

32212-000
22.02.00.0016

NAS Jacksonville IR Partnering Meeting

MINUTES

10 - 12 January 1995

Chairman: Jorge Caspary

Members: Diane Lancaster, Hermann Bauer, Dana Gaskins, Peter Redfern, Martha Berry, Fred Milton

Absent: Kevin Gartland, Tom Trainor

Tier II Link: None

Facilitator: Wandy Browne

Support: Mike Maughan, Hal Davis, Mike Planert, Bill Weber, Wayne Britton, Mark Kaufman, Jesse Tremaine

Location: Tallahassee, FL

1. The meeting began with the team huddle, team member greeting and check-in, and assignment of team meeting organizational roles. The guest introductions and self instructions, reading of the team ground rules, and introduction of Martha Berry as EPA Partnering representative were deferred until later due to no guests at this time and the flight delay of Martha.
2. Discussion of the new EPA representative to replace James Hudson was brought up and discussed. The team realized there could be no consensus reached on any items without EPA being a team member. The decision was made that the new representative would be brought on as a member and if at a later date there seemed to be a problem, she would then be re-evaluation.
 - **CONSENSUS ITEM:** The team brought the new EPA representative onboard as a member.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** NAS (Fred) to update telephone/fax cards.
3. The team noted there was no Tier II link at the meeting. The question was raised as to whether there will no longer be a Tier II link at our meetings. This is something which Tier II will have to provide an answer.
4. The previous meeting's minutes were reviewed and comments were made as to changes necessary.
 - **CONSENSUS ITEM:** Consensus was reached on the previous meeting's minutes.
5. The action items were reviewed with the following results.
 - Team to ensure each entity is represented at each meeting.
Each entity was represented.
 - Team to review impact of the delay in receiving EPA comments on the *Focused RI/FS work plan or RI/FS report for PSC 3 and 42*.
Discussed and dismissed as an action item.

- SODIV to give brief on NAS Jacksonville priority model status.
SODIV requested the team review the *DOD Relative Risk Site Evaluation Primer* and provide questions so the correct information/persons may be provided at the next meeting. Questions were requested 7 to 10 days prior to the next meeting.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Team to provide informal comments to SODIV 7 to 10 days prior to next meeting.
- NAS to give base tour at next Jacksonville meeting.
The team discussed this item and agreed that the entire team would take the tour to receive an update on the OUs and PSCs.
- NAS/team to give CO briefing in March 95.
This item has been deferred until the summer after the new CO is onboard.
- Bechtel to give NAS the off-site background sample locations for the RAD Survey.
The draft report is due out 17 January. Bechtel requested a list of recipients for reports. The team came up with the following list: 1) ABB-ES (1 copy), 2) NAS (2 copies), 3) FDEP (1 copy), 4) EPA (1 copy), & SOUTHDIR (2 copies).
- NAS to send a letter to EPA and FDEP regarding the lease of PSC 36, Dewey Park.
Complete. FDEP has replied; EPA owes response.
- EPA is to contact ATSDR for impact of health assessment on the RI/FS and ROD for OU1.
Action incomplete.
- NAS to determine if partnering history notebook should be put in the information repository.
Complete - NAS opts not to keep it in the information repository.
- The NAS is to send the UST Contractor CAR on the 119 tanks removal to FDEP. ABB is to send the CAR for the site to FDEP. A decision on including the area (old east waste water treatment plant sludge drying beds) in the OU3 AOC is pending team review of the ABB report.
On hold. NAS to contact SOUTHDIR UST.
- FDEP/EPA to send a letter concurring with the 1995 SMP.
This item was deferred due to the unknown impact of the OU3 work plan changes.
- SODIV to respond to item 12.0 of November Partnering Meeting Minutes. (LNAPL Update - when is field work to begin?).
Complete - Mobilization to begin 31 January.
- NAS is to provide the team copies of the UST CAR and a drawing (if available) of the contamination identified from the tanks removed at PSC 2. Bechtel will use the available information to remove the contaminated soil under the tanks and line to PSC 2.
Complete.
- NAS to send a letter to the Army Corp of Engineers requesting a federal wetland determination for PSC 42.
Complete.
- Bechtel to send the team a copy of the Radiological work plan response comments.
Bechtel needs to send to SODIV (Dana Gaskins) and NAS (Diane Lancaster).
- SODIV to verify that USGS will meet the delivery date for numerical modeling.
Complete.

- EPA to modify the letter to state that the IRA could be accomplished under 17-770 but that the final cleanup had to be under CERCLA.
EPA owes.
- ABB to provide team with the soil removal risk alternative letter regarding the old plating shop.
Complete.
FDEP/EPA do not need to approve or review soil removal work plan. Public notice of removal will be handled by NAS (Fred Milton). Action Memo will be provided upon completion.
TRC/RAB will be appraised of action. Preliminary Economic Evaluation Report (PEER) to be provided to team for info.
- Team to review Dr. Rhouhani's report by the next partnering meeting.
On-going.
- EPA behind on RDS Methodology document review and PSCs 6, 26, and 39 review and comment. Will provide on 10 January in Tallahassee along with the 5 PSCs in the 3rd package delivered in November.
EPA owes; FDEP asked for a 30-day extension on review.
- NAS to submit nationwide to USACE re: Polishing Pond.
Complete.
- NAS to take pictures to include in the next newsletter of the ROICC pre-construction conference for the OU1 LNAPL Interim Removal Action. Conference will be on December 12.
Action item deleted.
- NAS to confirm placement of IDW water into new fire fighting training pit for PSC 2 by December '94.
NAS has stated there is no oil-water separator at the new fire fighting training pit, therefore IDW water must be containerized. *Can go to WWTP w/ pretreatment*
- SODIV and ABB negotiate OU2 RI/FS.
Ongoing.
- SODIV letter to Petroleum Contamination Agreement (PCA) @ FDEP to transfer PSCs 7 and 19.
Ongoing.
- FDEP and EPA concurrence letters on NFRAP PSCs.
FDEP and EPA owe.
- ABB (Trainor) add BEI and ABB (Peter Redfern) to RRDS list.
Complete.
- ABB (Trainor) to coordinate January Tallahassee meeting.
Complete.
- SODIV clarify DERA execution funding as described in notes.
Complete.
- Hudson to clarify and submit letter by January meeting on issues with PSC 2 IROD agreement to 17-770 may not meet CERCLA requirements.
EPA owes.

- Team review Kevin's IR Blueprint and provide comments at January meeting. Complete.

- Bechtel to identify their second partner by March '95. Ongoing.

6. Agenda # 2.5 RAD Survey update.

A hot spot was found in the area where the LNAPL trench is to be placed. The hot spot will be removed and placed across Child Street inside the fenced area to allow the LNAPL project to continue.

PSC 26 is still ongoing. A hot spot was found along the moat and the survey will cross the moat to clear that side.

PSC 13 - Bechtel SAP has been sent to SODIV (BK Moring) for determination of volume for removal.

PSCs 17 and 18 are next to be surveyed.

what does this mean?

7. Diane Lancaster made the suggestion that the team cover all PSCs. It was agreed that each OU would be discussed and all information pertained to the OU would be discussed at that time.

LUNCH

8. Agenda # 1.5 Read team ground rules.

9. Agenda # 3.1 Bldg 106 and 780 field investigation presentation

ABB (Mark Kaufman) presented the results of the field investigations at buildings 106 and 780 (see attachment 1). The results indicated that although the areas are relatively close, the soil conditions, the types of contaminants, and the recommended IRAs are not the same. FDEP commented that the sources of the contamination need to be stopped prior to trying any remediation. NAS responded that at building 106 we know what the source was and it has been stopped.

- **ACTION ITEM:** ABB is to provide a letter to NAS identifying contaminants and levels found in the building 106 and 780 field investigation.

10. Agenda # 3.2 OU 3 Work Plan *Where do we go from here:*

• Goal: Finalize OU3 Work Plan.

ABB (Jesse Tremaine) presented an observational approach to give direction to finalizing the OU3 Work Plan (attachment 2). Due to varying conditions at OU3, the thoughts of the presentation were that the different hot spots could be evaluated and actions taken where feasible. The method of handling this would be by using an EE/CA and could handle several of the hot spots at one time. This would provide better information for inclusion in the RI/FS. The schedule for the RI/FS would be extended but removal action could be ongoing. Another point is that there may be no further remediation required by the RI/FS. The work plan goals and objectives will not have changed.

A set of Decision Rules will be developed which direct the decision making process. The number of DPT points is not known at this time. That is one of the items which will be determined by use of the Decision Rules. Geostatistics is one of the tools which may be used for the decisions.

11 January 1995 - Morning

11. Wandy led the team in partnering work.

Began development of a list of technical milestones (attachment 3).

Developed a list of partnering successes (attachment 4).

Developed a list of items which need improvement (attachment 5).

Martha Berry received a mini-introduction to the partnering process.

12. Agenda # 3.2 OU3 Work Plan continued.

Geostatistics pluses and minuses. Geostatistics was discussed to determine if the team desired to use it in the development of the OU3 RI/FS.

- **CONSENSUS ITEM:** Geostatistics will be used as a cost saving tool to the extent useful.

Jesse Tremaine provided info on EE/CA versus RI/FS (attachment 6).

EPA was asked what the feelings would be toward using an EE/CA for OU3. The response was that if the team felt it was a good idea the probability of getting their management approval would be better.

- **ACTION ITEM:** The team needs to buy-in using an EE/CA for OU3 to support our EPA partner.

- **CONSENSUS ITEM:** The team reached consensus on using an EE/CA at OU3 for hot spots remediation.

- **ACTION ITEM:** FDEP needs time-line for EE/CA implementation. (SODIV/ABB) *will be done as part of POA*

It was agreed that Decision Rules will be developed and that an additional Partnering Meeting would be needed to solidify them.

- **CONSENSUS ITEM:** OU3 Work Plan to stand as is except for slight changes to reflect EE/CAs. EE/CAs to be sent out as addenda.

13. Agenda # 2.3 SODIV present current budget execution plan

Team has not reviewed execution plan but, agrees to call SODIV (Dana) if there should be any questions.

14. Agenda # 3.4 Discussion on the subject of OU1 risk evaluation, with the purpose of establishing a meeting and gaining agreement with regulatory review representatives re: risk approach to be taken for this operable unit.

- **ACTION ITEM:** ABB is to provide a memo by the end of this month with an agenda and questions for the meeting.

15. Agenda # 2.4 Operable Unit Update

- OU1 Update

The following obstacles were presented which could affect the RI/FS:

1. Data not in for the RAD survey.
2. Soil Gas survey which starts 16 January.
3. Contaminant Fate and Transport model will be 2 to 3 months.
4. LNAPL - The assumption is that if soil gas survey shows something, it will be handled by the LNAPL IRA and that the LNAPL IRA will work.
5. The Flow Model will be done.
6. ABB will need all data by the end of the month to complete RI/FS to support September ROD.

LUNCH

16. Agenda # 3.12 USGS Presentation of their groundwater modeling efforts and concerns and logistics of their conducting the contaminate fate and transport modeling. Presentation was by Hal Davis with Mike Planert in support.

The entire base is now one model.
The shape of the Hawthorn is now much better defined.
The flow model is basically complete (slight tweaking needed).
Creek north of OU1 by golf course should be sampled if not already done.
USGS is to have an internal meeting to try to reduce time for review of report documents.
USGS needs to be appraised of needs and dates for support of OU2 and OU3 and any other projects.
OU1 contaminant fate and transport model will be done for additional information and use.

- **Action Item:** NAS is to provide USGS a list of wells with available data.
- **Action Item:** ABB will also provide their well data to USGS.

17. Agenda # 3.5 *Installation Restoration Program Blueprint*
No comments were provided by team.

18. New Agenda Item: Bechtel brought their concerns about how field changes to their work plan is to be handled.

The agreement is that Bechtel is to provide a letter to the ~~NAS~~ ^{SODIU ANY} on ~~field~~ changes and ~~NAS~~ ^{SODIU} will provide a letter to EPA/FDEP for notification.

19. Agenda # 3.6 Present Latest RRDS Appendices

PSC 30 - Further Remedial Action (RI/FS)
PSC 11 - OU3 RI/FS
PSC 46 - Site screening
PSC 12 - OU3 RI/FS
PSC 14 - OU3 RI/FS
PSC 10 - NFRAP

- **Action item:** NAS is to send EPA a copy of reference report and tech memo for PSC 10.

PSC 2 - OU2 RI/FS
PSC 8_r - Site Screening
PSC 20 - Site Screening
PSC 45 - RI/FS recommended (include in OU3)
PSC 23 - Site Screening

FDEP (Jorge Caspary) expressed concerns re: which documents need to be reviewed next; needs prioritization for document review. Basic thoughts are that primary documents receive review first.

20. Agenda # 3.7 EPA's position re: James Hudson's comments concerning the UST criteria for soil removal at PSC 2 as an ARAR.

EPA (Martha Berry) will check on.

21. Agenda # 3.8 Status update for LNAPL removal at OU1 and its interaction/integration with the OU1 FS.

Mobilization of RAC (Foster Wheeler) to begin 1-30-95. LNAPL removal to be integrated into OU1 RI/FS.

22. Agenda # 3.10 How does NAS propose to deal with the spot soil removal actions at PSC 3?

NAS wants hot spot removal to occur with PSC 42 remediation. PSC 3 hot spot remediation will occur with PSCs 41 and 43 per agreement between BEI, ABB, and NAS.

23. Agenda # 3.11 What is the status of the St. Johns River sample requirements (attachment 7)...does the river become an OU?

Status of the river will be determined later, probably by Natural Resource Trustees (NRT).

24. Agenda # 3.13 Activity presentation of February RAB meeting schedule, agenda, specific requirements, etc.

TRC meeting tentatively scheduled for 30 Jan @ 1300. Will turned into a RAB.

25. Agenda # 2.4 Operable Unit Update (continued)

- OU2 Update

Final Draft of the Proposed Plan for PSC 3 and 42 out 01/09.

Final FRI/FS for PSC 3 and 42 out 01/11.

Response to comments will be made in the document and marked to show change. An

unmarked copy of the document will be sent with the marked copy.

Pipe at PSCs 41 and 43 needs to be added.

- OU3 Update

Peer report is to be out 01/13.

- **Action Item:** ABB is to prepare a flow chart for the EE/CA.

26. General

- Meeting minutes

Meeting Minutes are to identify the action party with the action item.

Agenda to be set up by OU with all items pertaining to the OU located there.

Minutes are to be dated with meeting dates.

Agenda items should be sent to SODIV for the February meeting.

- Upcoming meetings/telcons

Changed February meeting dates to the following: Start 1300 13 February - end 1500 15 February.

Changed March meeting location to Jacksonville.

Set April meeting: Start 0900 25 April - end 1600 26 April.

Set April telcon: 1000 16 April.

12 January 1995 - Morning

27. Reviewed technical milestones (attachment 3)

28. Worked on the following partnering items.

Sources of conflict.

Communication.

Collaborative mediation or negotiation process.

resolving conflicts.

Brainstorming.

End of meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

1. NAS (Fred) to update telephone/fax cards.
2. Team to ensure each entity is represented at each meeting. Ongoing item.
3. SODIV to give brief on NAS Jacksonville priority model status.
SODIV requested the team review the *DOD Relative Risk Site Evaluation Primer* and provide questions so the correct information/persons may be provided at the next meeting. Questions were requested 7 to 10 days prior to the next meeting.
Team to provide informal comments to SODIV 7 to 10 days prior to next meeting.
4. NAS to give base tour at next Jacksonville meeting. Entire team to take tour and use as an update.
5. NAS/team to give new CO briefing after his arrival.
6. Bechtel to give NAS the off-site background sample locations for the RAD Survey.
7. The NAS is to send the UST Contractor CAR on the 119 tanks removal to FDEP. ABB is to send the CAR for the site to FDEP. A decision on including the area (old east waste water treatment plant sludge drying beds) in the OU3 AOC is pending team review of the ABB report.
8. FDEP/EPA to send a letter concurring with the 1995 SMP. On hold due to the unknown impact of the OU3 work plan changes.
9. Bechtel to send SODIV (Dana Gaskins) and NAS (Diane Lancaster) a copy of the Radiological work plan response comments.
10. Bechtel needs EPA to modify the letter to state that the IRA could be accomplished under 17-770 but that the final cleanup had to be under CERCLA.
11. Team to review Dr. Rouhani's report. On-going.
12. EPA owes RDS Methodology document review and PSCs 6, 26, and 39 review and comment.
13. SODIV and ABB negotiate OU2 RI/FS. Ongoing.
14. SODIV letter to Petroleum Contamination Agreement (PCA) @ FDEP to transfer PSCs 7 and 19. Ongoing.
15. FDEP and EPA concurrence letters on NFRAP PSCs.
16. Hudson to clarify and submit letter by January meeting on issues with PSC 2 IROD agreement to 17-770 may not meet CERCLA requirements
17. Bechtel to identify their second partner by March '95. Ongoing.
18. ABB is to provide a letter to NAS identifying contaminants and levels found in the building 106 and 780 field investigation.
19. A set of Decision Rules will be developed which direct the decision making process. The number of DPT points is not known at this time. That is one of the items which will be determined by use of the Decision Rules. Geostatistics is one of the tools which may be used for the decisions.

20. FDEP needs time-line for EE/CA implementation. (SODIV/ABB)
21. ABB is to provide a memo by the end of this January with an agenda and questions for the meeting with regulatory representatives re: risk approach to be taken for OU1. Discussion on the subject of OU1 risk evaluation, with the purpose of establishing a meeting and gaining agreement with regulatory review
22. NAS is to provide USGS a list of wells with available data.
23. ABB will also provide their well data to USGS.
24. NAS is to send EPA a copy of report referenced by RDS and tech memo for PSC 10.
25. ABB is to prepare a flow chart for the EE/CA.

Needs Improvement Items

1. Fine tune communication.
2. Action items need to be completed before meeting.
3. Revisiting subjects again vs. combining presentations.
4. Continue to work to meet deadlines
5. Staying on track
6. Understandings outside meetings
7. Not up to speed with documents and regulations.
8. Less presentations (more concise).
9. Agendas - too much material to cover in time frame.
10. Non-member agendas and decision making.
11. Changing partnering decisions outside of meeting - comments don't follow meeting decisions.
12. Meet schedules
13. Partnering work not being accomplished.
14. Offering help and solutions.
15. Recommending problem solving techniques and solutions.
16. TELCON Organization.
17. Efficiency - on-going.
18. Self-monitoring.
19. Self-facilitation.
20. Re-focusing.

Technical Milestones

1. Two IRODs.
2. Removal actions incorporating RCRA permitted facilities.
3. USGS model finished.
4. RAD survey underway (OU1 finished).
5. OU1 soil gas onboard review.
6. Resolved air permitting issues.
7. IRA at OU1 LNAPL.
8. IRA at PSC 2, 41, and 43.
9. Time critical removal of plating shop soils.
10. Tested soil vapor extraction (SVE) at building 106 and 780.
11. Incorporated Geostatistics as an innovative tool.
12. Petroleum contaminated site (UST) included in PSC remediation as a cost effective alternative.
13. Hawthorne formation mapped.
14. Complex scoping investigation of OU3 completed to develop a comprehensive work plan.
15. Prepared PEER documenting time critical removal action.
16. Final FFS submitted for PSC 3 & 42.
17. Finalized SMP.
18. Preliminary Risk assessments on PSC 26 & 27; 2, 41, & 43; and 3 & 42.
19. Presentation at CINCLANTFLT IR conference.
20. Agreement on sufficiency of PCB data at OU1.
21. Conducted town hall meeting.
22. Initiated RAB process.
23. Submitted a final draft Proposed Plan for PSC 3 & 42.
24. Initiated coordination with RAC contractor during investigation phase.
25. Incorporated innovative observation technique into RI/FS program.

Partnering Successes

1. Open Johari window more.
2. Communication in meetings has improved.
3. Meeting are easier to conduct.
4. Open communication.
5. Faster to the subject.
6. Action items being closed.
7. Faster through the agenda.
8. Working as a team.
9. Herman is an active member.
10. More openness, less hidden agendas.
11. Play well together. (socializing)
12. Much less conflict.
13. Pulling together to achieve same goal.
14. Bring in RAC.
15. Brought in 3 new members smoothly and with acceptance.
16. Partition level up.
17. Started telcons
18. Communication written & spoken.
19. Organizational efficiency.
20. Trust - revisit ongoing basis.
21. Risk taking.
22. Bonding of team.
23. Pace of meetings more even.
24. better goal setting.
25. Meeting each others concerns and interest.
26. Innovative problem solving.

Conflict Brainstorm

- Call conflict.
- Hear each party
- Recognize problem
- Try to find problem.
- Explain concern of each person re: stumbling point
- Paraphrase concerns
- Willingness to try to workout differences.
- Try to determine any hidden agendas.
- role of outside party
- Issue germane to subject.
- Determine other options.
- Outcome if differences not solved.
- How do people feel.
- How many people feel conflict?
- It's OK to hit and yell.
- Establish mediation rules.
- Generate options.
- Develop implementations plan.
- Willing to compromise.
- Appoint mediator.
- Establish ground rules.
- Request feedback.
- Reach consensus.
- Periodic restatement/re-focus.
- Resolve conflict quickly and completely.

New Member Entrance Norm

1. MBTI to be taken by new member.
2. Partnering notebook to be provided to new member.
3. Overview of partnering (2 hours) to be presented to new member.
4. Information regarding new member is to be provided to team.
5. New member is not a full member until former member leaves.
6. Person leaving entity has the responsibility to bring member up to speed on the history of team.
7. Advance notice to team.
8. Team discussion at next meeting.
9. Reach consensus.
10. Bring person to next meeting.

INTERNET ADDRESSES

NAME	INTERNET ADDRESS
Dana Gaskins	ddgaskins@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil
Peter Redfern	fnsy68a@prodigy.com
Diane Lancaster	bxnp00a@prodigy.com
Jorge Caspary	caspary_j@dep.state.fl.us
Wandy Browne	aardvarkco@aol.com
Mark Turnbull	mjturnbull@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil