

N65928.AR.001325
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING ON 28 OCTOBER 2002 NTC
ORLANDO FL
10/28/2002
NAVFAC SOUTHERN

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM - MEETING MINUTES

Date: 28-29 October 2002
 Location: Oak Ridge, Tennessee
 Team Leader: Steve McCoy (filling in for Dave Grabka stranded in Tallahassee)
 Gatekeeper/Timekeeper: Steve McCoy
 Facilitator: Pete Paznokas
 Recorder: Mark Salvetti

OPT MEMBERS:

Steve Tsangaris
 Barbara Nwokike
 Steve McCoy
 Greg Fraley
 Mark Salvetti
 Dave Grabka (By Phone)

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Scott Newman, Tier II
 Wayne Hansel, SDIV (by phone)

GUESTS:

Rick Allen, Tt NUS
 Lawson Anderson, Tt NUS
 Teresa Grayson, Tt NUS
 Jim Davis, Tt NUS
 Allan Jenkins, Tt NUS

HANDOUTS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

1. Meeting Minutes 9/4-9/5, 2002
2. UST/IR Update and Status – October 2002 (Tetra Tech)
3. Action items
4. SA 17 Tag Map
5. DoD FOSET Guidance handed out by Lawson
6. Non-Verbal Communication presentation & exercise
7. iSOC literature and SA 2 tag map with proposed iSOC wells
8. OU 3 (SA8 & SA9) arsenic distribution data figures
9. SA 39 Groundwater Data Maps

28 October 2002

CHECK-IN

Dave G in Maryland during the sniper shootings. Sheared his hair. At airport at 4AM this morning, only to find out his flight was cancelled a little after 6AM, so he's only joining us by phone. Scott just got back from a week in Germany. It was nice; still on German time a bit. Pete just happy to be here. Barbara just finished the PE test, and she's looking forward to her approval letter. Greg suffering with the Braves. Blaming Cox and Sheffield. Was at the last game. Rick A. and his wife were at bikefest in Daytona. Rode his Honda Gold Wing. Steve T. hates Florida State, so he's had a great month (Miami & Notre Dame wins). Other than that life's OK. Mark S. feels badly for the Giants, but at the same time it's nice to see bad things happen to someone other than the Red Sox. Still looking for a dog. Chasing the kids around at their activities. Trying to get house painted. Steve M. doesn't have much new to report. Eastern TN in mourning over the Vols problems. Lawson had a good college football weekend. Went to Ark – Old Miss game. Big win.

ACTION ITEMS

Went through action items (see revised list at end of minutes).

PERSONNEL CHANGES

None

UST/IR Update (see Handout)**Bldg. 200**

The ninth quarter MOP sampling was conducted the week of 7/29/02. Site looks about ready to close. We're approaching NFA. **Dave G:** Awful close. Spoke to Paul C. this morning. Last quarter below GCTLs, this quarter just above in one well (TRPH in MW-08). Paul is submitting a MOP report later this week, requesting semi-annual monitoring at this site for a year. Then we re-evaluate.

Bldgs. 2080

The final SARA recommending NA monitoring was submitted to FDEP on 5/30/02. TtNUS received verbal comments from FDEP requesting additional information, and is currently preparing the information for submittal to the FDEP. A Supplemental SAR addendum was submitted to FDEP on Sept 30, 2002.

Steve M: Are there still exceedances? **Dave G.** Yes, we will still be monitoring.

Bldg. 2273

The second quarter MOP sampling report (sampling performed in June 2002) was issued on Sept 7, 2002. Update handout has lots of graphs. MW-04 jumped well over 5 mg/L TRPH GCTL. MW-05 approaching GCTL for methylnaphthalene.

McCoy Annex**Bldg. 7125**

A data report summarizing the results of the June 2002 sampling event was submitted to FDEP on Sept 7, 2002. County added bugs here to attempt remediation (known as the County Bug Site). Was a while ago (even before Dave G.)

Bldg. 7151

We reviewed the graph of groundwater concentrations presented in the update handout. Top two lines are MW-01, bottom two are MW-02. **Dave G:** This is also a site where the next monitoring report is going to propose semi-annual monitoring.

Bldg. 7174

The third round of quarterly sampling was completed in September 2002, and a report summarizing the results will be submitted in December 2002.

Bldg. 7175

The 1st quarter MOP sampling report was submitted on 7/22/02. The 2nd quarter MOP sampling was conducted the week of 7/29/02, and the second quarter MOP sampling report is currently in preparation. Benzene and naphthalene are below GCTLs. Note that the update handout indicates the NA Monitoring

Plan was approved in Feb 2, 2001, but it was really 2002. Dave G. has the SAR approved 2/20/02, so there's a typo in the update.

Bldg. 109

Wayne H.: Soil was excavated and removed by Nodarse, and the excavation was dewatered until Nodarse got clean water. First round of sampling in October 2002 had no detections above MCLs. Nodarse will resample in January 2003 for final closure of the site.

OU 1

Draft 5-year review was issued to the OPT on 9/25/02. Medical waste removed; about 6,000 tons hauled offsite. Of this total, only a small fraction was actually considered a medical waste that required incineration. See OU 1 update below.

OU 3

Treatability sampling report for the baseline and 1st quarterly sampling conducted in May and June 2002 was issued on Oct 25, 2002. May want to consider sampling less frequently due to the slow GW velocities.

SA 36

A draft "Operating Properly & Successfully" (OPS) report was issued on 04/05/02. A Technical Memorandum on the groundwater investigation at SA 36 was issued 05/21/02 and subsequently approved by FDEP and USEPA. The portion of SA 36 excluding the groundwater contamination was included in the FOST/EBST Addendum 4 issued by the Navy during the week of 06/03/02. Tt NUS issued the draft Site Investigation Report on September 16, 2002. A draft Decision Document for the portion of SA 36 with groundwater contamination is in preparation. Dave G. drafted the final FOST approval for SA36, 39, and 40 (clean). Hoping to be signed today (Oct 28, 2002) or tomorrow and then will be sent out.

Replacement wells were installed at the site in April 2002, and treatment efficiency monitoring samples were collected from the replacement wells in April 2002. CH2M Hill issued a report summarizing the results of the sampling in October 2002.

SA 39

Monitoring wells at the site were abandoned in December 2001 as part of site development activities at the Main Base. The wells were reinstalled at the site in April and May 2002, efficiency monitoring continued at the site in May 2002. A report summarizing the results of the monitoring activities was submitted to the OPT in October 2002.

Problem with downgradient C well increasing from 26 ppb to 42 ppb. No additional wells downgradient from this well. May be hard to say we are being protective (OPS). See discussion later below.

OU 4

KMnO₄ remediation system expected to be complete by the end of February 2003. An EBST/FOST for the clean (southern portion) of Area C should be ready by the end of this year.

Herndon Annex - SA 2

Quarterly sampling of the SA 2 monitoring wells (those not included in the treatability study) was performed in June 2002, and the sampling report was issued on September 13, 2002. Will be proposing a new technology (iSOC - see SA2 discussion later).

OU 2

The second round of quarterly sampling was conducted the week of 06/17/02, and the sampling report was issued on September 13, 2002. The next round of sampling was conducted in September 2002.

A draft final EBST/FOST for three small parcels adjacent to OU 2 was issued Sept 24, 2002. Done with public comment review.

SA 16

Nothing new. When Site Rehab Completion Report is done (Steve T.), Dave will prepare an SRCR Order, which will say the LUCs can be removed.

SA 17

A second round of post-injection groundwater sampling was completed in July 2002; the results indicated that contaminant rebound had occurred. Consequently, five additional injectors were installed and additional Fenton's Reagent was injected at the site in August 2002. Additional injection was completed in September 2002, and post-injection sampling was completed in October 2002. Steve T. received the data last Friday. Steve hoping to have a data summary later today or tomorrow. **Steve T:** We may need to talk about what to do next if we still have significant contamination. Steve T. doesn't have money for another injection. Steve T. sent out a spreadsheet/graph (we think). See further SA 17 discussion below.

A draft work plan to delineate the downgradient groundwater contamination was issued to the OPT on May 31, 2002. The downgradient groundwater contamination was delineated with DPT in August 2002. Monitoring wells installed to complete downgradient groundwater delineation were sampled in September 2002. See further SA 17 discussion below.

SA 18

A draft Decision Document was issued in April 2002. A draft FOST/EBST is in preparation. A draft Technical Memorandum documenting the soil removal was issued on Oct 27, 2002.

SA 52

The data report for the June 2002 sampling was issued on Sept 13, 2002. Prelim data from September 2002 groundwater sampling event shows OLD-52-13 was ND for dieldrin (at 0.1 ppb). Ran filtered and unfiltered. Both were ND. Will analyze again using lower detection limit method, running both filtered and unfiltered.

SA 54

CH2M HILL issued a draft Technical Memorandum documenting the SA 54 soil excavation on Oct 27, 2002. Barbara hopes to have heard from the Army regarding the MOA by the time we meet again.

Updated Format Discussion: Keep the charts, but for IR need the longer verbage rather than the bulleted summary. Something like SA 36 would be fine. Use a horiz line to represent the GCTL for each graph, unless the GCTL is so low compared to the data that a line isn't practical (visible). Try to get the x-axis consistent on each graph (either monthly or quarterly). SA 36 writeup will be the standard for both USTs and IR. **OPT gave a thumbs-up.**

STUDY AREA STATUS:

55 study areas have been screened:

- ⇒ 42½ SAs have been submitted as final and approved for NFA: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8[WWTP], 10, 11, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55.
- ⇒ 4½ SAs became OUs (8 [greenskeeper storage] & 9 [OU3]; and 12, 13, and 14 [OU 4]).
- ⇒ 4 SA reports have been approved by the BCT as final, but will require additional investigation/remediation (SAs 17, 39) or continued groundwater monitoring (SA 2, 52).

4 SA reports are in various stages of being finalized (16, 18, 36, 54).

The Study Area Status has not changed since the July 2002 OPT meeting.

Tier II Update (Scott N.)

Tier II hasn't met. No update, other than the notes in the Action Item section.

SA 17 GW Delineation (Mike Campbell)

Mike handed out a tag map for SA 17 monitoring wells. That map is the basis for the following discussion:

Only methylene chloride exceeds GCTL in the shallow zone. Not present in the lab blanks, but Tt's chemist feels it's a 99 percent probability that it's a lab contaminant. Tt advises that the shallow zone has been delineated, and there are no exceedances of the GCTL.

Deep zone has a fair number of exceedances for 1,1-DCE, 1,2-DCE, TCE, and VC. Also one benzene exceedance. As you head from the center of the plume towards the NE, exceedances become deeper and deeper. Still exceedances at P-118 and P-119. Still have a 1,2-DCE exceedance in the downgradient well OLD-17-45C (100 ppb versus GCTL of 70 ppb). Also, in NE corner of map have well OLD-17-40C. Although not shown on the tag map, Mike wanted to note that this well had three exceedances (chloroform, bromomethanes). These compounds are almost always associated with chlorinated water. Tt chose not to include these compounds on the tag map, as the detections are probably associated with a potable water leak.

Bottom line, extent has not been completely delineated in the direction of GW flow. Recommend more DPT. This will require crossing Avenue C onto land the Navy no longer owns.

Dave G: How sure are we that we don't have 1,2-DCE deeper than 50 feet at OLD-17-45C? **Mike C:** We don't know, but if we're doing DPT we ought to go deep enough to confirm if we have deeper contamination. Since the plume seems to be plunging. State will insist that we have a clean well.

Mike C: Dave, will we need a MW at depth if the DPT is clean? **Dave:** Yes, if the water levels show that the plume is still moving downward.

Steve M: Tt NUS will issue an addendum to the delineation work plan for OPT review.

SA 36 and LUCs

Greg F: We keep getting mixed signals from Tier II. We understand that we have to move forward with remediation. But we would like something in writing to document what is expected of us for OPS determinations, transfers, etc. It would be nice to get this from Tier II to show the consensus. Is this even possible? We don't know.

Scott N: Have we seen John Johnson's position report? Greg has, because John is with EPA. We know what EPA wants, but that's not DoD.

ACTION ITEM: Scott N. to ask Tier II for written guidance regarding LUCs and how they relate to OPS and property transfers.

Steve M: Where does Orlando come in all this? **Barbara N:** If we go early transfer, EPA is out of the loop for the early transfer. Would be negotiating directly with the State of Florida. **Dave G:** Cecil is moving ahead with an EPA-written ROD using the bare minimum of what EPA needs in the LUC portion. This will then go to Navy for review. Then hopefully maybe something to satisfy both EPA and DoD may come from this. Also proposing to have a meeting with EPA and Navy higher ups to see what can be done.

Steve M: Why should we keep spending time and wrestling with this until the LUC issue is resolved? Seems like a waste of time.

Scott N: The way he understands the guidance, we as a team are supposed to work together on coming up with our own language and push it up the chain.

Lawson: LUC Assurance Plan is the big picture. It documents how LUCs are implemented, who's responsible for what, what to do when things change, etc. Then the implementation plan is site-specific.

What about what Joe MacCauley wants? **Barbara N:** As of 3 weeks ago, her legal said that we are to continue.

We've gone about as far as we can. We have an OPS and a DD for SA36. It's missing the LUC language, but once we have some it will only take hours to fix. Without the LUC language, Greg's attorney won't look at the OPS. **Dave G:** I thought the OPT agreed that we would let EPA insert their LUC language (minimum), and that's what we'd run up the chain for approval. **Barbara:** The Navy lawyer has said this is not what they want to do. Doesn't think DoD is willing to consider the EPA's language. **Dave G:** Oct 4, 2002 letter from Undersecretary of Defense says Navy agrees that EPA has post-ROD authority. Now they just need to work on institutional control part of it.

ACTION ITEM: Greg F: Will put together something for SA36 while we wait for a Tier II letter. This will be the minimum language for LUCs that EPA needs for DD and OPS. Won't be minimal, as he would prefer a letter from the Navy saying what they can live with. Will have this done by November 8.

Early Transfer (ET) (Lawson Anderson)

Lawson handed out the DoD FOSET guidance.

Dave G: State has taken an early look at the Early Transfer (ET) document recently distributed to the OPT, but has not yet gone to their attorney. Dave G. and Tim Bahr looked at the text. Page 1 mentions an October 14, 2002 letter from the City. This should be part of the ET package. Certain parts of McCoy have been transferred to GOAA. ET says Herndon is going to FAA. City has not requested Herndon. Largest portion of McCoy to be transferred to the City has to go to DOI as a public benefit conveyance. ET doc doesn't include this intermediate step. **Barbara:** At this point we'd prefer working with the intermediate agency in another document, but she will check. Dave thinks this needs to be clarified and the ET needs to spell out how this is going to work with the intermediate agency. Recall DOI botched the

last transfer (issue of deed restrictions not recorded). Tim Bahr wants more specifics on how LUCs will be incorporated. Restrictive covenants, third party rights, enforceability. **Lawson:** Typically would reference a separate document in the Risk Analysis section. Dave thinks the body of the report could mention the mechanism, but not necessarily the specific deed verbage. FDEP wants more specifics regarding intended land use, especially with respect to Area C in Section 4. **Lawson:** More detail is included in Exhibit C. **Dave G:** There are potentially indoor air issues at sites where contaminated GW exists or contaminated soil with VOCs. Want to see a plan illustrating that no buildings will be placed on these sites, or if so a vapor barrier would be required. Need to see details. Section 6, Page 9: State wants an enforceable agreement with the Navy laying out the schedule and time frames, and also ensuring future DSMOA (?) funding. **Lawson:** Is that appropriate for this document? **Dave G:** Because this isn't an NPL or RCRA permit base, the only real stick the state has thus far is denying that a site is suited for transfer. **Barbara:** Don't think we can go beyond 2 years on the funding. Dave wants the ET doc to mention the "agreement" (memo, consent order, etc) and a copy of the agreement must be included as an exhibit to the ET doc. State is worried that once these properties are transferred the Navy will make these sites a low priority and not fund them anymore. Dave thinks there has been a precedence for such an agreement in a Colorado early transfer case. Dave will ask Tim Bahr for more details. **Dave G:** Are there examples of ET sites that are not NPL or RCRA? **Lawson:** Mare Island is one. NTC San Diego, Louisville. **Dave G:** This is something the attorneys are going to have to work out for an enforceable agreement on cleanup schedule, penalties, etc like FDEP used to establish for sites.

ACTION ITEM: Comments to ET document to be emailed to Lawson at AndersonL@ttnus.com.

Draft Area C FOST (Teresa Grayson)

Lead paint? Chips observed on soil around buildings. May need to document that there is no lead paint in soil, unless there is no chance for residential use. If there is no residential, then the little building (SA 55) is OK too. There are PAHs around SA 55 that exceed residential but not industrial. So if we leave it as light industrial, we can leave everything as-is.

Although we didn't take consensus, there was a general agreement that Area C would be designated as non-residential.

On the FOST for Area C, does that mean we are going to transfer all of it, or just the piece w/o GW contamination? The FOST will be for the clean part only, or else we'd need OPS and LUCs for OU 4. But the FOSET will be for the whole of Area C.

29 October 2002

Training (Pete)

Non-verbal Communication. Sixty-five to ninety percent of communication is non-verbal. Body language and movements, facial & eye behavior, body spacing. Variations in speech.

Petroleum Discussion (Brought Wayne H. in via phone)

What is GW situation at Bldg 109? Soil has been removed. **Wayne:** Waiting to resample GW to get it closed out. First round of sampling was clean, but one of the wells was destroyed. Will be resampling in October.

At Bldg 7125, waiting for Paul C. to finish report so Dave G. can review.

Study Area 2

Teresa handed out iSOC information. Tt doing this at NAS JAX. Presented a paper at Amherst. Fits in a 2" well. Tt would install additional wells for this application. Will need to find a DO meter that can read high enough to measure oxygen concentrations that this system can achieve. Teresa thinks we might be

able to achieve DO concentrations above 50 mg/L and approaching 100 mg/L. Would install 20-30 wells for iSOC installation (see figure). Equipment would be rented from the iSOC folks. **Dave G:** Also looking at using iSOC at Cecil.

Discussed running a smaller scale installation around some of the existing deep wells so we can evaluate effectiveness before installing all the treatment wells. Also Steve T. suggested we approach the iSOC folks to see if they would provide the equipment for free, at least until the treatment is proven. We could install the wells.

Got a thumbs-up from the OPT for the two-phase approach, as well as approaching iSOC to contribute their equipment to the pilot. **ACTION ITEM:** Steve M. and Teresa to estimate the cost for full scale treatment of the neighborhood using iSOC.

OU 1 5-Year Review

Although we now need to perform a 5-year review for all the OU's, Steve and Rick would like some feedback on at least the format and content of the OU1 review, as that will serve as the model for future reviews.

The OU1 5-year review can document the change in the GW use restriction zone, but the 5-year review shouldn't wait for it. If we have the zone changed by the time the 5-year review is complete, great. But otherwise we'll document the change in the boundary in another document.

Schedule for completing all the 5-year reviews will depend on award of the SOW from the Navy. Barbara hopes the award will be in the next 45 days, so all the documents should be done by the end of March. But we also need to have the public comment period done and a Final issued. With this in mind, the OPT agreed that the Finals are to be issued by May 30, 2003.

GW Exclusion Zone: Rick Allen is concerned about the most recent detections of MCPA, arsenic, and antimony in the boundary wells. Concerned that we can't consider pulling back the zone until we determine if these are real. Also concern that the new dry retention basins and the removal of all the impervious area that was over the Grinder may change GW hydraulics. Dave G. recommended installing a new well between the dry ponds and the Grinder waste locations.

Note: The "new well" clusters along Glenridge that had the detections of MCPA, arsenic, etc. have been destroyed again. They no longer exist.

Steve T. would like to have Nodarse provide GW modeling info they may have done for the retention basin and recommendations for new well locations to support their new desired GW restriction zone.

ACTION ITEM: Barbara to call John Classe this week to have Dave Twedell get Rick A. an electronic CAD drawing showing the new grades, GW restriction zone boundaries, landfill location, etc. relative to the new development. Should show the new basins in the NW corner, utilities, structures, roads, etc that will help us evaluate potential locations for new wells. Twedell also to be told that for our January 2003 OPT meeting in Orlando we would like to see them present their modeling info on impact of the new infiltration basins and changes in grades and impervious area above the landfill on groundwater hydraulics. This to support developer's request that we pull back the GW exclusion zone. We want them to defend what they want to do with the exclusion zone, and also provide us with information to help us decide where the new wells could go.

ACTION ITEM: Dave G. to speak to Jean Burnette (City's real estate division) about sketches and legal description of the new no-dig zone. This was supposed to be sent to Dave G., but he hasn't seen it yet.

OU2 Site Cover

Golf course site cover inspection hasn't occurred yet. Weeds have grown in on the landfill cap itself, and it's pretty well vegetated now. If we need to add some cover, it will likely occur during the second quarter (Jan-Mar 2003).

Tt finished 3rd quarter monitoring in September. Report of the June monitoring went out in September too, and Steve M. doesn't recall anything unusual in the data. Still waiting for EPA review of the Draft OU2 FS that was issued in August 2001. **ACTION ITEM:** Greg F. to look into EPA comments on this document.

Barbara hoping to find out this week on GOAA's plans for the OU2 drainage ditch and their retention basin plans. Dave G. needs some assurances on the ditch before he is comfortable on the monitoring only recommendation in the PP and ROD. Concern is that this ditch is a component of the remedial action by capturing the plume. Because of all the LUC issues for OU2, the ROD isn't going final anytime soon. Dave has no problem going forward with the monitoring plan, but we should not issue the PP for public comment until the LUC issues are resolved and we have some idea when the ROD can be issued.

Barbara spoke to GOAA during the break. They will be providing design info for their retention basin to her tomorrow.

OU 3 (Teresa (SA8) and Jim Davis (SA9) (Tt))

Ideally the wells actually within the wall should be ND. This is true at SA 8. Wells OLD-08-25 and OLD-08-24 installed to monitor underflow - they are screened 26-31 ft bls, and the wall only extends to 25 feet. Arsenic exceedance in OLD-08-25, so we'll probably be seeing this in -24 soon. Also recall that SA8 was the site where the equipment couldn't get the wall as close to the lake as desired. The wall is actually in the plume a bit. But there is a lot of positive indication that the wall is working. Barbara has recently submitted her report to Congress that estimates a 5-10 year period before the groundwater is treated.

At SA 9 the wall is ahead of the leading edge of the arsenic plume. Based on the data, the wall is still ahead of the plume, so there isn't yet much evidence showing effectiveness. The arsenic hasn't really reached it yet.

Barbara: Any idea if or when we may need to add more alumina? **Jim Davis:** Did a worst-case calc and showed years (something like 6 years) of GW absorptive capacity. But GW sulfates are also absorbed, and this could affect the long-term absorptive capacity for GW. Next spring Tt will take a sample of the wall and evaluate the remaining absorptive capacity.

Dave G: How do the hydraulics look? **Teresa:** Looks fine. No change in GW potentiometric surface.

Jim D: Had some turbidity problems while sampling. So went ahead and collected filtered and unfiltered. There is no significant difference between the two sets of samples, so it looks like we are definitely dealing with dissolved arsenic. Turbidity therefore not that much of a concern.

OU 4 Update (Steve T, Tom Spriggs (by phone), Tom Palaia (by phone))

Second quarter 2002 report will establish baseline for NA, phyto, re-assess antimony, re-assess VOC plume. Third quarter report will include some of this info too. Cross section of PCE data shows some significant concentrations down at well -17C. Little pool of it in the vicinity of the source area.

P&T running very well. Influent concentrations are dropping (from 500 ppb in May 2001 to 95 ppb in Sept 2002). Little impact to the extent of the VOC plume. Some trends in a few wells that may be statistically significant, overall looks stable.

Phyto: Can't see building anymore! Average poplar and cottonwood height exceeds 18 feet. Average willow height exceeds 6 feet. Canopy closing in over the wetland. Dug out 6 trees on Oct 9 along with Univ. of Florida who provided the cottonwood clones. On east side of the building found a root system had extended over 10 feet down. Root systems looked very healthy and growing as planned.

Collected microbe samples from 10 wells. One upgradient control, and the rest within the plume. Diverse bacterial community. Majority are gram-negative, which utilize a wide range of carbon sources. Also methanotrophic bacteria are present. Also gram-positive bacteria are present that are known to degrade PCE and TCE. This is considered baseline, and don't think we are seeing any impact of the trees yet.

Current NA comparison to the old Harding Lawson data from 1998 was similar. Low TOC, similar scores. Electron donors are low. Low concentrations of competing electron acceptors. But data supports the current plan of trying to enhance the dissolved TOC. Negative indicators include no downward contaminant trends, ORP and DO a bit higher than we'd like, absence of elevated chloride, and low concentrations of TOC.

ISCO: Going through the submittal process. Dealing with asbestos/structural issues (asbestos dropping from pipes in the work area), drilling Nov 2002, equipment installation scheduled for Jan 2003, and testing and startup in Feb 2003.

For 2003 will continue with quarterly monitoring reports. NA, phyto, and antimony plumes monitored semi-annually. Construction documentation report after chemox is installed to document phyto and ISCO as-builts. Then issue tech memos for chemox during operation, followed by a Final Report after system shutoff.

SA 39 GW Discussion (Steve T. and Allan Jenkins)

We have three GW zones, with the C-zone wells below the cemented sand layer. Replacement wells all have an "R" in their name on the figures. GW flow in all three zones is to the SE. Pretty certain the A and B zones are controlled by Lake Gear. C zone has been a question. But the current data shows that the C-zone may be discharging upward to the bottom of the lake.

A zone looking pretty good. Had the veggy oil injection (open circles on figure). Flirting with GCTL. B zone a few more exceedances, stair-stepping down to the SE from the shallow zone.

In the C zone at well 32cR we see 43 ppb from April 2002. Historically, we've had 27 ppb in 1997 and 26 ppb in 1999 (these wells are now gone). This well on the downgradient edge is kind of a sticking point as far as OPS determination goes.

Steve M: Tt has put a hold on the OPS determination, primarily due to the data from this well. Would like to see more sample results from 32cR. **Greg F:** Agree. This is not OPS right now.

We discussed funding. Steve T. has completed his scope. Plan is for the EMAC to pick up on monitoring, but that won't happen until May 2003. SA 36 is in the same boat. If we cut down on the number of wells and limit the sampling to VOCs, Steve T. thinks he'll have the funding. **ACTION ITEM:** Steve M. to provide a list of wells and parameters for a different sampling event. Steve T. to then evaluate if he has the funding to do it.

Got a thumbs-up consensus on this approach.

Dave G. asked that Steve T. elaborate on his concern over Nodarse's work. **Steve T:** Not a problem now, but over the last couple of months have had trouble getting water levels consistent with historical info. Could have been due to lots of rain, could have been bad survey data (it was). So Steve T. had his surveyor do it again. And some of the wells may have been cut down more after the top of casing was surveyed. Initially had some concerns over the well installation method (not doing it the way we would

have), but Steve T. can't quite remember what the issues were. Dave Twedell told Steve T. it would be addressed and it wasn't an issue.

What we have now seems to be working fine.

Pete's Feedback

Team dynamics very good. Good participation and trust. Humor. Focused. Flexible agenda and completed all the business items. Did see energy level drop off towards the end of the first day. Maybe because folks flew in that morning. Some overload at times. Started a bit late this morning to avoid having trouble finishing on time. Check in may be a little too long. Got a lot of action items. Teams measured by how many they produce and how many get closed. We made a lot of decisions and took consensus. Good teams do that. So Pete's only thing is that a bit better time management might help. Doesn't think we should worry to much about a few business sidebars, as we have a small team and the sidebars we had were all business. Steve M. did a great job leading on short notice.

Parking Lot Items

- 1) OU3 & OU4 abstract for Navy Award. Telecon to be scheduled. Dave only interested in content, not so much how it's put together. **ACTION ITEM:** Steve T. and Steve M. to get together. Also will check the CNO website for info.
- 2) Project Management Schedule. Expand on the document log. Mark S. to look through minutes and recommend other milestones we may have discussed.

CRITIQUE/CHECKOUT/AGENDA

+ 's	? 's
Lots accomplished.	Dave & Wayne not available
Teresa's Grayson's input was welcome	Lack of some handouts for Dave G.
FDEP's comments on FOSET were helpful	LUC indecision

Future Meeting Schedule

January 15 & 16 in Orlando (RAB)

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY
October 2002

ACTION ITEMS (CARRYOVER)

1. **Barbara N.** to contact GOAA and discuss plans for the drainage ditch that intercepts the GW plume coming off OU2. Dave G. concerned that we are relying on the ditch to intercept the plume, yet the ditch is not on Navy property and we have no control over it. Navy would be looking for an agreement with GOAA to ensure no changes to the drainage ditch in this portion of the site. **Barbara spoke to GOAA on 10/29 during the OPT meeting, and GOAA promised they would provide their plans for the OU2 drainage ditch and new retention basin on 10/30.**
2. **Steve T.** to evaluate SA55 (Area C) for possible soil removal to eliminate need for LUC. May need to discuss other LBP and asbestos issues for the "clean" part of Area C.
3. **Steve T.** to inspect areas of OU 2 where the golf course was doing work to determine if additional soil cover will be required. **LEAVE OPEN**

ACTION ITEMS (Completed in October)

1. **Barbara N** to contact District people (Jim Bradner), Program Manager for Solid Waste in FDEP's Central District office to determine how long OU 1 landfill may need to be monitored, and whether there needs to be some coordination with them to determine future GW monitoring locations. **DONE Finally spoke to Bradner. District is deferring to whatever Dave G. and FDEP in Tallahassee want. Barbara told him we are doing the 5-year review now. District does not have any particular guidance for old landfills.**
2. **Steve T.** to provide Steve M. with a soil removal summary memo for SA 18 and SA 54 (also for SA 16?). Focus on SA 18 first, because it's a NFA transfer. Then SA 16 & SA 54. **SA 16 is done, but needs to be formatted as a completion report. SA18 emailed out. So was SA54.**
3. Barbara N. would like to submit OU 3 PAB project for Navy recognition. Scott N. to provide a sample submittal (MacGregor project). **DONE Steve M** will work on it. Also add OU 4 phyto to this (**Steve T**). **Scott: Not trivial. Probably need to have several folks sit in one room and focus on it. Need to put an abstract together for OU3 & OU4. Needs to be submitted to the Navy by early November. Steve M. to lead. DONE**
4. **Scott N.** to discuss meeting minutes with Tier II, to determine if Tier II should receive Mark S.'s technical minutes, in addition to Tony M.'s facilitator minutes. Maybe we need a distilled version of the long technical OPT minutes to provide Tier II with a concise summary of our issues. **DONE. Tier II moving towards requesting a one-page summary of technical issues from each meeting. But not asking for it yet.**
5. **Steve M.** will ask Paul Calligan to prepare a summary and a graph illustrating GW trends at MOP sites for the RAB. **DONE**
6. **Wayne H., Paul Calligan, and Dave G.** to discuss possibility of changing sampling frequency at long-term MOP sites to semi-annually rather than quarterly. **DONE**
7. **Steve M.** to prepare a presentation for the next OPT meeting on the groundwater hydraulics of the OU 3 PABs. **DONE**
8. **Steve M.** to schedule a conference call to discuss OPT comments to the OU 1 5-year review once that document has been issued. **NOT NECESSARY. OVERCOME BY EVENTS. ACTION ITEM CANCELLED.**

ACTION ITEMS (NEW - TO BE DISCUSSED IN JANUARY)

1. **Scott N.** to ask Tier II for written guidance regarding LUCs and how they relate to OPS and property transfers.

2. **Greg F:** Will put together something for SA36 while we wait for a Tier II letter. This will be the minimum language for LUCs that EPA needs for DD and OPS. Won't be minimal, as he would prefer a letter from the Navy saying what they can live with. Will have this by November 8.
3. Comments to ET document to be emailed to Lawson at AndersonL@ttnus.com.
4. **Steve M.** and **Teresa** to estimate the cost for full scale treatment of the neighborhood using iSOC.
5. **Barbara** to call John Classe this week to have Dave Twedell get Rick A. an electronic CAD drawing showing the new grades, GW restriction zone boundaries, landfill location, etc. relative to the new development. Should show the new basins in the NW corner, utilities, structures, roads, etc that will help us evaluate potential locations for new wells. Twedell also to be told that for our January 2003 OPT meeting in Orlando we would like to see them present their modeling info on impact of the new infiltration basins and changes in grades and impervious area above the landfill on groundwater hydraulics. This to support developer's request that we pull back the GW exclusion zone. We want them to defend what they want to do with the exclusion zone, and also provide us with information to help us decide where the new wells could go.
6. **Dave G.** to speak to Jean Burnette (City's real estate division) about sketches and legal description of the new no-dig zone. This was supposed to be sent to Dave G., but he hasn't seen it yet.
7. **Greg F.** to look into status of EPA comments on the OU 2 FS.
8. **Steve M.** to provide a list of wells and parameters for an additional groundwater sampling event for SA39. Steve T. to then evaluate if he has the funding to do it.
9. **Steve T.** and **Steve M.** to get together and plan for CNO environmental award submittal. Also will check the CNO website for info.
10. **Mark S.** to look through recent meeting minutes and recommend project milestone dates we may have discussed. These to be included in a Project Management Schedule that needs to be submitted to Tier II.

ACTION ITEM PARKING LOT

As discussed by the OPT at the October 2002 meeting in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, this Parking Lot has been established to document Action Items whose resolution is outside the control of the OPT itself. These action items are primarily related to the LUC issues awaiting resolution by USEPA and DoD at a national level.

1. **Greg F.** was asked to provide the EPA's preferred LUC language to the Navy within 30 days (Oct 2002). The LUC language was also to be provided to the developer. This needs to go into the draft DD for SA 36 and sent up the Navy chain for approval. However, Scott N. got a mixed read on this from John Johnson. At a Tier II meeting, John J. said to wait. This seemed like a reversal to the idea that the project teams continue to develop their own language as they see fit. **Greg F:** Language from EPA's point of view is easy. But not clear how this is going to shake out between EPA and DoD headquarters. Letter went to EPA from OSD (Sec of Defense) that DoD sort of agrees with EPA here (Scott's interpretation). Dave G. has seen the latest letter, and the post-ROD authority has been resolved. DoD agrees EPA has post-ROD authority. But they are leery about LUC issues that EPA wants to write into the ROD. Things like inspection frequency and reporting frequency. At Cecil, the EPA RPM is preparing a Draft ROD with language the EPA likes, and then that will be submitted to the Navy. **This paragraph added to parking lot after Oct 2002 OPT meeting.**
2. **Steve T.** and **Barbara N.** will work to prepare the contents of an MOU between the Navy, Army, and FDEP describing how LUCs will be maintained at SA 54. OPT recently concluded USACE in Huntsville would prepare draft text, but Dave has been told that FDEP may not agree with the MOA language. Barbara has also not yet called Huntsville. **This item to remain OPEN until LUC issues are resolved. Added to Parking Lot after Oct 2002 OPT meeting.**
3. **Greg F.** will send us his definition of OPS, and exit strategy guidance. OPS definition was emailed out. **Working on exit strategy idea (not guidance). Still working on this with contractor. Added to Parking Lot after Oct 2002 OPT meeting.**
4. **Greg F.** to provide formal comments to SA36 OPS Report. This is tied into the exit strategy issue. **HQ on board, but right now Greg F.'s attorney has it. Added to Parking Lot after Oct 2002 Meeting.**

In accordance with discussions during Training in September 2001, here are the ground rules (Code of Conduct and Process) to review prior to the next meeting.

GROUND RULES

Code of Conduct

- Allow speakers to complete their thought.
- Be forthright (no hidden agendas)
- Be on time (10 cents per minute to be given to person who purchased refreshments).
- Invoke the 100 mile rule (avoid distractions; i.e., conducting non-OPT business).
- Be open and honest.
- Be professional.
- Bring Teammates up to speed.
- Use I statements.
- Be courteous to the speaker; no side conversations.
- Leave your ego and "business coats" at the door.
- Stay for the hard parts.
- Fix the problem, not the blame.

Process

- Team leader, Timekeeper and recorder rotate alphabetically progressing in this order: timekeeper, recorder, team leader, participant.
- Check-in: personal up-dates; read ground rules; review agenda, ground rules, action items and +/-.
- Proxy: Absent members have the discretion of designating a proxy to represent his/her views at the meeting. The OPT will not deliberately make a decision contrary to an absent member's known views or interests.
- Guests: All guests must be invited by the OPT. The sponsor is responsible to brief guest(s) on the OPT meeting process.
- The Team Leader to confirm that the sponsor has briefed guest(s) on the ground rules. If not, then provide guest(s) with overview of ground rules.
- The OPT and guest(s) shall recite the Ground Rules immediately after the Team Leader calls the meeting to order.
- Close-out: Draft agenda for next meeting; critique meeting; review action items.
- Distribute draft of minutes and Agenda within 7 working days of concluding the meeting. A master copy of the minutes will be maintained and rotated with the recorder.
- Comments or acknowledgment of receipt due back to scribe 7 days after receipt of draft.
- Final minutes and agenda distributed 7 working days before next meeting.
- An action item list with due dates will be maintained and updated monthly.