

**PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES**

DATE: Oct 29; Nov 1, 2001
TEAM LEADER: Ron Joyner
SCRIBES: Barbara Albrecht/Phil Hardy
GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER: Gena Townsend
PROCESS FACILITATOR: Gus Campana

The meeting was accomplished by teleconference on October 29 and November 1, 2001. The following attendees were present:

Attendees	October 29	November 1
Team Members:		
Brian Caldwell – EnSafe Inc	x	x
Joe Fugitt – FDEP	x	x
Terry Hansen – TTNUS	x	x
Allison Harris – EnSafe Inc.	x	x
Bill Hill – SouthDiv	x	x
Ron Joyner – NAS Pensacola	x	x
Gena Townsend – USEPA	x	x
Amy Twitty – CH2MHill	x	x
Greg Wifley – CH2MHill	x	x
Support Members:		
Barbara Albrecht – Site 2/41 Support	x	x
Phil Hardy – Site 40/41 Support	x	x
Scott Dunbar – Site 15 Support		x

1. Check-In

The teleconference began at 9:00 AM each day. Every one is doing fine. The ground rules and processes were reviewed. Tom Dillon and Lynn Wellman were unable to attend due to schedule conflicts.

2. Review of Action Items/Reminders

The following items were reviewed as priority discussion topics for each day during the teleconference:

Topics	October 29	November 1
Site 15/RAC update	x	
Wetland 64 review	x	
OU-2 review	x	
Site 43 review		x
Site 40 review		x
OU-13 review		x
OU-11 review		x
Site 2 review		x

3. Site 15/RAC Review

Greg Wifley said the A.C. Read Golf Course is due for renovation beginning in March of 2002. CH2MHill would like to be finished with the Site 15 removal prior to the golf course renovation. Greg said that other than Site 15 and some UST work, TTNUS/CH2MHill don't have much currently going on at NAS Pensacola.

Amy Twitty e-mailed the draft Site 15 technical memorandum to the group prior to the Site 15 discussion. The technical memorandum is incomplete in some areas. Amy reviewed the Site 15 work accomplished to date. The first round of fieldwork at Site 15 commenced in August of 2001. Samples were collected per what was proposed in the Site 15 ROD. After three rounds of extent sampling, only one of 11 areas (a small area of dieldrin) is delineated. Arsenic is a problem throughout the site, with sample results ranging as high as 440 ppm. The data set is large enough to do a 95% UCL to statistically separate areas of contamination from background. Using a 95% UCL at Site 15 provides a more accurate representation of arsenic contamination at the site, since the arsenic hits are focused at the golf course maintenance area instead of on the fairways and greens. Soil removals would therefore only occur in the maintenance areas, where the focus of the Site 15 RI was. Amy also said the draft technical memorandum with conclusions and recommendations should be ready for submission by the week of November 5, 2001. Comments are expected by November 16th.

Gena Townsend said if using a 95% UCL for arsenic provides a more accurate representation for delineation of contamination and determining the amount of soil to be removed, it would be a minor thing to incorporate a change to the arsenic cleanup goal in the ROD. Gena acknowledged that by not using a 95% UCL, a significant increase in removal volume would be required over that estimated in the ROD. She will run this by Ted Simon for input and

approval. The FDEP likely will have the final say on the issue.

Joe Fugitt expressed concern over the possible bioavailability of arsenic from the site.

Bill Hill asked about possibly changing the arsenic cleanup goal for Site 15. Bill also wants the appropriate representatives to fully understand that the pending soil removals at Site 15 have nothing to do with the upcoming golf course renovation. SouthDiv's work at Site 15 is a CERCLA renovation and is being conducted separately.

4. Wetland 64 Review

A synopsis of the July 2001 mercury sampling field work at Site 40 and Wetland 64 was presented during the August, 2001 Tier 1 Team meeting. The data for this sampling effort was received and analyzed during September 2001. Phil Hardy presented the findings and recommendations for Wetland 64. A comparison of the 1996 sediment data to the 2001 data revealed that there has been a significant decrease in pesticides, PCBs, and SVOCs at Wetland 64 since 1996. The investigation found some variation in metals contamination between those years, but the overall trend for sediment exceedances is down. Sediment mercury data (1996 compared to 2001) and fish-tissue mercury data (2001) were applied to the Evans and Engel model (from the Site 40 RI). HQs adjusted with the appropriate SFF (0.043 for Wetland 64) showed that there is no impact to the red drum at Wetland 64. The 2001 sediment data was also applied to the upper trophic level fish model (from the Site 41 RI), and HQs adjusted for the Wetland 64 SFF showed there was no impact to predator fish at Wetland 64. Analyses of AVS-SEM data from Wetland 64 revealed that heavy metals were not bioavailable in the wetland's sediments. A literature review by Barbara Albrecht revealed that mercury in wetland and estuarine sediments in Florida comes mostly from atmospheric deposition. Based on these findings, no further action was recommended for Wetland 64.

Gena Townsend said that it appears that the contamination in Wetland 64 is not an ecological problem. We must state that the contaminant levels will not increase in the wetland; then no further action will be appropriate. Gena said she would talk to Tom Dillon and Lynn Wellman about Wetland 64.

Allison Harris said that the decrease in contaminants shows that industrial activities have ceased. Therefore, contaminant levels are not likely to increase. Allison said that an RI Addendum will be prepared after initial verbal comments are received.

Bill Hill wants Gena and Joe Fugitt to review the Wetland 64 memorandum and provide comments by November 9, 2001. Joe said he would try not to leave the Team hanging, and will get help from Tim and Ligia as necessary.

5. OU-2 Review

Brian Caldwell has been reviewing the OU-2 data based on comments from the August 2001 Tier 1 meeting and written comments from Gena Townsend. The biggest concern is subsurface soil leachability criteria versus groundwater criteria. Comparison to FDEP Rule 62.777 criteria should be okay as long as the rule is cited as a RBC. Subsurface soil leachability needs to be better addressed in the OU-2 document. The soil cleanup levels may change if the proposed changes to Rule 62.777 are incorporated. A decision needs to be made concerning using the current or pending 62.777 values.

6. Site 43 Review

Amy Twitty reviewed CH2MHill's work at Site 43. The only area with no exceedances is Area 4 on the west side of the tennis court. Buried debris was found to 7 ft bgs near the tennis court and fenced area. The tennis court is likely sitting on top of debris. Antimony and iron pose leachability problems at the site, based on SPLP analyses. The site cleanup will exceed the 330 cubic yard soil removal estimated in the work plan. Amy Twitty wants to know if the soil should be removed or capped in place? Greg Wifley said that iron exceedances are covered by a secondary standard; Ron Joyner wondered why groundwater should be protected from iron when it is naturally high at NAS Pensacola. Applying a 95% UCL to the delineation data might be helpful. Bill Hill told Amy to make a recommendation to the Tier 1 Team by November 16, 2001.

7. Site 40 Review

Phil Hardy presented the findings and recommendations for Site 40, based on the August, 2001 sampling results. A comparison of the 1996 sediment data to the 2001 data revealed that there has been a significant decrease in mercury at Site 40 since 1996. Sediment mercury data (1996 compared to 2001) and fish-tissue mercury data (2001) were applied to the Evans and Engel model (from the Site 40 RI). HQs adjusted with the appropriate SFF (0.32 for Site 40) showed a significantly reduced impact to the red drum at Site 40 (the offsite background fish-tissue mercury sample had the highest HQ when applied to the Evans and Engel model). Analyses of AVS-SEM data from Site 40 revealed that heavy metals were not bioavailable in Site 40 sediments. A literature review by Barbara Albrecht revealed that mercury in wetland and estuarine sediments in Florida comes mostly from atmospheric deposition. Based on these findings, no further action was recommended for Site 40.

Gena Townsend noted how the HQs have dropped and wants to make sure Tom Dillon and Lynn Wellman are happy with the models. Bill Hill wants comments from Tom and Lynn on Site 40 by November 16, 2001.

8. OU-13 Review

Ron Joyner said that the Barrancas Cemetery is expanding and will extend into the OU-13 area

by December 2002. Any required interim removal at the site needs to be accomplished before this expansion takes place. Gena Townsend said to plan for the interim removal. Bill Hill said that funding from Site 44 will need to be re-obligated for the OU-13 removal. Bill asked about doing an interim ROD, but later said that the ROD needs to be completed with institutional controls, noting in the Proposed Plan and ROD that a removal is underway. Bill wants a SOW issued for the OU-13 removal as soon as possible (November 2001).

9. OU-11 Review

Allison Harris said the Site 38 final RI addendum will be finished by early November 2001. This addendum will incorporate comments, and uses FDEP Rule 62.777 values in a new comparison. Brian Caldwell rewrote Section 4, recommending that the site be moved toward a Proposed Plan and ROD, with a continuing of groundwater monitoring and natural attenuation. Allison wants the final RI addendum distributed by November 14th.

10. Site 2 Review

Barbara Albrecht briefed the Team on Site 2. Barbara said that the data has now been normalized. Normalizing the data removed variability of control, and showed there are no effects across the board. Conditions 2 (absence of contaminants) and 3 (contaminants not bioavailable) exist at most Site 2 stations. Sediment chemistry and acute and chronic toxicity for the benthic community has improved at the site. Looking at the decision units, no further action is recommended at Site 2.

Bill Hill and Allison Harris want the Site 2 RI Addendum finalized by November 9th. Gena Townsend said that the whole site needs to be finalized and the Proposed Plan needs to be reworded for no further action provided Tom Dillon and Lynn Wellman agree.

11. Review of Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
0105-A2	Allison/Phil	Pending		Find out which Wetlands can be separated from the Site 41 RI into an IROD. Still looking at possibilities.
0105-A4	Bill	Pending		Develop proposed schedule for IROD.
0105-A5	Lynn	Complete		Check with Bobby Lewis concerning the Site 2 samples to see if there is a sample which could be used for TOC determination. No sample available; told to use 1996 TOC data.
0108-A1	Barbara	Pending		Review appropriate techniques for collecting surface water samples from very shallow water bodies.
0108-A3	Phil	Pending		Refine Site 41 matrix incorporating items presented during 08/01 meeting.
0108-A4	Brian	Complete		Incorporate regulator comments into the Site 38 Addendum 2.
0108-A5	Gena	Complete		Finish USEPA comments on OU-2 FS.
0108-A6	Brian	Pending		Compare FDEP 62-777 CTLs to federal criteria, note differences.
0110-A1	Toni and Lynn	Pending	11/09	Review Wetland 64 report and provide informal comments.

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
0110-A2	CH2MHill	Pending	11/05	Submit draft technical memorandum for Site 15 interim removal.
0110-A3	Gena and Joe	Pending	11/16	Provide comments on draft Site 15 technical memorandum.
0110-A3	CH2MHill	Pending		Make a recommendation for Site 43 as to whether the site should undergo a soil removal or be capped.
0110-A4	Tom and Lynn	Pending	11/16	Review Site 40 report and provide informal comments.
0110-A5	Brian	Pending	11/30	Write SOW for soil removal at OU-13.
0110-A6	Allison	Pending	11/14	Submit Site 38 Final RI Addendum containing comment responses.

12. Schedule Review

Pensacola 5-Year Review. Gena said the NAS Pensacola 5-Year Review is due by November of 2002 based on the OU-10 remedial action start date.

EPA Comments on the OU-2 FS. The final FS for OU-2 is due by December 30, 2001.

OU-1. The site is in the monitoring phase; the Team needs to agree on how the wetlands adjacent to Site 1 can be added to the OU-1 monitoring plan.

Site 2 ~~RZ~~ Addendum. The Site-2 RI Addendum is due by November 9, 2001.

Site 15. Site 15 appears to be on schedule.

Site 38. Site 38 appears to be on schedule. Final document is due during the 3rd Quarter, FY-2002.

OU-13. OU-13 appears to be on schedule.

Site 40. The ROD is due during the 3rd Quarter, FY-2004.

Site 41. The ROD is due during the 3rd Quarter, FY-2004.

Site 43. The IRA has been initiated and work for this site appears to be on schedule.

Site 44. The work for this site is still to be awarded. TTNUS will likely be awarded this work in FY-2002.

Site 45. Work on this site is still pending.

13. Proposed Agenda for January 2002 Tier 1 Meeting

Next Meeting: January 8 - 9, 2002 at the Anchorage Inn in Charleston, South Carolina. The meeting will be held from 8:00 am - 5:00 PM each day.

Leader: Gena Townsend

Scribe: Barbara Albrecht/Phil Hardy

Time Keeper: Greg Wifley

Note: *An interim teleconference will be held on November 16, 2001 at 9:00AM. Ron Joyner will be the leader of this conference.*

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
Site 2	Barbara	2 hours	Comments.
Site 41	Phil	2 hours	Ongoing Site 41 issues.
ou-2	Allison	1 hour	Provide status update.
OU-13/OU-11	Brian/Allison	1 hour	Provide status update.
TTNUS/CH2MHill	Terry/Greg	1 hour	Provide status update.
Station Update	Ron	0.5 hour	Give update on NAS Pensacola CA Study implementation.
Lunch	Team	2 hours	Refresh
Breaks	Team	40 minutes	Relax
Facilitator Training	Gus	1 hour	Learn
Check In/Check Out	Ron	2 hours	Hello/Goodbye
Schedule Review	Bill	1 hour	Review/update current schedule.

14. Parking Lot

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
9903-A13	Bill will submit a letter to 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.
NA	<p>The following is the proposed bi-monthly meeting schedule through August 2002:</p> <p>November 16, 2001 — Teleconference at 9:00 AM.</p> <p>January 8 - 9, 2002 — Charleston, SC (Anchorage Inn)</p> <p>February 26 - 27, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (Ensafe's office; a RAB meeting will also be held)</p> <p>April 24 - 25, 2002 — Tallahassee, FL (TTNUS's office)</p> <p>June 26 - 27, 2002 — (Ensafe's office; a RAB meeting will also be held)</p> <p>August 27 - 28, 2002 — Knoxville, TN (EnSafe's office)</p>

15. Perform +/- Criteria

+	-
<p>Meetings went well.</p> <p>Attendees were courteous to everyone else.</p> <p>Topics were well presented and understood without having a face-to-face meeting.</p> <p>The ability to adjust meeting to meet Gena's family needs.</p>	<p>Absence of Tom and Lynn.</p>