

N65928.AR.003025
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING CONFERENCE CALL DATED 4
JUNE 2003 NTC ORLANDO FL
6/4/2003
NTC ORLANDO

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

Date: June 4, 2003

OPT MEMBERS:

Steve Tsangaris
Steve McCoy
Greg Fraley
Dave Grabka
Mark Salvetti

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Hope Wilson, SDIV

GUESTS:

Facilitator: None for this call.

This conference call was requested by Greg Fraley to review the DOD/EPA Installation Metrics for NTC Orlando. The call also provided an opportunity to review the SCAP schedule, as the metrics table needed to be consistent with SCAP.

The conference call opened with a review of the previous metrics table submittal. That table showed Orlando had 9 total sites remaining. We proceeded to try and figure out which sites these were. We came up with the following:

OU 1, OU 2, OU 3, OU 4, SA 2, SA 17, SA 52, SA 36, SA 39, and SA 55. SA 18 was likely included before, but now it has gone NFA. And we now have to add SA 55.

We agreed that we now had 10 sites. We also agreed that SA 55 would be considered a new site, rather than fitting in the category of Re-Opened Sites. Particularly since Steve M.'s latest PAH in soil data (figure emailed to OPT during call) now shows exceedances of the industrial SCTL (previously only the residential SCTL was exceeded).

Next we discussed the new benzene plume at SA 36. We could consider this plume a part of SA 36, or we could consider the plume associated with Building 109, which would put the benzene in the petroleum site category and therefore not included on the metrics table.

Steve M. considered it preferable to include the benzene with Building 109. Benzene is not a contaminant of concern at SA 36, the SA 36 report has gone final, and groundwater flow direction suggests the plume is really from Building 109. **OPT agreed that the benzene plume at SA 36 will be considered associated with Building 109, and therefore a petroleum release that does not get included in the metrics table.**

SCAP

Once the sites were selected, we switched to discussing the SCAP schedule. Mark S. noticed that some of the dates the OPT agreed upon during the April 2003 conference call had not made it onto the schedule:

OU 2 ROD should show an Actual Start of 2/22/02 (corresponds to draft ROD submittal date).
OU 3 ROD Planned Completion date should be 2004/4. Delete 9/24/2000 from Actual column.

The SCAP discussion then turned to dates for the OU 4 ROD, Remedial Design, and completion of the Remedial Action. Dave G. noted that the Remedial Design actually had two components if LUCs were needed. One design for the remediation itself, and a second design document for implementation of the LUCs. Until the LUC design was completed, the Remedial Design task is not done.

The April 2003 conference call had settled on dates for Completion of Remedial Design of 2/15/02, Planned Completion of the Remedial Action as 2003/4, and ROD Planned Completion of 2004/2.

To accommodate the need for a LUC Remedial Design, we agreed to change the OU 4 dates as follows:

OU 4 ROD: Keep Planned Completion at 2004/2
 OU 4 Remedial Design: Use a Planned Completion date of 2004/2
 OU 4 Remedial Action: Use a Planned Completion of 2004/4

We also reopened the debate of what constituted completion of the Remedial Action. In April, we concluded it was the submittal of as-builts. But Steve M. noted that at least in the case of OU 4, since the as-builts are due to be submitted this month (June 2003), SCAP would show the Remedial Action complete before the ROD was even advertised to the public. Dave G. noted this has been happening at other sites too, since completion of RODs has been held up by LUC issues, but teams have still pressed on with remediation rather than waiting.

ACTION ITEM: Greg F. will look into EPA's definition of Completion of Remedial Action and email it out to the team this week. But for now we would use 2004/4 in SCAP for OU 4 Planned Completion of the Remedial Action.

Metrics Table

We agreed on the following categories for each of the 10 sites on the Metrics Table:

OU 1: Remedy in Place (RIP). Response Complete (RC) will **not** be achieved in FY +1 or +2.
 OU 2: Investigation Complete. Won't likely achieve RIP until 2006.
 OU 3: Investigation Complete. Won't likely achieve RIP until 2007.
 OU 4: RIP this fiscal year. RC will **not** be achieved in FY +1 or +2.
 SA 2: Investigation Complete. Assume will achieve RIP in FY+2.
 SA 17: Investigation Complete. Assume will achieve RIP in FY+2.
 SA 52: Technically we have achieved RIP (monitoring). **No RC** in FY+1 or +2.
 SA 36: RIP (two veggy oil applications). OPS looks good, so let's say RC in FY+2.
 SA 39: Have RIP now (assuming we don't do anything else). **No RC** in FY+1 or +2.
 SA 55: Will achieve Investigation Complete, RIP, and RC in FY+1.

Towards the end of the call, Dave G. brought up SA 54, the Army Reserve site at McCoy that needs to have appropriate institutional control language added to the transfer documents. Should this site be included in the Metrics Table? **All agreed no.** This is just an FDEP concern, so it's not still considered a site by EPA.

ACTION ITEM: Mark S. to include a review of the Metrics Table along with SCAP in future OPT meeting agendas.

June OPT Meeting Discussion

Steve M. is bringing someone that works for DOE at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Ohio. He would like to see the KMnO₄ treatment system, and Steve M. asked if Steve T. could arrange to have someone available. Steve T. said sure.

RAB Meeting Topics

Since RABs are now occurring only every 6 months, we'll probably need to cover several topics to bring the RAB up to speed each time. We came up with the following presentation topics and assignments:

OU 4 KMnO4 and forest update – Steve T.
Brief OU 3 Update – Steve M.
OU 2/GOAA Update – Barbara
Early Transfer - Barbara and Dave G.
SA 55 and SA 36 (benzene) update – Steve M.

We'll assemble these pieces into a single PowerPoint presentation. Mark S. offered to combine them all into one if each author can forward their pieces (preferably as PowerPoint files) to Mark before the next OPT meeting on June 25. We can then review all the pieces and make edits where necessary when we meet at 3PM on June 25.

ACTION ITEM: Steve T. will arrange for a laptop projector to be available for us in Orlando.