

32212-000
22.02.00.0013

NAS JACKSONVILLE IR PARTNERING MEETING

PLACE: USEPA Office
Atlanta, GA

DATE: October 19 & 20, 1994

ATTENDEES (Partners):

<u>Activity</u>	<u>SoDiv</u>	<u>FDEP</u>	<u>USEPA</u>	<u>ABB-ES</u>	<u>Mgm't Edge</u>
W. Raspet D. Lancaster F. Milton	(Absent)	J. Caspary	J. Hudson M. Hartnett	T. Trainor P. Redfern	W. Browne

ATTENDEES (Support):

<u>ABB-ES</u>	<u>BECHTEL</u>	<u>SoDiv</u>
C. Bernier J. Tremaine M. Kauffman	M. Bench	M. Maughon

Discussion

- 1.0 Wandy Browne stated that in view of Dana Gaskin's absence during the Partnering Session planned for both days that the group could not reach consensus on any issue and did we feel that this would be a problem with the Partnering Group. She also pointed out that we had in our Ground Rules procedures for this situation, which were not used for this meeting. It was felt by the Partners that any issue that became a **consensus issue** would be placed in a category of an **understanding** until such time that Dana Gaskins could be apprised of the issue for his consensus.
- 2.0 James Hudson was identified as the meeting Chairperson; Tom Trainor said he would assume the role of the Gate Keeper/Time Keeper.
- 3.0 The Team Ground Rules were read by James Hudson for reaffirmation by all Partnering Team members and to acquaint visitors and support personnel with the manner in which the partnering meetings were conducted.
- 4.0 James stated that he does not have the meeting minutes from the August meeting. Said that he would have them available for tomorrow's meeting.

- 5.0 The Action Items within the Meeting Minutes for September were reviewed. The following is a brief synopsis of this review and the status of each.
- 5.1 Miriam Lareau and Fred Milton of the NAS Jacksonville Public Affairs Office were to revise the Partnering Team Phone List to include Bechtel.
- Status:** Completed...A new call list was passed out at the meeting to all members.
- 5.2 James Hudson was to have mailed the August Meeting Minutes from the August 16 & 17, 1994 Partnering Meeting by September 22, 1994.
- Status:** James stated he would have the minutes ready by October 20, 1994.
- 5.3 Partnering Team was to review the personnel constraints that EPA and FDEP were experiencing specific to their ability to attend Partnering Meetings.
- Status:** This issue has not been totally resolved and was highlighted by the absence of Dana Gaskins and the Tier 2 representative from SoDiv.
- 5.4 SoDiv to establish a 1-800 number for the teleconference scheduled for October 12, 1994.
- Status:** Completed
- 5.5 W. Raspet to have agenda distributed for October 12, 1994 teleconference.
- Status:** Completed
- 5.6 FDEP questioned what was the Navy's goal for PSC 26 and 27 at OU1, following the soil gas survey.
- Status:** This Action Item has been placed on the agenda for the October 19 and 20, 1994 meeting.
- 5.7 The Final Draft of the Focused RI/FS for PSCs 3 & 42 was submitted to FDEP and EPA for review, allowing for a 28 day review cycle. The action is to have review comments ready for discussion for the October 19 and 20, 1994 meeting.
- Status:** FDEP will fax their comments for the Focused RI/FS by Monday October 24, 1994. EPA has not committed to a date.
- 5.8 SoDiv was to review ABB-ES's POA for the OU3 Soil Vapor Extraction Test at Building 106 and 780.
- Status:** The project has been awarded and is scheduled for initiation of the field program on October 31, 1994
- 5.9 SoDiv to distribute the guidance document for the DOD Priority Ranking System

Status: SoDiv was not in attendance at October 19 & 20, 1994 Partnering Meeting to distribute the guidance document.

- 5.10 SoDiv is to brief the Partnering Team on the NAS Jacksonville priority model status input.

Status: This action item is a carryover until the next partnering meeting.

- 5.11 IROD for PSCs 2, 41 & 43 is to be reviewed by FDEP and EPA with comments to ABB-ES by September 23, 1994.

Status: All actions have been conducted in accordance with the needed requirements.

- 5.12 Seeking review comment status for the Remedial Response Decision System (RRDS).

Status: FDEP stated that it has submitted to SoDiv their review comments for the first 6 appendices of the RRDS on October 18, 1994. ABB-ES informed the Partnering Team that it has submitted the second set of six appendices for review to all parties. EPA stated that it has not reviewed the first set of six appendices as it was still in the process of reviewing the RRDS Methodology guidelines.

- 5.13 ABB-ES to mail out the next set of six appendices to all reviewing parties.

Status: Done

- 5.14 EPA to discuss its availability to conduct site screening for the RRDS sites presently under evaluation, who will fund action, etc., at October 12, 1994 conference call.

Status: EPA does not have the funding or manpower to undertake a field investigation of this magnitude. This action item is effectively closed.

- 5.14 Bill Raspet to provide a tour of NAS Jacksonville during the next Partnering Meeting to be held in Jacksonville, Florida.

Status: This action item is a basket item, which will be accomplished during the our next Partnering Meeting in Jacksonville.

- 5.15 A Partnering Team Briefing is needed with the Base Commanding Officer on how partnering initiatives have helped cleanup NAS Jacksonville.

Status: Bill Raspet is putting together some information for Diane Lancaster's brief to the base CO.

- 5.16 Bill Raspet will prepare the base CO's "strawman" presentation for the Partnering Team for the October 19 & 20, 1994 meeting.

Status: Bill Raspet will fax the strawman to the Partnering members during the week of October 24, 1994

- 5.17 FDEP to finalize the "Flow Chart of Partnering" as approved by the Team during the September meeting.

Status: Action item is complete

- 5.18 Activity will check with Jack Banning on the drainage modifications near Hurricane and Braun.

Status: Action item is complete

- 5.19 Bechtel is to assure that all Partnering Team Members have received a copy of the corrected WP and a copy of their response-to-comments.

Status: This issue is a carryover for the RAD response comments.

- 5.20 Bechtel is to provide the locations of the off-site background sample locations to the Public Affairs Office (POA).

Status: It was thought that this issue had been resolved, however, Mark Bench of Bechtel will confirm with Lynn Simms, following her return from vacation.

- 5.21 SoDiv is to review the POA for conducting the pump test at OU1, which is intended to validate the USGS groundwater model.

Status: Action item is complete

- 5.22 SoDiv to send letter to FDEP for two sites (PSCs 7 and 19), which are to be transferred from CERCLA to the UST program as there are no hazardous constituents present.

Status: Unknown

- 5.23 FDEP will check to see if the review comments, which were sent approximately two years ago were actually sent and if the were sufficient (**This section will need some clarification**).

Status: Jorge stated that he will need an agenda for the meeting with FDNR, S. Maynard of NAS JAX, Abyn of NOAA, USFWS, and USEPA, which has been tentatively set for Tuesday November 8, 1994 at 1300.

- 5.24 SoDiv will check with its Contracts Branch to insure that the contract modification has been awarded for the POA for OU1 groundwater remediation.

Status: Action item is complete

- 5.25 NAS JAX is to provide the nearest sanitary sewer location for the OU1 groundwater pump test.

Status: Action item is complete. Bill Raspet states that the location is in the mail.

- 5.26 NAS JAX is to submit Diane Lancaster's MBTI to Wandy Brown of Management Edge.
Status: Action item is complete
- 5.27 SoDiv is to send a letter to State and EPA to solicit their concurrence on the suitability of the lease for Dewey Park.
Status: A letter will be sent (By whom?) to EPA and FDEP re soliciting their concurrence for the lease.
- 5.28 Health Assessment ASTDR coordination by SoDiv (Connie Merding, Code 18).
Status: Carryover
- 5.29 Health Assessment ASTDR-Navy Environmental Health Center Norfolk
Status: Carryover
- 5.30 SoDiv to contact ASTDR on status of Health Assessment
Status: ASTDR to conduct health assessment in January/February 1995.
- 5.31 EPA to coordinate with ASDT contact on priority.
Status: Action item is complete
- 5.32 SoDiv to provide NEHC point-of-contact to EPA
Status: Carryover
- 5.33 ABB-ES and NAS Jacksonville to contact Lt Mitchell to clarify his comment.
Status: Action item is complete
- 5.34 Input from Partnering Team is requested regarding the roadway impact to the background analytical...can these samples be used for background purposes?
Status: Action item needs further discussion and clarification.
- 5.35 James Hudson will check on treatment, types, limits, and methods of dioxins at Superfund Sites.
Status: James states regulations have not been changed as yet.
- 5.36 Ten locations at PSC 26 need to have samples taken for dioxins.
Status: Tom Trainor states that ABB-ES has recovered 6 sediment and 3 surface soil samples, using EPA Method 1613 for dioxin. This action item is complete.

5.37 Should dioxin testing be conducted elsewhere?

Status: Until analytical data has been received by ABB-ES, this issue cannot be resolved.

5.38 NAS Jacksonville to coordinate with ABB-ES regarding the recovery of the Partnering Notebooks.

Status: ABB-ES to provide this data to Fred Milton at PAO.

5.39 SoDiv to resolve the issue of whether or not the abandoned sludge drying beds to the North of OU3 will be included in the AOC and Work Plan for this location.

Status: This issue has not been resolved. FDEP has not received the PCAR for the UST investigation of this site.

5.40 Partnering Team review the Site Management Plan

Status: Action item is complete, however, the Partnering Team will still need a letter from EPA stating their agreement.

5.41 OU3 Plating Shop for POA action by September 30, 1994.

Status: Action item is complete.

6.0 SoDiv review of the budget execution plan was postponed in view of Dana's absence.

7.0 Mike Maughon gave a brief presentation on geostatistics (See Attachment 1) and how the Partnering Team could optimize the work plan efforts through its use. He explained that ABB-ES has been requested by SoDiv to contract Dr. Rouhani's services to evaluate the OU3 Work Plan for its compatibility with the incorporation of geostatistics.

Mike explained that the Partnering Team, as it moves forward, will need to use new and innovative technology to make full use of the diminishing DERA funds available for field investigation.

He feels that we can use geostatistics during all phases of the investigation program; that Geostatistics is not gw modeling and is not a statistical approach using means, etc. Rather, geostatistics allows you to gain the maximum information from the available data in addition to predicting sample locations to meet project objectives without expensive, redundant sampling. It is also a tool for efficient decision making with a scientific basis.

According to Mike, Fred Sloan and Don Hunter of EPA have both been sold on the use of Geostatistics after having taken Dr. Rouhani's course at SoDiv.

Jorge stated that Jim Crane of his office was very receptive to the idea of Geostatistics.

Tom Trainor asked whether Mike is seeking a consensus item be put forth to the Partnering Team

conveying the use of Dr. Rouhani and geostatistical analysis of the OU3 Work Plan or has SoDiv already directed that this action is to happen? Mike stated that SoDiv has already directed ABB-ES Contracts Group to proceed.

If following Dr. Rouhani's review of the OU3 Work Plan there are changes to the document (major) it will no doubt cause some concern on the regulatory level. Regulators will wait until Dr. Rouhani's presentation, scheduled for November 29, 1994 at 1300, to see what impact, if any, there will be.

Fred Milton asked how legally defensible is the statistical approach to field investigation? He also brought out the point that document reviewers will need to be educated in geostatistics if they are to conduct an informed review. James Hudson stated that this is a precedence setting site and we are not in a position to solve all of the problems at this time.

Jorge stated that once we see the presentation by Dr. Rouhani we should be in a better position to make informed decisions regarding the SMP and additional regulatory review.

Peter asked if this review process would be ongoing by Dr. Rouhani or SoDiv, as SoDiv had previously removed its requirement for Draft document review from all schedules and POA cost efforts. By incorporating a review subsequent to regulatory review, created delays in preestablished schedules, added costs, and additional reviews by regulatory authorities should modifications to the work plan be required. Mike Maughon responded by stating that at this point in time he could not say if he would be reviewing all submittals. This issue was left until Dana could be in attendance at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 1215

Meeting recommenced at 1330

- 8.0 Wandy brought out the point that there should be a formal, written agenda prepared, following the end of the telcon scheduled approximately 1 week prior to the scheduled Partnering Meeting.
- 9.0 Wandy mentioned that since Ann Marie Weaver of ABB-ES will be taking meeting minutes at the next Partnering Meeting, which was scheduled for Jacksonville, Florida, how did the Team Members want to handle the rotation of taking the meeting minutes? An agreement was reached by all present that Tom Trainor, who was scheduled to take the meeting minutes, would have his place taken by Ann Marie. This action would take place for all subsequent meeting minute takers, who's turn coincided with a meeting in Jacksonville, Florida. This was not a consensus action.
- 10.0 Wandy asked what has Dana's absence at this meeting done to our Partnering efforts? James felt that in spite of not being able to reach consensus there were several issues that we could address for information purposes. Jorge agreed with James...to him, Dana represents the money aspects of the program. He did state, however that he has issues for Dana re BEI's work Plan. Wandy feels that this is an empowerment issue, which will need to be addressed by us today. There appears to be a breakdown when certain entities don't show up, i.e., Dana. James Hudson stated he will address this issue with Dana and James Malone.

Tom feels that there are two issues re the missing Tier Two link. One is their absence at his meeting and the other is if the Tier Two representative was here, would we give them this issue to handle? It was agreed that the latter action would probably occur. Jorge stated that the situation of how we handle the absence of a Partnering member needs to be addressed with Tier Two.

Wandy indicated that this is a difficult issue and has been discussed with Tier Two...however, it is a non funded money issue at this time with respect to additional personnel.

Bill feels that this meeting can go on without Dana. If there are big issues that need addressing...they will need to be addressed when Dana is here.

Fred asked if we are establishing a precedence with this action, i.e., conducting a meeting without a Partnering Member. It was generally agreed that this would not be the case.

It was agreed that Dana, as well as all other Team Members, will need to review the procedures for attending the meeting and what action is required to notify members in the event of a last minute cancellation. The primary problem with Dana's absence was that his alternate could not attend. It was generally felt by all that he should have cancelled the meeting through ABB-ES.

The message to be taken away from this meeting is that it is a significant negative impact to the team when an entity cannot attend the meeting. Bill stated that from his discussions with Dana that Dana felt that he had significant knowledge of the agenda and felt comfortable that the meeting could continue without him.

Wandy feels that she has no partnering issues she could discuss re the meeting agenda for today and tomorrow in consideration of Dana not being here.

11.0 **SOIL GAS AT OUI...Goal: Obtain a clear direction for field program**

Tom explained the basis for bring up this issue again. He indicated that there has been some concern expressed by Bill, Jorge, and James about the overall purpose of the soil gas issue.

Jorge asked if we found a hot spot during the soil gas survey, would the Navy remove it? He felt that this action would not alleviate the threat of the land fill.

Tom explained that ABB-ES is not trying to characterize the site but rather was attempting to utilize a quick and cost effective procedure to understand given conditions at this location. Tom further explained that ABB-ES did not necessarily look at PSC 26 as a single source but rather as multiple sources that made up the site. One aspect of the survey will be to look for pockets of free product. In addition, ABB-ES will also be looking for the presence of methane at the site, that could effect the landfill cap design. Tom pointed out that in the past when pits have been dug at the site, there have been terrific phenol odors encountered.

Conrad Bernier of ABB-ES explained that ABB-ES needs some assurance, that there is not a continuing release, for design of a complete system. The survey will be conducted on a grid basis, which could pick up other sources as well as developing good engineering data for an overall remediation purposes. The previous consensus reached in a past Partnering Meeting was

to conduct the soil gas survey and then review the data to see what action, if any, would be required. ABB-ES expressed the continuing need for this information for the engineering data it will provide.

Bill Raspet stated that he didn't feel we needed to know all of this information at this time.

Jesse Tremaine explained the technical requirements for the feasibility study necessitated the obtaining of this information. Gases that existed beneath the landfill could be explosive under the right conditions. As such, mitigation actions need to be incorporated within this preliminary design.

Jorge asked if we are looking for engineering data or is ABB-ES looking for sources scattered throughout the site? If so, he felt the soil gas investigation program needed to be expanded. Don't have any information at PSC 26 with respect to the location of solvent pits.

Tom explained that the thought was that the LNAPL area may not be the only site around with free product. Can't just go into the project without this understanding. Tom further explained that rather than install the 60 wells found in the POA for this site ABB-ES had proposed the installation of the soil gas survey as a cost effective alternative.

Jorge, James and Bill stated that they now understand that ABB-ES is looking for engineering design data and free product and have no problem with the investigation at this time. They have all along been in favor of the investigation concept but did not understand the end point from an engineering sense.

12.0 **OU1 LNAPL...Goal: Status Update**

Bill will have an answer tomorrow re when the field work is to begin. His feelings were that it will happen next month, once a piece of equipment has been received. He will need to speak to B.K. Moring.

13.0 **OU1 Surface Water Health Risk... Goal: Status Update**

Tom explained that there was seepage observed in the residential area embankment. ABB-ES took samples in the area and from the results of this analyses there appear to be no significant health risk. A letter has been sent by ABB-ES to Dana Gaskins regarding these findings. Jorge stated that he has not seen his copy as yet. Bill explained that it was in the package provided with the meeting minutes.

14.0 **OU2 Newly Discovered Site...Goal: To expand the PSC 2 AOC to cover this contamination.**

Bill Raspet stated that NAS Jacksonville was in the process of removing of the above ground storage tanks when they found that the soil surrounding the tanks had fuel oil contamination above 500 ppm. Bill stated tht he would like to include this additional area within the AOC boundaries for PSC 2 and have BEI incorporate the area within its remediation of the PSC 2 site.

FDEP and EPA stated that they did not have a problem with allowing BEI to address this additional area during its remediation. Jorge did state, however, that this agreement was based

on the assumption that BEI will not exceed the 1500 cu yd limit imposed by the State. Diane Lancaster will develop a drawing of the affected area and corresponding description for transmittal to FDEP and EPA.

15.0 **OU3 Plating Shop Soil Remediation...Goal: Status Update**

Peter Redfern explained that although the POA had been negotiated with SoDiv, ABB-ES has not received authorization at this point to prepare the Preliminary Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER), which is to be used by Ebasco for its modification of their Work Plan for soil removal and its possible remediation.

16.0 **RDS Comments...Goal: Status Update**

Jorge stated that as far as FDEP was concerned the first 6 sites can be processed for Final designation. A letter has been prepared for submission to SoDiv dated Oct 17, 1994, outlining their requirements for adding a statement to the text for these first 6 sites.

Conrad Bernier asked that for those sites that have No Further Action, could a ROD be processed? Jorge stated that as far as he knew, no other base was preparing a ROD based upon No Further Action. EPA stated that it just can't forget about these sites...need to do something. No Further Investigation vs No Further Action.

Mickey Hartnett (Tier Two link from USEPA) clarified EPA's position. He explained that it was better to say "...yes, there was contamination but there is no need to continue with any further investigation" vice that of saying "...there is no basis for investigation".

James stated that the primary reason he has not submitted his review comments for the first 6 sites was he was still in the process of reviewing the Procedures Document, which was described to him by Joel Murphy as a document that will serve as the basis for similar RRDS activities for all Naval Installations throughout the United States. In consideration of the magnitude that this encompassed, James felt the need to conduct an extremely detailed review of the document.

Mickey Hartnett indicated that the RRDS methodologies document would only apply to NAS Jacksonville. He further stated that other bases were using some similar concepts as contained in RRDS but that it will not be applied unilaterally across SoDiv.

Tom expressed his concern that there are another 6 sites coming out shortly and he did not want to compound an error by not having reviewed the regulatory comments for the first six sites.

Bill Raspet voiced his concern regarding Jerry Young of the City of Jacksonville and what level of input the City might have re the RRDS review of these sites. Jorge felt that they are a stake holder for all work at NAS Jacksonville, but unless the City has its own, promulgated standards for cleanup, which was considered unlikely, they probably would not have legal basis for any action separate from that presently afforded to the State of Florida.

Tom again expressed his concern about the turnaround time presently being experienced on EPA's review of the first set of 6 sites. James felt that he might have the review done by the end of October 1994 for the first 6 sites and the Procedures Document. Both Jorge and James felt

that they could meet their review needs for the second set of six sites by the next partnering meeting scheduled for November 29, 30 and December 1, 1994.

- 17.0 Wandy stated that she is not seeing people jump in to refocus the discussion. We are not self monitoring or self facilitating. Need to work on this at tomorrow's session. She then presented issues that will need to be worked on for the October 20, 1994 meeting:

- 17.1 Need to read the September meeting minutes for next tomorrow's meeting;
- 17.2 Non-consensus...Presenters roles/responsibilities;
- 17.3 Bechtel Member...process of choosing a member; and
- 17.4 Conflict Resolution...written norm.

END OF FIRST DAY OF PARTNERING

Meeting commenced at 0845 on October 20, 1994

- 18.0 **RAC Work Plan for PSCs 2, 41 & 43...Goal: Clarification of the RAC WP**

Jorge stated that the State had been initially confused upon receiving BEI's Work Plan for PSCs 2, 41 & 43 as it did not address soil remediation. Following receipt of the amended Work Plan for soil solidification this issue has been cleared up. He pointed out that there was no definitive driver, other than excavating 6-inches below the bed, for the soil removal limits at each of the drying bed locations and was interested in what level of cleanup will be conducted by Bechtel. He stated that were possible to try to adhere to the State's clean up goals.

Conrad stated that the removal logic employed for this remediation was to excavate to the media, as the filter material was the only material which need to be removed...the filter material was not **media**. It was agreed by all Partnering Members that this position was correct.

Jorge asked during **post** excavation sampling...would ABB-ES be sampling for Appendix 9? It was agreed by all that ABB-ES would sample the remaining soil in accordance with FDEP representative Ashwin Patel's requirements.

Mickey Hartnett explained that Appendix 9 was to cover both CERCLA and RCRA issues. In consideration of our current knowledge of what is actually in the drying beds it allows us the opportunity to conduct less than a full scan for everything. He referenced Bill Neimes comment re sampling all chemicals that were in the domestic and industrial drying beds vice that which was encountered. **The following is an understanding of the Partnering Team:** There will be one composited sample taken and analyzed for "F" Listed wastes from each of the two PSCs (41 and 43) in addition to that previously called out in BEI's Work Plan.

- 19.0 **RAD Work Plan...Goal: Status Update**

Tom stated that ABB-ES has not as yet received its copy of BEI's final response to the RAD Work Plan review comments, following its discussions with BEI during the August 8 and 9, 1994 RAM meeting in Charleston. Tom was looking for a final copy of the WP and a direct response to the review comments. Mark Bench BEI felt assured that there was a letter to B.K. Moring covering all the review issues. BEI to research status of response comments and provide ABB-ES with a final copy of same.

20.0 **Clean Air Act...Goal: Status Update**

This issue was initially brought up by ABB-ES as an offshoot to its expressed concerns for air discharge permit requirements during site remediation.

CERCLA states that all that is needed is to **meet the substantive requirements of the existing permit**. Jorge suggests that NAS Jacksonville should get in touch with the necessary State people and bring them up to speed with what is presently under consideration.

Jesse stated that the basis of CERCLA exclusions is to **not** shut down remedial projects.

21.0 **PSC Overlap...Goal: Resolution to Permitting Requirements**

This issue was raised by Peter based upon his understanding that during the RRDS review process a determination was made by ABB-ES to expand the areal footprint of PSC 1 in a westerly direction, which truncated the tip of the OU2 AOC. This action has effectively overlain OU2 and PSC 1. The question posed to the Partnering Team was "...just what affect, if any, would this have in the permitting process"?

Based upon ABB-ES's evaluation of this site, it would appear that a No Further Action would be warranted. Based upon this potential action it was agreed by the Partnering Team to leave the AOC for OU2 as is presently shown. However, it should be mentioned in the overall RI for OU2 that PSC 1 did exist and its interaction to the AOC for OU2. This is an understanding until Dana can be in attendance to reach consensus.

22.0 **UST Involvement @ NAS JAX...Goal: Is there a need to have a member of the UST Group as a Partner or supporting member?**

Bill Raspet has spoken to NAS Cecil Field's representative with respect to what extent the UST program was involved with the Partnering Team. Bill states that Cecil was set up differently in that their Partnering representative was not involved with any UST. Bill and Diane are both directly involved with all UST issues and felt that they could/would be on top of any UST issue at NAS Jacksonville that might affect any of the IR Project sites.

A brief discussion of the contaminated soils at the Kemen Test Cell ensued, specifically focussing on how they would be handled if the remediation process could not remove those soils under the foundation slab found to be in excess of 50 ppm. It was agreed that at this time we were speculating on the remediation outcome and would wait to see the final results of BEI's remediation before speculating on alternatives.

23.0 **42 Construction Sites at NADEP...Goal: Status Update**

Peter gave a brief overview of the goal of this project. Specifically, NAS Jacksonville will be the recipient of several large pieces of equipment from activities scheduled for closure under BRAC. In addition, there will be some existing buildings that will be expanded and will require building foundation expansions. In consideration of the contaminated soils encountered during the construction of Building 780, the Architect/Engineers (KTB) are trying to identify any potential areas of concern prior to the actual construction process. Peter further explained that of the 42 sites identified approximately 15 will require some form of soil removal for foundation installation purposes. These sites have been separated into three "packages" for construction. However, ABB-ES will conduct its investigation on all three packages vice that of the soil remediation or construction activities, which will be dealt with as individual packages.

ABB-ES's investigations will consist of obtaining two discrete soil samples at the 0 to 2-foot and 2 to 4-foot depths on average, with some sites requiring a sample at the 4 to 6-foot depth, depending upon specific foundation depth, etc. On average, it has been determined that there will be approximately 4 areal sample locations per investigation site. Because of the need to identify any area in question on or before December 16, 1994, all laboratory samples will be conducted on a 3-day turnaround basis. Because of the nature of the area of investigation it has been projected that a TAL and TCL scan would be conducted for each of the soil samples.

Bill Raspet voiced his concern as to whether or not the removal of contaminated soil would constitute a removal action. James Hudson felt that this was not the case.

Mickey Hartnett spoke to the issue of a Removal Contingency Plan.

Lunch Break

24.0 **Presentation of the FSAP for Building 106 and 780...Goal: Obtain FDEP Approval of Verbal Presentation**

Mark Kaufmann gave a presentation of the Field Sampling and Analyses Plan (FSAP) for Building 106 and 780 within OU3. Mark pointed out that Table 2-1 found in the handout (Attachment 2) was the order of events intended for the proposed field investigation. He stated that the first step of this process will be to conduct a field investigation program to assess for the presence of volatile contaminants. Once this data has been collected, ABB-ES would focus on the identified hot spots. The second step in the field program would be the collection of saturated soil samples to identify soil properties and the different parameters which exist that allow for contaminant degradation and volatilization. The constituents shown on Table 2-3 show the analytical parameters which will be conducted on the saturated samples collected at each of the sample locations at each site.

Bill asked if the water table fluctuated greatly. Mark responded that past data indicates that the groundwater level does fluctuate but only about 1 to 2 feet. Will have 2 groundwater extraction wells for both locations along with 2 vapor extraction wells.

Mark spoke about the ABB-ES's Wakefield office and their involvement specific to the bioremediation aspects, i.e., re what kind of micro organisms grow at OU3 and how they could be amended, etc. He mentioned that three tests will be conducted at the two sites; groundwater pumping, which will be a simple low flow test of about .5gpm to assist USGS's groundwater

model; a vapor extraction test (reference Attachment 2); and an air sparging test conducted with the same wells utilized for the pump test.

Jorge questioned why did we only use one air sparging well? Mark explained that we be selecting the highest contaminated area for our test. He went on to explain that this was just a study of the area. Should it be determined from the field program that either of the two sites lend themselves to some form of vapor extraction, an engineering performance plan would be developed for subsequent action by BEI. It was not the intention of this investigation to remediate the site...only to identify its potential for remediation.

Diane Lancaster asked a question about the air sparging filter and what purpose it played in the system. Mark explained that it was a solids filter so the pump did not get plugged up.

Jorge and James both agreed with the content of the presentation. Peter Redfern explained that ABB-ES would take this agreement as approval of the FSAP, which would be prepared as final document and submitted to both FDEP and EPA. He explained that due to the nature of the schedule the Final FSAP would be delivered after the actual start of the field program, which is what necessitated the verbal presentation.

All Partnering Team members agreed with the presentation. However, in view of Dana's absence from the meeting it could not be a consensus issue.

25.0 PSC 42 Wetland Issue...Goal: Determine if the site is a wetland

Jesse Tremaine pointed out that this site is part of a regulated facility and does not fall into the category of a wetland as defined by Florida regulations. Diane Lancaster will speak with Sandy Maynard of her office with respect to setting up a meeting with all interested/affected parties to resolve the issue.

26.0 Wandy pointed out the following issues that need to be addressed:

26.1 November-Jan-Feb Meeting Dates

The November tel conf date is Thurs Nov. 17 at 1000 (Bill will tell Dana)
Can we accomplish everything we need to do, in consideration of the presentation by Dr. Rouhani for the month of Nov. meeting. Start the presentation at 1300. Also need to set aside half hour for the CO's presentation. The next meeting date will be February 15 and 16, with the conference call on Feb 8th at 1000.

26.2 Correction of September Meeting Minutes

Changes to the meeting minutes are being taken by Bill for his incorporation into the revised minutes.

26.3 Action Items...Consensus/Understanding

26.4 New Member Procedure (Basket)

26.5 **Roles & Responsibility of Support People (Basket Item)**

26.7 **Next Meeting Agenda**

26.8 **Base Wide Risk Assessment**

26.9 **Basket Items August, Sept. & Oct.**

Base wide risk assessment (J. Tremaine)¹
IROD/IRA integration into RI/FS-ROD process¹
Meeting length and time¹

26.10 **Bechtel member**

26.11 **Conflict Resolution Norm (Agenda-November)**

¹ Items retrieved from previous Basket Items, which came from the September 1994 meeting.