

N65928.AR.003034
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 2002
NTC ORLANDO FL
9/4/2002
NTC ORLANDO

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM - MEETING MINUTES

Date: 4-5 September 2002
Location: Orlando, Florida
Team Leader: Greg Fraley
Gatekeeper/Timekeeper: Dave Grabka
Facilitator: Tony Marchesseault
Recorder: Mark Salvetti

OPT MEMBERS:

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

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Wayne Hansel, SDIV
Scott Newman, Tier II

GUESTS:

Rick Allen, Tt NUS
Dave Twedell, Nodarse &
Assoc.
John Classe, Baldwin Park
Development Corp.

HANDOUTS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

1. Meeting Minutes 7/23-7/24, 2002
2. UST/IR Update and Status – September 2002 (Tetra Tech)
3. Action items
4. OU1 Test Pit figure and waste thickness table

4 September 2002

CHECK-IN

Wayne's kids came home. Daughter got a scholarship to study abroad. Battling bugs at home. Mark S. tried to adopt dog but it fell through, hit in the mouth by a line drive playing softball, but teeth intact, went to Storyland and Santa's Village in NH with family. Catherine started first grade, Dan in 5th. Steve M. went to festival in town. Witnessed parachute fatality. Dave G. checked out a boat with a co-worker, but no sale. Ready for vacation! Greg F. traveling a lot. Braves in first! World Series championship on tap! Tony M. picking up more partnering teams (Dave G.'s Other Team). Scott N. back from Japan. Rick Allen's back! Working on OU1 5-year review for Steve M. Did some landfill geophysics for rads recently in MA. Then 6 weeks at Sebago Lake relaxing. Barbara has been studying for PE. So busy; lots of traveling. Hope is doing well. Barbara keeping her very busy. Steve T. been really busy. Wife going back to work next week. Just got away for a nice weekend in Key Biscayne

ACTION ITEMS

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

PERSONNEL CHANGES

None

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

The eighth quarter MOP sampling report recommending continued monitoring was submitted on 7/24/02. The ninth quarter MOP sampling was conducted the week of 7/29/02.

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.

Bldg. 2273

Second quarter MOP sampling was conducted the week of 6/10/02. The second quarter MOP sampling report is currently in preparation. The third quarter MOP sampling is tentatively scheduled for week of 9/23/02.

McCoy Annex**Bldg. 7125**

The SRR was approved by FDEP on 8/3/01. Replacement monitoring wells were sampled on 5/1/02. A SAR Addendum is currently in preparation. (No update in September 2002).

Bldg. 7151

The 5th quarterly sampling event was conducted the week of 6/10/02. The 5th quarter MOP sampling report is currently in preparation. The 6th quarter MOP sampling tentatively scheduled for week of 9/23/02.

Bldg. 7174

The first round of quarterly post-active remediation monitoring was completed in March 2002. A report summarizing the results of the sampling was submitted in July 2002. The second round of quarterly post-active remediation monitoring was completed in July 2002, and a report summarizing the results will be submitted in October 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.

Bldg. 109

Wayne H.: Dewatered and now digging out more soil right now. Nodarse dug site w/o dewatering initially because they were waiting for sewer permit. Now dewatered about 10 feet, and digging out soil. Planning to keep dewatering until they get clean water. Hope to be done hauling work by tomorrow. Should have been completed last month (mostly weather delays), so we're finally getting there. After dewatering is complete, will backfill and install a well. Will then need to monitor for a while. FDEP and the county have both reviewed the SAR. Now Nodarse's responsibility.

OU 1

Authorization was received from the Navy to prepare the 5-year review which is presently underway. Five year review needs a public comment period. Does this occur when the draft is issued? This means a final 5-year review won't occur until October. OPT agreed that the date of completion for the 5-year review will be when the draft is issued, so getting the draft done by Sept 30 will meet the schedule.

OU 3

The first round of Treatability Study sampling was performed the week of 4/29/02. Sampling of the other OU 3 monitoring wells was performed the week of 06/17/02, and the data report will be issued in mid-September. The next round of Treatability Study and quarterly monitoring will begin the week of 09/09/02.

SA35

A draft Decision Document was issued in May 2002. The final Decision Document was issued on 8/27/02.

SA 36

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 will issue a report summarizing the results of the sampling in September 2002.

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 will issue the draft Site Investigation Report in September 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 will be submitted to the OPT in September 2002.

The portion of SA 39 excluding the groundwater contamination was included in the FOST/EBST Addendum 4 issued by the Navy during the week of 06/03/02. A draft OPS report for the groundwater IRA is in preparation.

SA 40

The final Site Screening Report was issued on 06/03/02. SA 40 was included in the FOST/EBST Addendum 4 issued by the Navy during the week of 06/03/02. The final Decision Document was issued 07/19/02. This study area is now complete, and no further updates will be necessary.

OU 4

VA has indicated that they no longer want the site. Navy real estate considering selling the site on the open market. VA apparently did not want old building liability. So now Navy has to take on caretaker status again. Steve M. to prepare an EBST/FOST for the clean portion. Working with Navy real estate to make sure there will be an easement to provide access to OU 4. **Dave G:** Don't forget that we now won't know the intended reuse, so the need for a LUC at the old PCB shack (SA55) needs to be considered. Looking at about 32 acres of the total 42 acres are clean. Everything else (remaining 10 acres) to be cut out. So exclude SA55 until LUC language gets resolved, or else everything will get held up.

ACTION ITEM: Steve T. to evaluate SA55 for possible soil removal to eliminate need for LUC.

Herndon Annex - SA 2

Quarterly sampling of the other SA 2 monitoring wells (those not included in the treatability study) was performed in June 2002, and the sampling report will be issued in mid-September 2002.

OU 2

The second round of quarterly sampling was conducted the week of 06/17/02, and the sampling report will be issued in mid-September 2002. The next round of sampling will be performed the week of 09/09/02.

A draft EBST/FOST for three small parcels adjacent to OU 2 was issued 08/16/02. However, there were some exceedances of surface water and sediment standards, so the document will need to be reviewed by the OPT.

SA 16

Waiting on CH2M HILL soil removal report. (Site Rehab Completion Report). Because we turned SA16 into a petroleum site, Dave G. believes the LUCs can then be removed. City should do this, but only with OPT concurrence. No FOST or EBST will be required, because this site was already transferred.

SA 17

A second round of post-injection groundwater sampling was completed in July 2002; the results indicated that contaminant rebound has occurred. Consequently, five additional injectors were installed and additional Fenton's Reagent was injected at the site in August 2002. Additional injection will be completed in September 2002.

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 were also installed and will be sampled in September 2002.

SA 18

A draft Decision Document was issued in April 2002. A draft FOST/EBST is in preparation. Will also need Steve T.'s soil removal report so it can be referenced in the EBST/FOST before FDEP can agree to the EBST/FOST.

SA 52

Quarterly sampling with overdevelopment (5000 gallons were removed) was resumed in March 2002 and the sampling report was issued on 06/14/02. The dieldrin concentration in OLD-52-13 jumped from 0.013J to 1.8/2.2 ppb. The next round of sampling was conducted the week of 06/17/02, and the dieldrin was measured at 1.7 ppb. Action level 0.005 ppb. Meeting this detection limit will be difficult. Will require 2-liter sample, but lab says they can do it. See additional discussions below.

SA 54

No update in September 2002. Waiting on source removal report from Steve T.

STUDY AREA STATUS: No change from July 2002.

Tier II Update (Scott N.)

Region 4, 5, and 6 met to share lessons learned last week. This joint meeting confirmed that practices were consistent across the board, although Region 6 appears to be more "hand's on" with regard to tracking individual milestones and project details. Regions 4 & 5 decided to integrate that more in their reviews. One "theme" of the meeting was for us all to be more vigilant in getting work completed -- we (as Tier I and II) need to keep asking ourselves the following questions. What are we doing? What's the next step When are we going to be done? What is our published end date? These elements should be addressed at all stages of the project and be clear in our minutes AND we need to publish and advertise these key milestones (in our minutes), and track against our plan.

Another big issue on a golf course at Cecil Field. Trying to transfer golf course at Cecil, and levels are such that it cannot be transferred without it being potentially an OU. So that raises flags about all golf courses across the country. This is presently being worked at the State level.

Overall, meeting affirmed the partnering process is working well across the board. Just more emphasis on milestones.

When Tier II meets, they go over each base and review current status. Tony provides Tier II with our minutes, and those minutes are reviewed at Tier II. Appears that there is some duplication. Purpose of Tony's minutes is from the facilitator's perspective, and Salvetti's are more technical details.

One, frequency of our team meetings continues to be a concern to Tier II. Too frequent; when are we going quarterly? Barbara told Joe McCauley that she expects us to go quarterly in January 2003. (Actually, current schedule has us beginning quarterly meetings in October 2002.) Navy's money getting reduced. Focus is on spending more time in the field, and meet less often. We are not the only team meeting more often than quarterly; others are meeting monthly. **Dave G:** Actually, having to deal with the attorney concerns and LUC issues causes us to have more work and maybe meet more frequently.

Also, if there are any negatives included in Tony's report, they tend to become a concern at Tier II. Need to make sure these issues are brought up with the entire team and Tier I addresses at their meeting if they are going to go into minutes. Many issues can be left to plus/minus discussion and dealt with there, rather than end up with negatives in Tony's minutes that may leave a false impression.

(The following text is included in the list of completed action items, but it's also repeated here for convenience.)

Scott N.: Navy is planning to take a test site and write in LUCs into that ROD and submit. Bottom line is Joe McCauley said Navy will come up with this test site to test out the language and run it up the Navy chain. If we have our language ready, then we can produce our language and run our site up the chain as a test case (This is Tier II guidance to the Tier I teams.). Barbara N. needs to make sure she works with Joe McCauley so he knows what's going on and that this is what he really wants. **ACTION ITEMS:** Greg F. to provide some example language. Steve M. will then revise the DDs for SA36 & SA39. **Scott:** If you cost out the LUC in perpetuity (monitoring, sampling, etc) to determine if the LUC is the cheapest way to go, need to keep the true cost in mind. EPA was finding that folks were instituting LUCs without really considering the true cost 30 years hence.

Just a caution: We may do all this work, but it could still get stuck at the national level.

RAB Preparation

OU4: VA got official package from the Navy transferring Area C to them. VA decided to decline. But did not do so officially yet. Just a verbal. Since this isn't official and final, no need to dwell on this at the RAB in the event the VA changes their mind again.

OU1: Team agreed to provide RAB info about the waste found at OU1. Volume of true medical waste excavated was very small, approximately equal to a household trash bag full. The remainder of the excavated waste is being landfilled. Excavated waste is consistent with the material we know is already within the boundary of OU1. Barbara is somewhat reluctant, but agrees it needs to be discussed. She will also run it by SDIV. Nodarse confirmed that Bruce Hosfeld is aware of the waste excavation.

SA 36 (Steve M. & Steve T.)

Had gotten odd data from the two new deep wells installed by the developer, and there was a concern that we were getting leakage from the upper aquifer. But last week the data from the deep wells was back to normal. So it looks like we are OK.

Developer Update

First talked about Dave T.'s action items from last month. Both done. Dave T. brought August 16, 2002 aerials of the site.

SA 36 & SA 39 FOST: Navy still working on that. Summarized instructions from Tier II that Scott N. provided earlier in the meeting. Will be sending a new draft DD for SA 36 & SA 39 up the Navy line. First need OPS determination. SA36 being reviewed by Greg F.'s attorney, and SA39 needs to be finished. Probably won't be done until early October. Steve M. can also begin EBST/FOST for these two sites. Scott N. cautioned not to get hopes up. Documents could still hang up at the upper levels of the Navy.

John C: Can we at least complete the FOST to get the 30-day public comment period started? **Dave G:** Lots of documents we are talking about. OPS determination is affected by the LUC issues, and OPS is dependent on the selected remedy in the DD, which is affected by the LUC. FOST is dependent on the OPS determination. Of these, FDEP is the main player concerning the FOST. For OPS, it's only EPA that has that determination. DD (equiv of ROD) has to be approved by everybody. Has to have LUC language in it. So sequence is OPS, DD, FOST. But DD will have the language necessary for the OPS.

John C: Can all the documents be prepared anticipating that the LUC issues will be resolved, and then we just insert the appropriate language when we are ready? **Dave G:** Yes we have draft DD's out there, but they are on hold without the LUCs. FDEP won't comment on them until the LUC language is in there. Otherwise there is a perception that the FDEP comments are final, and they won't be until the LUC language is there. OPS for SA36 is done (the technical part), but it's waiting for the LUC language. Working on the technical part of SA39.

Our shot at developing LUC language with the Navy will be for SA36. We'll put the EPA's LUC language into the draft DD and send it up the Navy chain. The OPS determination for SA36 will await the DD outcome. The FOST has not been started yet.

John C: Can we at least prepare the technical part of the FOST so it can be ready waiting for the LUC language? Dave and Steve M. think so, up to about the 90 percent level. But Barbara said she won't have any official funds that can be used on FOSTs until October. But that won't really delay anything. Even if the official funding doesn't show up until November.

ACTION ITEM: Let's say that **Greg F.** will provide the LUC language to the Navy in 30 days. The LUC language will also be provided to the developer. This needs to go into the draft DD and sent up the chain. This should be done by our next October meeting. The DD will go to Washington for approval.

OK, how about the OU1 ROD? Rick A. needs to interview Dave T. for the 5-year review. Dave G. sees only one real big OU1 question. We know where the old landfill was, but part of the 5-year review is to redefine this. Dave T. has delineated the extent of the waste on the other side of the fence. It is still inside the landfill deed. So all the waste extent is now inside the original ROD boundaries. Developer

can live with the current extent of the no-dig zone. But they do want to bring back the GW restriction boundary.

Steve T. also requested an additional week added to the access agreement for the OU1 excavation work, beyond the current September 13 date.

Transfer Update

No update for September 2002.

5 September 2002

Training

Watched video of our June Tier II presentation. Rest of training had to do with communications. Why do we meet? Do things faster, better, cheaper, quality.

How about communication with Tier II? Scott is our interface and he can help us resolve our issues as they come up, or take it up to Tier II if necessary. The mechanism to raise issues to Tier II on a regular basis will probably be going away, with a greater emphasis on solving problems -- with Tier II interaction on a real-time basis, if necessary or on our own. Some teams have more issues than others; the OPT here doesn't have that many.

Also had a discussion of the meeting minutes and their function. Tony prepares minutes, and Mark S. prepares minutes. Tony's minutes should be focused on whether the team is functioning. Mark's minutes are the technical minutes. Some discussion that it would probably be useful to have the technical minutes go to Tier II so they have a better idea of what we're doing. Right now this is not the procedure. **ACTION ITEM:** Scott N. said he would mention this issue to Tier II, and clarify the purpose of the two versions of the minutes. Maybe we need a distilled version of the long technical OPT minutes to provide Tier II with a concise summary of our issues.

Continuation of Petroleum Discussion:

Bldg 109

Still digging and dewatering. Rain has been a problem. **Dave G:** FDEP approved Nodarse overpumping, so they should be OK. They proposed they would dig to water table until they got their permit to discharge to sewer. FDEP is OK with what they are doing; consistent with the work plan, but about 2 weeks behind schedule. Excavation should be backfilled in about 2 weeks.

Dave G: Most of our sites are MOP, and they are doing pretty well. We had talked about using iSOC at a site. Do we still need to do that? **Wayne:** Paul Calligan feels if we have to do anything active, it would probably be at 7125. Not sure yet. **ACTION ITEM:** Steve M. will ask Paul Calligan to prepare a summary and a graph illustrating GW trends for the RAB. Already doing it for most of the reports anyway.

Also, some of the sites are in their eighth or ninth quarterly event. Examples are Bldg 200 and 7151 at McCoy. Maybe we should change these to semi-annually if the numbers aren't changing quickly? **Wayne:** Problem is these are often sites we are trying to close quickly. **Dave G:** If the developer wants to close the sites out quickly and aggressively, that's fine. But should we be doing the frequent sampling? **ACTION ITEM:** Wayne, Paul, and Dave G. will discuss this possibility.

This led into a discussion of the format for the UST/IR Update to provide the RAB more info. Scott N. proposed a bulleted historical summary of events, followed by a separate section for new info. Steve M.: Tag maps? No, team seems to feel the graph is more illustrative, gets the point across, and may avoid

unnecessary discussions. Graph should have only two or three illustrative wells from each site. Steve will reformat the Update to the bulleted format discussed.

OU1 Update (Steve T)

Steve T. handed out a figure of test pit locations and a table of waste thicknesses. The first column on the table represents the original estimated depth of the waste, and the second column shows how deep they actually had to dig. In general, they had to dig a lot deeper than they expected to get all the waste out. They expected 8 feet max, but in some places they had to go to 12 feet. Never encountered GW.

Health department came out to view the test pitting and provide advice as to what was regulated and what would be considered just municipal solid waste.

Dave G. asked if the temp storage area was large enough to hold all the waste? No, it was enlarged with the cooperation of the developer.

Original estimate was 1400 tons to incinerate at about \$1.5MM. Actually dug over 6,000 tons of material, but only about 100 tons will be incinerated. Actual amount of regulated medical waste was about the size of a small trash bag. Very small amount.

Dave G: Are we confident that we have the required 2 feet of cover on the west side of the fence, in the current exclusion zone? Given how shallow some of the medical waste was found? **Yes**, Dave T. checked several locations and he found at least 2 feet.

As for dates of the filling, they found an ad for a 1966 Pontiac GTO among the waste.

Material being hauled away now. Using 40 to 50 trucks per day, and will need about 500 trucks.

Steve M: Does this waste require that we review the boundary of OU1? This waste was outside the original boundary. How might this affect our effort to reduce the size of the GW exclusion zone? Do we need to extend the boundary of OU1 to the east? Not for groundwater.

Drums of roofing tar were found further north of the medical waste. Those were all removed in a couple of rollofs.

OU2 Update (Steve M.)

On August 16, issued EBST/FOST for a couple of parcels at OU2. Where do we stand with regards to getting comments on this document? We need comments on a few exceedances and how they are being addressed. Hits are BaP and aldrin. But Navy doesn't feel they are impacting the environment, and restrictions are not required. **Dave:** The ditch is upstream of OU2, and these detections are consistent with detections further upstream. These are also not detected further downstream.

Got a thumbs-up vote from all the OPT members. The above detections are not a problem, and we can move forward with the FOST.

Dave G. proceeded to give Steve M. his comments to the EBST and FOST.

OU3 (Steve M)

Dave asked about the hydro data around the walls to see if there was evidence of how GW was flowing. Steve M: Wall does not appear to have affected GW flow at all. **ACTION ITEM:** Steve M. will do a presentation next meeting on this topic.

OU4

Have a first quarter report coming up ASAP, second quarter later this month, sampling for third quarter next week. Starting construction of treatment system on Sept 23, expect to startup by Thanksgiving.

Sent some tree leaves to Univ. of Florida to look into what may be eating them.

Extraction wells and stripper working fine. Groundwater concentrations are going down.

SA 52 (Steve M.)

Tt NUS did some research into dieldrin. Partitions very strongly to soil. Activated carbon and reverse osmosis systems good for P&T treatment. No magic bullets for treatment.

Regarding DPT program to define GW contamination extent, the normal lab detection limits are pretty high compared to GCTL. Can get close to 0.005 ppb GCTL by distilling down a 2-liter sample. Also, concerned that the DPT sample will be turbid and could therefore show dieldrin on the suspended solids. So probably would have to install well cluster. Looking at about \$25K dollars. Is it worth it?

Dave G: Don't forget that we only dug to a number (dieldrin concentration in soil) that was much higher than the leachability number. Dave thought the DPT program could also look at soil to see if we had a lot of soil that could be a source. We could also run these samples for SPLP.

Wayne: Running SPLP and collecting some soil samples around the perimeter would probably be inexpensive. **Dave:** If we develop a site-specific leaching value, we could remove soil to that number and not worry about any more GW monitoring anywhere else.

Steve M: Last GW sample was 26 NTU. Color was cloudy. Resampling next week. How about they run filtered and unfiltered groundwater samples for dieldrin? Would prefer not to overdevelop. **Agreed.**

This could lead to a GW restriction, which should be acceptable in the long run and likely preferable to a complex remediation.

SA 17 (Steve T. & Steve M.)

Injecting now. Tt installed wells after completing DPT work. Think the downgradient plume is delineated; will be sampling the wells in the next couple of weeks.

Parking Lot

Monitoring reports. Greg F. sent out letters recently that included graphs of concentration as a function of water levels. Should these be prepared by Tt? **Greg:** No, not necessary that we do that. **Dave G:** If there is a correlation of concentration and water levels, then it would be useful to be included in the monitoring reports.

FACILITATOR Critique/Checkout/Agenda (Prepared at Greg's F.'s request)

+'s	Δ's
Training	
Greg's work leading the team	
Scott's Tier II Input	

CRITIQUE/CHECKOUT/AGENDA

+’s	Δ’s
Wayne’s input	Drifted off-topic on occasion
Rick Allen back to do OU1 5-yr review	Unnecessarily long RAB meeting
RAB Meeting; OPT member input	Speaker interruptions
Discussion with developer on LUCs; Twedell investigations	Some talking at the same time.
Rick Allen back to do OU1 5-yr review	Greg doesn’t like being team leader
+’s (Continued)	Δ’s (Continued)
OPT gets things done without a lot of stress	
OPT meetings going quarterly	
Mark’s minutes	
Good dialogue	
Steve M. able to start FOSTs	
Dave’s timekeeping	
Steve T. able to save millions (literally) on waste disposal at OU 1	

Future Meeting Schedule

September 4, 5 – Orlando (RAB on Sept 4) Starting at 1PM on 9/4

October 28, 29 in Oak Ridge (Start at 1PM)

January 15 & 16 in Orlando (RAB) (Tentative)

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY
September 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. For example, we believe GOAA is planning a large detention basin in the vicinity of the old ordnance bunkers. How will this affect GW flow? Also, need to make sure they are aware of the contamination migrating to their property (the ditch). Navy would be looking for an agreement with GOAA to ensure no changes to the drainage ditch in this portion of the site. Barbara has contacted GOAA, still waiting for a reply. **HAS REPLY! Will handout before the meeting is over. Not done yet, though. (Left open, as I don't think the handout occurred.)**
2. **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. **NOT DONE. LEAVE OPEN.**
3. **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.**
4. **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. Leave open.**
5. **Steve T.** to provide Steve M. with a soil removal summary memo for SA 18 and SA 54 (also for SA 16?). Not done yet. Focus on SA 18 first, because it's a NFA transfer. Then SA 16 & SA 54. **LEAVE OPEN**
6. **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. LEAVE OPEN.**
7. Barbara N. would like to submit OU 3 PAB project for Navy recognition. Scott N. to provide a sample submittal (MacGregor project). **Steve T** will work on it. Also add OU 4 phyto to this. **Dept of the Navy needs abstracts in early Oct and one in February. LEAVE OPEN.**

ACTION ITEMS (Completed in June)

1. Golf course appears to be doing work in the vicinity of areas shown as requiring additional soil cover on Tt NUS Figure 5-1. **Barbara N.** will speak to the golf course to discuss allowable activities. In particular, work was being done around Area 2. **Barbara waiting for a reply. Barbara needs to call them back. Barbara: We need to do another site inspection to see if we need to add more soil where the work was done. NEW ACTION ITEM: Steve T. to do the inspection.**
2. **Dave G.** and **Barbara N.** to pursue deed language from City of Orlando and the Navy to add LUCs to the deeds for park properties originally transferred to the Dept. of the Interior. Barbara will be sending FDEP a letter, saying Navy working on it. Waiting for DOI to provide a date for making the corrections. City hasn't done anything else, just working on SA 36 & SA 39. Barbara still needs to send the letter. **Barbara: Navy wants to wait pending resolution of DoD/EPA meetings. LUC issue still hung up. Air Force Langley language unacceptable to EPA. Scott N.: Navy is planning to take a test site and write in LUCs into that ROD and submit. Bottom line is Joe McCauley said Navy will come up with this test site to test out the language and run it up the Navy chain. If we have our language ready, then we can produce our language and run it up (Tier II guidance to the Tier I teams). Barbara needs to work with Joe so he knows what's going on to make sure this is what he really wants. ACTION ITEMS: Greg F. to provide some**

example language. Steve M. will then revise the DDs for SA36 & SA39. Scott: If you cost out the LUC in perpetuity (monitoring, sampling, etc) to determine if the LUC is the cheapest way to go, need to keep the true cost in mind. EPA was finding that folks were instituting LUCs without really considering the true cost 30 years hence. We may do all this work, but it may get stuck at the national level.

3. **Team** needs to review the draft Decision Documents for SA 36 and SA 39 that were issued by Steve M. on February 22, 2002. DoD does not want long-term responsibility for sites that have transferred and are no longer under DoD control. Steve M.: DD's will be revised to note that the clean areas can be transferred without restriction. This means we'll have two DD's, one for the clean and one for the groundwater. **DONE**
4. **Steve T.** to provide SA 36 & SA 39 survey coordinates to Steve M. this week (week ending July 26). **DONE**
5. **Dave T.** to also provide Steve T. a drawing showing the school layout so we can discuss where the new replacement wells will go. Should have been emailed to Steve T. He will check. **DONE**
6. **Dave T.** to provide Steve M. the new OU 1 cover thicknesses so the ROD can be refined to reflect the areas where a 2-foot concern still exists. This info included in a report that Dave G. has already received. Included in package sent to Steve M. **DONE.**
7. **Barbara N.** will check to see if the Navy is willing to move ahead with a LUC agreement. Barbara will talk to the Navy's attorney. If the attorney is receptive to this idea, then Barbara will tell Greg F. and he will provide EPA's preferred language for the Navy's attorney to review. **DONE (Navy not willing. See Tier II comments above.)**
8. **Greg F.** to check into whether the OU 1 ROD needs updating, or if all changes can be made in the 5-year review. Also consider if there needs to be a public comment period if there is a "substantial" change in restricted zones. **DONE. Greg: Yes, all changes can be made in the 5-year review, and there will be a public comment period.**
9. **Dave G.** to attempt to have Building 109 work plan review done by end of this week, and see if Greg Brown also needs to sign off. **DONE.**
10. **Steve T** to go look at the SA 52 dig report, and sum up what was done. Will do this with Wayne H. How much contaminated dirt was removed, what was left, etc. **DONE**
11. **Steve M.** will issue a brief work plan for DPT delineation of dieldrin in SA 52 GW. Also **Steve M.** will do a brief literature search on behavior of dieldrin in the environment (does it break down?). **DONE No work plan and did a brief literature search. Pending SA 52 discussions this meeting.**
12. **Steve T.** will have Jennifer O. look at the SA 17 GW delineation work plan in light of the new source area data. Mark S. noted that CH2M HILL or GeoCleanse probably has soil TOC data that could be used by Tetra Tech in the seepage velocity calcs rather than the default value currently assumed in the work plan. **DONE**

ACTION ITEMS (NEW - TO BE DISCUSSED IN OCTOBER)

1. **Steve T.** to evaluate SA55 (Area C) for possible soil removal to eliminate need for LUC.
2. **Greg F.** will provide the EPA's preferred LUC language to the Navy within 30 days. The LUC language will also be provided to the developer. This needs to go into the draft DD for SA 36 and sent up the chain. This should be done by our next October meeting.
3. **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.
4. **Steve M.** will ask Paul Calligan to prepare a summary and a graph illustrating GW trends at MOP sites for the RAB.
5. **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.
6. **Steve M.** to prepare a presentation for the next OPT meeting on the groundwater hydraulics of the OU 3 PABs.
7. **Steve M.** to schedule a conference call to discuss OPT comments to the OU 1 5-year review once that document has been issued.
8. **Steve T.** to inspect areas of OU 2 where the golf course was doing work to determine if additional soil cover will be required.

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM

PROPOSED AGENDA

28-29 October 2002

Oak Ridge, TN

Team Assignments		Support	Expected guests
Team Leader:	Dave Grabka	Wayne Hansel	Dave Twedell (Nodarse)
Gate/Timekeeper:	Steve McCoy		John Classe (Baldwin Park Development Corp.)
Recorder:	Mark Salvetti		Rick Allen (Tt NUS)
Facilitator:	Tony Marchesseault		
Tier II Link:	Scott Newman		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Monday – 28 October 2002			
1:00 PM	Check-In, Action Item Review	Administration	DG
1:45 PM	UST/IR/Transfer Update/Tank Trends Graphs	Information transfer	SM/BN
2:15 PM	LUC Language for DD/OPS/FOST; SA36 Test Case	Information transfer	Scott Newman
3:00 PM	BREAK	Leg stretch	
3:15 PM	Tier II Update	Information/Discussion	Team
3:30 PM	Developer Update	Information/Discussion	ALL
4:30 PM	SA 17 Data Discussion	Information/Discussion	Team
5:00 PM	End of Day		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Tuesday – 29 October 2002			
8:00 AM	SA 2 Remedial Technology Brainstorming	Information/Discussion	ALL
8:30AM	Petroleum Discussion (Including Bldg 109)	Information transfer	WH
9:00 AM	OU 1 Well Locations & 5-year Review	Information transfer	SM/ST
10:00 AM	BREAK	Recharge Batteries	ALL
10:15AM	OU 2 Site Cover Inspection/Update/Monitoring	Information transfer	SM/ST
10:45 AM	OU 3 GW Flow Discussion	Information transfer	SM/ST
11:15 AM	OU 4 Update (Photos/data)	Information transfer	SM/ST
11:45PM	Draft Area C FOST & Shed Update (SA 55)	Information transfer/discussion	SM
12:15 PM	SA 52 Groundwater Data	Information transfer	SM
12:30PM	Checkout/ next meeting agenda/ (+/-)	Information transfer/discussion	ALL
1:00 PM	End of Day		

October Agenda Items:

OU3 GW flow, SA 17 data, OU4 pictures and data, SA52, tanks trend graphs, OU2 site cover inspection & shed at Area C (SA55), draft Area C fost, LUC language re: RODS?DD/OPS/FOST, SA36 test case, SA2 remedial technology brainstorming, OU1 monitoring well locations, OU1 5-year review, OU2 monitoring.

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 +/Δ.
- 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.

**ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM
PROPOSED AGENDA
28-29 October 2002
Oak Ridge, TN**

Team Assignments		Support	Expected guests
Team Leader:	Dave Grabka	Wayne Hansel	Dave Twedell (Nodarse)
Gate/Timekeeper:	Steve McCoy		John Classe (Baldwin Park Development Corp.)
Recorder:	Mark Salvetti		Rick Allen (Tt NUS)
Facilitator:	Tony Marchesseault		
Tier II Link:	Scott Newman		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Monday – 28 October 2002			
1:00 PM	Check-In, Action Item Review	Administration	DG
1:45 PM	UST/IR/Transfer Update/Tank Trends Graphs	Information transfer	SM/BN
2:15 PM	LUC Language for DD/OPS/FOST; SA36 Test Case	Information transfer	Scott Newman
3:00 PM	BREAK	Leg stretch	
3:15 PM	Tier II Update	Information/Discussion	Team
3:30 PM	Developer Update	Information/Discussion	ALL
4:30 PM	SA 17 Data Discussion	Information/Discussion	Team
5:00 PM	End of Day		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Tuesday – 29 October 2002			
8:00 AM	SA 2 Remedial Technology Brainstorming	Information/Discussion	ALL
8:30AM	Petroleum Discussion (Including Bldg 109)	Information transfer	WH
9:00 AM	OU 1 Well Locations & 5-year Review	Information transfer	SM/ST
10:00 AM	BREAK	Recharge Batteries	ALL
10:15AM	OU 2 Site Cover Inspection/Update/Monitoring	Information transfer	SM/ST
10:45 AM	OU 3 GW Flow Discussion	Information transfer	SM/ST
11:15 AM	OU 4 Update (Photos/data)	Information transfer	SM/ST
11:45PM	Draft Area C FOST & Shed Update (SA 55)	Information transfer/discussion	SM
12:15 PM	SA 52 Groundwater Data	Information transfer	SM
12:30PM	Checkout/ next meeting agenda/ (+/-)	Information transfer/discussion	ALL
1:00 PM	End of Day		

October Agenda Items:

OU3 GW flow, SA 17 data, OU4 pictures and data, SA52, tanks trend graphs, OU2 site cover inspection & shed at Area C (SA55), draft Area C fost, LUC language re: RODS?DD/OPS/FOST, SA36 test case, SA2 remedial technology brainstorming, OU1 monitoring well locations, OU1 5-year review, OU2 monitoring.



CITY OF ORLANDO

October 14, 2002

OFFICE OF
GLEND A. HOOD
MAYOR

Jimmy Anderson
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive
P.O. Box 190010
N. Charleston, S.C. 29419-9010

Re: Early Transfer-Main Base, McCoy Annex and Area C

Dear Mr. Anderson:

First, let me start by saying "thank-you" to you, and Dierdre Scott, and the others at SOUTH DIV for taking the time to meet with City staff and discuss the Early Transfer proposal with us. The discussions that City staff has had with all of you concerning Early Transfer has been very informative and has aided us in concluding that this process is a potentially beneficial course of action for us as the Local Redevelopment Authority.

While many issues remain that require further investigation and will need to be addressed, the City of Orlando as the Local Redevelopment Authority is hereby formally requesting the Navy to transfer the remaining parcels on Main Base, McCoy Annex and Area C (if the VA decides not to accept it) by the Early Transfer method with the Navy retaining environmental remediation responsibilities.

Also, as you know, Orlando Partners is the re-developer on the Main Base and is extremely anxious to expedite the transfer of the remaining parcels on Main Base. Orlando Partners has made significant progress in re-developing the Main Base into the community of Baldwin Park. Baldwin Park's models and first homes are currently under construction, parcels have been sold to builders, and they have officially opened to the public for lot sales and reservations. Due to these pressing circumstances, the City is specifically requesting the Navy to expedite the transfer of Main Base by either allowing Main Base to proceed by Early Transfer on its own, with Area C and McCoy Annex to be followed upon its completion, or through whatever means are available to deliver Orlando Partners the remaining parcels at Main Base as quickly as possible. Early Transfer of all of the parcels is in the community's and the State's best interest and will accelerate the redevelopment and reuse of the property.

Sincerely,

Glenda E. Hood
Mayor

LP/tcp