PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES

DATE: August 14 – 15, 2000
LOCATION: Tallahassee, FL
TEAM LEADER: Allison Harris
SCRIBE: Amy Twitty
GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER: Ron Joyner
PROCESS FACILITATOR: Anne Marie Lyddy

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:	Support Members:
Allison Harris	Robby Darby – Tier II Link
Fugitt	Anne Marie Lyddy – Facilitator
Terry Hansen	
Ron Joyner	Guests:
Brian Caldwell (Day 7)	Greg Brown - FDEP
Amy Twitty	Lori Goetz - EnSafe
Gena Townsend	Rich May - TtNUS
Bill Hill	Gerry Walker - TtNUS

Joe

1. Check-In

Meeting began at 2: 10. Everyone is doing fine. Terry handed out copies of the ground rules from last meeting. Brian is not here, Allison has his proxy.

2. Review of Action Items/Reminders

0003-A06: The work plan and SAP for the Site 2 Sampling still needs to be completed for the record; Gena will get EPA's portion of this together. Pending; Bobby Lewis will finalize the SAP and send to Allison. Pending.

0003-A07: Terry to write up the Site 2 cooperative effort as a success story. Complete. To be resubmitted to team. Terry sent email. Still needs work. Allison sent email – she will re-send. Terry to complete by August 25, 2000.

- *0006-A14 Robbie is to check with Rich May to determine how success stories are placed on the USEPA Region IV web page.* Still pending until 9/8/00.

0006-A19 Robby to check with Rich May on getting the Tier II minutes and distributing. Robby is to send minutes to Bill & Bill is to send out. Sent out – all members did not receive. Robby will resend today. Complete.

0006-A22 Brian to review turbidity and water quality parameters for the Chevalier Field area samples – manganese in the samples is also to be reviewed. Ongoing.

0006-A23 Allison is to check on the HI calculation for manganese in the OU6 area. Complete. On agenda.

0006-A25 Gena is to check on the Site 2 data and report and send to Allison in electronic format. Pending. Bobby emailed it to most team members. Gena will follow up and make sure all team members have it. Complete – data was sent out.

0006-A26 Tom Dillon to provide concurrence on Site 40 RI errata submittal. Pending. Due 8/18/00. Gena will coordinate with Tom.

0006-A28 Terry/ Pittsburgh GIS to coordinate with Constantine Tudan Memphis EnSafe. Open.

0006-A29 Terry/ Pittsburgh GIS to coordinate with Scott McAvoy SDIV to determine what level of effort would be required to develop a Pensacola GIS. Open.

0006-A32 TtNUS (Gerry Walker) is to develop a Site 1 presentation for the Nov/Dec RAB meeting. Ongoing until 12/5/00.

0006-A33 Allison is to review the FS for site 38 with new guidance on 95% UCL and <3X SCTL for determining areas requiring remediation. The leachability profile is also to be evaluated. Pending until August meeting. Complete. Allison emailed to team on 8/10/00.

0006-A34 Joe is to talk with Greg Brown about the 95% criteria and its application to Site 38. Complete – will be updated at August meeting. Complete – on agenda.

0006-A35 Joe is to check on the possibility of using NA at Site 38 as an applicable remedial option. Pending until August meeting. Complete – on agenda.

0007-A39 Terry will send the June minutes to Tom Dillon and make sure he's aware of his action items. Complete – Terry sent email.

0007-A40 Joe will determine the status of the OU-13 FS review and give an update and/or comments to the team. Pending. Joe is reviewing the document, Greg Brown still needs to review.

3. Agenda Modifications

Site 1 and Site 15 ROD were added. Items to be discussed with Greg Brown are Site 38 and OU-13.

4. Training

Inter-Relationship Diagraph: Prioritizing ideas, distinguishing between cause and effect, analyzing ideas. See Handout.

LISA Diagram: Assigns the tasks from the Inter-relationship diagram to team members with L = Lead, I = Inform, S = Support and A = Approve.

We broke into teams and used these tools to prioritize topics for a joint Tier I/II meeting.

Action Item 0008-A41 Anne Marie will email a list of the team modules by the end of August, 2000.

5. Facility Update

Ron stated the staff is getting lighter. Bob Nelson is temporarily at NASWF. Blake Brown has left the base.

6. Site 40 Update

Gena spoke with Tom Dillon. There is still a risk at Site 40 that can't be written off (due to mercury in sediment - if there is mercury in fish in Bayou Grande is it site related?). Tom will forward his comments, however EPA feels we should wait on the FDEP and UF comments before moving forward. Either prepare to collect fish samples or wait on UF comments. Joe agrees. If the document says there is a risk – then until proven otherwise, there is a risk. Chris Saranko has left UF and there will be a new reviewer. We will review on September agenda since Tom D. will be there.

Action Item 0008-42: Joe will send the Site 40 RI errata to UF and make sure they can review it.

7. TtNUS Update

OLF Bronson (Sites 100 and 102): There was high turbidity in the temporary wells, therefore, TtNUS will install two pre-pack wells a~the Machine Gun Butt sits to resample tor metals.

Site 43 drums have not been sampled due to the heat. Sampling will occur in Level B.

8. OU-4/Site 15

Joe sent an email on August 9th regarding his Site 15 presentation. Tim Bahr pointed out Figure 6-2 in the ROD (arsenic risk in shallow groundwater) only shows the last phase of sampling instead of all of the sampling events (like Figures 9-3 to 9-7 in the RI). Page 78, Section 8.2.2.5 refers to cost alternatives for five groundwater samples hut it should he 4 soil samples. Page 72, Section 8.1.2.5 needs a statement saying Pollution prevention and good housekeeping may make the 30 year monitoring requirement less than 30 years.

Action Item 0008-A43: Allison will make changes to the Site 15 ROD based on Joe'scomments by the end of August 2000.

9. Day 2 Check In

Meeting began at 9 a.m. Brian Caldwell is present today. Gerry Walker and Rich May (TtNUS) will each give presentations to the team. Greg Brown and Lori Goetz will join us after lunch.

IO* OU-1 Update

Gerry Walker (TtNUS) gave an update on the groundwater monitoring at Wetland 3, OU-1. Handouts included the site map and the draft analytical data from the first round sampling event. No deep wells were sampled (they have been abandoned). Only shallow and intermediate wells were sampled. Benzene was not detected above criteria in the shallow wells, but had minor exceedences in the intermediate wells near the Bayou Grande. The wells were only analyzed for COCs, not full suite. Benzene and vinyl chloride criteria were also exceeded in the intermediate wells but not in the shallow wells. Gerry did not have historical data to compare the results with to look for any trends. Iron cleanup criteria were exceeded in the shallow and intermediate wells and in the surface water samples collected from Wetland 3. Gena is concerned about the levels of iron in Wetland 4 and asked if we planned on sampling the surface water there. Gerry said that TtNUS will be collecting samples from the wells and Wetland 3 this week and we'll have two sets of data to compare results. Based on the results, we can reevaluate the need to change the sampling plan.

Manganese was also exceeded in the shallow and intermediate wells (higher concentrations in the intermediate wells).

Brian is concerned the shallow groundwater is being pumped through the interceptor trench which may be causing the intermediate groundwater to be discharged into Wetland 3.

11. Tier II Update

Rich May (Tier II alternate) gave the Tier II update. He handed out meeting minutes from the June and July Tier II meeting and conference call. Rich made sure we were aware of the new facilitator evaluation form, the Key West goals, the facilitator roles and responsibilities, etc. He stated they want to look into having a joint Tier I/Tier II meeting. He'll be sending out a survey to us to see what issues we would like to discuss at the meeting. We need to move from Team Building to making decisions, problem solving, strategic planning, funding, etc. The facilitator should work with the team to meet the goals of the strategic plans.

Terry mentioned FDEP's loss of an RPM and that there is a hiring freeze. This may impact the workloads of the remaining RPMs and the team schedules. He would like Tier II to broach this with FDEP.

12. Site Management Plan/Schedule

Bill handed out the revised Sure Track schedules that he had emailed to the team as .pdf files. Allison had a few changes noted on the schedules. See handout changes on Sites 15, 38, and 40. Allison noted the OU-13 comments to the final FS are due today. Unless Greg Brown brings the comments with him today, that schedule will also need to be adjusted.

Team prioritized the sites (agreed upon by EPA, FDEP and SouthDiv):

1) OU-4 (Site 1.5) – Currently #1 on schedule Waiting for EnSafe to make a figure change and some text corrections to the ROD (Allison says she'll have [he changes by the end of the month). Joe will have his presentation ready for FDEP. Gena has most of her presentation prepared and is waiting on the FDEP concurrence letter. CH2M HILL has performed their site visit (August 2, 2000) and will prepare work plans and cost estimates when the ROD is complete. Ron agrees this is a priority (#1) also since there are workers that need to be protected.

2) OU-6 (Chevalier Field) – Currently not on the schedule. Ron lists as Priority #4. Final ROD is submitted requesting NFA. Brian is working on comments regarding manganese.

3) OU-13 (Sites 8 and 24) – Currently #3 on schedule. Ron feels this is critical (#2) due to the limited space in the cemetery. Need to finalize FFS, PP, and ROD. Joe is reviewing the FFS. Greg Brown also needs to review. EPA has already commented on the FFS and received comment responses. EPA has not sent in their concurrence letter, they will coordinate with FDEP.

4) OU-3 (Site 2) – Currently nut on schedule. Ron sets as Priority #3. Gena will try to get report from Bobby Lewis by 30 September 2000. EnSafe will need an additional 60 days to complete their report after they receive Bobby's report. We are scheduled to discuss the report at the February 2001 partnering meeting.

5) OU-11 (Site 38) – Currently #4 on schedule. Ron sets as #7. Waiting on concurrence to the RI addendum from EPA. On today's agenda (regarding comparing groundwater results to surface water criteria).

6) OU-15 (Site 40) - Currently #2 on schedule. Ron sets as #6. We are scheduled to discuss RI comments at September meeting (Tom Dillon).

7) OU-16 (Site 41) - Currently #5 on schedule. Ron sets as #5. Will send final RI on August 30. Gena says since there were changes, there will be more comments so it may not be final.

8) OU-2 (Sites 11, 12, 25, 26, 27, and 30) - Currently #6 on schedule. Ron sets as #8. Final RI (risk assessment) under review. Gena thinks she can review RI/FS by April 2001.

Bill will update the Sure Track schedule.

13. OU-6 FDEP Status/Data

Brian is comparing manganese (Mn) data from Sites 9, 34, and 29 to data from Sites 11, 13, 14, and 10 to see if the Mn at OU-6 is statistically significant compared to the other nearby sites. Joe said there can be a correlation between low pH and high Mn. Brian will look into the physical parameters of the samples.

14. Lunch

15. Review OU-13 FS Status

Greg Brown will review the FS by the end of August 2000.

16. Site 38 FS

Greg Brown from FDEP and Lori Goetz from EnSafe are present for this topic. Topics for discussion in order of highest priority:

1) 95% UCL in soil/3 x SCTL at hotspots

Allison handed out the Technical *Memorandum; Development of Remedial* Volumes, *Site* 38. Greg mentioned the 95% UCL memo came from one of their risk assessor consultants and was not guidance but could be considered on a case by case basis. It came from a client in a private sector who had several sites throughout the state that had one COC. He's never seen it applied to sites similar to ours (DoD). Should have our risk assessors review the data from an exposure standpoint. Allison noted that has already been performed.

Lori says it assumes the point coverage of samples is acceptable - need to include a map showing the spatial distribution. Greg says make sure the underlying assumptions are practical (future land use, etc.). Allison stated that the Navy agrees the land use will remain industrial. Lori noted the site is 90% covered by either buildings or asphalt/concrete. This eliminates most of the direct exposure. Joe spoke with Ligia Mora-Applegate (FDEP) who stated the 95% UCL has been used at other DoD sites (Orlando, Cecil).

Lori said there were about 40 surface samples and 70 total samples (combined). The 95% UCLs were below the maximum concentrations for all COCs. If there were any SCTLs exceeded, the 95% UCL was calculated.

Greg noted vanadium and copper are considered to have acute toxicity and Steve Roberts (UF) did not recommend using this procedure for these compounds. He wanted to make sure we're using it for groundwater leachibility and not soil direct exposure.

Joe would like to see the mass assumptions detailed in the reports. Define the residential verses industrial comparisons.

Action Item 0008-A44: Joe will take the Site 38 memo back to Ligia and/or Steve Roberts to see if they agree with the methodology. May need to set up a conference call.

2) Soil Leachibility

Greg looked at where soil exceeded leachibility criteria and it appeared to correlate with groundwater contamination in several areas.

Lori stated the first thing they do is compare soil samples to applicable criteria and second – compare to marine surface water criteria. Find a well nearby and another downgradient well to see if those COCs are present in the groundwater. Example: Pesticides and phenols were in exceedence of leachibility criteria, but there was no correlated GW contamination. Chromium and TCE did have correlating GW contamination. Next they look at soil hits by interval to determine fate and transport of COCs.

Building 71 chromium exceedences: Found groups of exceedences throughout the soil column verses areas where only the surface soil had exceedences. Lori assumes if the hits are only in the surface and not in the subsurface, there is no leaching. Numbers are compared to hexavalent chrome. They looked at trivalent numbers verses hexavalent chromium. Trivalent is not leachible, therefore, since the majority of the total chromium contamination is trivalent, it is not leaching to the groundwater. Nearby groundwater samples contain lower concentrations of Cr than historical data. It was noted that the 1993 – 1994 samples were likely collected with a bailer and not using the low-flow methodology.

Greg stated we need to either collect SPLP or TCLP samples or look at organic content (TOC), Percent moisture and bulk density to determine leachibility. Greg recommends analyzing at least three of the worse-case samples (ones that exceed the leachibility criteria) using SPLP or TCLP (not just ones that barely exceed, but the worst ones). Greg wonders if we have collected enough samples and are we sure we found the source?

Lori asks, "Are we happy with the sample density?" and "Are we sure we know the source is gone or does it exist in the soil?. Greg says he thinks there are not enough samples – some are 30 feet apart. We need more borings. Allison asked Greg is he had reviewed the Natural Attenuation memo. He said he had looked at it+She said it strongly indicated that NA was a viable alternative.

Lori stated that 7 out of 30 borings have hits of TCE in at least one interval. Only two areas show TCE throughout the soil column – not just in the surface. Greg says there are no upgradient GW samples (NW) and we may be missing the source. He says we can't assume, based on soil intervals, there are no leaching concerns. We have to show there are no SPLP/TCLP exceedences.

'Therewas an industrial sewer line in the area west and south of Building 71 that likely leaked. The line has since been cleaned out and filled with concrete. The soil was not excavated The source has likely been removed. Greg says since there is documented soil and groundwater contamination, he can't say the soil is not contributing to the groundwater contamination. He needs viable data to present to his peers.

Lori wants to know where to collect additional samples. Greg wants at least three from the hottest areas. Lori says this was already performed for chromium and only one sample had an exceedence. What are the COCs? What do we need to analyze?

Cd, Cr, Pb at Building 604 were also exceeded in both soil and groundwater. Also TCE. Greg suggests resampling these wells using standard low-flow methodology.

Bill thought since the source (sewer line) was removed, there is no reason to remove the soil even if the soil concentrations exceed the SCTLs.

Greg suggests another round of groundwater sampling using low-flow techniques (monitored NA was recommended in the FS) to establish whether there is an inorganic problem or not. Analyze for COCs in wells where there have been exceedences.

Joe says we may not need to collect more samples now, but wait until the remedial action plan is developed. He wants to see mass volumes calculated. Show some excavation alternatives. Use existing data to get there.

Action Item 0008-045: Team members involved in the Site 38 review will make a recommendation of alternatives and email to the team by September 8,2000. Include where samples can be collected, what they should be analyzed for, and a rationale (soil and groundwater) or alternatives which may not include sampling at all (with rationale).

Gena may not be able to met this deadline but will submit comments one week before the September 26 – 27 meeting.

3) Excavation Alternatives/ Source Control Alternatives

Gena wants excavation to be included as an alternative. This topic was covered above. Bill wants to know the difference between source removal and containment. Containment without removal could be slurry walls, capping, etc. Lori asked if soil would have to be excavated if there is no leaching if there is a cap – no way to have infiltration. Yes – if soil is excessively contaminated, it may need to be removed.

4) Groundwater to surface water discharge (assimilated capacity of Pensacola Bay)

Allison let Greg know about the additional site assessment currently underway at Site 2, immediately downgradient and offshore from Site 38. We are collecting samples for chemistry, toxicity and diversity. Since the surface water dues not appear to he effected, do our POC wells still need to meet marine surface water criteria?

Greg suggested breaking the surface water issues off of Site 38 and cover the surface water under Site 2. We would nut have to consider the groundwater meeting surface water criteria issue. In the Site 38 documents, state that all surface water issues are covered in the Site 2 investigation. The POC wells will remain at the surface water's edge, just compare the results to GCTLs. A similar project is at Whiting Field where basewide groundwater is beins treated separately from soil at individual sites.

5) Structure of FS (cart before the horse)

Refers to Cecil Field FS on Hangars 36 and 37. Takes the RI data at face value and then develops the FS using alternatives. Thinks the Site 38 FS takes the data and manipulates the data after the fact when it should be performed in the RI. If the information is not included in the RI, produce a letter report (addendum to RI) that summarizes the data. Joe concurred. Gena left, but Joe has her proxy and feels she will agree.

Greg wants the RAOs to be more explicit to the layman. Explain what you mean/want. State the groundwater MCLs ARE the RAOs – be more explicit. Bill wondered why we're comparing to 62-550 if we're not a public drinking water system.

6) Definition of significant mass (mass calculation)

Covered under #2.

7) Land use (current & future)

8) RAOs – need to be more explicit

9) How to document in FS? In separate document?

10) Risk Management Decision – shouldn't be included in FS

Covered under #5.

11) Technology Suite

12) Groundwater reclassification

Team Consensus: We'll start the September meeting on Monday, September 25th at 1300 so that Greg Brown can join us.

Action Item 0008-046: Amy will check with the CH2M HILL ATL office to see if we can have the conference room on the 25th and 26th and reserve the LCD projector.

17. Facilitator Evaluation

Completed Facilitator Performance Evaluation form.

18. **Develop Agenda** for **Next** Meeting

Next Meeting: September 25 - 26, 2000 at CH2M HILL office in Atlanta, begin 1:30 p.m. Day 1. Greg Brown will be present.

Leader: Bill Hill

Scribe: Amy Twitty

Timekeeper: Gema Townsend

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/ Expectation
Check-in/Agenda Modifications/AI	Allison	1 hour	Information
TtNUS Fieldwork Update	Terry	30 hour	Information
Facilitator Evaluation	All	15 min	Evaluation
OU-4 Status	Joe	15 min	Update
Site 40 – collect fish samples?	Allison/Tom	1 hour	Update
Tier II Update	Robby	30 min	Information
Training	Anne Marie	1 hour	Training
Site Management Plan/schedule	Bill	1 hour	Input Dates
OU-6	Brian	.5 hour	Information
OU-13 Update	Brian	1 hour	Information
CIS Update	Terry	15 min	Information
Facility Update	Ron	15 min	Information
Site 38	Allison/Lori Goetz	4 hours	Information
Lunch	Team	1 hours	Refresh
Breaks	Team	1 hour	Relax
Close Out	Allison	.5 hour	Planning

Parking Lot

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
9903-A13	Bill will submit a letter tu EPA and State requesting that OU-10 be handled under RCRA authority.
9802-A14	Brian to follow up on the list of wells to be kept for future modeling.
9806-A44	Review Tier II deliverable packages (rev. 9) for corrections and respond to Bill.
9811-M03	Bring MBTI materials to all meetings.
0003-A12	Terry will be copied on all correspondence henceforth for the AR.

Open Action Items

Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
0003-A06	Gena, Bobby	Pending		The work plan and SAP for the Site 2 Sampling still needs to be completed for the record; Gena will get EPA's portion of this together. Pending; Bobby Lewis will finalize the SAP and send to Allison.
0003-A07	Terry, Allison	Ongoing	08/25/00	Terry to write up the Site 2 cooperative effort as a success story. Complete. To be resubmitted to team. Terry sent email. Still needs work. Allison will help.
0006-A14	Robbie	Pending	09/08/00	Robbie is to check with Rich May to determine how success stories are placed on the USEPA Region IV web page.
0006-A22	Brian	Ongoing		Brian to review turbidity and water quality parameters for the Chevalier Field area samples – manganese in the samples is also to be reviewed.
0006-A26	Toni D	Pending	08/18/00	Tom Dillon to provide concurrence on Site 40 RI errata submittal. Gena will coordinate.
0006-A28	Terry	Open		Terry/ Pittsburgh GIS to coordinate with Constantine Tudan Memphis EnSafe.
0006-A29	Terry	Open		Terry/ Pittsburgh GIS to coordinate with Scott McAvoy SDIV to determine what level of effort would be required to develop a Pensacola GIS.
0006-A32	TtNUS	Ongoing	12/05/00	Gerry Walker is to develop a Site 1 presentation for the Nov/Dec RAB meeting.
0008-A41	Anne Marie	Open	08/30/00	Anne Marie will email a list of the team modules by the end of August, 2000.
0007-A42	Joe	Open		Joe will send the Site 40 RI errata to UF and make sure they can review it.
0008-A43	Allison	Open	08/30/00	Allison will make changes to the Site 15 ROD based on Joe's comments by the end of August 2000.
0008-A44	Joe	Open		Joe will take the Site 38 memo back to Ligia and/or Steve Roberts to see if they agree with the methodology. May need to set up a conference call.