was found in one surface water sample.

Another RAB member asked if the Ecological Baseline Report would be available on the Web site. Ken said that it would once the EPA had reviewed the findings and given their comments.

A community member asked if they found an explanation of the hole found in the eastern portion of the river near the mouth of Streeter Creek. Greg said that where the pipe comes close to that area, it looks as if there were a blowout. One community member saw something boiling up from that area. The pipe is an outflow line from the Hampton Roads Sewer District.

Thomas Decker asked how long SAIC has been doing these types of investigations. Greg answered 25 years. Thomas then asked if TNT degradives would show up in the sampling. Greg explained that one third of the samples were tested for degradives and none were detected.

One community member asked at what depths the samples were taken. Greg said samples were taken about six inches below the surface and that the core samples were taken to about two feet deep.

Ken finished by saying all of the information will be placed in the repository and the summary will be posted on the Web site.

8:30 p.m.

Landowner Update

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

8:31p.m.

RAB Business

RAB Member Reports

Bea pointed out an article on Institutional Controls in the most recent EPA newsletter, *Partners in Progress*. The other RAB members are receiving it as well.

Thomas Decker said that he is holding on to information for the Burbage Grant group until the next public meeting, because he feels that you only get one shot at proving information to people. Ken said the next public meeting is tentatively scheduled for October. Thomas said he is going to ask the EPA for a Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) to look at the water sampling and modeling that has been performed. He said this is a concern for some of the people he represents in his neighborhood and some other groups.

His concern is not with the residential well sampling, which he said is being addressed. He is concerned with the groundwater testing on-site, specifically the degradants involved where the Corps removed the two-ton slab of TNT. He feels that the sampling and analysis done there was relatively poor, so he would like an independent contractor to come in and do an analysis of the data.

Sandra asked for feedback from the other RAB members on Thomas's proposal.

Cherie Walton commented that she thought that was the role of the EPA and other experts on the project and didn't understand the need for additional money to be spent.

Sandra asked the EPA members present if a TAG could be used for additional sampling or for technical consultation to work with community groups on studies and testing that has already been complete.

Rob Thompson from the EPA said that the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) would allow the RAB to hire an independent consultant to review and evaluate the data and advise the community members.

Cherie didn't think the RAB needed to spend tax dollars on sampling unless the group believes there is something wrong with the data and she certainly believed that this was not the case here.

Thomas admitted he had a very limited understanding of the modeling of aquifers and the chemical reports and, unfortunately, when he has been to the Repository to review the data he has not seen anyone else there reviewing the data. He feels that most people associated with the program don't go over to the Repository and look at the analytical data. He said that, as someone who is not very familiar with this type of data analysis, he can't make a determination as to whether the project team is doing an adequate job of covering previous removal actions for TNT and similar items. He said that he has been unable to find the time to meet with Army Corps staff to review the data. He said there were multiple volumes of reports that would take a citizen hours, weeks or months to determine where the samples were taken, if the sampling was adequate, or if the sample geometry was correct. He concluded that he was considering requesting a TAG grant as a private citizen in order to get an independent opinion on the adequacy of the work performed to date, a review of all the data collected, and to identify weak areas that need further review and study. He also stated that he feels, historically, there has been a number of mistakes made involving this project and this is why he wants to have others revisit the data. He would welcome the project team to do so, but he knows they are very busy.

Cherie thought it had been determined that there would be some form of new member orientation at the last meeting. She also said that the team currently in place is not making any mistakes and suggested that the group's Army Corps and EPA experts could summarize what's been done in the past and review it with RAB members before spending any more tax dollars.

Bea reported that in the past, RAB members had discussed TAGs and decided not to apply for one because it would be a waste of money.

Rob Thompson explained that TAG money is separate from the project's clean-up money. The main goal of a TAG is to bring in someone independent from the project team.

Thomas said he just wanted an independent group to go back and look at the sampling data for TNT. He did not want to overtax the EPA and Army Corps.

Sandra continued to poll the RAB members on their opinion of the topic.

Tim Fink agreed with Cherie, saying that the project has a host of experts working on it so it didn't make much sense to go out and find more just to generate another opinion. Dave Saunders also did not see the need for an outside review.

Rob reiterated that the money for a TAG was earmarked as such and separate from the project money. He also said that the review of the data was not going to change what was in the data. The main purpose of the TAG is to bring someone in who has not looked at the data before to analyze it.

Sandra commented that there also is the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program offered by the Department of Defense, which is similar to the EPA's TAG program. She said that those programs are intended to have an independent source that the community members are comfortable with to look at the data to determine whether there are holes or gaps in the data. Sandra wasn't sure whether consensus from the RAB was required to apply for TAPP funding. She said she thought the group needed consensus, which the RAB does not have on this issue.

Rob answered that for a TAPP, the RAB needed to apply as a group. A TAG is not a RAB function, so any individual citizen can apply for that type of grant.

Thomas said that from his research he discovered that he could apply for a TAG as a private citizen and at that point he would probably resign from the RAB. He said that one of his concerns, and he knows that he may seem hostile at times and that he may question what's been happening, but he feels he has two sources of inside information. He also has worked with the government and knows how interaction between agencies goes. He also felt that EPA is the best source for oversight and his sources tell him that the EPA has been questioning the Corps' effectiveness.

Thomas stated that he finds the data that he has reviewed questionable. While he thinks that, right now, there are wonderful people working on the project, he is convinced that mistakes were made in the past. However, he stated that if the RAB did not want to pursue either a TAPP or a TAG grant at this time, he would go along with that.

Bea asked him for examples of some of the past mistakes.

Thomas said that his primary cause for concern was the evidence for the existence of chemical warfare materials at FNOD in the past. For example, he said that there was a large chemical warfare tank that tested positive for chemical warfare agents but was removed from the site, but without proper records indicating where it was taken. He also said that the project had lost two containers that were marked "chemical warfare." It was this type of mishandling that concerns Thomas. He said that he didn't believe that the site had a chemical warfare problem now. Thomas also was concerned about the ground

and water samples in regard to the TNT slab. His concern is that the reason a slab formed in the first place was due to years of flushing TNT-containing shells with water.

Ken said that any member of the Corps team would be more than happy to meet with any RAB member who has questions. Ken said that because most of the Corps team was relatively new to the project, being on the team for less than a year, they lacked any motivation to be covering up anything that may have occurred in the past since they had nothing to do with any such actions. The Corps of Engineers has no reason to be other than truthful about past efforts. It may not be possible to track down the details on every suspicion or rumor, but the FNOD project team will do its best to resolve all issues to the RAB and regulators satisfaction.

Thomas said he is involved in 8 volunteer organizations and did not have time to meet with the Corps.

Rick Aiken (a Corps contractor) said that he thought Thomas's concerns boiled down to two main issues:

1. A lack of confidence in what happened in the past, especially in regard to the whereabouts of the lost container
2. Not enough samples of TNT.

Rick explained that, in regard to the TNT sampling, the team was completing the risk assessment on TNT and has sampled the wells for TNT degradants. Rick suggested Thomas review the Q&A on the Web site and take advantage of existing offers to meet with the Corps team to review specific questions. Thomas agreed to meet with the Corps.

Newsletter Ideas

Sandra asked the RAB for possible newsletter topics. The group suggested:

- Ken's updates
- A synopsis of Ecological Baseline Study
- Information on the TCC Road Changes
- The Proposed date for the next public meeting

Meeting Date and Location

Sandra asked the RAB their preference on meeting dates and locations. The RAB members agreed that Thursday was a good date. Sandra said that was fine for the August meeting, but that they would not know until the August meeting if the regular room at TCC would be available in the fall due to class schedules. The RAB preferred meeting at TCC, but suggested the City of Chesapeake West Branch Community Center as a possible alternative.

9:10p.m.

Public Comment/Question and Answer Period

One community member asked how frequently the Corps would test the residential wells after the upcoming full-suite analysis. George answered that the Corps will follow up on wells with sampling results that may have any connection to FNOD. Otherwise, the primary intent for the upcoming sampling was to create a baseline screening tool. As such, periodic resampling of the new well cluster to be installed within the Respass Beach community would probably be conducted every couple of years. Any resampling

of residential wells would probably not be scheduled unless we were to detect significant changes in the monitoring well groundwater at some time in the future.

A community member asked if residents in Respass Beach could hook up to city water. Bea said that the cost would be \$1,500 after a rebate. New homes would have to pay about \$4,300.

Another community member asked how many people lived in Respass Beach. No one knew the answer to that question.

A representative from the Elizabeth River Soccer Club asked about the status of the soccer field. Ken reiterated that the work in pits 15 and 19 was complete and that they were graded over and seeded. Also the work in pit 12 was complete. Work in the soccer fields is complete. Pit 18, which is not on the fields, has not been done. A new contractor will be mobilizing in August to complete Pit 18. Any additional concerns or questions regarding the soccer fields should be directed to Tim Fink from TCC.

Cherie asked if the new member information packets/RAB orientation books were complete. It is complete. Sandra provided copies of it to Thomas Decker, Eric Salopek, and Bea Rogers. Cherie requested a copy of it.

9:15 p.m.

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

The next RAB meeting was set for August 2, 2001 at TCC. The **agenda items** for the meeting include the following:

- DEQ lake fish test
- Regular Corps update

Action Items:

- CRP to RAB Members or on Project Web Site
- New Project Map to RAB

9:20 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned

Guests Present:	Affiliation:
George Mears	USACE, Norfolk District
Bill Hudson	USEPA, Hazardous Sites
Harry C. Wheeler Jr.	Gannett Fleming
Tim Thompson	USACE, Norfolk District
Caroline Bari	USACE
Theresa Cummings	Elizabeth River Soccer
George Walton	Virginia Community College System
Pat Genzler	VCCS, Vandeventer Black
J. Cook	Citizen
Bob Kilpatrick	Citizen, Respass Beach
Keith Cichorz	Citizen Respass Beach
Susan Starkey	Elizabeth River Soccer
Sandra Chaloux	CEC, Inc.
Jennifer Schleman	CEC, Inc.
John Brzezenski	USACE
Drew Rak	USACE
Scott Emry	HRPDC
David Pohl	RF Weston