

N62604.AR.000846
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

TIER I PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 21-22 JUNE 2011 NCBC GULFPORT FL
6/21/2011
NCBC GULFPORT

**NCBC GULFPORT TIER I PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI
JUNE 21-22, 2011**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Team Members:

Charles Cook	Navy RPM
Gordon Crane	NCBC Gulfport, IRP Manager
Bob Fisher	Tier II Link
Bob Merrill	MDEQ
Jon Overholtzer	CH2M Hill, Project Manager
Greg Roof	Tetra Tech, Project Manager
Nancy Rouse	The Management Edge, Facilitator
Libby Claggett	Tetra Tech, Scribe

Adjunct Members/Guests:

Arne Olsen	NAVFAC SE
Bill Olson	Tetra Tech, Project Scientist

1. Meeting Opening

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. CT. The Team checked in and shared events since the last meeting. Introductions of guests were made. The ground rules were read.

Team members reviewed the agenda and modifications were made accordingly.

Team members reviewed the March 2011 minutes.

Consensus Item C-0611-01: The March 2011 meeting minutes were approved as final.

2. Rotation of Meeting Roles

The meeting roles include who acts as the Meeting Leader and Timekeeper; the Scribe, Meeting Host, and Facilitator roles are not rotated. Other Tier I Teams rotate the meeting roles among the core Team members. Rotation of meeting roles is encouraged to level the playing field and create an equal climate in the meeting room. Team members discussed their thoughts on rotating the meeting roles.

Team members agreed the meeting roles of Meeting Leader and Timekeeper would rotate among the core Team members alphabetically. Gordon Crane will be the Meeting Leader, and Charles Cook will be the Timekeeper for the June 2011 meeting. For the next meeting, Bob Merrill will be the Meeting Leader, and Gordon Crane will be the Timekeeper.

3. Response to Comments Letter and Final Document Process

Bob M. stated that some Response to Comments (RTC) letters (in preparation of a final document) are not following the correct process. If MDEQ requests a change to a document, the document needs to be addressed accordingly. The MDEQ feels there is some attitude and resistance to changes. Specifically, the Site 4 Remedial Design (RD) comments were not addressed to MDEQ satisfaction.

In the past, MDEQ issued a letter with their comments to the draft document. A RTC letter would be issued by the Navy addressing MDEQ (and other review comments). Currently, the contractor is issuing the RTC letter, and not the Navy. The Navy is who the MDEQ needs to respond, not the contractor. If

These minutes are a summary based on informal notes taken at the meeting. They are not intended as a verbatim transcript and may not have captured everything that was discussed.

the Navy (or their contractor) does not agree with the MDEQ comments, open and honest communication needs to be initiated to clarify the comments and provide appropriate responses.

Consistency is an important issue with the MDEQ. If the document states “MDEQ” and drawings reflect “MCEQ”, this is not acceptable. Greg Roof received the MDEQ comments to the Site 4 RD last month. Bob Mertz reviewed the document for Tetra Tech, all comments were believed to have been addressed, and the document was scheduled to be issued as final. MDEQ did not agree that the requirement of responding to the comments was satisfied. Greg clarified that the document will be reissued as final with comments addressed after the RTC letter is agreed upon by the parties involved. Other issues regarding the Site 4 RD document were also discussed.

MDEQ stated the Site 4 RD was not the only document with issues and was being discussed as an example of the lapse in the process of finalizing documents. Charles stated the he would ensure the Navy sends the formal, agreed upon RTC letter. Email communication is good as long as the MDEQ knows the Navy is involved and approving the decisions of the contractor and the email has the correct subject line. Greg clarified the RTC letter is the “intent” of the corrections to be made to a document before the document is issued as 100% final and asked if change pages should be issued with the RTC letter. Bob M. clarified that he would not need the change pages with the formal RTC letter as long as any text changes are included (in quotations).

Regarding MCEQ on the Site 4 RD drawing, Greg asked for clarification from Bob M. It would not be as costly to issue a statement in the document regarding the use of MCEQ in lieu of modifying and reproducing Size D drawings. Bob M. stated the clarification would suffice, but the acronym page should include MCEQ because of the reference on the drawings. Greg will also have an index made of the Size D drawings. Other modifications will be made accordingly.

Bob F. added the issue had been brought up at the Tier II level. The formal RTC letter should have a document control number from the Navy, making it an official document being issued by the Navy.

Discussion ensued regarding Team communications (email versus telephone, conference calls, etc.). The protocol for Team communication is that all can communicate with each other directly in order to gain clarification. Changes in scope (or decisions) for the contractor can only be made by the Navy.

4. Review Action Items

The following action items were reviewed:

Action Items				
Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0510-02	Debbie Humbert	Done	TBD	Work with Tier II to address EPA CERCLA involvement.
A-0311-01	Bob Fisher	Done	3/25/2011	Redraft MOA to replace “EPA” with “MDEQ”.
A-0311-02	Greg Roof	Done	3/25/2011	Send latest Site 6 LTM report to Charles for review.
A-0311-03	Nancy Rouse	Done	3/22/2011	Email RAB concerning change in meeting date.
A-0311-04	Charles Cook	Done	4/1/2011	Determine if DD can be signed by “XO” by direction. Update: The DD was signed by direction.
A-0311-05	Jon Overholtzer	Done	3/22/2011	Send info on Site 4 MOB date to Greg.
A-0311-06	Greg Roof	Done	4/30/2011	Set up room block and meeting room for next meeting.
A-0311-07	Charles Cook	Done	4/7/2011	Look into combining Sites 2 and 7 for RA. Update: Charles sees no reason why this cannot be done.

Action Item A-0611-01: Charles is to verify with Navy legal if the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) has to go through public review and comment.

5. Review Site 3 Remedial Investigation (RI) Responses to MDEQ Comments

MDEQ had two comments (#s 11 and 13) to the Site 3 RI that need to be discussed. Bob M. and Greg discussed the comments and responses. Bob M. agreed with the response made to Comment #11. Comment #13 recommended considering all possible stakeholders (i.e., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and getting a letter in writing stating their involvement or non-involvement. Bob M. stated that if all changes are made as stated in the proposed RTC letter, the Site 3 RI could be delivered as final.

The soil at Site 3 is not an issue, and this will be written into the Feasibility Study (FS). Groundwater has an arsenic issue; groundwater monitoring will continue.

Discussion ensued regarding Canal No. 1 and Navy funding for sites (ER,N program). Currently, Canal No. 1 (and other outfalls) is only monitored for turbidity under the Stormwater Program. The base has a Stormwater Permit under MS4.

6. Review of RAB Meeting

Team members discussed the RAB meeting held June 20, 2011. One item of note was that a citizen wanted to know if the MOA would be reviewed by the public before it is signed by the Navy and MDEQ. An action item has already been assigned to investigate this with Navy legal.

At the meeting, City Councilman Truck Casey stated he would try to bring more citizens to the next RAB meeting.

The next RAB is scheduled for September 12 at 5:30 p.m. (poster session) and 6:00 p.m. meeting presentations. A future RAB meeting date of December 5 was also tentatively scheduled.

7. Site 4 Remedial Action (RA) Update

Jon provided photographs of the landfill cap and golf course construction at Site 4. There is concern that the new sod is not being properly watered. Over \$1,000,000 was spent in purchasing and installing the new sod.

8. NAVFAC SE RPM Update

The new Navy CLEAN contract was not awarded to Tetra Tech. The Navy and Tetra Tech are preparing a transition plan. Tetra Tech is funded through the next three years.

The Navy also has an initiative to perform some work in-house (i.e., Proposed Plans, RODs) in lieu of using a contractor; however, the Navy does not have the ability to do any modeling at this time.

9. Tier II Update

Health and Safety reviews were discussed at the last Tier II meeting. As far as NAVFAC is concerned, the base Health and Safety Officer should be conducting the review. Typically, most base personnel use EM 385 instead of OSHA guidelines (which are less extensive). Someone beyond the RPM needs to inform the base Health and Safety Officer that they are funded to perform the reviews and given the guidelines to use. The base Health and Safety Officer should have the OSHA 40-hour training.

Action Item A-0611-02: Bob F. and Gordon are to investigate if the NCBC Gulfport Health and Safety Officer has had OSHA 40-hour training and discuss NAVFAC expectations.

Other items of discussion included performance-based fixed-price contracting being conducted at Air Force bases, energy and sustainability initiatives, the 20/20 Program (how to get efficiency on a small scale), and renewable energy.

Bob F. stated that Site 3 might be a good place to install a solar blanket. Gordon asked if the solar blanket could be installed on a roof. Jon stated that solar blankets have been installed on rooftops in San Diego.

Action Item A-0611-03: Gordon is to investigate if any renewable energy projects are scheduled for or in use at NCBC Gulfport.

10. Site 2 RI Activities

Greg provided Team members with the figure indicating the 100-foot sampling grid and the constituents found.

Action Item A-0611-04: Charles is to ask Laura LaBella to send Tetra Tech the Wetlands Delineation Map for Site 2.

Discussion ensued regarding the pond at Site 2. Gordon stated that it was not on the Base Stormwater Master Plan and was used to water the golf course. The pond is no longer needed and could be filled in. Material north of the pond has been sampled and can be used as fill for the pond.

Bob M. questioned the placement of the wells and how it will be determined if there is anything downgradient. Greg stated that if there were a continuing source, it would be found since there are monitoring wells along the perimeter of the landfill. Under presumptive remedy, the area under the landfill does not have to be investigated. An unbiased sampling approach was used around the outside of the landfill.

11. Site 4 Plume Evaluation

Some of the monitoring wells on the eastern side of Site 4 were removed and need to be reinstalled.

The Navy chemist provided comments to the UFP-SAP. The Navy chemist's comments will be incorporated into the UFP-SAP before it is sent to MDEQ for review.

The distribution of vinyl chloride in groundwater appears to be migrating westerly, taking a northwesterly turn.

12. Long-term Monitoring (LTM)

Aerostar sent the Health and Safety Plan to NCBC Gulfport and is awaiting approval from the NCBC Gulfport Health and Safety Officer.

13. Exit Strategy Review

Team members reviewed the Exit Strategy and adjusted dates accordingly.

Action Item A-0611-05: Charles is to send the updated Exit Strategy to Team members after receiving it from Greg.

Action Item A-0611-06: Greg is to verify that the Site 3 Decision Document was sent to Charles.

Action Item A-0611-07: Gordon is to send Greg the Site 3 MWR plans.

Action Item A-0611-08: Gordon is to inform the “front office” that the Site 3 Decision Document is coming.

Action Item A-0611-09: Bill is to send Gordon and Jon a copy of the current Site 3 survey.

14. Site 6 LTM

There have been eight monitoring events from January 2008 to January 2011. Naphthalene, vinyl chloride, and DRO remain as constituents of concern. Free product is still present. The plume is stable and at equilibrium. The extent of the groundwater plume is delineated by monitoring wells. The groundwater plume is not having an impact on the adjacent drainage ditch.

The Action Memoranda (Battelle 2006 and Tetra Tech 2008) recommended evaluation of monitoring activities after two years. Options include continue semiannual monitoring schedule for two more years, change to annual or biannual monitoring schedule for five years, and assessment of free product in soil and further active remediation

The Tetra Tech Action Memo stated to reduce monitoring to once every two years if site conditions were found to be stable. It is believed that free product is stable, the chlorinated solvent issue has not shown any significant migration, and Tetra Tech is planning to recommend reducing monitoring to once every two years. The decision needs to be made if the plume is stable or not.

Action Item A-0611-10: Charles is to check on status of the funding for the Site 6 LTM.

15. Review Day 1 Action Items

Team members reviewed the action items generated during Day 1.

DAY 2

The Day 2 began at 9:30 a.m. CT.

16. Check-In/Opening Remarks

Team members shared events of the past night.

Gordon and Bob F. met with the NCBC Gulfport Health and Safety Officer before Day 2 of the meeting. If a Risk Assessment Code (RAC) is added to the current HASP format, the document will satisfy the requirements of the NCBC Gulfport Health and Safety Officer.

17. Site 6 LTM Wrap Up Discussion

Discussion continued regarding changing the monitoring frequency at Site 6. Bob M. stated he did not want the site to go to monitoring every other year. Team members agreed that annual monitoring would be a better suggestion because the Team determined the plume is not stable at this point.

Action Item A-0611-11: Bob M. is to look for the Site 6 LTM reports for Events 6 and 7.

Action Item A-0611-12: Greg is to send Site 6 LTM report for Event 5 to Bob M.

Consensus Item A-0611-02: The Team reached consensus to change the monitoring frequency at Site 6 to annually because the Team determined the plume is not stable at this time.

18. Future Land Use and Land Use Control (LUC) Challenges

Gordon asked for direction from Team members regarding future tenants at the base and planned remedial projects. If a soccer field is going to be built at Site 3, the Navy does not to pay for costly sod. Greg added to consider the "standards" for building a soccer field (not just a flat field). Bob F. stated that a much longer time frame needs to be captured for the remedial projects to be fully completed.

Charles asked why the landfill was being capped. The driver to cap the landfill is the potential for groundwater to move to a receptor (the marshes). Team members questioned if a cap is the right answer for Site 3. An alternative discussed was addressing transport and flow. Jon stated that 18 inches of cap might not be needed to fulfill the 10^{-6} equivalency; however, there needs to be enough soil to cover the active layer and keep it moist. If the drainage layer and gas piping system were removed, there would be a significant cost reduction for the project. Greg added the presumptive remedy is also a driver for the cap.

Two equipment parking lots were built on the southern end of Site 1. Gordon received an email from Jerry Banks stating the parking lots needed to meet the requirement of the future cap. Gordon does not have any geotechnical information for the parking lot. A parking berm for a fuel truck needs to be constructed on the capped area. Gordon stated the berm could not be built until it could be proven to the state that the landfill cap met the requirements.

Action Item A-0611-13: Jon is to have Shelby tube samples collected at Site 1 (for geotechnical determination of the landfill cap).

19. Site 3 RD Update

Tetra Tech is in the process of completing additional surveying for the design. Greg asked if the design would be to match the existing topography or another design surface (i.e., soccer field). Bob F. stated there is no specific long-term land use requirement for the design; therefore, return the site to the existing topography, but do not leave any standing water.

Action Item A-0611-14: Gordon is to look at the Base Master Plan to determine if soil from the mounds can be used at Site 3.

Consensus Item C-0611-03: The Team reached consensus that the Remedial Design for Site 3 is an environmental project and determined future use considerations are not part of the design.

Action Item A-0611-15: Gordon is to communicate to MWR that the Remedial Design for Site 3 will not consider future use as part of the design.

Action Item A-0611-16: Gordon is to email Greg the name of the Stormwater Master Plan person at NCBC Gulfport.

20. LUC Implementation Plan (LUCIP) Format Discussion

Greg provided copies of LUCIP formats. One format was a traditional LUCIP, and the other was a CMIP format. Team members preferred the CMIP format. After the MOA is completed, the LUCIP will be started.

Consensus Item C-0611-04: The Team reached consensus to use the CMIP format as the template for future LUCIPs at NCBC Gulfport.

Bob F. commented ensure documents are uploaded to NIRIS.

21. Round Table Discussion

Gordon asked if there are LUC boundary figures available in NIRIS. Bob F. explained the capabilities of the NIRIS maps.

Action Item A-0611-17: Greg is to assemble LUC boundary figures for all sites at NCBC Gulfport.

Bob F. stated the NIRIS public web page for NCBC Gulfport would be started as soon as the Whiting Field page is completed. Team members will need to decide what documents will be available for public viewing. Bob F. will bring sample web pages to the next meeting.

Charles would like the Team to consider bi-weekly conference calls to discuss document status. The conference call would last approximately 15 to 20 minutes. Greg suggested having the calls on a monthly basis instead of every other week. Bob M. agreed that monthly calls would be better than bi-weekly.

Bob M., Charles, and Greg agreed to have monthly conference calls to discuss document status starting on Monday, August 1, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. CT.

Action Item A-0611-18: Libby is to arrange the first monthly conference call to discuss documents status (Monday, August 1, 2011, 10:00 a.m. CT).

Action Item A-0611-19: Charles is to check with Navy legal to determine if a formal court reporter is needed at the public meeting in lieu of a meeting scribe.

22. Meeting Closeout

Next Meeting: October 4 and 5, 2011, beginning at 9:00 a.m. CT on Day 1

Location: Hampton Inn, Biloxi, Mississippi

Meeting Leader: Bob Merrill

Timekeeper: Gordon Crane

Action Item A-0611-20: Libby is to check on meeting space and sleeping rooms for the October 2011 meeting at the Hampton Inn in Biloxi, Mississippi.

October 2011 Proposed Meeting Agenda			
Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
Meeting Opening: Check in, opening remarks, resource sharing, announcements, head count, and proxy assignments	Leader	15 min	Standard
Review Ground Rules	All	5 min	Standard
Minutes Approval	Leader	5 min	Consensus
Action Item / Parking Lot / Previous +/- Review	Leader	15 min	Standard
Agenda Review	All	5 min	Standard
Site 1 RD Planning	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 2 RI Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 3 RD Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 4 Groundwater Monitoring Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 7 RI Phase I Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
LTM Update	Aerostar	30 min	Information
Exit Strategy Review	Greg Roof	15 min	Standard
Review RAB Meeting	All	30 min	Discussion
Establish LUC Boundaries	Greg Roof	30 min	Discussion
NIRIS Public Web Page	Bob Fisher	45 min	Discussion

These minutes are a summary based on informal notes taken at the meeting. They are not intended as a verbatim transcript and may not have captured everything that was discussed.

October 2011 Proposed Meeting Agenda			
Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
Training	Nancy Rouse	60 min	Learning
Round Table Discussion	All	15 min	Standard
Facilitator Feedback	Nancy Rouse	15 min	Standard
Meeting Closeout: Review dates of next meeting, prepare next meeting agenda, review action item list, and create +/- list	Team	30 min	Standard

Future Meeting Dates

Dates

January 24-25, 2011

Location

Hampton Inn, Biloxi, Mississippi

Conference Call Date

Monday, September 12, 2:00 p.m. EST

Action Item A-0611-21: Libby is to arrange a conference call to set the agenda for the October 2011 meeting (Monday, September 12, 2:00 p.m. EST).

23. Review Action Items

Team members reviewed the action item list.

Action Items				
Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0611-01	Charles Cook		07/01/2011	Charles is to verify with Navy legal if the MOA has to go through public review and comment.
A-0611-02	Bob Fisher and Gordon Crane	Done	06/22/2011	Bob F. and Gordon are to investigate if the NCBC Gulfport Health and Safety Officer has had OSHA 40-hour training and discuss NAVFAC expectations.
A-0611-03	Gordon Crane		07/01/2011	Gordon is to investigate if any renewable energy projects are scheduled for or in use at NCBC Gulfport.
A-0611-04	Charles Cook		07/01/2011	Charles is to ask Laura LaBella to send Tetra Tech the Wetlands Delineation Map for Site 2.
A-0611-05	Charles Cook		07/08/2011	Charles is to send the updated Exit Strategy to Team members after receiving it from Greg.
A-0611-06	Greg Roof		07/01/2011	Greg is to verify that the Site 3 Decision Document was sent to Charles.
A-0611-07	Gordon Crane	OBE		Gordon is to send Greg the Site 3 MWR plans.
A-0611-08	Gordon Crane		06/23/2011	Gordon is to inform the "front office" that the Site 3 Decision Document is coming.
A-0611-09	Bill Olson	Done		Bill is to send Gordon and Jon a copy of the current Site 3 survey.
A-0611-10	Charles Cook	Done		Charles is to check on status of the funding for the Site 6 LTM.
A-0611-11	Bob Merrill		07/01/2011	Bob M. is to look for the Site 6 LTM reports for Events 6 and 7.
A-0611-12	Greg Roof		07/15/2011	Greg is to send Site 6 LTM report for Event 5 to Bob M if needed.

These minutes are a summary based on informal notes taken at the meeting. They are not intended as a verbatim transcript and may not have captured everything that was discussed.

Action Items				
Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0611-13	Jon Overholtzer		06/22/2011	Jon is to have Shelby tube samples collected at Site 1 (for geotechnical determination of the landfill cap).
A-0611-14	Gordon Crane		07/01/2011	Gordon is to look at the MWR Master Plan to determine if soil from the mounds can be used at Site 3.
A-0611-15	Gordon Crane		07/15/2011	Gordon is to communicate to MWR that the Remedial Design for Site 3 will not consider future use as part of the design.
A-0611-16	Gordon Crane		07/01/2011	Gordon is to email Greg the name of the Stormwater Master Plan person at NCBC Gulfport.
A-0611-17	Greg Roof		By next meeting	Greg is to assemble LUC boundary figures for all sites at NCBC Gulfport.
A-0611-18	Libby Claggett		07/30/2011	Libby is to arrange the first monthly conference call to discuss documents status (Monday, August 1, 2011, 10:00 a.m. CT).
A-0611-19	Charles Cook		07/15/2011	Charles is to check with Navy legal to determine if a formal court reporter is needed at the public meeting in lieu of a meeting scribe.
A-0611-20	Libby Claggett		07/30/2011	Libby is to check on meeting space and sleeping rooms for the October 2011 meeting at the Hampton Inn in Biloxi, Mississippi.
A-0611-21	Libby Claggett		07/30/2011	Libby is to arrange a conference call to set the agenda for the October 2011 meeting (Monday, September 12, 2:00 p.m. EST)

Consensus Number	Consensus Item
C-0611-01	The March 2011 meeting minutes were approved as final.
C-0611-02	The Team reached consensus to change the monitoring frequency at Site 6 to annually because the Team determined the plume is not stable at this time.
C-0611-03	The Team reached consensus that the Remedial Design for Site 3 is an environmental project and determined future use considerations are not part of the design.
C-0611-04	The Team reached consensus to use the CMIP format as the template for future LUCIPs at NCBC Gulfport.

There were no parking lot items developed during the June 2011 meeting.

24. Plus/Delta

Plus/Delta	
+	Δ
Discussions focused	No projector
Well-oiled function group	Room too small
Got work done in a cooperative atmosphere	
Bob F. back	
Open discussion about difficult issue	
Flexibility in schedule to allow addressing an issue in real time	
Jon's photo presentation at Site 4	
Good job working without projector	

25. Facilitator Feedback

Nancy discussed meeting accomplishments with the Team.

1. Resolved document review process
2. Determined health and safety requirements for NAVFAC
3. Determined that Site 3 RD will only address environmental restoration requirements

26. Training

Nancy provided training on Team Self Evaluation. The training consisted of a formal farewell to Bob F. and along with conducting a self evaluation.