

N62604.AR.001550
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

TIER I MEETING MINUTES 10 AUGUST 2010 NCBC GULFPORT MS
8/10/2010
TIER I MEETING MEMBERS

**MINUTES
NCBC GULFPORT TIER I MEETING
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI**

AUGUST 10-11, 2010

MEETING ATTENDEES

Team Members:

Bob Merrill	MDEQ, State RPM
Greg Roof	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., Project Manager
Gordon Crane	NCBC Gulfport, IRP Manager
Robert Fisher	Navy RPM
Nancy Rouse	The Management Edge, Facilitator
Jon Overholtzer	CH2M Hill, Project Manager

Guests:

Bill Olson	TtNUS, Project Scientist
Jacqueline Strobl	Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., Scribe

1. 1ST DAY CHECK-IN (TUESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2010)

Welcome and Administrative:

- Announcements: None.
- Team Check-In/Introductions: Each meeting attendee took a turn providing a brief personal update. The team then reviewed the meeting conduct ground rules.
- Proxies/Guests: None.
- Review Agenda: The meeting agenda was distributed and reviewed. Mr. Fisher requested an additional time slot for a Tier II Update via teleconference with Mrs. Helen Lockard, NAVFAC SE, prior to the joint team training scheduled for the second meeting day. The team briefly discussed the length of the lunch break on the second meeting day to ensure that everyone would be able to attend.
- Personnel Updates: None.

2. BREAK

3. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS

Prior to review of the action items, changes to the wording of the Consensus Item C-0510-04 (per Mr. Merrill) were reviewed and consensus reconfirmed.

The team reviewed the action item list noting completed items and updating information corresponding to ongoing action items (see table below). Shaded rows have been noted as "Completed" and will be removed from the Ongoing Action Items table prior to the next action item review.

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item	Comments
Ongoing Action Items					
A-0510-01	Greg Roof	Complete	TBD	Contact Bobby Miller about Site 4 golf course greens and irrigation.	Still working on the process.
A-0510-02	Debbie Humbert	Ongoing	TBD	Work with Tier II to address EPA CERCLA involvement.	
A-0510-03	Greg Roof	Complete	TBD	Check Fed Ex tracking info corresponding to the Site 4 RD package sent to Bob Merrill.	
A-0510-04	Robert Fisher	Complete	TBD	Discuss regulatory driver language with Steve Beverly.	Navy agrees to MOA process.
A-0510-05	Robert Fisher	Overcome by Events	TBD	Discuss post ROD significant changes at Site 8B&C with Steve Beverly.	Steve Beverly does not see this as a significant change. Since this is not an ESD or ROD Amendment, it just needs a letter.
A-0510-06	Robert Fisher	Complete	TBD	Contact Aerostar and invite them to the next meeting.	Aerostar has been invited and will become involved at the end of 2 monitoring periods.
A-0510-07	Greg Roof	Complete	TBD	Send the 2000 ABB Groundwater Investigation Report for Site 7 to Bob Merrill	Mr. Roof distributed a CD of the Aerostar Letter Report (a follow up to the 1998 Groundwater Monitoring Report. This is in consideration of the Site 7 RI – it will be referenced.
A-0510-08	Gordon Crane	Complete?	TBD	Provide TtNUS with pre- and post-golf course construction topographic maps.	

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 Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item	Comments
Ongoing Action Items					
A-0510-09	Greg Roof	Complete	TBD	TtNUS will find a new meeting place location.	
A-0210-01	G. Crane	Complete	3/2/10	Determine fencing standards for 8B&C.	The fencing currently meets NAVFAC standards. This is an ongoing base issue. The fencing standard is chain link (6-foot high).
A-1109-06	N. Rouse/Tier II	Complete		Provide the process for stepping down Tier I to the next partnering level.	Long-term planning concerning Tier I Partnering will be discussed during the next Tier II meeting. This should be covered in the next Tier II update.
A-0809-10	Y. Martínez & N. Rouse	Complete	11/15	Discuss the issue of public meetings & review requirements.	RAB Meeting Review/ Community Relations Path Forward to be discussed per the scheduled agenda topic. Resolution concerning this action item has been put on hold until the team determines how to move forward with the RAB. The RAB has been funded for the next 2 years.

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.

4. NCBC GULFPORT UPDATE - FUTURE USE OF IRP SITES

Mr. Fisher provided the update on the NCBC Gulfport facility noting the following:

Site 4 Update: The two greens will be replaced as inexpensively as possible. The bottom line is that this will not be a USGA course, but instead a “Golf Experience” that will need to be level in order to make it easy to mow and keep maintenance cost effective. If there is extra fill, some contouring may take place at the end. TtNUS should be able to proceed with finalizing the plan. Mr. Fisher went on to note that discussion had produced an idea concerning use of a vegetative grass bunker to protect each green (in an upside down horseshoe shape). CH2M Hill plans on starting construction at the beginning of October. TtNUS will need to have the final plan completed by September 15th. The irrigation system re-installation will not be in the final design, but will be covered in an amendment.

Site 3 Update: Potential long-term use as an RV Park to the north, but nothing on the actual site. The issue of access to the RV Park and possible options was discussed by the team. Mr. Fisher noted that if they wanted to build the foundation up to our specifications with a low permeability layer, that might work, but then the question would be drainage to the east. Further discussion concerning design elements will be necessary. For now, Site 3 will just be an open field (we will just plan for sod); a road may be constructed at the eastern edge.

Sites 2 and 7 Update: Mr. Roof asked what the future use was planned for Site 2 and Site 7. Mr. Fisher replied that it had not yet been determined.

Site 5 Update: They will be putting down sod at Site 5. The team discussed sod/turf options and irrigation issues. Mr. Crane mentioned there had been discussion concerning a sod that could grow on plastic. Sod usually takes months to thrive through traditional methods. Irrigation options were discussed. Mr. Overholtzer noted an option of hydraulically run cars instead of having water lines run out over the surface lying around. This would allow for irrigation immediately after laying down the sod. The team discussed the time line of events. Mr. Overholtzer stated they could begin installation in about 2 weeks. Mr. Fisher noted the schedule is as follows: first a quick memo on amendments from the sod farm, then a second memo would cover sod installation and watering technique, and then the third and final memo would cover how to care for the grass. These memos will originate from CH2M Hill and be sent to NAVFAC.

Action Item A-0810-01: Jon Overholtzer – Site 5: Prepare the series of memos concerning the Site 5 driving range grass. Memo #1: Soil Amendments (Due 8/17), Memo #2: Installation Schedule/Irrigation (Due 8/24), Memo #3: Long Term Maintenance (instructions to PWO) (Due 9/30).

Mr. Crane asked about the erosion around the site. Mr. Fisher noted that this would be addressed separately. The plan is to turn this over at the end of October. There will be a memo to cover sod care, but after that it will be up to them. Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Crane to communicate that they may need to have a little capital investment on this maintenance.

5. LUNCH

6. RAB MEETING REVIEW/COMMUNITY RELATIONS PATH FORWARD

The team discussed the RAB Meeting held the previous night noting that turnout had been better. It was noted that we are still in the comment period from the last public meeting. Most of the discussion at the RAB was about MRP. Mr. Fisher briefly noted that IRP funding would be reduced, and MRP funding would be increased. Mr. Fisher also noted that Malcolm-Pirnie had been provided with funding for Susan Burnett to provide a presentation at the next meeting.

The team began discussion concerning meeting facility location noting specifically the need to achieve consistency on a location. The team noted pros and cons regarding several of the facilities used in the past. Ms. Rouse offered to explore options and present her findings to the team.

Action Item A-0810-02: Nancy Rouse – RAB: Identify RAB Meeting location to present to the team (Due 8/31).

Ms. Rouse noted that RAB attendance continues to wane, but the RAB is currently funded for 2 more years. This will be reassessed in FY12.

Action Item A-0810-03: Nancy Rouse – RAB: Summarize the RAB closeout process per the RAB rule (Due 8/29).

7. NAVFAC RPM UPDATE

Mr. Fisher provided the NAVFAC RPM update. Mr. Fisher stated he had re-baselined NCBC Gulfport and NAS Meridian; NORM was changed significantly; therefore, he is now encountering many internal questions concerning how much it will cost to finish these. We now have some realistic numbers and it is now time for the execution plans. Mr. Fisher stated he has committed funding to finish all the sites by 2014. This funding will be just to handle the sites through Phase 4. The LTM work and LUC monitoring occurs in Phase 6. The other issue is the MRP program. We will expect to be very busy for the next four years, but as time goes on we will become more of a caretaker group.

Mr. Fisher noted that Site 3 was just approved, and next year the design will be implemented as a RAP. The award will come in March 2011. Mr. Fisher stated that they were going to do the MOA for the whole base. One issue raised was the quarterly reports, which may have ended with completion of Site 8.

Action Item A-0810-04: Robert Fisher: Contact Jerry Banks to discuss quarterly report requirement for Site 8 (Due 10/29).

Action Item A-0810-05: Robert Fisher: Determine how to formally close out the Agreed Order (Due 10/29).

Parking Lot: AO update (in RPM update).

Mr. Fisher stated that as far as the Navy is concerned, Site 8 is closed. We will need to figure out how to close out the agreed order. Mr. Merrill noted that it would need to be clear that this will not be closed under the Brownfields Program, but instead under CERCLA.

Mr. Fisher noted that in regard to Public Meetings, RAB Meetings, and/or Proposed Plans, the PAO, Sue Brink, needs to review things presented to the public. The problematic issue is the timing for review; we should be giving Sue at least 2 weeks to review documents. Ms. Rouse added that another issue was that the presentations have become more technical, and acronyms have not been explained well.

8. BREAK

9. AGENDA REVIEW

The team reviewed the remaining agenda item topics and adjusted the schedule accordingly. The team decided to move the Exit Strategy/Long and Short Term Goals until tomorrow morning.

10. NAVFAC RPM UPDATE (CONTINUED)

Mr. Fisher continued the NAVFAC RPM update. Mr. Fisher noted Site 4 compaction issues. If compacting fine material when it is sitting on top of water, the material will turn it into quicksand. During the kickoff meeting, Mr. Overholtzer stated that CH2M Hill could add something a little different – more of

a permanent barrier adjacent to the canal. Instead of putting in the compacted soil that meets 10^{-5} and instead of having the low permeability soil from the bank up, the GCL or 40 mil HDPE could be used. The question with the 40 mil HDPE is where there is overlap (it would have to be cut in sections). The other issue with the 40 mil HDP would be whether or not there was a hydrostatic seal.

Mr. Overholtzer explained that of the product ideas explored, the easiest would be the 40 mil textured liner and overlap (there were no plans to weld it together, and we don't want to do this unless it can be overlapped). The second option would be a thin plastic liner with a thin bentonite layer; when we put that down, it would prevent moisture from getting up there to hydrate (note this could be overlapped). Another option is PVC panels that are glued together. Another possibility is instead of the low permeability, create a 10^{-8} membrane and then quickly come in with material that is already tested and onsite and is granular.

Mr. Fisher stated the question is whether or not it would be okay to move toward one of these construction methods. We want to make sure everyone understands this so that when you receive the as-builts there is not any confusion.

Mr. Overholtzer stated the way he would like to handle this would be to utilize the most easily used product and to go out and put 22.5' wide rows and overlap them. The second easiest option would be the aqiseal/bentonite. Mr. Fisher stated that he was fine with the HDPE as long as we did not need to do a vertical wall.

Consensus Item 1: Modify construction of the Site 4 landfill cap of the low permeability layer near the canal to make it more constructible.

Consensus Item 2: Use overlapping textured HDPE in place of compacted soil for the Site 4 landfill cap within +/- 25 of canal bottom.

Action Item A-0810-06: Jon Overholtzer – Site 4: Prepare request for information for Canal Landfill Interface (Due 8/12).

11. AGENDA REVIEW

The team reviewed the remaining agenda item topics and adjusted the schedule accordingly. A decision was made to drop the LTM and LUC topics from this meeting. These topics can be covered at the next meeting.

12. REVIEW DAY 1 ACTION & CONSENSUS ITEMS

Day 1 Action Items were reviewed by each responsible team member.

13. 2ND DAY CHECK-IN (WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2010)

- Team Check-In/Introductions: Each meeting attendee took a turn providing a brief personal update.
- New Team Member Welcome: Ms. Rouse noted that Mr. Roof had not had a proper new member welcome/introduction. Ms. Rouse requested that each team member tell Mr. Roof two things about themselves that he did not know.

The team paused to address issues with the projector. It was determined that an alternate display would be necessary.

14. REVIEW EXIT STRATEGY/LONG & SHORT TERM GOALS

Mr. Fisher and Mr. Roof led the team in a site by site review of the exit strategy; the most recent changes are noted in red (see attached).

SITE 1: DISASTER RECOVERY DISPOSAL AREA

- DD was supposed to be completed by 10/31, this will need to slide. DD should be completed by June so the PP Meeting should be held in May.
- RI is still in review.
- FS is currently in TtNUS internal review.

Action Item A-0810-07: Robert Fisher – Exit Strategy: Change dates in NORM (8/17).

SITE 2: WORLD WAR II LANDFILL

- UFP SAP still under review. The NAVFAC chemist has reviewed the UFP-SAP, but still needs to sign it.
- RIP date changed to 9/30/12

Action Item A-0810-08: Robert Fisher: Ask chemist to sign the Site 2 UFP-SAP (8/17).

SITE 3: NORTHWEST LANDFILL/BURNING PIT

- RIP date pushed to 8/30
- In progress: RI/FS/PP/DD

Mr. Merrill noted that, historically, the risk assessment has been done separately. Mr. Roof asked how many separate documents should be submitted and whether or not all of the historical information would need to be presented in each one. The team discussed separating the document into volumes, separate reports, etc. Mr. Merrill reminded the team that all of the stake holders would need to be involved (specifically, NOA and F&W).

Mr. Fisher noted unless there is an obvious contaminant, what is being seen in Canal No. 1 is a smattering, and it is very difficult to say that the contaminant would be related to any one site, since no actual plumes have been observed. The Navy policy states unless contaminants are attached to a site, they are not to be chased. If it looks like there is a real long-term risk, a separate study can be conducted on the canal. Mr. Merrill asked whether or not the Navy would see any reason to go back and look at the canal. Mr. Fisher stated if the upstream and downstream data after the cleanup at the landfill sites and determine additional study is necessary, there will be an additional investigation.

If necessary, there will be an additional investigation.

Consensus Item 3: Bind Final RI Reports as multiple volumes and submit routine appendices (e.g. data) on CD.

It was noted that Mr. Merrill still did not have the DD yet because Mr. Fisher was still in the process of reviewing it. Mr. Crane noted that he would fill out the comment matrix as soon as he received them from the PWO.

Mr. Fisher noted that a quick conference call would need to be scheduled as soon as the copies of the DD were distributed in order to make sure that there are not any high level concerns/issues.

Action Item A-0810-09: Greg Roof – Site 3: Schedule a conference call when DDs go Bob Merrill (Due TBD).

SITE 4: GOLF COURSE LANDFILL

- The 6/30 DD date has passed.
- In progress status: RI/FS/PP/DD

9. SITE 8 B & C

Mr. Olson provided an update on Sites 8 B & C. A figure displaying the Site 8 wells was provided for the team. The planned LTM wells specified for dioxin monitoring have all been located. Mr. Olson is currently in the process of writing the LTM plan for the contractors; water levels will be taken at all of the displayed wells, and four of the wells will be sampled.

Action Item A-0810-10: Robert Fisher: Send SOW for LTM Plan for Site 8 to TtNUS (Due 8/17).

Mr. Fisher noted the first set of sediment data may include some surprises; however, they probably will not be related to releases from the site; it is more likely that ECC missed some things. They did a removal on soils that exceeded 15, but the remainder was left. Mr. Fisher noted a memo was sent to Art Conrad several years ago concerning a spot that he believed was missed. There was approximately 60 feet of soil that was never removed.

Mr. Olson noted monitoring wells MW-6, MW-5, MW-13, and MW-9 will be monitored. Mr. Fisher noted the monitoring may end up being every other year since the contaminants are not really moving. The sediment monitoring will be the key.

10. RAPIDGate

Mr. Roof noted that the new access program for the bases is a very lengthy process. In order to bring on other contractors, the company and the employee both have to apply through RAPIDGate to be approved; once the company has filled out the paperwork, the individual employees have to apply. This is a costly and lengthy process that has to be completed yearly. If someone does not have a RAPIDGate pass, they would have to obtain a 1 day pass for every day on base and would only be allowed to be onsite from 8 AM to 2 PM. RAPIDGate offers 90 day passes that cost a little less, which could be useful for subcontracted work. Just be aware of the costs and delays since the security has been privatized. It is not an easy process, and it is going to create a need for longer lead time on field work. Mr. Crane noted that this should begin to be enforced by November 1st.

The team discussed the possible benefits of CAC Cards versus RAPIDGate. Mr. Roof noted that PKI certificates also had to be purchased in addition to the RAPIDGate passes, and that a CAC Card may be the better way to go.

Action Item A-0810-11: Robert Fisher: Address CAC Card vs. Rapid Gate with Tier II (Due 8/11).

11. EGIS

Mr. Roof provided information concerning EGIS. The upgraded software will allow us to produce the EGIS. Extra copies are available for the team if requested. Mr. Roof will provide an EGIS demonstration to the team at the next meeting.

12. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Parking Lot Review:

- Meeting Location
- AO Update (in RPM Update)
- Tier I Agenda

The team discussed the meeting place location.

Action Item A-0810-12: Gordon Crane: Look into the Holiday Inn Express in Longbeach as a potential Tier I meeting location (Due 8/24).

Action Item A-0810-13: Nancy Rouse: Check Hampton Inn for meeting room readiness (Due 8/24).

The team discussed proposed changes for the next Tier I Agenda:

- Tier I Agenda:
- LTM/LUC Discussions
- RPM Update to include - AO Update (Exit of the agreed order)

The next Tier I Meeting will be held November 9-10, 2010.

The next Tier Conference Call is scheduled for 2 PM EST on October 4, 2010.

14. REVIEW DAY 2 ACTION & CONSENSUS ITEMS

The scribe read the Day 2 Action and Consensus Items aloud to the team.

The team reviewed the meeting accomplishments:

- Finalized plans to address Site 5 grass surface.
- Addressed the constructability concerns/issues as a group for Site 4.
- Adjustments were made to the exit strategy based on recognition of complexity of landfill issues.

23. PLUS/DELTA

MEETING REVIEW

<u>+ (pluses)</u>	<u>Δ (deltas)</u>
Nice boardroom	Projector issues
Good cooperation and participation	Expensive coffee
Merrill's solution to the projector issues	Tossed from Blowfly
Chairs	No team outing (due to temp)
Comfort	Bob Fisher and Gordon Crane not feeling well
Team flexibility on emerging issues	
No clatter of carts	
No \$ lost in casino	
Met Greg's family	
Bob Fisher and Gordon Crane participating despite feeling poorly	

23. FACILITATOR FEEDBACK

Ms. Rouse provided facilitator feedback noting that the ground rules were followed better on the second day and that people stayed on topic. Ms. Rouse also expressed her appreciation of team participation in Mr. Roof's new member induction process.

24. LUNCH

23. TIER II UPDATE

Ms. Lockard provided a Tier II update via teleconference. The last Tier II meeting was held June 8-9 in St. Petersburg, FL. New member integration was held for the two new Tier II team members. Ms. Lockard noted that Bob Nashburn had passed along communication from Tier III noting their meetings are open to all levels; if anyone ever wants to attend, an invitation is not required.

Ms. Lockard noted there had been discussion concerning the definition of harmonization noting there are different goals and interpretations of success.

Ms. Lockard also provided an update concerning the EPA National Enforcement Initiative; the Navy is currently going through a dispute process with NAS Whiting Field right now.

Discussion concerning EPA involvement at NCBC Gulfport and NAS Meridian was met with a response that due to the regulatory status of these facilities, an EPA link for these bases would not be necessary. The EPA will not be involved except at a technical level when specifically requested by the state.

Tier II also discussed the life cycle of a partnering team as they go through the active stage, to the transition stage, and then to the care taker stage. This was basically an exit strategy for partnering discussion and a way to look at the success of meeting team goals. Tier II considers NCBC Gulfport and NAS Meridian to be in the active stage. There are teams that have already met RIP and worked through issues; therefore, there was discussion on when to end facilitation. The Tier II team has realized that there were not any well established guidelines on partnering participation; the life cycle wording has not been formally agreed upon, but it is in process and will cover basic guidelines.

Mrs. Lockard noted when the Tier II meeting minutes were finalized they would be shared with the Tier I team.

25. PARTNERING/FACILITATOR EXERCISE

The NCBC Gulfport and NAS Meridian facilitator training sessions were merged to avoid repeating the presentation to those that are members of both teams.

Nancy Rouse distributed handouts (see attached) for her facilitator training session entitled, "Crucial Conversations – Part II." Ms. Rouse noted that the training session had been adapted from the book *Crucial Conversations: Tools for Talking When Stakes are High* by Kerry Patterson, Joseph Grenny, Ron McMillan, and Al Switzler.