

**FINAL
PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES**

DATE: July 17, 2002
TEAM LEADER: Terry Hansen
SCRIBE: Phil Hardy/Barbara Albrecht
GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER: Allison Harris
PROCESS FACILITATOR: Gus Campana

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

Allison Harris – EnSafe Inc.
Brian Caldwell – EnSafe Inc.
Terry Hansen – TTNUS
Ron Joyner – NAS Pensacola
Gena Townsend – USEPA
Tracie Vaught – FDEP
Greg Wilfley – CH2MHill

Support Members:

Barbara Albrecht – Site 2 Support
Tom Dillon – NOAA
Phil Hardy – Site 41 Support
Paul Stoddard – Tier II Link
Amy Twitty – CH2MHill
Lynn Wellman – USEPA
Hugo Ochoa – The University of
Florida

1. Check-In

The meeting began at 8:00 AM. Everyone is doing fine. The ground rules and processes were reviewed. The group welcomed H. Ochoa, from the University of Florida, who covers ecological issues for FDEP.

2. Meeting Discussion Items

Before the Team Meeting on July 17, 2002, an Eco-Subgroup meeting occurred on July 15 and 16, 2002. The attendees included G. Townsend, T. Vaught, A. Harris, P. Stoddard, T. Dillon, L. Wellman, H. Ochoa, B. Albrecht, and P. Hardy. Minutes for the proceedings from this focus group are included in Appendix A. The Team Meeting addressed the agenda. T. Dillon and L. Wellman did not attend the Team Meeting. H. Ochoa left the July 17 session after the Site 2 discussion. The minutes from the May 2002 meeting were approved by consensus, action items were reviewed and updated, and the priority was set for the items needing discussion.

The table shows the July meeting agenda items as they were discussed:

Topics	July 15-16	July 17
Site 41 Review	X	X
Site 2 Review		X
Training		X
Tier II Update		X
OU-2 Review		X
Facility Update		X
ROD Update		X
TTNUS OU-1 Review		X
CH2MHill OU-13, Site-15, UST-18 Review		X
Tier II Presentation Preparation		X

3. Site 2 Review

B. Albrecht has received comments from NOAA, EPA, and FDEP. All comments expressed similar concerns. H. Ochoa related that the chemical data from the 1996 and 2000 sampling events cannot be used to show a reduction in constituent concentrations between these events. Prior samples were discrete, while the follow-on samples were composited. The Team cannot compare data from different sampling designs. B. Albrecht stated that we need to acknowledge the existence of the earlier data. A. Harris said we will develop means for the earlier sampling results, and compare these data to the results of the latter event. B. Albrecht also discussed how subsurface sediment sample results will be included in the final report for Site 2. H. Ochoa noted that the AVS/SEM data is only useful if the sediments remain stable and anoxic. There is no guarantee that constituents will remain sequestered, since meteorological events and man-made disturbances might change sediment conditions. H. Ochoa said that we did not use a screening value for BEHP at sample stations IJ-12, CD-23, or KL-34. A. Harris stated that in comparing contaminant concentrations to survivability, antimony, chrysene and fluoranthene were the constituents that showed the greatest effect. The only sampling station with a survivability effect was CD-23. B. Albrecht said that station KL-34 did not jump out at her, and she will revisit the data for this location. H. Ochoa said there might be samples where constituents show no effects when considered individually, but there may be additive effects when they are grouped together (i.e., total PAHs). The Team can calculate ERMs for constituent groups and total the results to get an ERM quotient. B. Albrecht expressed concern that if the data is manipulated too much, something might be lost; we also need to make sure that the site data is compared to the reference stations. G. Townsend said it might be helpful to restate the sample conditions in the follow-on report, such as the paint chips found in the samples during the 1996 investigation. T. Hanson asked if the Team has enough information to proceed with Site 2, and are we comfortable that we can get where we need to go with what we have? A Harris stated that we have no data gaps.

Action Item: T. Vaught and H. Ochoa will provide supporting documentation for indexing sediment contaminants and comparing their additive effects.

4. Site 41 Update

G. Townsend summarized the proceedings of the Site 41 focus-group meeting for Team members who were not present for this session of the July forum. G. Townsend related how the focus group went through a COPC refinement process using data tables prepared by B. Albrecht and P. Hardy. COPCs were refined for the wetlands surrounding OU-1. An overall understanding was developed concerning how to address contaminants. The final product will allow the Team to note trends that might be tied back to sites. The Team is satisfied with the new approach. T. Vaught said having a side-bar meeting was very helpful and might be useful for future issues. A detailed synopsis of the focus group's accomplishments is provided in Appendix A.

5. Training

G. Campana took the Team through training on how to conduct effective meetings. He showed the group the video *Meetings, Bloody Meetings*. The theme of the video is that people should do appropriate planning for meetings. Proper steps include: (1) planning, (2) informing participants, (3) conducting adequate preparations, (4) exercising structure and control over the proceedings, and (5) summarizing and recording what took place. G. Campana would like to train the group next on the proper methods for giving a presentation.

6. Tier II Update

P. Stoddard said that Tier II will have a joint meeting with EPA Regions V and VI and representatives from Texas and Illinois during August 2002. The discussions will include LUCIPs, ROD language, and MOAs. The NAS Pensacola Tier I Team can expect to give a presentation to the Tier II team in Orlando on Wednesday, August 28th.

P. Stoddard said that this team seems to be grappling with issues that are not clear-cut, such as ecological issues. He said that this should be brought out in its presentation to Tier II. P. Stoddard feels that the Pensacola team would otherwise be criticized for lack of progress. He also feels that Tier I should emphasize that the Navy front-loaded the field investigations at NAS Pensacola, with the site field work being mostly conducted between 1992 and 1996. The process of moving the sites through the rest of the RI/FS process has been slow-going.

7. OU-2 Update

It was stated that the goal of the Team should be to direct and focus future sampling at OU-2 to complete the FS. B. Caldwell began a discussion of the previous shallow and intermediate groundwater data and subsurface soil data. The 1993 phase of sampling addressed soil, while the 1995 phase addressed groundwater. The Team has already decided that the data is old and resampling is needed. The minimum resampling is likely to consist of the wells with previous constituent exceedances, as well as the wells immediately upgradient of wetland areas. G.

Townsend asked if a resampling proposal has been written. B. Caldwell said that a skeleton proposal has been compiled, but there may be other wells added to the resampling list. No proposal for soil sampling has been written. G. Townsend wants to look at soil sampling that may be required to address leaching concerns at the OU-2 sites. After looking at some maps that B. Caldwell had prepared for this discussion, T. Vaught suggested, and the Team concurred, that a focus-group meeting for Site 2 is needed to arrive at a consensus for the proposed additional sampling. The focus-group meeting is tentatively scheduled for the week of September 9, 2002, at the TTNUS office in Tallahassee, FL. Alternatively, T. Vaught said the group could meet over at the FDEP headquarters.

8. Facility Update

R. Joyner discussed the planned repairs to the seawall that parallels the Intercoastal Waterway, saying that Facilities Management wanted to put rock rip-rap along the entire length of the seawall. He also said that MWR wants to build a mini-mart and gas station on the former Building 709 footprint at Site 27. R. Joyner said he is trying to discourage both of these moves.

9. ROD Update

G. Townsend said the dispute between EPA Region III and DOD about ROD language is out of control. The major dispute concerns how to incorporate LUCIPs aboard installations. She related how she is currently having problems getting a ROD signed at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. G. Townsend said that the LUCIP planned for OU-13 will affect the ROD. T. Hansen said he currently has six RODs stacked up.

10. TTNUS Review

T. Hansen said that Gerry Walker will come to the August meeting to update the Team on what is currently happening at OU-1. TTNUS has received new groundwater data from OU-1 and is finalizing a new quarterly report for the data. The Site 43 report is also currently being finalized. G. Townsend said the final report will need to include a LUCIP for Site 43.

11. CH2MHill Review

G. Wilfley stated that the cost proposal for confirmation sampling at OU-13 Sites 8 and 24 was submitted with the estimate for the removal actions at these sites. UST-18 has been resampled for soil and groundwater. The ongoing investigation at Site 15 has discovered two pesticide plumes in site groundwater.

12. Tier II Presentation Preparation

It was decided that Tuesday, August 27 will be reserved for the Tier I meeting, and for preparation to prepare for the Tier II presentation on Wednesday, August 28. P. Stoddard

wanted the topic to focus on an update of what is currently happening at NAS Pensacola. Appendix B contains the outline showing the presenters and who has responsibility for compiling briefing materials. A. Harris will compile the briefing; materials should be submitted to her by August 2, 2002.

13. Review of Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
Old Action Items				
9903-A13	Bill Hill	Complete		Submit a letter to EPA and State requesting that OU-10 be handled under RCRA authority. Letter was submitted to EPA and FDEP
0201-A2	R. Joyner	Pending		Check the status of the LUCIPs for OUs 01, 10 and 15.
0201-A4	P. Hardy	Complete		Incorporate T. Dillon's comments into the Site 40 Mercury Sampling Report. The RI Report Addendum 2 has been updated. The updated mercury concentrations will be incorporated into the RI Report Addendum 1. Expected submittal for the two addendums is August 9, 2002.
0201-A6	B. Hill	Complete		Obtain execution plan for OU-13 interim removals. Hill has submitted its POA. The Navy has broken the scope into two parts, delineation and removal. Greg had conversations with the Contracting staff on July 17 and believes the delineation sampling will be funded quickly.
0201-A7	A. Harris	Pending		Compile OU-11 RI Addendum 3 that ties Site 2 to OU-11. The RI Addendum 3 is being compiled. Expected submittal by August 30, 2002.
0202-A1	B. Hill	Complete		Update schedules to reflect training to be performed at each meeting. Schedules have been updated.
0202-A3	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Pending		Refine the Final Site 40 RI Addendum of April 24, 2000 to reflect a recommendation of NFA for the site. As described above, mercury data are being incorporated into the RI Addendum 2. Expected submittal for the two addendums is August 9, 2002.
0502-A1	G. Wilfley	Pending		E-mail CH2MHill's change to the Site 15 ROD to G. Townsend for review prior to submission to USEPA. Will finish before August meeting.
0502-A2	T. Vaught	Complete		Find out if FDEP is agreeable to keeping Site 43 as a SI site instead of an RI site. T. Vaught stated they are agreeable.
0502-A3	P. Hardy	Complete		Identify Site 41 wetlands with storm water features. Stormwater sewer lines and outfalls have been added to the GIS website for NASP.
0502-A4	A. Twitty	Complete		Prepare a sampling plan for the OU 13 soil removals for Team approval. Sampling plan has been submitted to the regulators.
0502-A5	B. Caldwell	Complete		Analyze data, outline assumptions, and produce maps to show at the next meeting to facilitate recommendations for OU 2 resampling. Complete. Figures were presented during the meeting. Additional information was requested for the figures and a Subgroup meeting was scheduled for September 10 and 11, 2002 in Tallahassee.
0502-A6	B. Albrecht	Pending	Aug 27	Develop tables of the subsurface sediment data and relate it to the surface data. In addition, a comparison of the 1996 overall mean of Site 2 data will be compared to the 2000 mean data to determine if any changes (degradation or improvements site-wide) have occurred.
New Action Items				
0702-A1	A. Harris	Pending	Aug. 9	Submit revised RI Addendums 1 and 2 for Site 40 by August 9, 2002.
0702-A2	T. Vaught/H. Ochoa	Pending		Provide supporting documentation for indexing sediment contaminants and comparing their additive effects.

14. Proposed Agenda for August 27-28 Tier 1 Meeting

Next Meeting: August 27 - 28, 2002 in Orlando, Florida. The meeting will be held from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm each day.

Leader: A. Harris

Scribe: Ron Joyner

Time Keeper: Gena Townsend

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

Allison Harris – EnSafe Inc.
 Brian Caldwell – EnSafe Inc.
 Ron Joyner – NAS Pensacola
 Tracie Vaught – FDEP
 Greg Wilfley, CH2MHill
 Bill Hill, Southern Division
 Terry Hansen, TetraTech NUS

Support Members:

Paul Stoddard, Tier II Link
 Gus Campana, Facilitator

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
<i>August 27, 2002</i>			
Check-In <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda Review • July Minutes/Action Item Review • What's new? 	A. Harris	1 hour	Check status/prioritize
Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Something About Communication 	G. Campana	1 hour	Learn
Site 2	A. Harris	1 hour	Present Mean Comparisons for the two sampling events. Present total PAH remedial goals.
OU 10 RCRA Transfer	T. Vaught	0.5 hour	Update status.
OU-2	A. Harris/B. Caldwell	0.5 hour	Inform Team on Status of OU 2 evaluation.
Site 41	A. Harris	1 hour	Inform Team of progress made since the July meeting.
OU-1 Update	Gerry Walker	1 hour	Site update/status. Gerry requests that his topics be addressed on Tuesday morning, so he can drive back to Tallahassee.
OU-1 5-Year Review	Gerry Walker	1.5 hours	Update/status.
Tier II Preparation	Team	2 hours	Practice for Tier II presentation on August 28.

August 28, 2002			
Tier II Presentation	Team	2 hours	Effectively communicate to Tier II our Team's current status and eliminate Tier II's erroneous perception that this team is poorly performing.
Future Meetings?	A. Harris	0.5 hours	Establish dates and locations for remaining meetings in 2002.
Mini-Meetings	B. Hill	0.5 hours	Establish criteria for having a mini-meeting.
Facilitator	G. Campana	0.5 hour	Evaluate Team's performance during this meeting.
Check-Out Action Item Review Plus/Delta of Meeting Agenda for Next Meeting	A. Harris	1 hour	Tie things up and say "farewell".
Lunch	Team	3 hours	Refresh.
Breaks	Team	40 min.	Relax.

Note: Meeting agenda will be reprioritized if necessary. Members should plan on staying until 5:00 PM each day.

15. Parking Lot

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
9802-A14	B. Caldwell 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 B. Hill.
9811-M03	Bring MBTI materials to all meetings.
NA	The following is the proposed bi-monthly meeting schedule through August 2002: August 27 - 28, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (EnSafe's office; a RAB meeting will also be held).

16. Checkout

G. Campana stated that he felt we had a good group and that our meeting was focused and very productive.

17. Perform +/- Criteria

+	Δ
<p>L. Wellman and T. Dillon were in attendance.</p> <p>Separate focus-group meeting for Site 41.</p> <p>Presence of and contribution made by H. Ochoa.</p> <p>Decision to publish separate agenda prior to meetings.</p> <p>The outline developed for the Tier II presentation.</p>	<p>The schedule was mis-communicated to/mis-understood by G. Campana.</p>

Appendix A
Site 41 Focus Group

NAS Pensacola Site 41 Focus Group Meeting
July 15-16, 2002

The attendees of the Site 41 Focus Group meeting included G. Townsend, T. Vaught, A. Harris, P. Stoddard, T. Dillon, L. Wellman, H. Ochoa, B. Albrecht, and P. Hardy. The group went through a COPC refinement process using data tables prepared by B. Albrecht and P. Hardy. COPCs were refined for several wetlands surrounding OU-1. An overall understanding was developed concerning how to address contaminants and tie them back to sources at nearby sites

In order to bring H. Ochoa up to speed on the issues concerning the wetlands, B. Albrecht started the discussion by recapping what has been accomplished at Site 41 thus far. The rationale for the current approach was also discussed. It was decided to conduct a COPC refinement process beginning with the wetlands surrounding OU-1 (Wetlands 1, 3, 15, 16, 17, and 18).

The group decided to retain as COPCs those constituents with a screening value that had an HQ above 1. Inorganics with no screening values would be retained and refined based on background levels (H. Ochoa wanted to make sure new background values were computed using the original Site 41 reference wetlands, but with fresh water and salt water wetlands kept separate – P. Hardy will adjust these values, since the Site 41 RI considered sediments from the reference wetlands collectively). Metals should also be addressed based on their relative toxicity. Certain organics with no screening values would also be retained until refinement. The refinement process for inorganics and organics with no screening values would also include examining sample locations to see if any particular location or area of a wetland had more detections than another, as well as looking at possible instrument anomalies from the laboratory analyses. Surface soil and groundwater data from nearby terrestrial sampling locations will also be brought into the refinement process.

The group also decided on several screening values to be used for all Site 41 wetlands:

- Total PAH values will be developed for each wetland. PAHs will be normalized based on TOC. The 1999 article by Richard G. Schwartz will be used as a guide. Based on calculations performed by T. Dillon, the organic carbon normalized screening level for TPAHs for Site 41 will be 2,900 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$.
- The 182 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ screening level for bis(2-Ethyhexyl)phthalate will be used as a screening number for all other phthalate esters.
- A no-effect surrogate screening value of 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ will be used for phenol detections.
- The 0.32 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ TEL for gamma-BHC/Lindane will be used for alpha, beta, and delta-BHC.

- Total endrins will be developed from endrin, endrin aldehyde, and endrin ketone for each wetland, with the results compared to a screening value of 3.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$.

The group also decided to consider VOCs, even though these compounds have no USEPA or FDEP screening value, because VOCs are an issue at the Site 1 landfill.

The Group reviewed Wetlands 3, 15, 16 and 17. Detailed tables outlining the decision process will be provided separately.

Appendix B
Tier II Presentation Outline

Tier I Presentation for August 2002 Tier II Meeting

Section	Topic	Number of Slides	Presenter	Graphics	Time
I	Introduction - Team Members	1-2	B. Hill	A. Harris	10 Min
I	Aerial Base Map	2-3	B. Hill	R. Joiner & P. Hardy	↓
I	Historical Account of P'cola NAS	2-3	B. Hill	R. Joiner & P. Hardy	↓
II	Accomplishments, Challenges, & Future	1-2	G. Townsend	G Townsend	5 Min
II-A	Accomplishments to Date:	1	T. Hanson	G. Townsend & B. Caldwell	25 Min
II-A	95% UCL used by FDEP	1	T. Hanson	T. Vaught	↓
II-A	# of Remedial Efforts	1-2	T. Hanson	G. Townsend & B. Caldwell	↓
II-A	Navy Sediment Policy	1	T. Hanson	B. Hill	↓
II-A	EnSafe GIS Link	3-4	A. Harris	A. Harris	↓
II-B	Challenges Encountered:	1	T. Hanson		↓
II-B	Ecological Issues	1-2	T. Hanson	A. Harris & B. Albrecht	↓
II-B	Evolving Policies - Moving Targets	1	T. Hanson	B. Hill	↓
II-B	LUCIPs / RODs	1	T. Hanson	G. Townsend	↓
II-B	Old Data	1	T. Hanson	G. Townsend & B. Caldwell	↓
II-B	Cemetery - Removal before the ROD	1-2	T. Hanson	B. Hill & R. Joiner	↓
II-B	Archeological Issues	1-2	T. Hanson	B. Hill	↓
II-C	On-Going & Future Projects:		T. Hanson		↓
II-C	Wetlands	1-2	T. Hanson	P. Hardy	↓
II-C	Site 2 - DQO Process	1-2	T. Hanson	B. Albrecht	↓
II-C	OU-1	1-2	T. Hanson	T. Hanson	↓
II-C	OU-2	1-2	T. Hanson	B. Caldwell	↓
III	Summary	3	T. Vaught		10 Min
IV	Question & Answer	-	T. Vaught		↓