

NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MEETING

N00204.AR.000842

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

I. Meeting Review

a. Date: 12/12/94-12/14/94 Place: **Atlanta**

b. **Attendees**

please see **attached** attendance sheets

c. **Notetaker**

Tricia **Rohr**

d. **Agenda:**

Removal Candidates

1995 SMP

Site 30 and Groundwater Resampling

IW Line

OU 10 RI

Schedules/FFA

Adding New Sites

Soil Background

Revisit **Partnering Goals/Ground Rules/Individual Roles**

Detection **Limits/Data** Presentation Needs

USGS Involvement

e. **Decisions and Action Items:**

OU-10 Decisions

1. To include **FDEP** regression limits for metals for **sediments data as a means for comparison in the drainage ditch** area.
2. When an agreement is reached in this meeting in regard to the **response** to comments, the decision reached in the **meeting** will be the **accepted response** to comments.
3. Comment #49 Response - (a) **Include a separate section on ecological effects**, (b) Acceptable to use a qualitative approach to the **eco-risk** section, (c) **include summary tables for applicable situations to support information in text**
4. Comment #61 Response - (a) Address the **area quantitatively**, (b) **Area will not be included in the OU-10 report because it is a small area and not considered to be a large risk**, (c) reference in the Bayou study because basically all Bayou **sediment**
5. Section 10-168 #3 Response - delete **Natural status** and Trends information from **OU-10**, but keep it for other **OU's** that may occur in the **future**
6. Allison Humphris' general comments #2 - (a) **The fill area should be studied and additional fieldwork done during the OU-10 Remedial design. this decision should be stated and explained in the OU-10 RI report.** (b) Agreed this area is not a wetland
7. Page 5 #3 Response - If a wetland is only impacted by a **UST site** then that **wetland** will be the responsibility of the **UST** program.

OU-10 Action Items

1. Section 10-168 13 Response - John Mitchell to provide Joan Dupont and David Trimm with a copy of the **FDEP** data to clarify where data points are located.
2. Allison Humphris' comment pg.5 #6 - **E/A&H** to expand upon the description of the pathways which impact the **drainage ditch**.

Removal Candidates Decisions

1. Support the removal actions for Sites 1, 27, 25, 30, and 43 as far as the **obligation of funds**, but delay the removal action until the team **has an opportunity to discuss the actual**

data which will be presented at the next meeting.

2. Site 14 - Maintain the terms for now - seek DERA funds after data is in. Also expediate the data generation.

Removal Candidates Action Items

1. Bill Hill to go back and continue work on the procedure - will present info at the next meeting.

2. Data Presentation (without Risk Assessment) for Site 14 by E/A&H.

3. Allison Humphris - do pro/con of doing removal actions late in the process of the RI

FY '95 SMP Decisions

1. 3380 will remain as a part of Site 36

2. Site 3380 will require a BRA, thereby raising it to RI/FS status.

3. Table the proposal (Initially Site 36 will be addressed through PA/SI process, upon completion of PNSI, any portions easily identified as No Further Action will be dropped. The redefined Site 36 will be defined by the contaminants that will be required to go through the RI/FS process, including Site 3380 OR the Site will be designated as a new site) until Bill Hill reports on his action item.

EPA's Comments -

4. #1 - keep the screening Site schedule and also add a paragraph further describing Site 36 and the agreement reached for that site and the area 3380.

5. #1 - keep Site 14 as a screening Site. if it needs to be elevated to RI/FS level based on the data presentation in February, the decision can be made then.

6. #1 - If a site is decided to be elevated to an RI level. at the next Partnering meeting a schedule will be submitted. The Team will either reach agreement on the schedule at that meeting or will set a time frame for agreeing on that schedule.

7. #2 - change wording to "only FDEP concurrence to modify the CRP is necessary".

8. #3 - agreed to change

9. #4 - Insert phrase (next to last sentence) "the DON shall incorporate these PSCs into existing OUs prior to the submittal of the RI report.

10. #5 - consensus with statement

11. #6 - wording to be put into the SMP as a milestone, within 60 days of the receipt of both regulators sets of comments, based on either the next Partnering meeting or a conference call, the Navy will submit a written response. Incorporate a 60 day time period for comments into the SMP schedules.

12. Tier I team has the ability to amend the FFA per section XXXI in the FFA

13. Modify the FFA in Section 8, subpart i - insert the phrase "Unless the parties agree to another time frame..."

14. Modify the FFA in Section 8, subpart g, paragraph 5 - insert the phrase "Unless the parties agree to another time frame..." in front of the 2nd and 3rd sentences.

15. Comment #8 - agree to revise the schedule of OU 1 and my other schedules to reflect having the draft FS submitted either after or concurrently with the draft final RI.

FY '95 SMP Action Items

1. Bill Hill to find out the Navy's position on forming new sites and amending the existing contracts for further reference as new sites come up.

2. Henry Beiro and Brian Caldwell will draft an agreement outlining the team's decision to modify the FFA to be signed by the Navy, FDEP, and USEPA and submit it to the Administrative Record.

Brian Mulhearn's Comments Decisions

1. Do not include sensory-based (organoleptic only) FDEP standards as screening values in the Baseline Risk Assessment.

2. Do include leachability-based soil concentrations for any contaminants detected in the groundwater as screening values in the Baseline Risk Assessment.

Brian Mulhearn's Comments Action Items

1. Allison Humphris to check with agency on whether background data for OU 10 is okay to apply to the whole data set.

2. Allison Humphris to check with Julie on her comment regarding the inclusion of the

arithmetic mean in a table when she originally asked E/A&H to do it according to RAG Exhibit 5.6 which does not include a mean. She will respond directly to Brian Mulhearn.

f. Attachments

NONE

II. Next meeting

- a. **Date: week of January 23 , 1995 (exact dates to be announced)**
Place: Atlanta, GA

- b. **Attendees - All members**

- c. **Facilitator - TBA**