

N65928.AR.000590
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING ON 22 JANUARY 1997 NTC
ORLANDO FL
1/22/1997
NAVFAC SOUTHERN

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 22 - 23, 1997
 Location: Orlando
 Team Leader: Mac McNeil
 Scribe : John Mitchell
 Gatekeeper/Timekeeper: Nancy Rodriguez

ATTENDEES

OPT Members

Wayne Hansel
 John Kaiser
 Steve McCoy
 Mac McNeil
 John Mitchell
 Nancy Rodriguez
 Lt. Gary Whipple

Support Members

Barbara Nwokike
 Nick Ugolini
 Rick Allen
 Anne Marie Lyddy (Facilitator)

Guests

Capt. Yesensky
 City Environmental

ATTACHMENTS DISCUSSED AT MEETING

1. Adjunct Team Member Roles and Responsibilities
2. Study Area 2 Herndon Annex Data Presentation
3. Secondary Standards Exceedances Memo
4. Study Areas 39 & 40 Data Presentation
5. IRA Design/Performance Specifications for OU 4
6. UST update and status report
7. Status on FOSTs and FOSLs
8. OU 1 Remedial Action Components and Schedule
9. Memo from James Berotti on effects of potential funding cuts

JANUARY 22, 1997

Meeting began at 0800 with reading of OPT Mission, Vision, and Ground Rules. We then had a brief check-in to see how all members are doing.

UST/IR Update and Transfer Status

John K went over the IR/UST update. For the OU 4 IRA they are looking at two contractors (NOVOX and the proprietary UVB method. - SEE ATTACHMENT

Wayne and Capt. Y. provided the Transfer Status and Update. HBO Pictures and the City want to use portions of the North and South RTC Area to film a movie. Negotiations are ongoing. The team agreed that as long as no intrusive work was done on the property that no problems should occur.

FY97 Tank Management Plan

Nick Ugolini stated that PWC Pensacola was onsite to remove 30 additional tanks. Some of these tanks are in the Nuke School Area and were dual (kerosene or natural gas) tank lines. Many of the tanks had fill ports and vents some distance from the tank location. The tanks were next to buildings, but the fill port

was at the edge of roadway or parking lot. The removals are being performed with remaining funds. The funding for the 2nd quarter had not been released so they are unable to begin work at Building 7174. Also, PWC has yet to approve a contract for the groundwater assessment at the previously removed tanks. Until this is completed the Tank Closure assessments are delayed.

Funding

Second quarter funding has yet to be released. Jim Berotti submitted a memo to all BECs to provide a short impact statement indicating what a shortfall in funding would mean to the project. The OPT reviewed which work has awards pending and established a list of potential impacts from any funding shortfalls. The list was assigned an alpha character and the team analyzed which impacts applied for each pending award. The potential impact list and the sites effected follow:

A.	Delay Transfer	I.	Potential N.O.V.
B.	Nix Movie Deal	J.	Transfer Value
C.	Increase Caretaker Cost	K.	Eco and Human Health Risks
D.	Increase O&M Cost	L.	Impact CRA Reuse Plan
E.	Increase Cleanup Cost	M.	Roadblock RI/FS Money from unknowns
F.	Delay Assessment	N.	Community Concerns
G.	Continued Injury to Natural Resources	O.	Damages for Natural Resource Injury
H.	Increase Contractor Cost		

DECISION

The OPT agreed on the following potential impacts to funding based on the above matrix.

OU1 ROD and Misc. Plans - A; B; C; D; L; H

Group IV and V Study Areas - A; C; F; G; H; K; L; M; O

OU 3 RI/FS and Removal Actions - A; D; E; F; G; J; K; N; O

OU 4 RI/FS, IRA & RA - A; C; D; E; G; H; K; L; N; O

FY97 UST CARs and RAPs - A; C; E; F; G; H; I; J; L

OU 2 RI/FS - A; E; G; J; K; L; M; O

Training

Anne Marie followed up on the Project Situation exercise that the OPT worked on the previous meeting. We looked at team scores as well as individual scores and determined the synergy which occurred during the exercise.

OU 4 RAB Presentation

The team worked on developing overhead slides for the OU 4 Presentation to the RAB on the selection of the remedial technology for the interim action for groundwater. It was decided Lt. Whipple would give the presentation and he performed a brief run-through prior to the meeting.

Study Areas 39 and 40 (see attachment)

Rick Allen gave a data presentation concerning the results and the need for further sampling and analysis. Further soil assessment of PAH contamination will be performed as per the proposed plan for assessing PAHs. Delineation will be done using immunoassay kits with 20% of the samples submitted for lab

analysis. PCE/TCE contamination above MCLs was discovered downgradient from the initial screening monitoring well. It was also discovered in the intermediate portion of the surficial aquifer.

ACTION: ABB to perform preliminary Human Health Risk assessment on soils.

DECISION

Further investigate the PCE contamination in groundwater at the shallow, intermediate and deep portion of the surficial aquifer with DPT. This will be performed within the shaded area shown in the work plan. Based on the DPT results, permanent monitoring wells will be installed accordingly.

OU 1 ROD and Schedule

The proposed schedule (see attachment) for the OU 1 ROD and Remedial Design was discussed and refined.

DECISION

It was decided that the draft and final proposed plans could be moved up and run more concurrent with each other. The ROD should be able to be signed in June 1997.

OU 4 (Area C Laundry) - Responsibility Action Matrix (RAM)

In the attachment, ABB provided an outline of the design and performance specifications for the IRA. Sections 1 & 2 are to be detailed by ABB. The remainder will be general by ABB with Bechtel providing the details. The draft is expected by 2/18/97. John K. indicated that at the preliminary meeting with the vendor that Mike Mahaughn suggests an additional well be placed near the sump to attack the source. ABB is to investigate with a DPT in the area upgradient of the sump and around the old laundry building.

ACTION: Gary to check on closure documentation of the old production well on site.

ACTION: Gary to check with the ROICC about the OU 4 RAM.

Herndon Annex (Study Area 2) - see attached data presentation

Rick Allen gave a presentation on the DPT results at Herndon Annex. Benzene and chlorinated solvents are located in the deeper portion of the surficial aquifer at the top of the Hawthorn Foundation. There is no evidence from previous investigations that it is related to activities at Herndon Annex. It appears to be coming from offsite on the GOAA property. It is possible and likely it is from previous air force fire training areas which were located on what is now the GOAA parcel. The FUDs program investigation did not determine a source. However, their investigation was not in the supposed area of the FTAs, nor did their sampling extend to the deep portion of the surficial aquifer. The team made a visit to the GOAA area where the supposed FTAs were located, but no evidence remains.

ACTION: John M. to notify the FDEP district office after the screening report is produced and will provide a copy of the report to the district

ACTION: Nancy is to check with EPA attorney on whether a FOST is possible with known contamination.

OU 2 Final Work Plan

The team discussed the proposed work schedule and made a site visit.

DECISION

In the P.O.A. do the surface water and sediment sampling in Phase I, with the sampling following analysis of the DPT and CPT action.

ACTION: Gary to review records for aerial photos on OU 2 landfill activities for next meeting.

ACTION: Rick Allen to send his aerial photos of OU 2 landfill activities to Steve for next meeting.

PAH Investigative Approach Letter

The team performed a table top review of the Approach to analyzing PAHs at Study Areas 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26, 27, 39, 40, and 50. Specific comments were made related to the methodology proposed and specific site sampling. Comments made included:

- What is meant by "average" conditions at a Study Area?
- Extent of site sampling should be on a site-by-site basis. Some would have a broad approach while others would investigate hot spots.
- Exposure Point Concentrations are based on the 95% UCL or the maximum detected concentration, whichever is less; not on the arithmetic mean of all samples. Arithmetic mean can only be used in a hot spot.
- Study Area 16 suppose to be transferred and analyzed under the UST program. Soil analysis is to be TCL; not with an FID.
- John M. suggested more focused investigation at SA 17 around sampling location 17B035 as it had only PAH exceedance above industrial SCGs. Also, subsurface soil should be compared to leachability SCGs not surface soil SCGs.
- John M. stated driver at SA 21 was arsenic; not PAHs. Suggests resampling the area of lone soil sampling exceedance for PAH and further sampling related to arsenic.
- John M. thought SA 27 was to be reused as residential, but BCP indicates it is to be commercial. A single soil sample exceeded industrial SCG and John M. believes this should be adequately delineated or a larger number of samples be taken at the site to determine if risk exists.
- SA 39 and 40 will use immunoassay tests to delineate PAH contamination in soil with 20% of samples submitted for lab analysis. PCE contamination in groundwater to be further delineated through DPT.
- Study Area 50 requires no further investigation as agreed at previous OPT meeting as long a site is restricted to industrial use.

ACTION: John K. to check on reason why there is a hold up on signature to transfer site to UST.

ACTION: John K. to check on action items related to arsenic at Site 21.

ACTION: John M. to check with risk assessors about arsenic levels at Site 21 related to recreational use.

ACTION: Nancy to get Ted Simons comments on PAH Approach by 2/1/97

Study Area 3

ACTION: John M. and Nancy to have response to SA 3 Additional Site Screening Letter by next meeting.

City Briefing

Wayne and the team briefed the City Environmental Office on the current status of the IR and UST sites. They were provided with a list of the proposed and approved FOSTs and FOSLs. They were informed of the status of the states issue concerning Secondary Standards fro groundwater.

ACTION: John K. to resurrect letter concerning McCoy Annex well closures.

Partnering Discussion - Teams Role in Technology Selection

Prior to the meeting there had been lively E-mail discussion on the role of the team in selecting a remedial technology. Mac felt that contractors and the team should be involved in discussions, but that the Navy should have the final decision. He felt uncomfortable as a contractor making these decisions. After discussion with the team and in that all other members, including the Navy BEC, believe it is the teams decision for which we are empowered, Mac was more comfortable in being part of the decision making related to remedial actions.