

32501.000
03.01.00.0054

N00204.AR.000289
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

MINUTES OF THE
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING
NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
July 30, 1991

October 1991

Prepared for:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
SOUTHERN DIVISION
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
2155 Eagle Drive, P.O. Box 10068
Charleston, South Carolina 29411-0068

Contract Number N62467-88-C-0200



ecology arid environment, inc.

316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32501, TEL. (904) 435-8925
International Specialists in the Environment

The project managers meeting was held on July 30, 1991, in Building 1754 at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola, Florida and commenced at 9:40 a.m. The attendees of the meeting were:

Suzanne Sanborn	- U.S. Navy Southern Division (SouthDiv), Charleston;
Ron Joyner	- Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola;
Franklin R. Fritz	- NAS Pensacola;
Michelle Glenn	- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region IV, Atlanta;
Allison Drew	- EPA, Region IV, Atlanta;
Tim Bahr	- Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER), Tallahassee;
Eric Nuzie	- FDER, Tallahassee;
Jorge Caspary	- FDER, Tallahassee;
Rick Rudy	- Ecology & Environment, Inc. (E & E), Tallahassee;
John Barksdale	- E & E, Pensacola;
Brian Caldwell	- E & E, Pensacola.

Suzanne Sanborn started the meeting by stating that a sign-up sheet would be passed around for everyone to sign. She also requested that everyone introduce themselves.

Introductions were made.

S. Sanborn began by stating that the purpose of the meeting was to have an open discussion concerning the interim data reports for Batch 1 and to proceed according to the outline which had been provided prior to the meeting.

Michelle Glenn opened the discussion stating that the EPA has several problems with the interim data reports, one of which is the volume of reports submitted at one time. This overload is particularly difficult

for the EPA risk assessment group. She continued stating that, due to this large volume of documentation, the priority of the reports for EPA review is that those pertaining to the RI/FS sites are given first attention and those reports pertaining to site screening are secondary. This position was explained in a letter that should have been received by SouthDiv from the EPA. Furthermore, the interim data reports, as interpreted by the EPA, are secondary documents according to the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA). She then stated that she would like some input as to how SouthDiv wishes the EPA to review these documents. The EPA review comments can be provided in two ways: 1) revisions to the actual reports themselves; or 2) in a format for use in the RI/FS work plans.

S. Sanborn commented that she would like to know how this will affect the proposed Phase II recommendations in the work plans.

M. Glenn suggested that the review comments would probably be more useful if, instead of revising the interim data report, the comments were incorporated into the work plans themselves.

S: Sanborn asked how the FDER would feel about this suggestion.

Eric Nuzie answered that the FDER review comments had already been sent out on three different sets of interim data reports and that he felt that their comments could be used either way.

M. Glenn concurred saying that the FDER comments could be used either way. Furthermore, the EPA agreed with the FDER review comments and in some cases would actually want more information above that requested in the FDER review comments.

S. Sanborn stated she had not yet seen the FDER review comments.

E. Nuzie commented that the FDER would do whatever was needed to expedite the review/comment incorporation process. He further stated that a faxed copy has been provided to SouthDiv as well as a

hand-carried copy at the RPM meeting.

Comments were received from FDER on the interim data reports for all 10 sites and the Group 0 draft work plan. John Barksdale asked when review comments on the interim data reports would be submitted from the EPA to SouthDiv in order for them to be incorporated into the Phase II work plans.

Allison Drew answered that, on the total of ten sites, the EPA review, comments for the six RI/FS sites should be received by the beginning of September and the comments for the four screening sites would come later.

M. Glenn stated that, under the FFA requirements, review comments for the RI/FS sites are due on September 4, but that they plan to have them back before this date. She stated that she expected to have all of the comments from each EPA department involved in the review by August 16, at which time they would need a week to consolidate them into one set of comments to be submitted to SouthDiv.

S. Sanborn asked when the review comments pertaining to screening sites would be received from the EPA.

M. Glenn answered in early October.

S. Sanborn stated that the date which the comments are received on the screening sites will directly impact the fieldwork schedule since these screening sites are incorporated into the fieldwork for those nearby RI/RS sites.

M. Glenn stated that the EPA's priorities and commitments are to the RI/FS sites and that the screening sites are on a lower priority due to the EPA's manpower problems. Technically, the interim data reports, as secondary documents, do not need to be reviewed by the EPA.

Consequently, in order to expedite the entire process, what the EPA would like to review is the RI/FS work plan itself, with the interim

data report information incorporated into it.

S. Sanborn said that they need to have the EPA comments on the interim data reports in order to revise the Phase II work plans.

M. Glenn answered that, upon submission of the interim data report to SouthDiv, some progress should have already been made toward revising the work plan. She continued by saying that the EPA review comments on the interim data reports should help the SouthDiv to understand what the EPA is looking for in future work plans, and should make the entire process easier as it goes along.

S. Sanborn clarified that the EPA review comments on the interim data reports for the RI/FS sites would be received by the end of August or first of September and that the review comments for the screening site reports would probably be received sometime in October or earlier.

H. Glenn agreed.

S. Sanborn continued by asking if the EPA is aware that the review comments from the regulatory agencies (EPA/FDER) for the work plans for Groups H, I, L, O, P and Q are due during approximately that timeframe.

H. Glenn answered that if the EPA is able to submit comments on the interim data reports in early September, then the comments on those work plans should not be a problem. She continued by saying that the EPA manpower shortage occurs when a large number of documents are received at once. Additionally, when the documents fall under the FFA, which have priority, they receive more support for quick review.

S. Sanborn stated that it appears that the EPA has some internal problems that need to be worked out to maintain the expedited schedule.

H. Glenn disagreed saying she wished to clarify with SouthDiv that the EPA does not consider this a problem and that it is just a matter of prioritization. She continued by saying that the FFA is very clear on

the review of documents, and the EPA is clear on their responsibility; they will give support on all the documents as time and manpower permits but that their first responsibilities are to the primary documents which fall under the FFA.

S. Sanborn asked if this situation would impact the proposed work plans.

M. Glenn answered that it should not have any impact, and if it does, the situation would strictly be an organizational (EPA) problem.

J. Barksdale stated that the FFA is not very clear on where the interim data reports fall within the prioritization of documents.

M. Glenn answered that this is something that should be clarified. She then questioned the decision of phasing the work as was the concern of Nancy Dean (EPA) at the last TRC meeting.

J. Barksdale stated that the reasons for doing the work in phases had previously been discussed between all parties (Mike Green [SouthDiv], David Criswell [SouthDiv], N. Dean and E. Nuzie), and that all parties generally felt they were very good reasons. He continued asking E. Nuzie how the FDER had approached the review of the interim data reports.

E. Nuzie answered that they had reviewed the documents within the timeframe, hoping that it would expedite the work. He continued saying that apparently the EPA made the decision that it would not be done within their agency's departments this way due to their lack of manpower. He then introduced Jorge Caspary who had performed the technical review of the interim data reports.

M. Glenn stated that she felt the FDER had a different situation due to their involvement with site screening overall.

E. Nuzie continued saying that EPA's point-of-view is correct under the FFA, but that the FDER is looking more toward the overall environmental

impact of the screening site areas. He continued saying that some of the screening site areas could possibly be worse than some of the RI/FS sites.

H. Glenn commented that under the PPA, the FDER would be more interested in the screening data at the base than the EPA is. She continued saying that the interim data report is something for them to use as a helpful reference, but does not facilitate the progress of the project. She stated that it would have been more helpful had the interim data report been submitted along with the RI/FS work plan. She continued saying that the EPA review comments could be presented in two ways: 1) comments on format, style, and content of the interim data report; or 2) how the data in the report should be incorporated in the RI/FS work plan. She stated that she preferred the latter suggestion. Furthermore, the recommendations and justifications in the interim data report cannot be fully evaluated until the RI/FS work plan is properly prepared, at which time it will be evaluated as supporting documentation.

S. Sanborn stated that some of the screening sites are so close to the RI/FS sites that it is necessary to have the review comments back on the screening sites to complete the work plans for other RI/FS sites, as well as FDER's desire to track and proceed with the screening sites in the quarterly reports.

H. Glenn commented that the EPA has a problem in that the classification of projects (i.e., batch, phase, group, etc.) is confusing. Apparently, it is focused more toward ease in accomplishing fieldwork as opposed to the overall progress of the project. She continued stating that the groups should be rearranged into operable (OUs) units which could be evaluated individually, and could have a definite record of decision for each operable unit. This approach would give more clarity in the overall objectives of the project and would help to create better records of decision.

S. Sanborn stated that the organization of site batches was based on a
recycled paper ecology and environment

worst-first prioritization, as well as other internal issues prior to the signing of the FFA.

J. Barksdale stated that a great deal of thought was put into the arrangement of the site groups, and that the reason the site organization is confusing to the EPA is because they are probably not familiar with the structure and philosophy behind it. He continued saying that it would be useful for the EPA to assemble background information which may help them to understand the organization of the sites as well as SouthDiv's rationale behind the organizational structure.

M. Glenn disagreed, stating that the organization is even confusing to her as an experienced environmental engineer and would therefore also be confusing to the public should they wish to understand it. She continued saying that the EPA wants the organization to be easily followed by whomever wishes to follow it, including the public.

Rick Rudy stated that because of the nature and size of the sites, it will always be complicated and there is no way to make it completely clear.

M. Glenn continued saying that the organization needs to follow a more logical framework to allow for more clear administrative records. She then asked if it is anticipated by SouthDiv that whole groups will have a record of decision or will each site have an individual record of decision. She continued saying that due to the number of sites, having a record of decision for each site would be inappropriate.

A. Drew asked for clarification between the group designation and the operable units designation.

J. Barksdale answered that sites were organized into groups based on their proximity to each other and/or the type of contamination that appeared to be present at the sites. He continued saying that this was the only logic used in the group organization. Consequently, that is

why the reports are on a site-by-site basis; it would not make sense to organize them into operable units when the contamination is relatively unknown.

H. Glenn stated that once a determination has been made of the contamination, the sites could be organized into operable units. The rationale/logic for the operable unit designation is: 1) organizational clarity in the site management; and 2) Congress has required that government organizations report in operable units. She continued by suggesting that they have a working meeting to try to organize the sites into operable units, and asked if SouthDiv would be open to such a meeting.

S. Sanborn commented that it was too soon to have such a meeting because the EPA has not yet given SouthDiv comments back on the screening sites' interim data reports and that those comments would be necessary to determine their position in the operable unit organization, as well as the stage in which the sites are in, in the IR program.

J. Barksdale suggested that they discuss the operable unit organization for the sites either later in the current meeting or at another time in order to comply with the EPA's request for the sites to be in operable units versus groups and batches.

S. Sanborn stated that she would look into this request of reorganization but did not feel this was really necessary at this time.

H. Glenn stated that she would like to have a meeting with all of the involved parties and to clear up any misunderstandings that the EPA's risk assessment group has regarding the Phase I recommendations and/or work plans.

Tim Bahr stated that, generally, FDER has their risk assessment contractor submit their comments after all of the preliminary data and risk assessment for a site has been completed. He continued saying that after completing this, someone in FDER submits their comments.

It was generally agreed that review comments on the interim data reports for screening sites and RI/FS sites, and the Group 0 work plan was needed before the meeting could be conducted. Furthermore, each party should decide which individual departments and/or individuals they wish to have attend the proposed meeting.

Dates for a meeting were discussed but not resolved due to conflicts with vacations and other meetings.

S. Sanborn asked what comments the FDER has on the interim data reports for the record.

Jorge Caspary answered stating that they are pleased with the extent of the work. However, the detection limits of some parameters, particularly volatile organic compounds (VOCs), are quite high and they would like to see them lowered. He continued stating that other than lowering the detection limits on some of the constituents, they had no other major comments.

M. Glenn commented that the Target Compound List (TCL) and the Target Analyte List (TAL) constituents need to be analyzed for each of the sites, as necessary, for the purpose of risk assessment. She asked if that was what the FDER was referring to.

J. Barksdale stated that M. Glenn and J. Caspary were talking about two different things. J. Caspary was referring to detection limits on screening parameters, whereas M. Glenn was referring to detection limits for TCL/TAL analyses on RI/FS sites.

Both M. Glenn and J. Caspary agreed.

M. Glenn stated that these high detection limits might give a false negative in an area of concern.

J. Barksdale said that this had already been discussed in a previous

meeting and that the detection limits on screening parameters are at or near the detection limits for a normal analysis. He continued saying that it would be difficult to drop the detection limits down any lower and still maintain the benefits of the screening analyses. Furthermore, on the next round of sampling, they will be going back to locations which appear to be a problem and to some where there does not appear to be a problem to sample and analyze media for the TCL using the lowest possible detection limits. He continued saying that he did not know of any sites which would not have a follow-up suite of sampling for the full TCL.

J. Caspary stated that E & E's interim data reports indicated that, based on the screening levels for VOCs in soils, no additional soil sampling will take place on certain sites because the VOCs were below detection limit. Because the screening detection limits for VOCs are so high, this is not acceptable to FDER. He continued saying another problem is that the quantity of Methylene chloride detected was extremely high in some samples. Furthermore, the figure presenting metals in the report did not sufficiently delineate the primary metals.

J. Barksdale commented that the primary metals were not shown on the figures but were presented in the tables.

J. Caspary agreed, saying that the figures could be misleading as total metals and that he would like to see this presented in the text. He also stated that he assumed that it had been agreed in a previous meeting that total phenols would be presented as trichlorophenol, but that this did not adequately differentiate between naturally occurring phenols and contaminants.

J. Barksdale replied that there were a limited number of illustrations budgeted to work with and that an effort was made to simplify the presentation. In addition, the objective of the task was to see where the main problems were.

J. Caspary said that it is mainly a presentational problem, but that the
recycled paper ecology and environment

screening detection limits are still a problem.

E. Nuzie said that it was his impression that full analyses would be performed at every site.

J. Barksdale said that it will be. All water samples will be analyzed for the full TCL and that, even on sites where not much showed up, at least several soil or sediments are proposed for full analyses.

T. Bahr said that he would like to see more analyses at each location.

J. Barksdale said that the reasoning behind the limited analyses in some locations was that there was just nothing to indicate that anything else might be there.

M. Glenn responded that even so, that you just can't walk away from it from the aspect of the risk assessment.

J. Barksdale agreed but said that the question is to what extreme does this get carried out.

J. Caspary said that it will depend on the site.

E. Nuzie said that more justification would probably answer their questions.

J. Barksdale said that more rationale and justification would be provided in the Phase II work plans.

S. Sanborn then asked about the format of the Phase II work plan and proposed a similar format for Phase II with a few exceptions. She then asked J. Barksdale to expand on how the document would appear as negotiated with SouthDiv.

J. Barksdale stated that review comments would be incorporated as a revision to the proposed Phase II work in Section 14.2 in each site work

plan. This revision will include a table of contents, tables and figures showing the sampling parameters and sample locations. He continued saying that the original table of contents, tables and figures in Section 14.2 would be pulled out and attached as appendices in order to show a record of the original sampling plan versus the revised sampling plan.

It was generally agreed that the Phase II sampling plan would be expanded beyond that described in the letter of recommendations already attached to each interim data report. This expansion would include rationale behind each sample location and analytical parameter. This will be done when comments are received and will be site-specific.

The issue of how to go about doing the RI/FS was discussed and how far along in the RI they are. The EPA feels that the process is moving very slowly as compared to other projects which they have worked on, and SouthDiv and E 6 E feel that it is progressing very well due to the process that is necessary for the large number of sites involved. It was pointed out that the majority of the groundwork for the RI/FS is done, and that now it is simply a matter of getting the various information together, along with appropriate review comments, to proceed further.

A. Drew stated that in the letter of recommendations attached to each interim data report there are suggestions as to more sampling but that there needs to be more justification as to why more sampling is needed.

R. Rudy answered that they did not feel it was appropriate in that letter to add that information.

M. Glenn stated that because that information was not included, they had not yet reviewed the specific recommendations.

J. Barksdale stated that it would almost require one justification per sample to do provide that information and they did not feel that it was feasible to provide that in the recommendations letter. He said that he

and S. Sanborn and D. Criswell had spent a great deal of time discussing the rationale for Site 15 and that it was complicated.

M. Glenn stated that this information would have to be there for the administrative record and it could not be left up to the reader to find the information out.

R. Rudy answered, saying that information would be included in the Phase II work plan, and they had every intention of providing all of that information for the public record.

M. Glenn asked if there was a work plan submittal date for the Batch 1 revised work plans. She continued saying that they wanted to be able to stagger the submittal dates to alleviate the problem with the length of time it takes to get review comments back to SouthDiv. She also reiterated their decision that interim data reports would be considered a secondary document.

R. Rudy asked what is the expedited schedule for the Phase II work plan submittals.

M. Glenn checked the schedule and a discussion ensued regarding the expedited schedule dates versus the non-expedited schedule.

M. Glenn said that N. Dean had vehemently opposed the Phase II portion of the work plan, probably because she thought there was not enough information in that part.

S. Sanborn clarified that the Phase I work plans have been approved by the EPA and FDER. She continued saying that the original Phase II work plans were only proposed recommendations, and had been discussed by D. Criswell, E. Nuzie, and N. Dean during earlier meetings. However, this proposed Phase II fieldwork in the work plans was not approved.

J. Barksdale said that the EPA had never been clear as to why the Phase II portion was not approved.

f. Glenn said that it was probably too soon to evaluate it and that we may need to go back to the written record to determine this. If an earlier agreement was made in writing, then it would be honored, but with the FFA now in-place, some things would have to be looked at differently.

J. Barksdale stated that everyone agrees that the bulk of the work on all sites should be done during Phase 11.

M. Glenn commented that the interim data, report has no meaning to the EPA except as a document to support the decisions made in the Phase II work plan. She continued saying that if it had been submitted as a preliminary RI report then the EPA could have submitted comments which would have been more helpful to SouthDiv.

R. Rudy stated that the data contained in the interim data report will indeed be a part of the RI.

J. Barksdale expanded by saying that these reports are not screening reports; they are interim data reports and therefore are important to the development of the RI.

M. Glenn reiterated her position by stating that they approved the Phase I and will treat the Phase II work plan as a primary document.

T. Bahr asked for the date of submittal of the Phase II work plans.

R. Rudy answered that, according to the non-expedited schedule in the FPA Site Management Plan (SMP), the Phase II work plans are scheduled for submittal to the TRC on October 17, 1991.

M. Glenn stated again that they would try to have review comments on the interim data reports back by the end of August and would fax these comments as draft if needed.

S. Sanborn asked how the EPA review on the Group 0 work plan was progressing and stated that review comments are due September 20.

M. Glenn answered that they have reviewed Group 0.

J. Caspary again expressed the concern of the detection limits in the screening analyses.

J. Barksdale stated that they would talk to the laboratory and see if they can lower the detection limits without getting false positives. He continued saying that if they can lower the limits that it may increase the price somewhat.

J. Caspary continued that they would prefer that SouthDiv take a worst case approach and pay a higher price now rather than have to go back later to resample.

J. Barksdale said that most of the sites have proposed samples to be collected for TCL analyses anyway.

J. Caspary expressed FDER's concern regarding the shut-down of the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant (IWTP) groundwater recovery system.

S. Sanborn stated that one quarterly sampling event at the IWTP was missed and that the FDER District (Bill Kellenberger) was notified by Greg Campbell of PWC Pensacola. SouthDiv has just negotiated to get the recovery system operating at optimum capacity for a long period of time with minimal maintenance.

J. Barksdale stated that discussions are underway to get the system back on-line. In addition, a meeting was scheduled for Wednesday afternoon to inspect the system. He expanded by saying that, due to the age of the pumps, they were all losing prime and had to be completely shut-down. He continued saying that SouthDiv was currently working to obtain and install new pumps for the system.

S. Sanborn invited FDER and EPA to attend the initial inspection meeting for the recovery system tomorrow at the IWTP.

J. Caspary stated that those were all of the FDER comments.

S. Sanborn asked if the EPA would be able to submit the review comments for the Group 0 work plan by September 20, 1991.

M. Glenn answered that SouthDiv should receive Group 0 review comments and possibly the other ones (Groups E, I, L, P, and Q [which had not yet been submitted to EPA]) at the same time.

J. Barksdale stated that they are going to submit only replacement pages for Section 14.2 in the Phase II work plans. The new section 14.2 will contain revisions based on screening data and TRC review comments but will not be an entirely revised work plan.

H. Glenn answered that they wanted the entire work plan and not just replacement pages per a discussion at the TRC meeting dated January 19, 1990.

E. Nuzie asked when the EPA review comments on the interim data reports and work plans would be submitted to SouthDiv.

M. Glenn answered that the review comments on all 10 interim data reports and the work plans should be available by August 22 or 23 and possibly earlier.

J. Barksdale asked for clarification on whether the review comments for the four screening sites would be submitted to SouthDiv by October.

M. Glenn stated that the EPA may be able to get some draft comments to SouthDiv before October.

R. Rudy asked if the term RI would be used instead of RFI on the RCRA
recycled paper ecology and environment

sites.

M. Glenn answered that RI could be used.

R. Rudy asked M. Glenn to point out within the FFA where it states that the CERCLA supersedes RCRA.

M. Glenn answered that the authority for this has been delegated by executive order from the President to the EPA Branch Chief. She continued saying that it is her understanding that it is written in the FFA. However, if it is not and if this information needs to be in writing, that it would be possible to have the Branch Chief issue a memorandum stating this.

RCRA versus CERCLA discussion ensued. It was generally agreed, in regard to the IWTP, that if the existing RCRA permit is in need of a revision due to the RCRA/CERCLA integration that it could be amended. It was also determined that it may be possible to delete Appendix IX sampling when CERCLA supersedes RCRA.

R. Rudy suggested that a memo should be written that clarifies the terminology which is being used in the various documents to keep the issues less confusing.

M. Glenn agreed.

E. Nuzie, S. Sanborn and J. Barksdale asked M. Glenn if she would look into whether Appendix IX sampling will be required on the 17 RCRA sites on NAS Pensacola if CERCLA supersedes RCRA.

H. Glenn stated that she would.

Regarding the issue of stainless steel wells, M. Glenn said that EPA was not rejecting PVC wells altogether, but wanted the Navy to submit the seven-point justification. EPA will then evaluate based on this.

J. Barksdale then stated that apparently a problem exists with the reviewing process regarding the modification procedures for work plans. He continued stating that the EPA reviewed an entire work plan and QAPP that had previously been approved when only minor changes had been proposed for the original. He continued asking if this was standard procedure.

M. Glenn commented that she is not sure why these documents would have been reviewed again unless some comments had not been previously addressed or some statute had been issued which would require a change. She continued saying that, in this case, because of a letter from E & E stating that there was a detection limit error in the QAPP that she may have requested that it be reviewed again. This would have been primarily because she had no input into the original document and did not know exactly what detection limits were agreed upon.

H. Glenn suggested that future documents have staggered submittals and that SouthDiv in conjunction with E & E, should give the EPA a general schedule of submittals to help in the review process of the documents.

S. Sanborn stated that September 1, 1991, is the submittal date for the revised FFA site management plan which will cover the Batch 4 RI/FS sites (Groups H, I, L, P and Q). Additionally, the revised site management plans for Groups E, I, L, P and Q, which are RI/FS sites, are also due for submittal to regulatory agencies in September 1991.

R. Rudy asked what date had been agreed upon for the submittal to EPA of the draft Phase II work plans on the five site groups in Batch 1.

M. Glenn responded that they were due on October 17, 1991, on the regular schedule. She suggested that an alternative to the slower process of reviewing each work plan could be an integrated review which could cut the turnaround time. She stated that comments from the *A. for one work plan could be integrated into similar work plans. This would eliminate several different sets of review comments for each work plan which may address the same issues or may be contradictory between work

plans.

R. Rudy stated that the EPA review comments on Batch 1 interim data reports should be received in mid-September and that negotiations between SouthDiv and E & E to incorporate these and the FDER comments into the Phase II work plans should be completed in a few weeks.

J. Caspary asked about the free product observed on Site 11.

J. Barksdale answered that it would be advisable to gather more information specifically about the nature of the product, but there was little information available from the analyses regarding product type.

M. Glenn stated that she would get documentation regarding the EPA processes of delineating and removing contamination by interim remedial measures which might help in developing the RI/FS work plan.

R. Rudy commented that the FDER and EPA guidelines are probably inconsistent.

M. Glenn answered that they are finding middle ground on which to work together with similar problems on other projects, so there should not be a large problem here.

Various areas were stated to have exhibited free product, which included Sites 1, 11 and 30. E & E gave a brief description of the free product encountered.

M. Glenn suggested that a section on potential problem areas, included in the quarterly reports, would be helpful in building the administrative record for an area even if the area was not fully investigated at that time. She continued saying that this could help expedite the process in submitting a request for change in work or a request for extension of work, because it has been documented that there was a potential problem in that area.

S. Sanborn agreed and brought up the issue of the Navy's problem with E 6 E's contract which could require an extension. She said these or other problems could be included in the quarterly reports. She also requested that future RPH meetings are such that decisions on issues can be made.

A discussion ensued regarding whether the EPA should see the Phase I work plans for upcoming sites. It was generally agreed that, due to the nature of the work plans, that it would be beneficial for the EPA to review them.

M. Glenn suggested that future Phase II work plans be called RI/FS work plans instead of Phase 11; however, SouthDiv did not agree to change the titles.

R. Rudy suggested that the upcoming interim data reports should be in the RI format.

M. Glenn agreed.

S. Sanborn stated that areas being discussed for future work plans are Pensacola Bay, Bayou Grande, and the NAS Pensacola Wetlands (OUs 15, 16 and 17).

M. Glenn stated that the entire RI/FS for those areas will be driven by the ecological risk assessment.

R. Rudy agreed.

S. Sanborn agreed and asked for guidance from the EPA and FDER on SOW development and also mentioned the EPA wetland study which was completed just a few years ago.

J. Barksdale commented that we have already spoken to the Fish and Wildlife Department and they had **some** very clear ideas on what needs to be done. The screening approach for these sites is **not really**
recycled paper ecology and enviro. dept

appropriate. He continued saying that approximately a year ago Nancy Dean brought the Fish and Wildlife Department to look at the sites and to determine what needed to be done at the wetland sites.

M. Glenn stated that the Ecological Technical Assistance Group (ETAG) group will need to be involved and can provide a valuable service. The work plans for the wetland sites should be tailored to their needs.

R. Rudy asked when the ecological survey work plans for these areas are due.

S. Sanborn stated that they are due to the remedial project managers (RPMs) at the end of the summer next year, approximately July 1992, as written to date in the approved SMP of 1991.

M. Glenn commented that she would like to find someone in the EPA who had some experience with the ETAG who could provide them with recommendations that could be incorporated into the ecological investigation.

R. Rudy asked if there were meeting minutes of the meeting with the Fish and Wildlife Department which contain all of this information in it.

J. Barksdale answered yes.

R. Rudy suggested that copies should be sent to the appropriate persons involved with the project.

J. Barksdale asked if there should be some discussion regarding the global positioning system (GPS) information which was passed out by S. Sanborn at the beginning of the meeting.

S. Sanborn asked J. Barksdale to briefly discuss the GPS Technology.

J. Barksdale explained that this system works with satellites and could provide a better way of obtaining latitude and longitude readings per

discussions at the previous project managers meeting.

A short discussion ensued regarding the feasibility and technical accuracy of the global positioning system.

E. Nuzie said that he was aware of the system but did not know that much about it. He said it could be helpful.

S. Sanborn commented that several things which appeared to be unresolved at the last TRC meeting that needed to be addressed. These items were signs at potential problem areas, report format, and headspace screening for soils.

M. Glenn asked who would be the responsible party paying for the fence and signs to put up around the Oak Grove Campground site.

S. Sanborn said that SouthDiv would provide funds to NAS Pensacola (Ron Joyner) for signs and, if need be, for fences for areas which would potentially subject humans or the environment to increased risks.

S. Sanborn asked if the EPA had approved the soil headspace method for screening purposes.

J. Barksdale stated that this issue had been resolved at the April 1990 meeting with the EPA in Athens.

It was agreed by all parties that the soil headspace method was approved for screening purposes.

S. Sanborn asked when would be a good date for the next RPM meeting, and suggested it be scheduled for September 1991 or mid-October based on the submittal of the draft workplan for Group O (OU 10) and Groups H, I, L, and Q (OUs 11-14).

M. Glenn suggested having the meeting when the EPA review comments on the interim data reports are received by SouthDiv at the end of August.

recycled paper

ecology and environment

E. Nuzie added that the meeting should wait until after receiving the screening site review comments from the EPA.

M. Glenn asked if this would hold up the Phase II work plan process.

S. Sanborn responded that it would not.

M. Glenn proposed to have the RPM meetings rotated in location due to the travel costs involved.

It was generally agreed that the RPM meetings, which are generally held in conjunction with the TRC meetings, would be held at NAS Pensacola, but that any RPM meetings scheduled between the TRC meetings may be rotated.

There were no further discussions or agreements between the parties present. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.