



TNT AREA B
PO WATER
GENERAL

IT Corporation
Kennedy Business Park 2
431-F Hayden Station Road
Windsor, CT 06095-1313
Tel. 860.688.1151
Fax. 860.688.8239
A Member of The IT Group

June 23, 2000

Commander
U.S. Army Engineer District, Nashville
ATTN: CELRN-ED-R-M (Ms. Linda Ingram)
Estes Kefauver Federal Building
801 Broadway
Nashville, Tennessee 37202-1070

Rec'd 27 June 2000

Synopsis of the Plum Brook Ordnance Works Team Meeting
May 10, 2000 – NASA Plum Brook Station, Sandusky, Ohio
Contract Number DACA62-94-D-0030; IT P/N 773701 and 775616

Dear Mrs. Ingram:

In accordance with the requirements of delivery orders 0031 and 0034 of contract number DACA62-94-D-0030, IT Corporation is pleased to submit three copies of the synopsis of the Plum Brook Ordnance Works Team Meeting held at the NASA Plum Brook Station on May 10, 2000. Should you have any questions or require additional information regarding these minutes, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,



Mikael L. Spangberg
Project Manager

cc: R. Meadows, CELRH – 6 Copies
R. Kunath, NASA Plum Brook Station – 1 Copy
R. Nabors, Ohio EPA, NW District – 3 Copies

**Synopsis of Plum Brook Ordnance Works Team Meeting
May 10, 2000 – NASA Plum Brook Station, Sandusky, Ohio**

<u>Attendees:</u>	Linda Ingram	USACE Nashville District
	Jim Beaujon	USACE Nashville District
	Lannae Long	USACE Nashville District
	Rick Meadows	USACE Huntington District
	Lisa Humphreys	USACE Huntington District
	Frank Albert	USACE Huntington District
	Kathryn Lucas Berezo	USACE Huntington District
	Ken Woodard	USACE Huntington District
	CPT John Osborn	USACE Huntington District
	Rich Kunath	NASA Plum Brook Station
	Ron Nabors	Ohio EPA
	John Weaver	Ohio EPA
	Laurie Moore	Ohio EPA
	Mikael Spangberg	IT Corporation, Windsor, CT
	Michael Gunderson	IT Corporation, Knoxville, TN

General Project Discussions. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Rick Meadows at 1300 hours at the NASA Plum Brook Station engineering building. Following introductions, Captain John Osborn provided a summary presentation of the Project Management Plan for the former Plum Brook Ordnance Works and requested that NASA and OEPA review and sign the plan on the signature page.

Mr. Meadows indicated that the USACE was considering the implementation of an 800 number that former employees of the PBOW or others with information regarding the operation of the facility could call to provide this information to the USACE. Ms. Moore stated that she had experienced difficulties with such requests for information at other sites due to confidentiality agreements signed by employees. The USACE indicated that they would confer with the members of the RAB to see if anyone had knowledge of such agreements having been signed at PBOW. The team agreed that barring difficulties with confidentiality agreements, the 800 number was a good option for gathering additional information regarding the site. However, it was agreed that the advertisements or requests for information should clearly limit the timeframe and type of information sought.

Red Water Ponds Areas Direct Push Investigation and Risk Assessments. In response to one of the OEPA comments regarding the evaluation of groundwater in the HHRA, the USACE clarified that the intent was for groundwater to be addressed on a site-wide basis. Mr. Nabors stated that he recalled discussing this in the past and that the OEPA was in agreement. However, the site-wide evaluation will be required to include evaluation of both the construction worker exposure scenario and drinking water exposure.

The USACE next inquired as to the status of OEPA's decision regarding the classification of the overburden groundwater as a non-potable water source. Mr. Nabors stated that the OEPA had determined that the overburden groundwater would not be classified as a drinking water source; however, the USACE will be required to evaluate and demonstrate results of possible migration between the overburden and bedrock groundwater zones before being permitted to eliminate potential exposure scenarios. It was agreed that such an evaluation would likely be conducted during the feasibility study (FS). Additionally, the parties agreed that the site-wide groundwater evaluation would include evaluation/comparison to site-wide groundwater background levels.

Regarding consideration of "background" PAH levels, OEPA stated that they would require site-specific background levels for any constituent that is of non-site related origin. The use of ATSDR levels without accompanying site data is not acceptable to OEPA. It was agreed that the six samples planned for collection at the upcoming ecological field investigation at the Red Water Ponds Areas could be used to establish site-specific background levels for PAHs at the RWP only. Evaluation of PAHs outside of the RWP would require the establishment of site-wide background levels.

Ms. Moore stated that many of her comments were the result of her attempt to apply consistent approaches for all risk assessment work at federal facilities within Ohio. The team agreed that this was a good approach. The first such approach related to the calculation of background risk, site risk, and total risk within the risk assessment. Ms. Moore stated that this approach was contrary to OEPA policy and that only total risk should be used in the risk assessment. Background levels and associated risk could then be applied following identification of COPCs through the risk assessment. IT agreed to evaluate the level of effort associated with this revision and determine whether this change would be made. Subsequent to the meeting, IT determined that the needed effort was minor and the requested change would be made.

OEPA inquired whether supporting documentation was available for the argument that VOC dilution was occurring in ambient air. Ms. Long stated that she had the supporting documentation and would provide this for information. Ms. Moore also inquired whether VOCs were detected or detected above screening levels in site soils. The USACE and IT stated that the data was not immediately available, but felt that any VOC detections had been below screening levels. Ms. Moore then asked that the dilution argument be removed – state simply that the screening levels were not exceeded since the pathway could potentially be complete.

The OEPA requested that while differentiating between the adult and child risks would not be necessary in the calculations the corresponding exposures be presented in the text parenthetically; i.e., "...risk is 5E-6 (adult 3E-6, child 2E-6)...". IT and the USACE agreed that this change would be made either in the text or tables of the risk assessment.

Regarding the comment on how samples exceeding the SQL were treated, OEPA asked that since none of the samples were so evaluated the statement be removed from the document. The USACE agreed that this would be done.

Ms. Moore added that in future risk assessments she would require that the minimum of the 95% UTL or maximum detected concentration be used (Comment 27). Although the use of 95% UTL in the current risk assessment sometimes exceeded the MDC, the use of the MDC in those cases would not alter the conclusions and changes to the assessment would not be required.

Upcoming Events. IT stated that field work would be conducted at the RWP, TNT Area A, and TNT Area C during the summer and fall of 2000. The kickoff meeting for this work was tentatively scheduled for June 13, 2000, at the NASA Plum Brook Station. Mr. Meadows stated that the next RAB meeting was scheduled for May 24, 2000.

The meeting was adjourned at 1600 hours.