

N62604.AR.001909
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

TIER I PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 10 AND 11 APRIL 2012 NCBC GULFPORT
MS
4/11/2012
TETRA TECH

**NCBC GULFPORT TIER I PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI
APRIL 10-11, 2012**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Team Members:

Charles Cook	Navy RPM
Gordon Crane	NCBC Gulfport, IRP Manager
Bob Fisher	Tier II Link
Bob Merrill	MDEQ
Greg Roof	Tetra Tech, Project Manager

Adjunct Members/Guests:

Libby Claggett	Tetra Tech, Scribe
Bill Olson	Tetra Tech, Project Scientist
Nancy Rouse	The Management Edge, Facilitator

Absent Members:

Jon Overholtzer	CH2M Hill, Project Manager
-----------------	----------------------------

1. Meeting Opening

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. CT. The Team checked in and shared events since the last meeting. The ground rules were read. The meeting leader will be Greg Roof, and the timekeeper will be Charles Cook.

2. Approval of Minutes

Team members reviewed and approved the December 2011 minutes.

Consensus Item: The December 2011 meeting minutes were approved as final.

3. Review Action Items, Previous Plus/Delta, and Parking Lot

Team members reviewed and updated the action item list and parking lot and reviewed the December 2011 plus/deltas.

Action Items				
Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0611-05	Charles Cook	Done	07/08/2011	Charles is to send the updated Exit Strategy to Team members after receiving it from Greg.
A-0611-08	Gordon Crane	Ongoing	January 2012	Gordon is to inform the "front office" that the Site 3 Decision Document is coming.
A-0611-19	Charles Cook	Done	12/16/2011	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 (for Proposed Plan meetings). Update: a formal court reporter is needed.
A-0911-02	Greg Roof	Done	9/30/2011	Greg is to provide Charles information on the Site 10 monitoring requirements.

Action Items				
Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0911-03	Bill Olson and Greg Roof	Done	11/30/2011	Bill and Greg are to provide the correct lithologic description (thinly interbedded sand and clay) in the Site 3 RI and the Site 1 RI, and reissue both.
A-0911-10	Charles Cook and Greg Roof	Ongoing	3/30/2012	Charles and Greg are to prepare an information package with conceptual ideas regarding the cap design at Site 1 and schedule a meeting with NCBC personnel.
A-0911-12	Charles Cook	Done	9/23/2012	Charles is to check on funding Sites 2 and 7 together for remedial construction and design. Update: The sites are in different phases and cannot be funded together.
A-1211-01	Charles Cook	Ongoing	12/14/2011	Charles will talk to Steve Beverly and Bob Fisher about DD brownfield and Site 8 with off base AOC.
A-1211-02	Gordon Crane	Done	12/9/2011	Gordon is to send the CIP to the RAB members.
A-1211-03	Greg Roof	OBE	12/25/2011	Greg is to determine if there is enough existing funding to additional methane measurements at Site 3. If adequate funding is available, he will put together an informal plan and provide it to the team.
A-1211-04	Greg Roof	Done	1/15/2012	Greg is to get an electronic Admin Record copy to Gordon for the information repository.
A-1211-05	Greg Roof	Done	12/25/2011	Greg is to contact Glenn Wagner concerning the whereabouts of the Admin Record.
A-1211-06	Greg Roof	Ongoing	12/16/2011	Greg is to verify Site 2 response to comments and change pages for the UFP SAP to Bob Merrill and to the team.
A-1211-07	Greg Roof	Done	12/16/2011	Greg is to request comments for Site 6 Monitoring Reports as needed to Bob Merrill as well as the Five-Year Review Comments.
A-1211-08	Jon Overholtzer	Ongoing	12/25/2011	Jon is to send a copy of "as built" reports for Sites 4, 5, and 10 to Charles, and only send Site 4 to Bill and Greg.
A-1211-09	Greg Roof	Done	12/7/2011	Greg is to email Gordon the completed Exit Strategy.
A-1211-10	Greg Roof	Done	12/25/2011	Greg to send Site 4 DD to Bob Merrill.
A-1211-11	Bill Olson	Done	12/8/2011	Bill to send Greg Battelle's DD for Site 6.
A-1211-12	Gordon Crane	Done	12/9/2011	Gordon to send Charles the Site 8 DD.
A-1211-13	Nancy Rouse	Done	12/9/2011	Nancy to contact RAB about the meeting change.

Action Item: Gordon is to send Greg a list of documents missing from the Administrative Record.

Previous Plus/Delta	
+	Δ
Discussions were more significant that were necessary to move the program forward or were resolved	Eliminate electronic distractions
Better meeting room	
Good technical discussion/presentations	
Good participation by parties	

4. Site 8 Long-term Monitoring (LTM) Discussion (from Parking Lot Review)

Action Item: Charles is to write a Letter of Intent to close the Site 8 off-base Areas of Concern under CERCLA and not Brownfields.

The Team reached consensus that Site 8, to include on-base contiguous areas and off-base Areas of Concern, will be closed using CERCLA and not Brownfields. The Edwards property will be addressed via a separate letter that describes the remedial action process for that site only. The Edwards property is not a part of Site 8 and was not in the CERCLA process.

Team members discussed revising the Decision Document (ROD Amendment) or do an ESD.

Action Item: Charles is to discuss the document options (ROD Amendment versus ESD) with Steve Beverly to determine the path forward for Site 8.

The Team discussed the LTM for Site 8. Bob M. wants us to monitoring off site groundwater. Charles is not inclined to do so since the most recent sampling indicated the groundwater was clean. Bob M. stated the monitoring of a remedy is general practice. Charles stated that performance monitoring will be conducted to ensure the remedy remains protective, but performance monitoring is not the same as LTM. Bob F. suggested reviewing the data from the off-base sampling.

Action Item: Bill is to present Site 8 off-base groundwater data to the Team at the next meeting.

5. Agenda Review

Team members reviewed the agenda and modifications were made accordingly.

6. NAVFAC RPM Update

Charles would like to propose a schedule for the projects (i.e., Gantt chart) to track dates and ensure funding is not lost. Greg showed Team members the Naval Station Mayport document schedule he created in Microsoft Project. The document schedule is divided by site and resource loading is available. Team members discussed the document schedule regarding what was needed (data and column headings), how often the schedule would be updated (every other week), etc. Charles requested the document schedule be updated and sent to the Team every other week.

Action Item: Greg is to prepare a document schedule for NCBC Gulfport by the next meeting.

Some funding is expiring. Before funding expires, it may be pulled and used for NIRIS and other items. Some documents may need to be prepared after funding expires.

The Navy is working on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Gordon. Greg stated that Tetra Tech will be available to support work on the MOA. Charles stated there should be enough funding for the work on the MOA.

7. Tier II Update

There has not been a Tier II meeting since the December 2011 NCBC Gulfport meeting.

Expiring 2007 funds are being used to support work so CTO funding is not used.

Gordon stated that a new site was found at NCBC Gulfport; MILCON funding was used to remediate the site.

Action Item: Bob F. is to prepare a site request and enter Site 11 Army Warehouse (Building 215) Disposal Area into NORM upon approval.

Team members discussed the Exit Strategy revision being done in Florida.

Charles stated that it would be helpful to him as a Navy RPM to have a clear understanding of Tier II's expectations of him and of the Team.

8. Site 3 Corrective Action Proposed Modifications

Greg provided a presentation on Site 3 that included a historic overview, the municipal landfill presumptive remedy directive, and the proposed changes. The proposed corrective action changes at Site 3 include the following:

- Eliminate low permeability cover
 - Waste material at depth of 4-8 feet reported in the RI, but 1-4 feet bls in cover assessment
 - Groundwater typically < 2 feet bls
 - Precedent at other military landfills
- Landfill Gas Monitoring and Management
 - Limit generation

The proposed changes would provide the following:

- Less restrictive re-use – no gas vents in way, more freedom to shape area as needed
- Limited benefit of cap versus cover
- Cost savings to the Navy

Five vadose samples were taken, and all readings were less than instrument detection levels for methane and LEL. Bob M. does not think believe samples are representative of the landfill.

Bob M. asked about the landfill liner material – the base (natural liner) of the landfill. At this landfill, trenches were dug, and wastes were burned in the trenches. Bob M. stated there is not enough data to characterize the liner, and that a 10^{-5} cover would probably apply because it is not known what the liner is. Bob M. stated that if more samples were taken and vertical hydraulic conductivity testing conducted, it is likely the liner material is less permeable than originally thought.

Bob F. stated that the path forward for Site 3 seems to be: 1) conduct more study to determine natural liner material from hydraulic conductivity standpoint or 2) default back to original corrective action.

Greg asked Bob M. if there was any way the landfill could be remedied without completely stripping the site (like at Sites 4 and 5). Bob M. stated it was not a good idea because an uncovered landfill is a target,

will be monitoring for a long period, and it would be cheaper to put a cover on the landfill. Plus, it is a decision he cannot make on his own and it would have to be elevated to higher management.

Bob F. stated that most of the landfills are at a lower elevation than the surrounding areas because the surrounding areas have been built up over the years without building up the landfills. This is particularly true for Site 1. Bob F. asked if the capping could focus on the individual cells (trenches) rather than dealing with a major parcel. The cost to cap the entire site is not feasible. Bob M. agreed that if the cells can be identified, it could be done that way. Bob F. also asked about consolidating some of the cells at the same site to make the sites easier to manage.

Charles said he will report back to his management with the information regarding Site 3 and work out a solution. Bob F. stated the Navy would like to get away from covering an entire site (full extent of study area) and just cover the trenches; Site 1 will be a similar case.

Action Item: Charles is to arrange a conference call with Team members after obtaining a proposed approach for Site 3 from his management.

Discussion ensued regarding Site 3 being in a flood plain. Bob M. stated that if Site 3 is in a flood plain, it can be assumed the natural liner of the landfill is clay since the ponds hold water. Also, it shows the site is hydraulically connected to the ambient water that is in all flood plains. Bob M. suggested plotting the landfills directly onto a topographic map in order to show they are in a flood plain. After reviewing topographic and other maps, Bob M. agreed that Site 3 is in a flood plain, the natural liner of the landfill is no longer an issue, a low permeability cover would not work, and minimum 2 foot vegetative cover would be sufficient. Sites 2 and 7 are in the same flood plain. Bob M. does not have any issues regarding the monitoring of groundwater at Site 1, and methane will not be an issue since Site 3 will not be capped.

Greg suggested completing a basewide groundwater background study. Bob M. was receptive to the idea.

The Team reached consensus that Site 3 is in a flood plain, and it will cause changes in the way the design is approached.

Action Item: Greg is to plot Sites 1, 2, 3, and 7 on flood plain maps and verify if Site 1 is in a flood plain or not.

Action Item: Greg and Charles are to discuss the administrative requirements associated with changes to Site 3 (revised FS, new PP, DD, etc.).

9. Discussion of Corrective Action Approach for Sites 1, 2, and 7

The cost to cap the landfill at Site 1 is not feasible. Sites 2 and 7 are in a flood plain, and it is possible that Site 1 is also in a flood plain. A similar approach will be taken at Sites 1, 2, and 7 as is being taken at Site 3.

10. MOA Discussion

Gordon provided copies of the LUCIPs (Appendix B) for Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Gordon also provided the checklist the Navy uses in the NIRIS LUC Tracker and a copy of the checklist the Air Force uses. Gordon asked if the state had a particular format for a LUCIP, and Bob M. replied they did not.

Action Item: Libby is to reformat the NIRIS LUC Tracker checklist into a form that can be used by field crews. **Done**

Action Item: Bill is to have GIS coordinate points added to the site maps for every site and send to Gordon for the LUCIPs.

Charles stated information on reporting and violations may need to be added to the MOA. Gordon would like to see something in the MOA stating that changes will be made.

Per Bob F., Navy Headquarters has redefined how site boundaries are established. It is now the maximum extent of contamination identified. LUC boundaries will eventually be re-evaluated. Team members discussed buffer zones around LUCs.

Gordon stated he will review the MCRD Parris Island LUC RD and incorporate some of the items into the Gulfport site LUCIPs along with site maps.

Action Item: Gordon is to send Greg a copy of the MOA.

11. Review Day 1 Action Items

Team members reviewed the action items generated during Day 1.

DAY 2

The Day 2 meeting began at 9:00 a.m. CT.

12. Check-In/Opening Remarks

Team members shared events from the previous night.

13. Site 7 Preliminary Remedial Investigation Results

Bob M. asked if the full TCL list will be sampled. Greg responded that the next phase will include full TCL sampling.

Charles asked about vapor intrusion; Tetra Tech has not received the Gore sober results at this time.

The magnetometer results indicate a wide-spread area of debris, but no real trend such as what is found at Site 2. Magnetic anomalies were found in the wooded areas. Metallic debris and concrete are visible in the wooded area as well. No large pieces of debris were found. The waste found is a thin layer 1 to 2 feet thick.

Soil sampling will be conducted in the waste disposal area. The exact locations are not known at this time. Tetra Tech will put together a new strategy based on Site 3 discussion. Site 7 is in the flood plain as well.

Bob M. asked if hydraulic conductivity measurements would be taken. Greg stated the measurements would be added to the plan.

14. Site 2 Risk Assessment Results

The preliminary HHRA identified the only constituent retained as a COC at Site 2 is chromium in surface soil, subsurface soil, and sediment. There are no COCs identified for surface water.

The preliminary ERA retained numerous COPCs because no screening values exist for many of the constituents. The eco risk for surface soil will be eliminated because there is not a lot of habitat use. It is unknown if the pond contains fish; however, Bob M. believes there is a habitat in the pond. Gordon stated the rule on the Base is catch and release, so any birds would be affected. Tetra Tech will investigate how detailed of an ERA will be conducted.

At this time, no groundwater contamination is migrating off site. There are three well nests at the edge of the site near Canal #1, and samples from the well nests are clean.

15. Review Exit Strategy, Long- and Short-term Goals, and Document Review Status

The Exit Strategy was reviewed and updated accordingly.

Action Item: Charles is to discuss with Steve Beverly issues relating to changes for the Site 3 remedial action, including whether a new Proposed Plan needs to be prepared or not.

Action Item: Greg is to send the updated Exit Strategy to Team members. **Done**

Action Item: Greg and Charles are to evaluate the status of Site 1.

Bob M. asked if he was going to get as-builts for Site 4. Charles stated they will be in the completion report. Bob M. stated he has not received any completion reports.

Action Item: Charles is to check on the status of the CH2M HILL completion reports and ensure Bob M. has copies and the reports are in the Admin Record.

Action Item: Gordon is to have a Base map with site locations generated and send it to Bob M.

Action Item: Greg is to provide a cost estimate for reducing the scope (+/- 20% order of magnitude) for Site 3 to Charles.

16. NCBC Gulfport Public Website Discussion

The Navy through NAVFAC is developing public websites for the Administrative Record and other documents for public viewing. Each installation will have its own public website, and the website will be designed by the Team. Greg showed Team members some public websites from other installations.

17. Next Tier I Meeting and RAB Meeting Agendas

Next Meeting: July 16, 2012, poster session (if needed) at 5:30 p.m. and presentations at 6:00 p.m.

Location: Good Deeds Community Center

July 2012 Proposed RAB Meeting Agenda		
Description	Presenter	Time
Site 3 Proposed Plan	Greg Roof	
Site 1 Proposed Plan	Greg Roof	
Remember to send RAB presentations to Libby		

Action Item: Nancy is to contact the RAB regarding July 2012 meeting date.

Action Item: Gordon is to book the Good Deeds Community Center for the July 2012 RAB meeting.

18. Round Table Discussion

Team members reviewed the parking lot and discussed outstanding items.

19. Review Action Items

Team members reviewed the action items generated during the meeting.

20. Plus/Delta, Meeting Accomplishments

Plus/Delta	
+	Δ
Nice meeting room	Training after the meeting closeout and lunch – possibly eliminate group training with Meridian
Nice hotel	Success Stories not being developed
Good Site 3 discussion and agreements	
Meeting in Jackson for a change	
Used principled negotiation style for getting to conclusions on the landfills	

Meeting Accomplishments:

- Site 3 – develop a Success Story
- Carried over decisions from Site 3 for consideration at Sites 1, 2, and 7

Action Item: Charles is to develop a Success Story on the money saved at Site 3.

21. Facilitator Feedback

Nancy restated she was impressed with the discussion and decisions on Site 3.

22. Meeting Closeout

Next Meeting: July 17-18, 2012, beginning at 9:00 a.m. CT on Day 1

Location: Hampton Inn, Biloxi, Mississippi

Meeting Leader: Charles Cook

Timekeeper: Gordon Crane

July 2012 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 – Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 2 – RI (FS?), Risk Assessments	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 3 – Design	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 4 – Monitoring, possible Aerostar monitoring?	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 7 – Update	Greg Roof	30 min	Information
Site 8 – Groundwater Data Presentation	Bill Olson	30 min	Information
Site 8 – Update	Greg Roof/ Charles Cook	30 min	Information
LTM Update	Aerostar	30 min	Information
Exit Strategy Review	Greg Roof	15 min	Standard
Community Involvement Plan Implementation / RAB Meeting Review	Gordon Crane	45 min	Information

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.

July 2012 Proposed Meeting Agenda			
Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
Tier II Update	Bob Fisher	15 min	Information
Site Tour (in the morning)	All	240 min	Information
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
Training	Nancy Rouse	60 min	Learning
Remember to send any presentations to Libby			

Action Item: Gordon is to investigate passes for Team members to have a site tour at NCBC Gulfport.

Future Meeting Dates

<u>Dates</u>	<u>Location</u>
RAB Meeting – October 15, 2012	TBD
Tier I Meeting – October 16-17, 2012	TBD

Conference Call Dates

June 14, 2012, 2:00 p.m. EST – agenda and discuss training topics