

N00204.AR.002597
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 28 MARCH AND 29 MARCH 2001 NAS
PENSACOLA FL
3/28/2001
NAS PENSACOLA

**PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES**

DATE: March 28 - 29, 2001

LOCATION: Charleston, SC

TEAM LEADER: Brian Caldwell

SCRIBE: Barbara Albrecht

GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER: Allison Harris

PROCESS FACILITATOR: Barbara Albrecht

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

Allison Harris
Joe Fugitt
Ron Joyner
Brian Caldwell
Tom Dillon (Day 1)
Gena Townsend
Bill Hill

Support Members:

Robby Darby - Tier II Link
Paul Stoddard - Tier II Link

Guests:

Barbara Albright - EnSafe

1. Check-In

Meeting began at 8:00. Everyone is doing fine. There was not a formal check-in. The agenda was limited to Site 41 for the first day and the Tier I presentation for the April meeting for the second day. The meeting did not follow the standard format (review of action items etc.).

2. Site 41

Meeting participants representing stakeholders were asked to briefly summarize their concerns with the Site 41 Report.

- Gena Townsend indicated that the sources of contamination were not clearly identified and defined. In several cases, groundwater and soil and/or sediment data were not available for each site thus making technically defensible decisions difficult.
- Tom Dillon indicated there was a definite disconnect between the NFA decision and the results of the wetland toxicity and analytical data. From an eco-risk and US EPA process viewpoint, the data suggests an unacceptable risk exists and then the report proceeds to a NFA or just stops which is not part of the process. The eastern portion of the Base is suspicious. There are too many unanswered questions regarding the source of contaminants. In addition, the report does not highlight the "DDT" success story on base enough.
- Joe Fugitt indicated similar concerns with regards to source identification. In addition,

in wetlands which did have detections for chemical constituents the constituents were not addressed. Resampling at certain locations may be necessary before NFA can be concluded.

The team agreed to discuss the possible pathways and sources for each group of wetlands in Site 41, and to clarify the disconnect between the data, ecorisk, and conclusions. In addition, the team agreed to enhance the DDT success story.

Wetland 5A/B → Wetland 6 → Wetland 64 → Bayou Grande

Wetland 5 A/B

- Issue: Elevated levels of Cd, Pb, Co, Zn, and Hg were detected in A-01, A-05, and B-02. PAHs were also detected A-05.
- Source: Surface runoff, area is a large depression with surrounding parking lots. Plating operation may be the source for metals. Oil/water separator may be another source for metals.
- Confirmation: Need groundwater data from adjacent area. If no contaminants are detected in the groundwater, then stormwater may be to blame. Data should be in OU2 groundwater investigation, check for a connection. Brian stated that this was done in the fate and transport section. After looking in the report, it was noted that the report states that groundwater could affect the wetland but nothing specific was stated concerning COCs. If data collected in 1994 showed detections, and data collected in 1996 showed a decline or non-detects then the area could have been flushed.
- Wish list:
1. A figure indicating groundwater and surface water flow, including known stormwater culverts and discharge points.
 2. Include a table which compares surface water data from wetlands to groundwater data collected at adjacent wells (in OU2). Include concentrations. This would provide a qualitative (not quantitative) comparison. **Focus only on the constituents found in the wetland when reviewing the groundwater in adjacent areas.**
 3. Re-sample 5A-05 and 5B-02 since Level B was worn when removing the Oil/water separator.
 4. Collect groundwater and surface water at OU2 Site 30 and compare to Wetland 5A surface water to confirm source.
- Concerns:
1. Is degradation from TCE occurring?
 2. If this is a seasonal wetland (experiences a wet/dry cycle) problems could occur when sediments dry out, oxidize, re-flood (during rain events), thus making metals more leachable and bioavailable.
- Toxicity data: Sub-lethal hits, no acute response.

Wetland 6

Issue:

Station 10 has elevated Hg levels, as did Wetland 5B-02. The area south of site 07 is clean.

DDT was detected at Wetland 6-01, may be from pesticide/herbicide application.

Source: Is Wetland 6 a transport mechanism of chemical constituents from Wetland 5A/B to Wetland 64? Big culverts from the east and west area serve as runoff to Wetland 6.

Confirmation: Look at adjacent groundwater data for a possible source.

Concern: Basewide DDT detections have HQ values at 40, at Wetland 6-01 HQ values are 260. Was this a collection area for rain? Could there have been a spill?

Wetland 64

Issue: Chemicals have begun to partition out in the southern and northern areas of this wetland. In the north, Co, Cr, and Ar have been detected.

Source: Remnants of old wooden docks which were replaced in 1992 with PVC floating docks.

Concern: How were these pilings removed? Were they pulled up, pushed down, or cut off? If cut off, this may be attributed to the source via leaching.

Issue: The biggest problem is in the southern area of the wetland. Is the transition area from freshwater to saltwater contributing to a salting out process which is also attributing to high turbidity?

Source: Review Site 11 data. Determine if PAH constituents from Site 11 are contributing to the problem in the southern end of Wetland 64. Review groundwater and surface water data from the adjacent area. Where is the fueling facility located which services the marina? Could this be a potential source?
Action Item 0103-A01: Ron Joyner to find out what fueling facilities exist at the sailing marina.

Action Item 0103-A02: Allison will see if there is any low-flow data for Site 11.

Concerns: Is the UST site adjacent to this area active?

Action Item 0103-A03: Joe Fugitt to find out if the UST Site is still active.

Historically: The well in the parking lot of the old DERMO yard (Bldg 3445) had free product in it when J. Lunceford sampled this well in the early stages of the investigation. An aviation fuel line was located around the perimeter of Chevalier Field, has it been completely removed?

Concern: Is the small area going into Wetland 64 man-made fill or natural? (P. Hardy, I can point this out to you on a map)

Source: Review groundwater data from OU-10.

Site Foraging Factor for Wetland 64

Two foraging factors were used to determine the potential risk at Wetland 64. In the absence of site specific information, US EPA would like to be conservative. The lack of site specific data for prey is translated into a high level of uncertainty, since all calculations were made from sediment.

Fish tissue will be collected in spring/summer to develop specific site foraging factors for this wetland. In the interim, investigations should continue to try to identify the primary and secondary sources of contamination.

Wetland 12 + Wetland 13 → Wetland 10 A/B → Pensacola Bay

Wetland 12

Issue: There are PAHs in sediments sampled from A-2. The topographic map indicates that water flow moves towards A-2. Wetland 10 is a receptor for UST-K area before Wetland 12. Wetland 13 is a swale collection area.

Source: Are PAHs from the bilge water plant?

Wetland 13

Issue: Is Wetland 13 a seasonal wetland? If so, the high turbidity in saltwater and metals concentration in this wetland may be explained. High detections of metals are basically a magnification of sediment in very little water. Since concentrations are on the same order of magnitude between sediment and water, this may be the explanation.

Source: Since this wetland had very little standing water, someone recalled that samples were obtained by digging a hole in the sediment and allowing water to fill the hole before being sampled. (Action item for B. Albrecht to check with P. Hardy)

Recommendation: No further action, NFA, if samples were collected in the manner described above.

Wetland 10A/B

Issue: Silver was mentioned in Table 10-7-4, but was missing in Table 10-7-3. At issue is whether silver was really detected or if there was a typo in the data entry process. Silver and sodium levels are identical, and appear next to each other alphabetically. Cadmium and chromium are still an issue at this site. Is Wetland 10 a man-made feature?

Recommendation: Check raw lab data to confirm detections at this site. Was silver an issue at OU-10? Was it only a concern at Site 42?

Confirmation: Review groundwater and sediment data and determine at which sampling time (Phase 1 or Phase 11) the constituents were observed.

Wetland 63A → Pensacola Bay

Issue: There is/was an oil/water separator at this site. Compare groundwater and surface water stations located near this site.

Concerns: Fish have not been observed at this site. Might there be an impact from this wetland into Pensacola Bay?

Confirmation: Collect another surface water sample from this site.

Wetland 63B → Pensacola Bay

Issue: None. The Partnering Team feels that this would make an excellent reference wetland.

Classified: No further action required.

Wetland 3

Issue: Station 2 was turbid during sampling. DDT was elevated at this site (sample 3-03). Chemicals of concern may be coming from Site 1 in the form of leachate.

Confirmation: Site 1 is being monitored for natural attenuation, compare groundwater data from this site to surface water samples collected in the past.

DDT

Issue: DDT levels at Wetlands 15 and 18 are elevated. There appears to be a pattern of elevated levels on 3 or 4 sides of Wetland 3 which are contributing.

Of Interest: Over the 20 month period between sampling events, DDT levels dropped significantly. Is there an explanation? Was the same analytical lab used for both sampling events? What was the amount of precipitation which occurred between Jan '96 and Aug '97? Was it a wet year?

Action Item 0103-A04: Ron Joyner to get rainfall data from January 1996 to August 1997.

- Wetland 18
- Seeps need to be identified
 - Potentially needs to added to the Site 1 Monitoring Plan
 - Stormwater flow direction needs to be identified on the map.

Wetland 1 - Compare the groundwater data from 16.
 - Aircraft operations are suspected as potential source.

Wetland 16 - No Further Action

Wetland 15 - Joe suggested to attempt resampling in order to get a lower turbidity than the previous samples that tested positive for Mercury.
 - Compare with the groundwater data from Site 1.

3. Tier I/Tier II Presentation

Gena Townsend with very little assistance from the rest of the team, generated the power point presentation for the April Joint Tier I and Tier II meeting. The presentation will be made by Gena, Bill Hill and Joe Fugitt.

4. Develop Agenda for Next Meeting

Next Meeting: April 24 - 25, 2001 at the Tier I / Tier II meeting in the Hibiscus Room at the Bellview Biltmore in Clearwater Florida.

Leader: Joe Fugitt

Scribe: Terry Hansen

Timekeeper: Allison Harris & Company

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/ Expectation
Check-in/ Agenda Modifications/ AI	Joe	1 hour	Information
Presentation	All	4 hours	Prepare
Site 41	All	4 hours	Resolution
Close Out	Allison	.5 hour	Planning

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.

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
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	Complete		Concurrence on SAP received from FDEP, and given by EPA at this meeting.
0006-A28	Terry	Complete		Terry/ Pittsburgh GIS to coordinate with Constantine Tudan Memphis EnSafe. ECD April 2001.
0006-A32	TtNUS	Complete	12/05/00	Gerry Walker is to develop a Site 1 presentation for the Nov/Dec RAB meeting. Ongoing until next RAB meeting.
0009-A47	Team	Complete		Team members will provide Robby with information on video conferencing facilities available at each member's location.
0009-A50	Joe	Open	10/30/00	Joe will submit concurrence (pending 0009-A49).
0010-A54	Joe	Complete	11/1/00	Joe will prepare a NFA letter for OU6 and Site 34.
0012-A1	Joe	Open		Site 102: New wells have Al and Fe above secondary standard. Joe to get Tim Bahr's spin on issue.
0012-A2	Terry	Open		Site 102: Terry to look at Site 102 Al and Fe in comparison to regional ambient data, and the FDEP calculated health-based RGOs.
0012-A3	Ron	Open		Site 43: Ron to take care of excavated drums and overpacks from Site 43.
0012-A4	Allison	Open		Site 12: Allison to check and see if any soil exceeded leachability values on the western side of Site 12 (contractor wants to pave).
0012-A5	Gena	Open		Schedules: Gena to clarify "start" dates for RA. Will also submit any review comments to Bill on schedules.
0012-A6	Allison	Open		Site 2: Allison to use ERM quotients to factor chemical data from Site 2 into the triad system.
0012-A7	Joe	Open		Site 38: Joe to discuss discrepancies and applicability between 62-302 and 62-770 for some parameters (F) with Tim Bahr.
0012-A8	Joe	Open		Site 41: Joe to synthesize his comments and discuss with Jim, Eric, and Tim.
0012-A9	Gena	Open		Site 41: Gena to get Lynn's feedback on her comments.
0012-A10	Joe and Tom	Open		Site 41: Joe and Tom to have their comments by next meeting.

Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
0012-A11	Team	Open		Joint meeting presentation: Ron, Bill, Brian, Joe, and Gena to prepare slide text for joint meeting presentation on Site 2.

5. Perform +/- Critique

+	Δ
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ron's Trip• Material was covered• Gena took charge• Teamwork• Power Point Presentation• Barbara's Attendance & Assistance• Meeting location	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Robbie's Leaving