

N60508.AR.002426  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM PARTNERING TEAM MEETING HELD 18 MARCH 1998 NAS WHITING  
FIELD  
3/18/1998  
NAS WHITING FIELD

MINUTES

**NAS Whiting Field Partnering Team Meeting**

March 18-19, 1998

Held at NAS Whiting Field, Milton, Florida

NOTE: Amended or changed items are preceded and followed by two stars (\*\*).

1. begin 0845

Tom Conrad is the leader; Jim Cason is the Scribe

Present-Earl Bozeman, Craig, Terry, Gerry, Tom, Jim H., Jim C., Linda, Phillip, Pat D., Pete Paznokas (Facilitator). All members are present

2. LM has SCAPS report - can copy for whoever wants. JC wants time for deliverables

3. Minutes from last meeting APPROVED.

**NOTE: a numeric number which incorporates a number based on the type of item ("A" for Action Item; "C" for Consensus item), the date and the sequence number has been assigned to open items from the current meeting and to any subsequent action items. An example is the following number: A0318981, which is the first number of the sequence. The "A" denotes the Action Item category; the next six numbers are the date and the number(s) remaining are the sequence number. In the above example, it is the first action item of the day. When an Action Item has been completed (closed), the minutes of the meeting should reflect the closure by listing only the Action Item Number and affixing an "X" after it. In the above example, if the item is deemed closed, it should appear in the list of closed items in the next meeting minutes as 'A0318981X.' Use of the numbering scheme places the responsibility of number assignment and numbering continuity on the designated Scribe for that particular session. Listing only by number with an "X" affixed is less anal than having to write the entire action out.**

**ACTION ITEM A0318981: The team should read, consider and understand the actions and implications of the Action Item/Consensus numbering system and reach consensus as to adoption and use.**

Action items: see list attached to agenda; the following items remain OPEN:

**There are no OPEN Action Items from the last meeting.**

Parking lot Items: done.



4. RAB critique - it was good but long; the next RAB will have TAPPS presentation by \*\*Pat Durbin\*\*.

5. Break

6. Tier II Update: - Earl. (HO-1, Tier II Minutes) Tier II. Met March 4, talked about Land Use Restrictions, the old sticking point was that Florida wanted enforceability for the document. Resolved by new language to be incorporated which refers to ICs as part of the remedies for sites. If a problem occurs later, regulators may come back and change the ROD and possibly seek judicial relief. Hope to be finished by 03 April. Earl says that a big signing ceremony will be held when first one is done. Contractor transition: method, when, etc. to be considered by Tier II. Success stories: presently in a binder. Should format be altered? No decision made as yet. Tier II will consider success stories which may be put on "Home Page" by next Tier II meeting. Disbursement possibilities were discussed. Some discussion on the concept of "graduation" ensued. Education modules were considered but not finalized as yet. Performance model will be reviewed (in April for Tier II). Pensacola, Pensacola Compliance and NASWF are invited to give update on program (specifics later). Tier II links will review schedule for major milestones. Earl polled the team for Myers-Briggs testing. All have had. Metrics: Tier II is evaluating future submissions format and coverages. Team performance measurement is one of the basic considerations. A prolonged discussion ensued. Tom Dillon, Natural Resource Trustee presented information to Tier II will possibly give a training session at SouthDiv for selected Tier I teams in the "near future."

Break

7. Gerry - RI update 4 is out, 3 is coming out (Sites 1,2,18, 9& 10) (Sites 11, 12, 14). Sites 13, 15, 16 & 31 will be out in 1 month or less. Site 17 waiting on IM. Industrial Area report about 1/2 done. A discussion on data transfer ensued, including Clear Creek and ground water data needs/interrelationship and that they will be funded together. GW indicated that the document will be the Industrial Area Ground Water Interim Report. It will include data on Clear Creek.

Response to comments for Site 1: see (HO 2). Craig will need time for his comments, numbers 12, 13 and 17. The rest of his are adequate. Jim C - responses are adequate. Linda - weasel words - can they be clarified some more? Terry - probably not conclusively. Linda will take into further consideration. Craig indicates that if we have problems in this report, we may have problems with others. Could she propose language for ABB? Linda will discuss with others in SouthDiv.

**ACTION ITEM A0318982: Linda to check on the "weasel word" usage and report back to the team (by 3/27/98).**

The team will revisit the comments regarding the Nature Conservancy report after lunch.

Jim C. - reported on FDEP approach on arsenic at capped landfill sites. The Department will probably agree with the higher, combined surface and subsurface sites, as the specific, "capped landfill" industrial screening number (see Table G-1). Discussion ensued regarding ubiquitous arsenic problem at other than "capped" landfills. Earl related the experience at Homestead which was the model for the Whiting approach. Much discussion, including the basewide arsenic "problem" occurred.

Linda indicated that the landfills be called the "covered" landfills instead of the "capped" landfills. It was also noted that the basewide arsenic problem should be retained at this time as a "Parking Lot" item.

**Parking Lot Item T0318981: the basewide arsenic problem.**

Gerry finished up by noting the difficulty in correlating the "NFA" category and special exemption for arsenic at the sites.

9. Tom reported on Site 17: metals (including arsenic) are a problem. There was much discussion on the problem, including possibly placing a 2 foot cap and taking SPLP samples per 62-770. No firm conclusions were reached.

**ACTION ITEM A0318983: ABB & JC will assess using the "770" rule regarding remediation for Site 17 (by 3/27 to Team).**

10. Craig: Water quality standards are adopted by states; if they don't, EPA will promulgate them for them. All is done by incorporation of scientific studies and basically is required by the Clean Water Act with states promulgating standards which are at least as restrictive as national standards. Note: this was an action item.

12. Lunch

Gerry presented the Nature Conservancy map from the rare species and natural communities survey of 1997. Gerry will find out if any specific species were found. He later noted that ABB will amend the Site 1 document to \*\*reference the Nature Conservancy document which will indicate\*\* that no endangered flora or fauna were found.

13. Terry handed out HO 4, example appendix for the LURA. It is from Mayport for SWMU 26. Linda handed out HO 5, draft MOA for LUR. Some discussion ensued on how they will interface. Craig noted that there seems to be no specific way to institute a regulatory corrective action.

Linda presented (HO 6) an example of a ROD from Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, GA.

AGENDA ITEM - Linda - next meeting - how to handle NASWF ROD with respect to body and content.

**ACTION ITEM A0318984 - Terry and ABB to define and determine the relationship between the various closure documents.**

14. Groundwater model update - Linda says Cliff Casey is still working on the 7 layers of the model. He has run some scenarios (using two layers). She presented two figures with estimated particle flow patterns. A discussion of the ground water flow divide took place. Linda noted that there are some problems with well coordinates but that he is working on the problem. It was also noted that the draft figures seemed to indicate that Jim Cason will be dining on hot wings and O'Douls which will be paid for by someone else.

15. Break (not taken)

16. Letter Report on Sites 35, 36 and 37 - Gerry - it was decided that: Site 35 will have additional investigation - it will require a full investigation & report; Site 36 will require some limited confirmatory soil sampling to determine if acetone & methylene chloride is from the lab. On Site 37, the groundwater contamination appears to be associated with the West well; therefore, no additional investigation at Site 37 is warranted.

18. Delayed until later.

19. Proposed Plan Review - Terry - the plan is presently on hold (probably until the next meeting) since we will need a focused feasibility study because of the arsenic treatment at the covered landfills. Additionally, how do we handle the action in the case of the waiver of the arsenic on the covered landfills? It was generally stated that the waiver effectively raises the industrial screening levels. Jim C. will check with Jorge as to how they handled the details of a similar situation on arsenic at Homestead AFB.

**ACTION ITEM A0318985: Jim to talk to Jorge regarding the Homestead approach at basewide arsenic contamination by March 27.**

**ACTION ITEM A0318986: Gerry to rewrite the Appendix G, Response to comments for Site 1.**

22. (out of sequence) - Linda discussed spending priority updates. HO 7 illustrates the sites/phases/ and other data. High numbered items (3) will be funded. Others (2, 1 and 0) \*\*may not\*\* be funded. Jim C. noted to Earl that "metrics" do not generally reflect the Navy's "fund/no fund" decisions and that they do (can) affect our apparent "progress" in cleanup at our sites. Earl so noted the comment.

Phillip introduced Melinda Hampshire and Bryn who are working on wells here at NASWF. Phillip noted that they are collecting aqueous TRPH samples. They are not using the new SWA 846 sampling technique equivalent method (HO 8); instead, they are using the EnCore method which is approved by EPA.

**ACTION ITEM A0318987: Phil will give the team a memo clarifying what/why they are doing with respect to soil collection techniques (by 3/20/98).**

Bryn talked about the field effort. They are still installing wells (one up to about 300' bls). 7 have been developed; data on Sites 3, 4 and 32 showed contamination down to the water table. Question: what additional sampling is needed? 5 additional borings at Site 4.

**CONSENSUS C0318981: The team agreed to the proposed sampling and suggested moving the sample locations outward, more than was first proposed.**

Gerry requested that it be noted that we are NOT "calling the shots" and that the final decision must remain with the field personnel. (so noted)

At Site 32: 2 to 3 more soil borings, placed outward at the field geologists discretion. The team indicated noted the previous CONSENSUS item by the team and the comments by Gerry. At Site 3: they are awaiting analyticals; no input from the team was requested.

Craig left at 4:30 PM to take Earl to the airport. Pete gave two homework items to the team.

The team adjourned at 4:45 PM.

## Day 2 - March 19, 1998

19. Begin at 0800 hours

20. Success Stories Development - Linda showed examples of the format for success stories.

### Success Stories Format:

- \* Original Condition-traditional (old) approach
- \* Original Approach
- \* Results of Original Approach
- \* How partnering was applied
- \* Savings realized
- \* Overall Results

Generally, the success story about Clear Creek concerned:

1. Site access
2. Innovative use of funds
3. Innovative investigation of Clear Creek Floodplain

Applying the format:

Original condition:

1. Landowner reluctance to allow of-base property access for Navy for MW installation

Original approach:

2. Use of Navy legal office to obtain access to property (approval by Asst. Sec. of the Navy)

Results of Original Approach:

3. time-consuming process (up to 3 years)
4. Costly process (legal fees, RI program delays)
5. Public dissatisfaction/mistrust of Navy

How Partnering was applied:

Partnering team decided that RAB should be approached with plan and requested to talk with landowner/neighbors & community about need for access. Special RAB meeting was held;

property owners invited; plan discussed-need for ground water investigation/results to be derived (ground water contamination)

Savings Realized:

Access was granted; allowing RI program to proceed on schedule saving up to 3 years in schedule and \$ in legal fees, kept the public trust.

Overall results:

\$\$\$\$\$ saved; \_XXXXX\_ time saved; improved public trust in NASWF

There was some discussion with respect to the continuing need to access the offbase monitoring wells.

**ACTION ITEM A0319988: Jim Holland will contact appropriate offbase landowners with regard to continued access for monitoring.**

21. break

23. Training session - Pete distributed two handouts: HO 11 - Whiting Field Tier I Team Performance Model Assessment Results and HO 12 - Leadership Support curriculum

We used an L-type matrix, non-weighted to decide on our training; in order:

1. Managing customer satisfaction (19)
2. Managing team discussions (29)
3. Visionary Planning (34)
4. Managing team culture & values (39)
5. Dealing with difficult customers (41)
6. Strategic planning (44)
7. Public speaking (46)

The team was requested by Jim Holland to consider Pat Durbin as a member. This was discussed and it was decided by:

**CONSENSUS C0319982, Pat Durbin was made an adjunct member in an effort to better coordinate our RAB and the Partnering Team.**

**ACTION ITEM A03199829: Pat is to report to the team at the next meeting what her expectations as an adjunct member are.**

Tom Conrad asked that arsenic as a basewide issue be considered by the team and that Linda and Jim C. examine their respective agencies perspective regarding the formulation of a basewide approach versus a site by site approach at this problem and the use or pursuit of a variance(s) in this regard. This is an **AGENDA ITEM** for the next meeting. Jim C. stated that he may ask L. Mora-Applegate to come and help with this issue.

24. New technology evaluations - Linda distributed HO 14 in this regard. Linda is interested in the treatment of ground water for TCE. Terry asked about in-situ ground

water technologies and the team discussed various types of treatment. Tom said that NS Orlando is using an in-well air stripper.

**ACTION ITEM A03199810: Craig will report on the Eglin experience with an air stripping design in use there which is used for petroleum/solvent removal.**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Tom will discuss treatment technology at Orlando

25. Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) - Craig/Jim

Craig gave the team the following web site address -

<http://www.doi.gov/oepc/wp/docs/43cfr11.html>

The site gives information on NRDA. Craig discussed the NRDA process in general including phases, damages, injury, and other aspects. He noted that damages are compensatory, not punitive and that funds collected are to be used for injury amelioration. Jim C. noted that the Secretary of FDEP is the State trustee, that the office of the Trustee is not fully functional but is overseen by the Office of General Counsel. He further noted that the State approach with regard to the NRDA process has been to work with the parties involved to help ameliorate damages which may have been incurred. He also noted that Clear Creek is an active item of interest to the regulatory and public sectors and that we should always keep this in mind in our approach to Clear Creek.

**AGENDA ITEM:** Clear Creek Field Trip - Pat

**AGENDA ITEM:** New member process

26. Coordination of Data Transfer - Terry asked about the total/final transfer of data (such as logbooks, etc.); where to go, to whom, and the process. He would like a directive in this regard.

**ACTION ITEM A03199811: Terry to determine the general process, direction and timing of data transfer for NASWF.**

**ACTION ITEM A03199812: Phil to determine the disposition of the transferred data from ABB.**

**ACTION ITEM A03199813: Jim H. will try and locate the UWF report on TCE degradation at NASWF.**

27. Proposed Agenda for next meeting:

Tier II Update	Linda	0.5
How to Handle RODs	Linda	0.5
TAPP Presentation	Linda	1.0
Arsenic - variances , basewide & site (maybe Schedule for 2nd day)	Jim	1.0
Treatment at Orlando	Tom	0.5
Clear Creek Field Trip	Pat	2.0
New member expectations	Pat/team	0.5
Prepare Tier II Presentation	all	0.5

Success Stories	all	1.0
RAB pre/post	Bill/Pat	0.5
Training	Pete	1.5
Site 17 Status	Tom	0.5
Base Status	Terry	0.5
Field Update	Bryn	0.5
Schedule & Funding Update	Linda	0.5
Prepare Tier II Presentation	all	0.5

28. Review Action Items for the meeting: done.

29. Meeting Critique: Pete

PLUS: we resolved tough issues; added adjunct member; were flexible; had many accomplishments; still working together; very few sidebars; good focus; nailed success stories beginning; better handouts/topics; Tier II link present and participated; humor & trust; finished all agenda items.

DELTA: we need to show up on time; there was regulatory posturing; long days.

Next Meeting: April 28, 1998

Leader - Terry  
 Scribe - Tom  
 Timekeeper - Jim C.

Action Items from March 18-19, 1998 NAS Whiting Field Partnering Meeting

**ACTION ITEM A0318981:** The team should read, consider and understand the actions and implications of the Action Item/Consensus numbering system and reach consensus as to adoption and use.

**ACTION ITEM A0318982:** Linda to check on the "weasel word" usage and report back to the team (by 3/27/98).

**ACTION ITEM A0318983:** ABB & JC will assess using the "770" rule regarding remediation for Site 17 (by 3/27 to Team).

**ACTION ITEM A0318984:** Terry and ABB to define and determine the relationship between the various closure documents.

**ACTION ITEM A0318985:** Jim to talk to Jorge regarding the Homestead approach at basewide arsenic contamination by March 27.

**ACTION ITEM A0318986:** Gerry to rewrite the Appendix <sup>I</sup>G, Response to comments for Site 1.

**ACTION ITEM A0318987:** Phil will give the team a memo clarifying what/why they are doing with respect to soil collection techniques (by 3/20/98).

**ACTION ITEM A0319988:** Jim Holland will contact appropriate offbase landowners with regard to continued access for monitoring.

**ACTION ITEM A03199829:** Pat is to report to the team at the next meeting what her expectations as an adjunct member are.

**ACTION ITEM A03199810:** Craig will report on the Eglin experience with an air stripping design in use there which is used for petroleum/solvent removal. 

**ACTION ITEM A03199811:** Terry to determine the general process, direction and timing of data transfer for NASWF.

**ACTION ITEM A03199812:** Phil to determine the disposition of the transferred data from ABB.

**ACTION ITEM A03199813:** Jim H. will try and locate the UWF report on TCE degradation at NASWF.

Consensus Items from the meeting:

**CONSENSUS C0318981:** The team agreed to the proposed sampling and suggested moving the sample locations outward, more than was first proposed.

**CONSENSUS C0319982:** Pat Durbin was made an adjunct member in an effort to better coordinate our RAB and the Partnering Team.

Parking Lot Items from the Meeting

**Parking Lot Item T0318981:** the basewide arsenic problem.