

N65928.AR.003026
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING CONFERENCE CALL DATED
23 APRIL 2003 NTC ORLANDO FL
4/23/2003
NTC ORLANDO

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

Date: April 23, 2003

OPT MEMBERS:

Steve Tsangaris
Barbara Nwokike
Steve McCoy
Greg Fraley
Mark Salvetti
Dave Grabka

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Hope Wilson, SDIV

GUESTS:

Facilitator: Paul Rice

PROPOSED CONFERENCE CALL AGENDA

1. Fed to Fed Transfer Discussion (based on the document Scott sent us on April 8)-**Not Discussed**
2. SA 17 Downgradient Plume Extent (continuation of March OPT discussion led by Steve T)-**Not Discussed**
3. Complete SCAP (including changing dates already in there, updating all our deliverables, and establishing the interim deliverables that we need to track but won't necessarily include in SCAP)-All, but led by Greg F.
4. Update on GOAA Meeting-Barbara
5. Herndon Update (private well sampling?)-Steve M.
6. OU 4 Update (including indoor air sampling)-Steve T.
7. Update on SA 55-Steve M.

GOAA Meeting

Barbara and Allan Jenkins (Tt) recently met with GOAA to discuss the OU 2 groundwater plume and GOAA's plans for the drainage ditch.

The meeting focus quickly changed when GOAA realized that the OU 2 plume was onto their property, and the drainage ditch was apparently intercepting the plume. GOAA claimed that they were not aware the plume was on their property. Bruce Hosfeld was in attendance, and although OU 2 has frequently been discussed at RAB meetings, Bruce also stated that he had not realized the plume was on GOAA property. During the conference call, Dave G. provided a copy of OPT meeting minutes from March 1999 where GOAA was in attendance to discuss the OU 2 plume. The following is an excerpt from the minutes:

GOAA VISIT

GOAA (Cindy Sellers, Steve Pue, and Tom Maurer) met with the Team to address concerns regarding contaminated water moving into GOAA property. A letter from the South Florida Water Management District (reference #10) was handed out and

discussed. GOAA was told that the hydrologic model based on the pump test and groundwater elevation data indicates that groundwater from the landfill is intercepted by the drainage canals between OU 2 and GOAA property. Creation of stormwater retention ponds on GOAA property is not expected to alter the interception of groundwater by the canal.

Dave G. noted that GOAA may also have a problem with the northern portion of the OU 2 plume, as a drainage ditch near the petroleum storage tanks is intercepting this part of the plume too.

GOAA is currently planning to construct their stormwater detention basin in 2005. The only available location is where the basin is currently proposed – no alternatives.

Overall, the meeting went well, and additional meetings and communications will occur between the Navy and GOAA. GOAA was pleased to hear from Barbara that she had set aside contingency funding should groundwater remediation be required. In the meantime, the FOSET should proceed saying the Navy is working with GOAA to resolve the groundwater issues. If necessary, the Navy will deal with the offsite groundwater contamination.

Barbara also remarked that the next step will be for us to wait for GOAA to tell us how they expect the Navy to respond. However, because any major decisions related to GOAA land have to go through the Orlando City Council, it was unclear how long this would take. Barbara estimated at least 6 months. How are we supposed to factor this into SCAP? (See dates we assigned in the SCAP section below).

Greg F. stated that we shouldn't have to wait for the City Council. Their opportunity to comment on the proposed remedy for OU 2 is during the public comment period. If they choose to stop the Navy's remedy (such as denying access to monitor groundwater), then the Navy can pursue other means of gaining access. But we should not provide any additional waiting period for GOAA comment beyond the normal public comment period.

Steve T: It really should just come down to what is protective. If we decide that a remedy using GOAA's ditch and property as a buffer is protective, then the Navy has met their obligation. GOAA could object to the remedy during public comment, but they must have a legitimate reason.

So do we need to wait for GOAA and their plans for the ditch before we finalize the FS? What if they eliminate the ditch or otherwise make changes that might cause the proposed remedy to change?

Steve M: Not a problem. The FS has a number of alternatives to deal with the OU 2 plume. Even if we need to consider additional alternatives, we can do that in the Proposed Plan. So the FS can go final now (this is reflected in the SCAP schedule for OU 2 below).

The SCAP schedule for OU 2 has therefore been prepared without a separate review and comment cycle for the Orlando City Council.

ACTION ITEM: **Barbara** is working on minutes for the GOAA meeting. These minutes should reference and preferably attach a copy of the March 1999 OPT meeting minutes showing GOAA's attendance for the OU 2 discussion.

SA 55 (PAHs around Area C Building 1104)

Steve M. distributed a tag map showing PAHs in surface soil so far. Have not delineated to residential SCTLs for benzo(a)pyrene and dibenzo(a,h)anthracene. Because of the low detection limits required, the lab is unable to provide quick turnaround results. So Steve M. proposes that additional soil samples be collected in areas where PAHs are still above residential SCTLs,

stepping out in rows spaced approximately 10 feet apart (similar to the existing sample spacing). The lab will run one set of rows at a time. If residential SCTLs are met, then the additional soil samples will not be analyzed. If SCTLs are exceeded, then the lab will be instructed to analyze the next set of samples. **OPT thumbs up**, with Steve M. asked to look into holding times to make sure they won't be exceeded for samples run later in the sequence.

Herndon Annex (SA 2)

Steve M. stated that the residential irrigation wells in Azalea Park have been resampled, but the results are not yet back from the lab.

OU 4 (Building 1100 Indoor Air)

CH2M HILL sampled indoor air in Building 1100. PCE was detected, and their modeling shows there is a potential for vapor intrusion if a residence was built on the site in the future. **Dave G.** asked about a future scenario where someone were to move into Area C and use the current Building 1100 for storage. Would there be a risk? Steve T. was not sure, but CH2M HILL's evaluation did conclude that the indoor air quality in the building was safe for the current site workers.

Dave asked about a comparison to OSHA standards. Although those standards may not be risk-based, they are enforceable and would possibly be the only means Florida would have to impose use restrictions on the building in the future. The concern here is related to what requirements may be imposed on a future owner. **Mark S.** suggested that wording similar to the following be added to the deed, and **the OPT agreed**:

Future use of Building 1100 is contingent on the occupant performing an indoor air health assessment for the portion of the building being used to demonstrate the building is safe to occupy.

Future Meetings

Just a reminder that the June 2003 OPT meeting in Orlando will begin on Wednesday, June 25 at 3PM, with a RAB that evening.

Because of the late start, Thursday, June 26 will be a full day, probably running to 4PM. Please make travel plans accordingly.

SCAP Discussion and Dates

Operable Unit 1

5-Year Review: Only summarizing remaining OUs. This document just needs to get to Greg F. so his committee can approve. **Leave Planned Comp as 2003/3.**

Operable Unit 2

- RI/FS: Only FS remains. Currently shows Planned Completion of 2003/03. **Leave as-is.**
 PP: Currently shows a Planned Comp of 2003/3. **Change to 2005/2.**
 ROD: Now shows Planned Completion as 2002/02, and an Actual Complete date of 2/22/02. **Change Planned Completion date to 2005/02, and use 2/22/02 as the Actual Start date (this date currently represents the submittal of the draft ROD).**
 RD: Now have 2003/4 as Planned Comp. Leave the current Planned Start at 2003/2, and Actual Start 2/11/03. **Change Planned Comp to 2006/1.**
 RA: **Change Planned Comp from 2004/4 to 2006/4.** *(Do we need a Planned Start? We didn't discuss a change from 2004/1.)*

Operable Unit 3

Right now, all we've completed to date is an Interim ROD (for the PABs as a treatability study). We have also completed the RI/FS. SCAP is missing a PP.

- PP: This document still has to go through OPT review and public comment. **Use 2004/3 as a Planned Comp date.**
 ROD: **Use 2004/4 as a Planned Comp date.**
 RD: **Planned Start 2005/1; Planned Complete 2005/4.**
 RA: **Planned Start 2006/1; Planned Complete 2007/1.**

Operable Unit 4

- RA: Completion of the RA is defined as submittal of as-built drawings. Steve T. plans to submit these in June 2003. **Use Actual Start date of 2002/3; change Planned Completion to 2003/4.**
- ROD: **Take the Actual Completion date of 12/14/01 and make that the Actual Start date. December 14, 2001 was when the draft ROD was submitted. Make Planned Completion 2004/2.**