

# PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES

N00204.AR.001480  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

Date - July 22 - 23,1997  
Location - DEP Pensacola, Room 501B  
Team Leader- Allison Dennen  
Recorder - John Mitchell  
Gate Keeper/Timekeeper - Gena Townsend  
Facilitator- Janet Briand

## **ATTENDEES:**

### TEAM MEMBERS:

Karen Atchley  
Henry Beiro  
Brian Caldwell  
Allison Dennen  
Bill Gates  
Bill Hill  
Ron Joyner  
John Mitchell  
Gena Townsend  
Bill Kellenberger (adjunct)

### SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Tier II Link, Dr. Jim Speakman (7/23)  
Janet Briand (Galileo)

### GUESTS:

Jason Winningham  
Allen Snow

## ***ATTACHMENTS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING***

1. Team Charter
2. Draft FS OU2 and Site 38 Presentations
3. Bill Hills questions about state requirements/policies

### **JULY 22**

The mission, vision and meeting ground rules were read. The Pensacola resident team members survived Hurricane ~~Danny~~. Everyone has been very busy. We went over the previous meetings Critique (+/-).

### **TEAM CHARTER AND DELIVERABLES**

Bill G. presented us with the revised charter with the changes decided on from the previous meeting. The team then went over the remainder of our deliverables and made the following decisions:

**9707-D23:** *Add to the groundrules "team processes and procedures apply to sub-committees.*

**9707-D24:** *Team norms are to be added to the deliverables following the groundrules.*

**9707-D25:** *Change in the meeting processes that “the scribe will provide the meeting minutes and agenda.”*

**9707-026:** *Change in the meeting processes that “the scribe will accept changes and distribute the final minutes and agenda one week prior to the next meeting.”*

**9707-027:** *Rather than sign the team charter, the team members will be identified on a distribution list to be include with the deliverables.*

**9707476:** Janet will complete the distribution list and submit it to Bill G.

**9707477:** Bill G. will make the changes to the meeting groundrules and processes.

#### INSTITUTIONALCONTROLS (IC)

We discussed the current status of IC. John indicated that the most recent info. he had was that Jerry Wallmeyer of the Region IV REC office was to receive an instruction from his admiralty to the bases under that command to enter into an MOA with the base, EPA, and FDEP. An MOA is being drafted by both SDIV and EPA legal which will hopefully be usable at all facilities. If the bases under the REC Admiral accept the MOA, then hopefully it will be used by the other facilities under other commands.

Concerning groundwater IC, John indicated he had yet to get a response from our letter to Jim Wright at the NW Florida Water Management District.

**9707-A78:** If Rob Wright has not contacted John by a week prior to our next team meeting, then John will call him.

#### FACILITATOR TRAINING

Janet provided a team building exercise ‘Groundrule Bingo’ to facilitate our remembering our groundrules. The winner was also to be king/queen for the day with team members required to assist the winner.

#### TIER I/TIER II WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

The team had heard that Denise Klimas had been invited to the conference. We did not know whether this was because she was an adjunct member of Pensacola or a part of Tier II’s request. If it was as an adjunct member, we felt that Bill Kellenberger was slighted as he was not invited as an adjunct member.

**9707479:** Janet to see that Bill K. receives an invitation.

The team then brainstormed what we wanted to cover in our ERA presentation for the workshop. We looked at:

- providing a site background and history up to the present (pre-partnering; post partnering);
- present the benefits (costs and times saved) from using the **eco-subcommittee (i.e., reduced no. of wetlands to assess; reduced overall measurement areas in the bayou; NFA for the bay);**
- and lessons learned (**clearly** define your objectives; why separate into OUs vs. site specific potential impacts to eco.; do ERA base on site specific terrestrial sites).

We then developed our overheads and agreed on the following and the presenter.

1. ECO Risk **Success** (include the NAS Pensacola logo) - Bill G.
2. Overview of Presentation- Bill G.
  - Site History
  - Successes
  - Lessons Learned
3. History
  - **NASP** Environment - Henry
  - Chronology of Events
    - Pre-partnering- Henry
    - Partnering- John
    - NOAA Adjunct membership- John
    - **Eco-subcommittee** -John
4. Successes- Bill H.
  - Wetlands
  - Bay
  - Bayou
5. Lesson Learned
  - Separate **OUs** or Not
  - Clearly define objectives
  - Utilize partnering processes in **sub-committees**
  - Era at the cutting edge
  - Open communication

9707479: Bill G. to produce overheads.

9707480: Ron to bring big map showing wetlands, bay, and bayou.

## TIER II UPDATE

Jim **Speakman** filled in for Paul Stoddard as the link. He attended on Wednesday 7/23. He informed us of what was happening related to IC and confirmed the info., that John had heard. Those bases in Florida to receive the instruction are NS Mayport, NAS Jacksonville and NAS Key West.

## OU2 AND SITE 38 FEASIBILITY STUDY PRESENTATION

Allen Snow and Jason Winningham presented an overview of the upcoming draft **FS** and the alternatives proposed for each. The same three alternatives for groundwater are proposed at both **OUs** (e.g., no action, natural attenuation, and pump and treat). John asked why air sparging wasn't considered and it was indicated that it was not feasible due to the water table being so close to the surface. John also asked if In-Well treatment had been looked at and it had not. There was no action related to remediation of **soils** at Site **38** due to it all being beneath concrete or asphalt. Alternatives other than no action proposed for **OU 2** include soil removal and capping.

## SITE 42 RI

John indicated that the RI can be approved as NFA, and that the PAH contamination can be transferred to the UST program and identified as a new site. Funding will either be DERA or compliance which is yet to be determined.

## SITE 15 RI

John presented his comments on the RI which will be discussed at the next team meeting. The significant comment he noted was that the state does not accept Central Tendency for risk assessment. The state accepts the Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME).

## SITE 8 AND 24 RI (OU 13)

John presented his comments on the RI. The most significant being that the risk assessment for groundwater needs to be incorporated for the entire OU; not for each individual site. The comments will be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.

## SITE 2 FS

We discussed the proposed alternatives (No Action; Capping; Dredging; Natural Attenuation) for sediments at Site 2. Each alternative was reviewed. No action would not eliminate the determined eco-risk; capping would likely require heavy maintenance; dredge and fill could cause release of contaminants and destroy what habitat does remain; natural attenuation of metals is not likely and did not appear to be an appropriate term for the alternative.

**9707-D28:** *Eliminated No Action, Capping and dredging from consideration and chose monitoring as the preferred alternative.*

**9707-D29:** *Change the Natural Attenuation to Monitoring*

It was determined that adequate reasons need to be included in the document to support our decision (i.e., 1. site is an apparent depositional area; 2. the terrestrial Site 38 source is no longer operative; 3. there are potential continued effects from various activities adjacent to the area; 4. conditions to date have not changed significantly; and 5. the habitat is not expected to change regardless of dredging.

**9707-A81:** John M. to check on what is meant by metals exceedences which fall outside the metals-to-aluminum regression line. Does it indicate bio-availability?

**9707-A82:** Henry to make changes in the FS.

**9707-A83:** Gena is to provide additional comments by 7/25.

## SITES 40 AND 41 FIELD UPDATE

The SOW had been submitted for bids from the labs. A decision on which lab should be made by the end of July. EnSafe should be in the field by the first or second week of August and the results in by October.

**9707-A84:** John to see if he has submitted approval on the Site 41 Work Plan and SAP. If not, he will submit approval letter.

## SITE 7 UPDATE

There was a lively discussion (conflict) on whether further sampling was needed where arsenic exceeded the soil PRG at one sampling location. John had indicated in previous comments that further sampling was needed around the one exceedence, as there were a limited number of soil samples at the site and that we should determine if this was a hot spot. Henry and Ron had

gone to the site to determine if this was runoff/depositional area from the trailer park and found that it was not. A question was raised about whether a single hit which was not an order of risk magnitude different from the PRG should be assessed further. The sample already exceeds the states industrial risk value making it greater than  $1E-4$ . The state along with EPA concurrence believe the need to clarify whether or not contamination is more extensive especially since this is a residential area. Consensus was received for the following:

**9707-D30:** *A minimum of three samples will be taken around the previous sample which exceeded the arsenic PRG to confirm whether this is an area contaminated with arsenic.*

## FRUSTRATIONS- CONFLICTS - LIMITATIONS

Bill H. handed out a list (see attachment) of 8 areas which he had some disagreement with and frustration related to the states position on anthropogenic background, groundwater standards, cleanup, groundwater/surface water interface, risk factor of  $1E-6$ , soil cleanup goals, etc. From this meeting an 8th was added concerning central tendency in risk assessment. After Bill had gone over his viewpoint on his list of concerns/frustrations, John presented the state's response and limitations. The responses are as follows as per each number of Bills list:

1. Anthropogenic compounds are man made and not natural, therefore they do not have a natural background value such as metals. However, if a compound exceeds a PRG and has no known evident release from a site or can be attributed to normal basewide practices or events, then these can be taken into consideration. For example, a PAH may be detected slightly above a soil PRG and it can be explained that the sample was from a drainage area next to a road or a parking lot, and the site under investigation would not be indicative of a release.
2. In the states surface water and groundwater rules, groundwater must meet surface water standards at the point of discharge. This is an ARAR. If a monitoring well adjacent to or in the very near vicinity of a surface water body does not meet surface water standards, then the point of discharge and the analyte/compound value at that point must be determined otherwise the water from the well must meet surface water standards. Also, should the surface water standard be exceeded in the well, another alternative is to run bioassays on the groundwater from that well to determine if it is toxic (chronic or acute).
3. The state may or may not require cleanup of groundwater to secondary or primary drinking water standards depending upon the weighing criteria (i.e.; receptor; cost to clean-up; risk; feasibility; etc.)
4. Again, the state may or may not require cleanup. Institutional controls are also possible.
5. Yes, the state would require land use restrictions as a method to manage risk at a level of  $1E-6$ ; not  $10E-6$ . The states policy, as well as in petroleum and Brownsfield statutes, requires management of a site to be  $1E-6$  through either cleanup or institutional controls. This form of risk management addresses future use scenarios.
6. All aquifers are not classified as potable. Although most are classified as G-II (potentially potable). This is in state rule which is an ARAR. However, remediation may not necessarily be required.
7. The state established the soil cleanup goals based on a calculation to  $1E-6$  for residential and industrial uses. Actual site risk assessments may determine a more or less conservative value than these SCGs. The clean-up levels are generally determined by the

risk assessment, the RGOs and the technical feasibility to clean to those numbers. Risk is still to be managed at 1E-6.

8. Again, risk management for the state is 1E-6. This is consistent with all other hazardous waste sites in the state and with the apparent intent of the state legislature at petroleum and Brownsfield sites.
9. Although the USEPA Risk Assessment Guidance allows for calculating both RME and CT, the state's position is only to accept the RME values.

Bill also had questions on empowerment for the team and individuals on the team. He questions FDEP's policy of having document comments and document approvals going through supervisory approval, and is concerned it undermines the team's empowerment to make decisions at the table. John indicated that this was the department's policy and would discuss it further with his management.

**9707-A85: Everyone is to further identify their and our limitations for the next meeting.**

**9707486:** John M. to provide to Bill H. the definition of "free from" in our rules.

**STATUS OF ACTION ITEMS - PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**STATUS**

<b>9703-A20</b>	Donna to compare <b>MBTI</b> to Problem Solving Scores. May Results: Janet will compare at next meeting.	Pending (Agenda)
<b>9701-A13</b>	OU2 : RI review comment responses due ASAP; potential IRAs spring (sites 12+27); draft <b>FS</b> due July 97. Henry to submit responses (before doing next version of document). June Result: Comments addressed, concurrence letters forthcoming.	<b>Pending</b>
Site 38 RI		
<b>9703-A21</b>	John to check with Tim Bahr on antimony background and notify Team ASAP. June Results: Background rules.	Complete
<b>9703-A23</b>	OU 10 Proposed Plan - Gena to send concurrence letter. June Result: Letter forthcoming.	Pending
<b>9703-A29</b>	Site 38 RI - Pending comment resolution. June Results: Errata ECD is July 3.	<b>Pending</b>
<b>9703430</b>	OU 2 RI - Pending comment resolution. June Results: Prepare errata to incorporate comment resolution. Est. completion date is <b>7/3/97</b> .	<b>Pending</b>
<b>9703-A49</b>	John will modify meeting minutes format when he is scribe to present another possibility to the Team.	<b>Pending</b>
<b>9706463</b>	Paul To Find Out If Tier II Expectations Of Tier I Will Be Brought Up At The Upcoming Joint Meeting.	<b>Pending</b>
<b>9706468</b>	Gena will send comments by 3 July on the Site 2 FS.	Pending
<b>9706-A71</b>	Bill Gates will E-Mail Team upon Award of Phase III (IRA for Site 17)	Pending

## PENSACOLA TIER I MEETING AGENDA

August 25 - 26, 1997

Tallahassee, Florida  
Mamott Residence Inn

Team Leader: John Mitchell  
Recorder: Gena Townsend  
Timekeeper: Karen Atchley  
Facilitator: Janet Briand  
Tier II Link: Tier II Link

Expected guests and support: Tom Dillon (NOAA)

Start Time: 8/25 @ 1:00 PM

ITEM	GOAL	TIME - hr.	TOPIC LEADER
Checkin • Team Building Exer. • Plus-Delta Review • Processes • Groundrules	Sharing	1	JM
Site 1 FS Addendum	Collaborative Resolution	1	BC
Training	Learning	1	JB
FY98 Execution Plan	Collaborative Resolution	1	BG
Site 15 RI	Collaborative Resolution	1	BC
OU 13 (8 & 24) RI	Collaborative Resolution	1	BC
Site 7 Update	Info Share	.5	BC
Limitations	Clarification	2	JB
Removal Update	Info Share	.5	BG
Site 40/41 Field Update	Info Share (PAH Update)	.5	HB
SMP	Collaborative Resolution	2	BH
Performance Model	Collaborative Resolution	1	JB
Checkout • Metrics • Success Stories • Meeting Critique	Resolution	1	JM/JB