

N65928.AR.000641
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING ON 21 MAY 1997 NTC
ORLANDO FL
5/21/1997
NAVFAC SOUTHERN

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM**MEETING MINUTES**

Date - May 21-22, 1997
 Location - NTC Orlando
 Team Leader- Wayne Hansel
 Recorder - John Kaiser
 Gate Keeper/Timekeeper - Steve McCoy
 Facilitator- Not present

ATTENDEES:**OPT MEMBERS:**

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

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Barbara Nwokike (SDIV RPM)
 Nick Ugolini (SDIV)
 Rick Allen (ABB-ES)
 Mark Salvetti (ABB)

GUESTS:

Harry Doo (SDIV)
 Bob Cohose (BEI)
 Shannon Gleason (ABB)
 Rich May (ABB)
 Ali Malek (B&R)
 Capt. Southgate (NTC CO)
 Doug Dangerfield (SDIV)
 Shane Benner (City of Ori.)
 Charleston Shipyard DET reps
 Julie Cozzie (ABB)

ATTACHMENTS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

1. UST/IR Update and Status
2. FOST/FOSL Status Matrix
3. Shipyard's Marketing Pamphlet
4. Capt. Southgate's letter to SDIV

May 21, 1997

CHECK-IN

The Mission, Vision and meeting rules were read. Bob Cohose was introduced by Mac; Bob will be replacing Mac on the team starting next month. Rich May was also introduced; he will be replacing Eric Nuzie as the Tier II link starting next month. Ann Marie was up north graduating with her MS. Wayne Hansel conducted a good ice-breaking exercise which showed favorite foods and favorite famous personalities of the team and guests...only some surprises.

UST, IR, TRANSFER UPDATES

John K presented the IR and UST update status. Wayne presented the transfer status. An article from a recent Orlando Sentinel was read in which it was noted the City has offered about 1.5 Million dollars for the Navy property while the Navy believes it's worth is closer to 13 million dollars. Both parties are in negotiations. The Main Base FOST has been sent to SDIV. The McCoy Annex Parks FOST should be sent next week. A question was asked; what if the City

does not want all the land that is part of that FOST. The team felt that those parcels could be leased but that it would cost extra paper work to do that.

Rich May gave a Tier II update. There are now State specific Tier IIs. The Florida Navy Tier II has a new Action Plan that they have been working on. Part of it includes a change in some of the "links" due primarily to work load. Another big issue they are wrestling with is Land Transfer and restriction issues. The Florida team also just added Key West to the Tier. A joint Tier I and Tier II meeting is being planned; tentatively for August 6,7,8 in Jacksonville. Dates will become firm next month.

The updates moved on to the Bldg 7174 UST removal update which was given by Nick Ugolini. The Pensacola team removed two small (1000 gls) tanks that were behind the station yesterday. The canopy and all asphalt surrounding the building was also removed. Removal of the six larger (10,000gls) tanks will begin on May 28. Soils saturated with free product will be transported to an approved thermal facility. All excessively contaminated soils (estimated to be about 1,100cy) will be moved to an adjacent parking lot where it will be "land farmed". The Pensacola team will be submitting a letter that addresses FDEP concerns about air emissions, volume of soil and storm water/run-off control. The plan is to cover the mound and avoid any run-off. Off gas is expected to be below the Base's 15 pounds per day permit limit. ABB-ES will be over seeing the work and will be sampling the soil farm area. It is expected that the soil should meet remedial goals in about one month.

OU 2 Update

Steve McCoy gave a brief update on OU2 and introduced Ali Malek who described in very good detail the current work. Work began on May 5th and has included geophysical surveys to better define the landfill's boundaries. GPS has worked well in all areas except the wooded area to the south of the golf course. Significant discussions revolved around how to best get location data in the wooded area. **Decision: It was finally decided that GPS accuracy within the wooded area is not as important as finding the boundary of the landfill.**

Herndon Annex

JK opened the Herndon Annex discussion by briefing the "Options" Letter which was issued on May 13,1997. That letter listed five possible options to address the deep benzene plume at the annex. Of the five, ABB-ES recommended pursuing natural attenuation which would entail some additional screening. Then with the appropriate data a possible No Further Action (NFA) could be justified if there are no receptors and/or the plume could be shown to have negligible risks associated with it.

Capt Southgate arrived at this point and he explained that he wanted to see how the Team operated and how decisions were arrived at. Doug Dangerfield of SDIV echoed the same reason for being in attendance. Rick Allen briefed the team on where the elevated benzene has been located: generally only deeper than 40 ft bls and in no pattern that suggests a well defined plume. Discussion centered around the water drainage ditch to the east of the Annex. It is possible that the ditch may serve as a hydraulic divide between the Annex and the residential area further to the east. Rick also showed an "artists rendition" of the possible behavior of the hypothesized plume; starting at the old fire fighting training area, some of the plume could have traveled southwest towards Lake Underhill, which is higher than Lake Barton, while most of the plume would have been driven deeper by the downward hydraulic gradient, then northeast toward Lake Barton.

Decision: The OPT decided to accept ABB-ES recommendation for future actions at the Annex. This would include use of the Navy's SCAPS CPT rig or another CPT rig depending on availability to test adjacent to the eastern fence line where the elevated benzene hits were found. Initial probes would be along the cities road (right of way), still to the west of the drainage ditch. IF no benzene is found, probing would stop. If benzene is still encountered, probings east of the

ditch would be required. Three wells would also be installed in the areas where elevated benzene hits currently exist. A round of sampling would also be included to collect parameters from wells used to show the likely hood of natural attenuation. **Action item: JK will draft a letter workplan for the OPT prior to any work.**

SA 39 Update

JK gave a brief update on the groundwater PCE plume work. All wells have been installed and sampled. Groundwater sample results should be available in three weeks. Samples also included natural attenuation parameters. An area of shallow (@<26ft) PCE has been delineated. The highest value seems to be located in a bowl-like clay area. More to the east and south the contamination runs deeper, matching what appears to be a thinning of the clay lens to the point of less than a foot in thickness. The deeper plume to the south and east has not been delineated yet. The cities utility corridor runs along the fence line in this area. SA 30 is due east of the plume. Lake Gear is also just south of the Navy fence line.

The proposed four surface water and sedimate sample points in the lake were discussed. All agreed to those sample points. (POSTNOTE: The Lake was sampled accordingly on Friday, May 23). A report on the PCE plume is in progress.

Julie Cozzie from ABB-ES addressed comments on the focussed risk assessment letter. She included verbal responses to EPA comments that had been received. Further discussion continued surrounding the best way to handle the elevated risk due to the PAH and arsenic in surface soil. John M. recognized that the EPA accepts Central Tendency (CT) methods when determining risk but stated that Florida does not accept CT methods. The risk at SA 39 and 40 is therefore above 1×10^{-6} for a residential reuse scenario. Shannon Gleason observed that it may be very costly to remove enough soil to reduce the risk. Brainstorming on options to reduce the risk then ensued, the results of which included; whole sale soil removal, "hot spot" (reduced volumn) removal, deep tilling, application of surface cover. **Action item: ABB-ES was tasked to finalize the Focused Risk Tech Memo. ABB-ES was also tasked to present these options with a cost benefit analysis in a letter.** The Focused Risk Assessment Memo will be finalized following receipt of FDEP comments.

IRA Updates for SA 52, and OU 3 Areas

The Charleston Shipyard DET's Director Bobby Dearheart gave a very informative brief on their history, mission, and success to date. They gave this information in a handout also. They also passed out a workplan that addressed the soil removal actions planned for SA 52 (pesticides), and the OU 3 areas 8 and 9 (arsenic).

For OU3: At SA 8 (grounds keeper area) they will excavate the marked areas, take confirmatory samples from the excavation walls, back fill, and provide sample results for use in the RI/FS. At SA 9 they will use immunoassay kits for chlordane to determine if the proposed excavation area is sufficient; they are prepared to excavate two times the estimated area. The DET will also do confirmatory sampling on the sides of the excavation, back fill, and provide sample results for use in the RI/FS. The depth will be about two feet. This soil is a RCRA listed waste and is expected to be shipped to Alabama. The NTC Orlando base should check their waste disposal permit to see what the consequences of this removal will be. Perhaps a one-time exemption should be pursued.

For SA 52: The amount of soil recommended to be removed by ABB-ES included excavating to a depth of four feet around the entire area. This was to be very conservative since only in one or two borings was soil found to exceed standards. To reduce the volume it was agreed to excavate to only two feet except in those areas where it was shown to be at a depth of four feet. The DET will also do confirmatory sampling on the side walls. Because there is no evidence of an appropriate use of the pesticides, ABB-ES and the DET believe the soil should not be considered a listed waste.

Additionally, a soil sample was collected and analyzed by TCLP to determine if the waste would be characterized hazardous; the sample passed TCLP for pesticides **Action item: Nancy Rodriguez (EPA) and JM (FDEP) will check with their organizations to see if listing applies.**

The confirmatory samples will only test for the chemicals currently exceeding standards. The DET expects to mobilize for the removal action sometime in late July.

OU 4 Update

Mac gave an update of the work on OU 4 IRA design procurement actions. BEI received five bids originally but one was withdrawn. Mac then gave a brief of each of the bidders technical aspects.

Company "D": A line of seven wells spread from north to south, crossing the 100ppb lines. All wells are 4" PVC. Three are 30' deep, have an 80' diameter sphere of influence, and are screened at the 5 - 15' and the 25 - 30' depths. Four of the wells are 40' deep, have a 100' diameter sphere of influence, and are screened at the 5 - 20' and the 30 - 40' depths. All wells pump about 8 gpm for a combined daily rate of about 80,000 gals.

Company "C": Two recirc wells roughly on a north south line, crossing the 100ppb line, each with a 160' diameter sphere of influence which allows almost a 100% overlap. They are about 10' from the wet lands line of demarcation and are 56' deep. Water is taken in at the top screen which is screened at the 3.5 - 12.5' depth, and is discharged at the bottom screen at a depth of 49 - 55'. The 10" wells are in a 16" boring and circulates about 40 gpm per well. An air stripper is on top of the well head.

Company "B": A line of six wells again on a north south line; each has about a 60' diameter sphere of influence, and all are 45' deep. They are 12" diameter wells, pump between 5 and 10 gpm (x6 = 30 to 60 gpm total) and are screened at a 20 - 25' depth and at a 40 - 45' depth. This design does not bridge the hard pan layer. The "stack on top of the wells seems to look like a traditional air stripper.

Company "A": Two wells each with a 100' diameter sphere of influence are placed in the north south line. They have no overlap and are about 20' east of the wet land line. They are screened at a 15 - 25' depth and at a 40 - 50' depth and both pump at a rate of about 20 - 60 gpm.

A discussion followed that addressed individual design aspects of each. Mac and Mark Salvetti said that since each bidder had the same hydraulic information, each one should have similar flow rates. However screen size and location affects flow rates too. The OPT concluded that Company "A" and Company "B" were not fully responsive to the design parameters in the RFP. It also concluded that Company "C" and "D" were more responsive and could meet the specifications, however Company "D" influences less of the contaminated water under the wetlands than does Company "C".

Mac said that they (BEI) would have to now review the cost and contractual terms to ultimately select the preferred vendor. He hoped to have an answer soon.

Business Plan Presentation review

Wayne practiced the presentation for tonight's RAB meeting.

MAY 22

OU 1 ROD and Proposed Plan Discussion

Shannon Gleason reviewed the highlights of the ROD starting with the signature page. The draft showed signature lines for the EPA, the FDEP and the Navy. **Decision: After discussion a decision was made to only include a signature line for the Navy (Wayne).** This is based on

the fact that the Navy is the legal owner of the land and lead agency for environmental restoration per CERCLA (with SARA amendments). Letters of concurrence would be required from the EPA and the FDEP.

Language on page 2-21 of the ROD was also reviewed. As the draft is currently written: "excavation and construction should be prohibited within the landfill boundary..." there is some concern that the city may have a problem with this statement since their desire is to demolish the current buildings and construct new buildings. Therefore foundations would probably breach the landfill area. Wording in the proposed plan is "softer" in that it recommends "notifying future users of site conditions...[that] potential health and safety issues are involved in excavation, drilling, construction, and repair of buried utilities within the landfill footprint". **Decision: The team agreed to "soften" the ROD wording to resemble the proposed plan.** The word parcel will also be reviewed to ensure it is used consistently to address only the landfill area, and not the entire transferring property. WH said the schedule may slip into July for the Final ROD.

OU 4 Treatability Letter Discussion

The letter, which was issued by ABB-ES on 5/12/97, lists those technologies that may be used as the final remedy for OU 4 and are therefore suggested as candidates for treatability studies and or pilot studies. JK and M. Salvetti explained that unlike most RI/FS scenarios, much is known about OU 4 because of the IRA. Therefore some of the treatability studies can be performed in parallel with the RI/FS. This would allow for a quicker solution, and allow for biological samples of the aquifer to be taken before the in-well stripping system is started. The intent of the letter was to get feedback from all interested parties prior to getting to far into the Treatability workplan. The OPT will review the letter more in-depth. M. Salvetti and Barbara will arrange a conference call with Mike Maughon.

OPT Business

Capt. Southgate's letter to Southern Division requesting contractors be removed from the "voting process" within the team was discussed. There was agreement that contractors do not have input into the procurement process. **Decision : It was also decided that Southern Division should be the ones to officially reply to the letter.**

Wayne then lead the team in discussing OPT Metrics. The dilemma is : How to apply metrics to show the positive affects of Partnering on the clean-up process. Metrics should be a measurement of a process to achieve improvement, not just an accounting of "beans produced". The processes that will be included for metrics determination follows. **Action item: Also shown below are the initials of those OPT members who have the responsibility to develop a matrix or point paper to show PRE and POST partnering costs.**

PROCESS	RESPONSIBILITY
Petroleum site closures	NR, JM, JK
Site investigations	NR, JM, JK
Transfer documents (FOST/FOSL)	NR, WH
Community Relations	GW, WH

Preparations for the night's Public Meeting addressing the Proposed Plan was accomplished. Shannon flipped through the slides. It was agreed that Wayne would present if Gary could not make the meeting. Supporting evidence was discussed that supported the current boundary for groundwater restricted usage. If the issue is raised by the city, an appropriate response would be generated as part of the "response to comments" which would be part of the final ROD. Responses to public comments will be prepared for and discussed at the next OPT meeting.

Facilitator Training topics that the OPT suggests are as follows:

How to be a Facilitator.

Understanding non-verbal communications.

How to hold a meeting in a low trust environment.

How to be an effective leader.

How to run effective meetings.

Decision making tools.

Metrics.

Team building processes / games.

Team expectations of the facilitator.

Provide training.

Provide tools.

Assist the team when it goes off track.

Bring lobsters.

Point out potential conflict if the team is avoiding it.

Critique the team.

Respect all team members.

Abide by team ground rules.

Assist in developing training schedule.

The OPT wished Mac McNeil success in his new endeavors and presented him with "just a small token" of their thanks and support. **Fair winds and following seas Mac !!**

The cities representatives were briefed on the OPT meeting highlights. They will want to know if work will be done in the residential area adjacent to Herndon Annex.

MEETING CRITIQUE

Because of a late ending to the days events, and the OU 1 public meeting tonight, the meeting critique was not done.