

**PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES**

32501.000
03.01.00.0195

N00204.AR.001616
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

Date - January 27 and 28, 1998
Location - Cabot Lodge, Tallahassee, FL
Team Leader- Brian Caldwell
Recorder - Allison Dennen
Gate Keeper/Timekeeper - Bill Hill
Process Facilitator - Ron Joyner
Facilitator- Janet Briand

ATTENDEES:

TEAM EMB

Karen Atchley
Henry Beiro
Brian Caldwell
Allison Dennen
Bill Hill
Ron Joyner
John Mitchell
Gena Townsend

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Tier II Link, Paul Stoddard
Janet Briand (Galileo)
Tom Dillon (NOAA Adjunct)

GUESTS:

David Grabka, FDEP
Jim Crane, FDEP
Tim Bahr, FDEP
Brian Mulheam, EnSafe
Ron Severson, EnSafe
Lisa Tonner-Navarro, U of FL
Christine Halmes, U of FL
Greg Brown, FDEP

The meeting processes and ground rules were read. Janet Briand and Paul Stoddard will be here both days. Reviewed +/-'s.

Check in/Check out

Discussed the role of team leader. There is too much responsibility on team leader at the meeting.

9801-DO1 Process facilitator will be added and will rotate sequentially between team members. Start with Ron Joyner.

9801-A01 John to check on concurrence letter for the Site 39 ESD. **Original was filed and was not mailed. The letter has been signed.**

9801-D02 Team concurs with the **success** stories written by Bill Gates. Bill Hill will add them to the Tier II deliverables.

John shared that a *Pensacola* News Journal reporter contacted him. The reporter also left **two** messages for Gena. Ron was also contacted by the reporter.

Tier II Update

Paul presented the "hitlist" developed in the December meeting. **Facilitation** was an important topic. Galileo cannot provide training contractually. After it is approved, formal training will be provided. Paul had submitted to us previously the Tier II meeting minutes for October. Tier II discussed Tier 1 **meeting frequency**. Meet as often as needed. **Survey** results are pending contract negotiations. **LURs** are in process. EPA has written a guidance document. **DSMO Funding** California is getting most of the funding. **SOUTHDIV** is asking for more funding for states that are partnering. Role of

Natural Resource Trustee Worry about lack of trustee involvement. NASP has trustee as an adjunct. Tier II would like to know how we are integrating trustees. **Have a Tier 1 representative at the Tier II meeting?** Resistance at first, then reversal. Input wanted but logistically tough because of travel \$ scrutiny.

Site 38 RI/OU 2 RI

Risk assessors (Christine, Lisa, Brian, and Ron) formed separate group to discuss comments on the risk assessments. Team agreed that risk assessment subgroup could benefit from facilitator involvement. Janet worked with them while team continued with separate discussion.

Team discussed other comments on the Site 38/OU 2 RI. Gena expressed concerns regarding the conclusions/recommendations section of the OU 2 RI. She would like to see general remedial volumes and types of contaminants in that section. Team discussed the value added to the document.

9801-D3

If major risk assessment revision is required on the OU 2 RI, the **conclusions** section will **be** revised to include approximate remedial volumes (based on MCUPRG exceedances), and general types of contaminants. Divide soil by site. Groundwater will **be** described for the entire OU. If risk assessment does not require large revisions, the **conclusion/recommendation** section will not be revised.

9801-D4

Decision 9801-D3 will **be** incorporated into future draft RIs. RI reports that are currently going from draft to final will not be revised to reflect this decision.

Site 38 RI relating to Groundwater/Surface Water Interface Sampling

Brian presented his calculations for point of discharge at 100 feet and 1,000 feet offshore using only dispersion from EPA guidance.. His calculations show little decrease in concentration from the well to the offshore points. Team discussed sampling of groundwater/surface water interface. Point of compliance is the point of discharge.

Site 38/OU 2 Risk Assessment

The risk assessors returned with some questions. Can groundwater be restricted? Yes, on a site by site basis. Base is agreeable to the restriction.

Comment 1: Within groundwater plume, use the maximum value, not an average.

RME calculations: 1) use the maximum across the entire site; 2) average of detected values; 3) point risk. All of the information is in the document, but it needs to be reshuffled into appropriate format.

Comment 2:

Iron in soil - reference dose

Site 38 concentrations are below RfD

OU 2 one sample was above FL residential soil cleanup goal

9801-A02

Lisa to check reference dose for iron and email to Brian Mulhearn, Ron Severson, and John Mitchell
Pending

Molybdenum was analyzed at only three Site 38 locations. It was detected at **two** of the three locations.

9801-D05

Molybdenum may be excluded from the Site 38 HHRA

DCE was detected in 5.6% of the samples. It needs to be included in the max RME calculation.

Sodium has no reference dose. It was addressed in the Nature and Extent section regarding its MCL exceedance. It may be dropped from the BRA.

9801403 Ron to send OU 2 Fate and Transport section on VOCs in soil and subsurface soil to FDEP risk assessors. Complete

Fugitive Dust Inhalation does not need to be added to calculations, but better justification for why the pathway is excluded (sample calculations showing little change in the overall risk) needs to be provided in the document,.

Construction Worker Scenario - The industrial work scenario is protective of construction workers. It includes groundwater inhalation and dermal contact.

Manganese does include dietary intake as written.

9801-D06 The tables may remain as they are. Add footnotes to tables to revise the hazard for manganese.

OU2 - How to handle the nondetects
½ the detection limit or ½ the lowest detected value

9801-D07 Use ½ the lowest detected value

Future trespasser scenario will be added as an addendum

9801-A04 FI/FC Lisa will send Brian and Ron what the acute values are for cadmium (due in mid-February). Lisa and Christine will talk to Steve Roberts about FI/FC Brian and Ron have received the acute values for cadmium. FI/FC is pending.

Site 38 RI issues

Point of Compliance Approach

1. Point in Bay
2. Point at monitoring well closest to the Bay
3. Measure integrity of the sea wall

Lead Exceedances Extent and Source

Outside Source of Buildings 71 and 604) - Funding

Incorporation of groundwater exceedances into scope of remediation

Compliance with ARARs

Baseline Risk Assessment for Soil

No action Institutional Control for Industrial Scenario

Soil as Source for Groundwater Contamination

Revisit

Better Range of Alternatives

Solution: Screen technologies

Funding (use current funds?)

Explore the possibilities

Interim ROD on Soil Only

Team reviewed the issues. Is groundwater discharging to surface water? Yes. What if discharge was stopped? What is the integrity of the sea wall? Is groundwater infiltrating into the storm drains? Possible solutions: Line the drains. Study the integrity of the seawall.

9801-DO8

Drop the point of compliance issue (make closest monitoring well poc). Design groundwater remedial system to have the capabilities to meet groundwater and surface water standards. Gather data and submit report on the viability of the alternative. Containment would be considered as an alternative or portion of the alternatives.

Natural Attenuation

Bill Hill reviewed December 1997 meeting minutes. Tom Dillon summarized information available on NA in sediments. Burial is one option for larger sites. Cores, sediment traps, establish mixing zones, age dating of sediments would all be required to evaluate burial. Biodegradation is another option. Insitu degradation is still being evaluated.

Are any additional data needed for PAHs, metals, pesticides? Alkalinity, hardness, acid volatile sulfides (AVS). As AVS goes down, metals availability goes up. Daughter-product analysis.

Gena shared that HQ considers NA to be natural only. If nutrients are added, it is an active remediation. Greg cautions against using NA only. Time to cleanup should be a weighing factor in selection. Paul stated that a treatability study would be required. NA sampling would not support the alternative alone. Tom suggested an NA subgroup.

9801-A05 Gena and John to give memorandum to their respective agency experts. **Pending**

Which sites would benefit from NA sampling? OU 2, Site 15, OU 13 (Sites 8 and 24), Site 1, and Site 38 would benefit.

OU 2 FS

Brainstorm remedial technologies - Dropped. Previous decision stands.

9801-DO9

EnSafe will revise the FS incorporating comments received on the Site 38 FS before the draft submittal. Air sparging will be added as an alternative.

9801-A06 John to check with risk assessors on following scenario. If after removal of hot spots, rerun risk assessment. Isolated hits may fall out.

Bill brought up issues regarding risk assessment and if it should be included in the remedial design. Gena's answer is no. Write in the report that after removal of may hot spot, risk will be negligible. All of this discussion will be in the FS and incorporated into the ROD.

OLF Bronson

OLF Bronson was used from 1948-1954. Western area of the base is recreational. Airfield will be transferred to local school board. NEESA performed an assessment in 1991. Found machine gun butt and crash crew training area. EPA requested an SI. Site was a low priority so it has not be done. Funding is an issue. Lease middle portion of the airfield for temporary school buildings. School board would like property by the end of the year. The site is not a Brownfield. How much Team involvement

would there **be** for OLF Bronson? John has no choice, he **will** be involved. Gena has no resources. If part of NASP, what do we give up? If something not given up, it will **be** a new site. Possible to use OU 2 and OU 3 remedial design funding. OU 3 is going directly to an IDIQ contractor. OU 2 will not be awarded this fiscal year. Bill could use those funds of OLF Bronson screening. Is OLF Bronson part of NAS Pensacola? **Yes**, it is an outlying field for NASP. It is a separate property 12 miles west of NASP. However, if not considered separately, then it **would be** considered part of the NPL. Ron's needs for Bronson:

When will funding be in place?

How long will it take to investigate and remove?

Bill said it would not be funded until 1999 if it is a new site.

Site 2 Monitoring: Clear the Air

Ron presented the public comment received on Site 2 proposed plan. Is the eco risk negligible? Monitoring of biologic as well as chemical. How have chemicals decreased over time? There have been only two events with only one biologic sampling. The disturbed benthic community and toxicity tests indicate risk. Tom is concerned that the **contaminants** are still there 20 years after the faucet has been turned off. Has the community reestablished somewhere else? John and Tom are unwilling to accept.

Objectives of Monitoring

1. Determine Depositional Rate
2. Bioavailability and Toxicity
3. Chemical concentrations decreasing or increasing

The area is 300 feet x 400 feet x 1 foot. If dredged, would monitoring continue? No.

Comment Approval Status

9801-D10 Site 17 proposed plan, Verbal concurrence from EPA

9801-A07 John to check with Greg on various site removal work plans. **John has the letter**

Site 2 Monitoring

9801-D11 Decision for Monitoring stands. It is the most cost effective alternative. The plan will address the following objectives

1. Depositional Rate
2. Bioavailability (using EPA standard method), Toxicity, and Benthic Community Analyses
3. Chemical Concentrations

Monitoring plan will address the above objectives. After review of the data if there is not a positive result, remedial action will be reconsidered.

Add to Site 2 ROD that Port Ops will be notified of hazard in the boat slip. It is an active facility and will be handled by them.

Bill asks if contractor can take X number of samples within the area of contamination. Three samples within area is adequate per sampling event. Tom would like for conversation to focus on the objectives. Establish rate of recovery for the site. Tom will present NOAA's concern in comments on the Site 2 ROD.

John brought up that UST Site 21 is near Building 604 (Site 38). Status: PWC should be doing a free product removal. Additional delineation is still needed, but the product is widespread. Any treatment at Site 38 will need to consider the impact to and ~~from~~ Site 21.

9801-A08 Bill Hill to ask Byas Glover for a copy of the Site 21 CAR. The **CAR has not been submitted yet. Bill will double check with Byas.**

Site 38 RI

9801-A09 Gena to contact Fred Sloan about lead and why they did not delineate it any further.

9801-D12 Gather information and discuss at next meeting

9801-D13 BRA revisions are also on hold

Proposal for interim ROD has been withdrawn

Site 40 HHRA

A preliminary comparison was done of whole body killifish samples to fish ingestion RBCs and a potential excess risk to human health was identified. However, the killifish samples included bones and organs and does not represent what humans would actually consume (muscle tissue from game fish).

9801-D14 Do a table-top risk calculation based on max sediment contamination in Bayou Grande to flounder (muscle tissue). If unacceptable, do a food web model.

Site 41 FS

How to evaluate vertical extent of contamination. Samples were only collected from 0 to 6 inches. A proposal was made to collect core samples from Wetland 3, Wetland 5A, Wetland 18 and Wetland 64 to evaluate depth.

9801-D15 Collect cores to 2 foot depth. Number of cores per wetland is okay. Contaminants of concern only.

What are the remedial goals for the wetlands? The goals would need to be back calculated from the HIs to develop levels that do not pose an excess risk.

Action Items from Previous Meeting

	Status of Action Items - Previous Meetings	status
9712-A108:	HHB to develop new schedule for these, keeping in mind we are trying to achieve ROD this year.	Complete. On Agenda
9712-A109:	GT to investigate status of EPA comments on these Site 38 and OU RIs.	Pending
9712-A110:	Site 39 concurrence letters from FDEP and EPA forthcoming.	Gena's letter went out last week.
9712-A112:	JM to circulate NCP language regarding RCRA deferral internally, and report back on FDEP initial (not formal) response.	Complete. State feels it is required.
9712-A111:	Pending response to A112, Navy to issue rebuttal letter to decision.	Pending
9712-A113:	GT to bring examples of previously designed groundwater monitoring strategies.	Pending
9712-A114:	Site managers to provide wells needed for long-term monitoring on individual sites by next meeting; this will be a first cut only.	Complete
9712-A115	Karen will submit the completion report by mid-January; in accordance with the FFA, this is a secondary deliverable and does not require concurrence	Complete
9712-A116	GT to take Document Approval status form back to office and determine which concurrences can be conveyed verbally at the time of the next meeting.	Complete. On Agenda
9712-A117	GT will submit legal comments next week.	Complete. Comments provided
9712-A118	GT will pass on ROD reviews for legal review in the order that the Team has them prioritized- she will ask for Team input on these priorities.	Complete. RODs were submitted to legal.

Status of Action Items - Previous Meetings

status

9712-A119	ALD and TD will prepare additional language for the ROD that bridges this transition and develop the line of logic - this language should present practical reasons (cost, efficiency, etc.) for the choice as they were developed in the FS; and acknowledge that the risk left in place will not be neglected but addressed through monitoring	Complete. ROD submitted for review on 12/19/97
9712-A120	BC to run a few calculations to see preliminary what concentrations could be expected with maximum retardation - this will be done to determine whether sampling outboard of current well configuration should even be pursued (is there value added?)	Complete. On agenda
9712-A121	BG to compose these ideas into our existing "Success Stories" format and submit to the Team for approval - he will be asking for input from team members.	Complete. Bill emailed success stories to all team members. Three members responded.
9712-A122	GT will bring the newest guidance documents on NA available to her	Completed by John for chlorinated v o c s
9712-A123	All team members will bring NA information they have available to them to TLH.	Complete. On agenda
9712-A124	ALD, BC, HB to evaluate which sites may be good candidates for this sampling.	Complete On Agenda
9710-A101	R Joyner to provide news clippings of removals to A. Dennen.	Complete
9710-A104	Chuck to e-mail Tom information supporting the use of non-standard testing for chironomids.	Complete
9710-A105	B. Caldwell to revise the Site 7 SCR to include new data.	Complete. Submitted on 12/17/98.

Proposed PENSACOLA TIER I MEETING AGENDA
February 24 & 25, 1998
Charleston, South Carolina
Place: Anchorage Inn in Historic Downtown Charleston

Team Leader: Allison Dennen
 Recorder: Bill Hill
 Timekeeper: Ron Joyner
 Process Facilitator: John Mitchell
 Facilitator: Janet Briand
 Tier II Link: Paul Stoddard
 Guest: David Grabka, FDEP

Tom Dillon will join us at 1300 on 2/24

Start Time: 2/24 @ 0800
 End Time: 2/25 @ 1700

ITEM	GOAL	TIME - hr.	LEADER
	February 24		
Checkin	Sharing	2	AD
- Team Building Exer.	(9801-A01, 9801-A05, 9801-A07)		
- Plus-Delta Review			
- Proc./Groundrules			
- 1997 Success stories			
- Tier II update		(0.5)	PS
Update August 1997 Survey Results with Handouts	1) Answer questions from December Meeting 2) Provide handout 3) Answer any new questions	0.5	JB
Site 40 HHRA	Those Pesky PCBs	0.5	AD
Bronson Field Update	School Board Involvement	0.25	BH
Training (How to Make Decisions)	Learn	1.0	JB
Rededication to the Partnering Initiative	Unlock the Samsonite	2.0	JB
Decision Process	Reaching Supportable Decisions or How to Avoid "False Consensus"	2	AD
99 Budget	Concurrence	0.25	BH
MBTI	Fun	0.5	AD
Bill Gates Closure	Say Good-bye ; Honor Bill Gates	0.5	JB
	February 25		
Site 2 ROD	Resolution on Preferred Alternative	2	JM
Site 38 RI/BRA	Get the lead out or How to Complete the RI (9801-A02, 9801-A03, 9801- A04, 9801-A06, 9801-A08, and 9801- A09)	2.0	GT

NRT Integration for Tier II	Define how it works within Partnering for NOAA and John's former role	0.75	TD
LTM	Identify wells that may be abandoned	0.25	BC
GW Model Presentation	Presentation	1	BC
RODs (Site 17, OU 6, Site 1)	Collaborative Resolution on Comments	2.0	AD
Checkout	Resolution	1	AD
- Metrics			
- Success Stories			
- Meeting Critique			