

JAN 1996 - N

32501.000
03.01.00.0140

Date: 1/14-15/96

Place: Pensacola, FL

Time: 8:00-5:00

Attendees: Ron Joyner, Steve Cowan, Allison Dennen, Bill Gates, Bill Hill, Henry Beiro, John Mitchell, Jay Bassett, Brian Caldwell, Bill Kellenberger

N00204.AR.001065

Tier II Rep: Eric Nuzie

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

Facilitator: Ron Wroberski

Guests: Charlie Black, South Div
Kim Reavis, South Div
Jeff Drummond, South Div
Mike Gold, Hotshall & Allan

Leader: John Mitchell

Scribe: Jay Bassett

Timekeeper: Henry Beiro

ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Status</u>
1. Steve F provide list of training available for use in out years	Working
2. Bill H check with DRMO for disposal facility used and contact Al Newman for site approval status	Working
3. Ron prepare CO's endorsement with copy to Tier II	Pending - CO signature
4. Henry provide RI due date for Sites 9,29,34	Parking Lot
5. Henry revise team's laminated card	Working
6. Jay Bassett will provide Bill Hill a letter of acknowledgment regarding PSCs 3, 9, 19, 20, 21, 23, and 37 being removed from IR Program	Working
7. Michelle Harrison will write article for team to submit to Tier II on ESD and Tier I coordination effort (Site 38)	Working
8. Henry to provide modify and detail ARARs section	Due - Jan 26
Ron to learn how to amend Base Management Plan (BMP) concerning issue of non-residential for area of Site 10.	Working

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Status</u>
10	Ron to submit letter to base command about modifications to BMP	working
11	Ron to check when, where, and by whom construction to take place at site according to site attendant (site 15).	Working - gathering additional info
12	Henry to redo card and include Allison, Eric and Steve F. on card	Working
13	Ron to present logo (Blue Angels with Contrails) at next meeting	Working

ACTION ITEMS GENERATED FROM THIS MEETING (JAN 17 & 18, 1996)

- | <u>No.</u> | <u>Item</u> |
|------------|--|
| 1. | Ron - follow up on Site 15 Construction. |
| 2. | Jay - draft sample SMP amendment letter - handwritten versus typed. |
| 3. | Jay - document agreed changes to '96 SMP. |
| 4. | Brian - submit SAP amendment for Site 24 by Jan 26. Goal is to adjust sampling strategy to include DPT technology, data review & quick turnaround of screening collection and selection of definitive data points. Call by Feb 2 if issues require resolution to schedule Feb 9 conference call. |
| 5. | Brian/Henry - follow-up on sampling results from Hyman's IRA to finalize Site 9, 29, & 34 RI by April 1. |
| 6. | Bill H - follow up on Off-Site rule compliance by ROICC and coordinate performance of a QA/QC audit of ROICC contractor. |
| 7. | All - Discuss amending SMP deadline for Proposed plan for Site 9, 29, & 34 during Feb meeting. |
| a. | Brian/Henry - use John's suggested language and revise recommendations/conclusion section in Site 14 Report. Jay will approve report based on Eco assessment being addressed in Site 40 & 42 RI. |

-
- | No. | Item |
|-----|------|
|-----|------|
3. Henry -- have Sites 40, 41, & 42 sediment data ready for Apr meeting and present proposed surface water sampling locations and techniques.
 10. Jay -- Investigate if GW COPC can be screened out if concentrations below MCL or FDEP Guidance concentration.
 11. Jay -- Investigate if using RBC HQ of 1 or .1. Current tables only reflect HQ of 1 values
 12. Jay -- Check with Elmer on latest on manganese RFD
 13. Jay -- Check on how to move Site from RI to Si or petro or are we committed to drafting a No Action ROD (Limited Risk assessment -- sites 3 & 17)
 14. Brian -- determine BA _____ for Site 17
 15. John -- Discuss with Eric FDEP's perspective on moving Site from RI to SI/UST
 16. Allison -- Submit OU10 FS addendum by Jan 26
 17. Allison -- Submit (hopefully) last draft of OU10 Propped plan by Feb. 2
 18. Ron -- Investigate and stop disturbance and grading activities at Site 16
 19. Brian -- Evaluate and revise Site 16 SAP based upon disturbance activities at S i 16
 20. Bill K/Ron -- Investigate RCRA applicability to Site 6 -- should or can it be permitted and/or can Subtitle "D" closure be pursued vice a CERCLA response
 21. Jay -- send sample EPA RD/RA SOWs to Bill H & John M
 22. Brian -- send samples of approved RD Workplans, RDs, RA Workplans to Bill H & John M.
 23. Bill H/Bill G -- evaluate program and provide feedback on identifying top 5 priority projects to address FY97 funding -- Team needs to make decision by Mar 96 to make changes in the identified prioritization for FY 97 funding..
 24. John -- Give Site 40, 41 & 42 presentation to RAB. Henry to provide support and be in attendance.
 25. Henry -- Ensure samples are taken at and up gradient to back ditch identified as a concern during the Jan RAB. Henry will have Phil observe the "foaming activity" to address RAB concerns.

JAN 1996 -- NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MINUTES
Page 4

DECISIONS

1. FFA Amendment

- EPA's Regional Council position is that FFA Amendment concerning flexibility in deadlines is not valid as it constitutes a major change and must follow formal amendment process
- However, *the FFA does give* the signing parties Project Managers the ability to modify the SMP, if agreeable to all parties
- The mechanism to record these agreed upon changes to the SMP will be the establishment of a "SMP Notebook." The notebook will contain memorandum(s) signed by the project managers from the Navy, FDEP, and EPA documenting agreed upon deadline changes and rationale to the SMP until the next annual SMP revision.

2. Site 24 – SAP Amendment. Agreed to amend Sampling strategy to include using DPT as a screening phase and placement of wells/samples for definitive data will be based on team consensus supported by screening data.

Site 14 – NFA recommendation. Team agreed to add John's suggested language into the recommendations/conclusion section. John (FDEP) stated can support NFA if suggested language is included. Jay (EPA) will support NFA and approve Site 14 report upon including John's language and statement that (as referenced is contaminants assessment) that ecological risk and concerns will be addressed in he Site 40 & 42 investigation.

4. Site 12 & 26 – Data presentation. Team agreed to the following:

- Soil data adequate to conduct BRA
- Need to evaluate GW with nearby sites 11 & 30 to get picture of GW conditions for decision making.

5. Sites 40 & 42 – Surface Water Samples. Team agreed to review sediment collection results prior to final selection of surface water samples. These results in conjunction with evaluation of potential upland sources will be used to select final Surface Water collection points as well as sampling techniques used (pore volumes versus water column).**6. Site 1 – FS strawman memo. The following comments were noted concerning the scoping of the FS. Of general – program wide – note, team decided that (1) PRGs should not include contaminants that are above screening levels but no not present an unacceptable risk as supported by the site specifics BRA, and (2) the FS Tech Memo will be used as a "strawman" and prescope FS to determine issues and results of issues prior to the generation of the draft FS. Specific Issues as follows:**

JAN 1996 – NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MINUTES
Page 5

- Complete ARARS needs to be addressed
- TCLP should not be used as a leachability test to determine leachability of contaminants to GW
- Change FDEP TAC for "military goals" to new terminology 'FDEP Goals'
- Ensure FS briefly and concisely supports screening of technologies addressed in the memo – need a transition (few paragraphs) explaining why other potential technologies screened out.
- Address GW Issues – include that impacts to wetlands will be addressed in the Site 41 investigation.
- Manage and address seeps/leachate and control of in Site 41 investigation; however need to ensure seeps evaluated for human health risk in some forms or manner.
- Risk and remediation conclusions associated with inorganic – manganese in particular - should be presented as a risk management decision versus a naturally occurring/background issue as the presented data is not conclusive.
- Drop PRG's for contaminants that are over screening levels but the risk assessment supports as not presenting an unacceptable risk.
- Cadmium GW screening level is a MCL not FGC

TRAINING

Kim Reavis and Jeff Drummond (SOUTH DIV Contract Officers) provided an overview of the Southdiv's CLEAN contract processes and procedures.

Ron W. of Galileo provided the Team Skill Training in the area of interpretations and asking proper questions. Other topic areas to be discussed in future meetings are listening, feedback, meeting management, and presentation skills. Training consisted of description, use, and practice (interactive exercise) of the 4 types of questions. The four types are 1) Open – how, why, what; 2) Closed – who, which..; 3) Feeling – you + feeling; and 4) Summary – confirming, paraphrase.

JAN 1996 - NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MINUTES
Page 6

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Shared comments on CRP - no issues identified -- awaiting RAB review prior to finalizing
2. Bill presented ROICC Strawman which brings ROICC into the review process for RD/RA and/or RAC review process -- led to discussions on the need for Navy, EPA, and State to coordinate efforts on design/action documents such that Navy's contractual documents meet the needs of the CERCLA/RCRA process (i.e. -- that Navy's Performance Criteria Package meets RD Workplan and/or 30% design submittals).
3. Charlie black gave presentation on DERA program Guidance in relation to funding and funding prioritization. Summary as follows:
 - SECNAV is directing renegotiate FFA for 1 year rolling schedule within funding targets
 - Regulators require reporting total requirements to congress and will discuss schedule adjustments based upon funding of req'ts -- 3 year enforceable schedule, as well as a share in risk prioritization.
 - Navy has developed budget costs based on CTC or worst case budgeting system -- if information and data is available more realistic site specific budgets can be inputted.
 - Funding Strategies as follows:
 - Estimated funding: 97 -- \$40MM, 98 -- \$32MM, 99 -- \$36MM, 00 -- \$27MM, 01 -- \$24MM. SOUDIV baseline goal is \$40MM per year
 - Programming constraints of 60% clean-up and 80% high risk is applicable
 - Priorities are 1) Fund all LOT & LAMS, 2) fund at least most important project for each base, and 3) add other projects & prioritize using R.E. model and legal drivers (top 5 projects).
 - Trend in LTO & LTM's is estimated to be \$4MM per year.
 - Far more RA's in pike next 5 years than can be funded -- it is likely that only top 3 of identified 5 projects will get funding.
 - Goal is to fund each bases priority 1 project in FY 97 & 98
 - Project estimate uses Cost to Complete (CTC) model with uses worst or most expensive remediation for costs -- may not be realistic.
 - NASP team needs to evaluate top 5 priorities and determine procedure to prioritize based on worst first and best risk reduction not SMP schedule as currently prioritized.

JAN 1996 -- NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MINUTES
Page 7

- Team initial prioritization matrix (lowest score is highest priority) based on worst first as follows:

<u>OU/Site</u>	<u>Cumulative Team Score</u>	<u>Priority</u>
OU 2 – Site 11, 12,25,26,27 & 30	12	1
Site 15	25	2
OU 15, 16, & 14 (Bay & Bayou)	27	3
OU-11 (Site 38)	39	4
OU-1 (Site 1)	42	5
OU-10	44	6

NAS PENSACOLA PARTNERING MEETING
FEBRUARY 28 - 29, 1996 AGENDA
PENSACOLA, FL

<u>Item</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Time(hrs.)</u>	<u>Topic Leader</u>
Check-in/Action Review		1	Team Leader
Hyman Removal Compliance	Resolution	1	Bill H
SMP Modification	Resolution	1	Jay B & Allison D
Site 14	Approve	1	Jay B
Graduation Awards/Pres	Resolution	1	Team Leader
Site 39- 5-year Review	Info Share	1	Jay
Site 6 RCRA Transfer?	Info Share	1	Ron/Bill K
ROICC Strawman	Resolution	.5	Bill H
Site 10 BMP	Resolution	.5	Ron
Host Training	It's a surprise	1	Ron/Bill G
Team Training	More surprises	1	Steve
RD/RA documentation	Info Share	1	Bill H/Jay B
Site 1 RI	Approve	1	Jay B/John M
Site 38 ESD Work	Info Share	2	Jay B/Fred. S
Site 15 SAP	Resolution	1	Brian
Site 16 Dumping	Resolution	1	Ron/Brian
RAB Public Meet Debrief	Info Share	1	Team Leader
Check - out		1	Team Leader
		<u>18 hrs</u>	

PARKING LOT

PG Certification

Data presentation on Sites 40, 41, & 42 and surface water sample locations

Sites 9,29, & 34 – Schedule & Removal

Site 39 Five Year Review

ESD results from Site 38

Metric Tools - February Meeting

Inorganic (As & Mn) Concentrations background analysis

Priority ranking for 97 & out year funding

JAN 1996 - NAS PENSACOLA TEAM MINUTES
Page 8

FUTURE RAB MEETINGS

February 27 (includes OU10 Proposed Plan meeting)

March 26

FUTURE PARTNERING MEETINGS

Feb. 28-29. NASP

Mar. 27-28. NASP

Apr 16 - 18. CHA

Team Leader:
Scribe:
Timekeeper:

Jay Bassett
Henry Beiro
Men Caldwell

Henry Beiro
Brian Caldwell
Allison Dennen

Brian Caldwell
Allison Dennen
Bill Gates