

## **APPENDIX F**

### **Comments Provided by EPA Moderators**

This section of the report presents the highlights of written comments collected from the EPA moderators who facilitated the paper discussions, and panel and information sessions. The comments presented are not presented verbatim; they have been paraphrased as appropriate to reflect the main observations and recommendations.

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>Arsenic Information Session (Steven Chang)</p>	<p>As moderator, I think the session went smoothly with good transitions among the speakers. Time was tight for 4 presentations especially when we were asked by the NARPM Co-Chairs to accommodate NIEHS grantee, Dr. Wendall Ela. I had to limit the Q&amp;A time to two questions per presentation. Despite that, the audience remained in the room beyond 10:30 AM to hear Dr. Ela. Apparently, arsenic contamination beneath landfills is of high interest to the audience. There may be closer cooperation between EPA and NIEHS in arsenic research.</p>
<p>Asbestos Panel (Sandra Bourgeois)</p>	<p>The NARPM Asbestos Panel session went very well. The session started and ended on time. The panel consisted of 3 EPA staff who were very knowledgeable on asbestos issues and presented very well organized and easy to follow presentations. One panelist gave two presentations. The timing and order of each presentation was preplanned so everything flowed very well. Each panelist had about thirty minutes for his/her presentation which included a brief question and answer period. All questions from the audience were answered with no need for parking lot issues. We had only minor problems (twice) with the computer slides which were resolved by the contractor in a few minutes.</p> <p>The "moderator tips" which I received by email were very helpful in getting me organized for the panel session. I would suggest including the Moderator Evaluation Form as well next year. This way the moderator knows in advance what he/she will be rated during the panel session and the expected flow pattern of the session. We did not have enough Moderator Evaluation Forms for the participants and were not able to get more before the session ended. As a result, some participants probably did not get a chance to rate me as a Moderator.</p> <p>I experienced some coordination issues due to the fact that the original list of panelists was not the actual panelist. They were the "training team" for the panelist. It took me a while to figure out who was on the panel and who was on the "training team." Because of this mix up, it was a bit more difficult to get copies of presentations and autobiographies in a timely manner. But in the end, it all worked out very well. The participants seemed pleased with the information presented, all questions were answered, and the session ended on time.</p>
<p>Attorney/RPM Panel (Damian Duda)</p> <p>Note: The moderator also provided a detailed summary of discussions as a separate attachment.</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, the panel went fairly smoothly. No disruptions.</li> <li>• PowerPoint slides are effective but can slow down a presentation if relied upon too much by the presenter.</li> <li>• The use of a facilitator was critical for our effective roundtable discussion. I recommend continued use of facilitator for such interactive roundtable discussions. The facilitator was also able to focus the key points from a large list of topics.</li> </ul> <p><u>Concern #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various segments of the panel went over their allotted time. I wasn't able to have as much time for the roundtable discussion.</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that someone [contractor] keeps track of remaining time for each segment.</li> <li>• Ensure that this time information is conveyed to the presenter.</li> <li>• Ensure that each panelist has gone over his/her presentations prior to the conference and has timed it for the period necessary.</li> <li>• Discuss the timing issue during preparatory conference calls.</li> </ul> <p><u>Concern #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some write-up materials, including flip chart sheets containing discussion notes, were not collected after the session. In my case, there</li> </ul>

Session & Moderator	Moderator Feedback
	<p>were a number of “Notes Sheets” which were inadvertently left behind. This information is crucial to preparing the panel summary.</p> <p><u>Resolution #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before the panel begins, decide early on who has the responsibility for ensuring that all pertinent materials have been gathered up by the moderator. Sometimes the moderator needs to be reminded of this. It seems likely that the contractor rep would be able to monitor this fairly closely.</li> </ul> <p><u>Concern #3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the handout materials were not distributed beforehand. As such, panel moderator and others had to distribute copies of materials to participants.</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution #3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure beforehand that there are enough copies of handout materials available for the entire group of participants. Know the number of participants signed up in advance. This should be done a day or two before the panel meets. Try to provide as much electronic information to contractor prior to conference so that materials can be duplicated in a timely fashion. Within the week prior to the conference, the panel moderator should make sure that all electronic files have been sent, received and duplicated. Panel moderators should be assigned a named contractor rep prior to the conference so that he/she knows who to ask to make sure information has been copied, etc.</li> </ul> <p><u>Concern #4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract for the Attorney/RPM panel that was printed in the Conference Brochure was inaccurate and reflected an earlier iteration of the content. The inaccuracy may have affected the ultimate attendance at the panel. A more accurate abstract may have drawn more participants into the panel.</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution #4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As they are being developed, panel content and agendas can change from the original concept or abstract. Moderators should be able to have a chance to review the final abstract or description of their panel that will be highlighted in the Conference Guide and Conference Brochure, prior to their going to print. Maybe an e-mail for final changes or something like that.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderator should prepare a game plan early on with specific dates for follow up conference calls. If panelists have conference call dates in advance, they can schedule around them and be available for the calls. Set up deadlines for garnering information early on; I know that these have been set up in the past. The moderators need to make the panelists more accountable for their part of the agenda. I really think that if we stick to these general rules, the panel will end up being more effective.</li> <li>• The formal moderator debriefing session at the conference should be reinstated. The one time we had it proved very enlightening and provided immediate feedback.</li> <li>• Set aside a specific time period after each panel is completed for the panelists to meet, discuss and prepare the overall Panel Summary. The material is fresh in their minds, and the ideas are still brewing. The moderator can write up the summary and have it ready before conference end. Have a computer available for this use. This can only happen if the panel is able to meet with no distractions and</li> </ul>

Session & Moderator	Moderator Feedback
	<p>concentrate on a final product.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Facilitator training should be made available to all potential moderators prior to the conference. This training should be geared to our NARPM needs, specifically. The moderator's role for each type of session (panel or paper) is slightly different. For panels, moderators are usually more involved in the overall proceedings, especially with respect to soliciting audience discussion, both through Q&amp;A and directed feedback. Ultimately, we should be able to develop a group of moderators that the Co-Chairs could select from when the need for moderators arises. This way potential moderators would be more formally committed to the task at hand and could be informed early on in the selection process.</li> </ul> <p>Note: The moderator also provided a comprehensive summary of the discussion items. These are a separate attachment.</p>
<p>DNAPL Paper Session (Marsha Knadle and Dick Willey)</p>	<p>The DNAPL Remediation Paper Session included the following presentations: <i>Subsurface Contamination: Application of Innovative Technology or Perpetual Stewardship</i> (Linda Abriola, Tufts University); <i>DNAPL Source Zone Characterization and Remedial Performance Assessment</i> (James Jawitz, University of Florida); <i>In-Situ Oxidation -- DNAPL Mass Reduction Technology</i> (Scott Huling, US EPA-NRMRL); and <i>Overview of Thermal Remediation</i> (Eva Davis, US EPA-NRMRL). The session was moderated by Marsha Knadle and Richard Willey.</p> <p>Each presentation provided insights into specific aspects of the problem of remediating sites where DNAPLs are present. This session was followed by the DNAPL Remediation Panel Session where the four speakers answered questions from the audience and moderator.</p> <p>While each of the presentations provided important information on recent technical advances related to the DNAPL remediation issue, there was insufficient time to fully articulate each topic. Given the time constraints, it is recommended that the scope of future sessions like this be scaled back to allow for greater depth in each presentation. It is also recommended that where a paper presentation session is followed by a question and answer panel session, the conference guide could do a better job of linking the two sessions in each session description.</p>
<p>DNAPL Remediation Panel (Kathy Davies)</p>	<p>The DNAPL Remediation Panel was comprised of speakers from the preceding session entitled DNAPL Remediation Paper Discussion. Panel participants included Linda Abriola (Tufts University), James Jawitz (University of Florida), Scott Huling and Eva Davis (both of USEPA NRMRL). The panel answered questions from the audience and moderator, as well as questions previously prepared by the DNAPL paper session workgroup. A lively discussion continued right up until the end of the session at 5:25 pm.</p>
<p>Ground Water Paper Session (Gwen Massenburg)</p>	<p>[Comments edited by R. Stites to maintain a basic description of the issue and the intent of the recommendations]:</p> <p>Over all two of the three paper sessions went very well. I thought the audience participation was great with the papers presented by Judy Canova and Mary Tierney.</p> <p>The moderator hand-out was very helpful; there were no parking lot issues to follow-up on. I would suggest having evaluation forms for each presenter, or having one evaluation form but somehow have the form such that one could evaluate the individual speakers on the same form.</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>IC/Redevelopment Paper Session (Monica Baussan)</p>	<p><u>IC Paper Session</u></p> <p>1) <i>What went well:</i> Good audience turnout; one good paper and one good idea of a paper but not executed as well as it could have been. Since there were only two presenters, the session ended earlier than anticipated and gave enough time for both presenters to answer all of the audience's questions.</p> <p>2) <i>What would I like to see changed:</i> There should be a pre-meeting for moderators and presenters to meet beforehand and discuss any last minute requests and not wait until the day and time of the session to do so. I think the presenters should have a dry run before the conference in order to make sure that their presentation is ready and good to go for the deadline and also to receive constructive criticism towards material and time. I also think the communication between the moderator and the presenter should be reinforced and given a higher level of importance mainly for the presenters to have their presentation in time and help the moderator to be prepared.</p>
<p>Institutional Controls Update and Panel (Dante Rodriguez)</p>	<p>Things went very well at the IC Panel discussion. We had a three hour timeslot, and did a facilitated discussion for most of the time, followed by a Jeopardy game about institutional controls. It was good having lots of time for facilitated discussion, rather than having people give presentations then answer questions. People always say that there wasn't enough time for questions, so we made it so that all the time was for questions. The moderators (myself and Sheri Bianchin) had prepared an extensive list of questions, covering all the main subject areas regarding ICs, so we could move the discussion along to cover the different subjects we wanted. We polled the attendees as they came into the room, to get their questions written down too, so we could pose those to the panelists in the course of the discussions. The panelists all thought it went really well, and it seemed like the attendees liked it too. They especially liked the jeopardy game!</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>Mining Paper Session (Andy Bain)</p>	<p>1) What went well: good audience turnout; great papers; and great audience questions.</p> <p>2) What would I like to see changed: insist on a dry run with presenters to ensure enough time for Q&amp;A. We didn't have time for what I planned to be a broader audience discussion of emerging mining issues, because the presenters filled all the time available. It seems like we consistently run out of time with these sessions, even with one speaker dropping out. The information is rich in content. Moderators should actively facilitate brevity and judicious use of slides.</p> <p>3) Particular problems, such as cooperation of participants in coordinating with you and scheduling their presentation time, whether too much or too little material was in the session or anything which affected the timing and flow of your session (and in particular where the Co-Chairs can help).</p> <p>Only one of the three provided his presentation by the deadline, despite up front notice and repeated reminders both by email and by phone. I would be more assertive about balancing time spent on papers with a group discussion.</p> <p>4) Were the "moderator tips" attached to the email(s) you received useful? Is there anything you would add to the tips based on your experience? Is there anything else you would recommend?</p> <p>I used all my facilitation tricks to remind speakers about the time. Moderators really need to reinforce reasons for time management.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to moderate. Let me know if you need help with next year's session. Overall, I thought the conference was a resounding success - kudos to you all!</p> <p>Comments from R. Stites: I attended this session. It went smoothly (without disruptions) and the moderator kept things moving. The moderator also made brief summary comments of the presenter's main points. Time management was an issue. One presenter went well over time (where the topic was really five-year reviews more than mining – a decision we made as Co-Chairs). The final presenter was left with only a few minutes.</p>
<p>New Cancer Risk Guidelines (Stiven Foster)</p>	<p>I am afraid that don't have much to feedback to offer - only complements. The meeting was run well, the meeting space was good, and I had everything I needed to make the presentation successful. Kudos to all who made the NARPM meeting such a success.</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>National Hurricane Response Information Session (Mary Aycock)</p>	<p>Overall, the presentation was very well received! We started our preparation at least 2-3 months before the conference. As moderator, I conducted conference calls every 2 weeks until June of 2006 to ensure that we were adequately prepared. During the course of the calls, one of the presenters dropped out of the conference due to an illness. We scrambled to try to get a replacement, and we were successful, however, by the time NARPM rolled around, the presenter had returned and was ready to speak, even though we had replaced him. We decided to go ahead and let all 5 people do their presentations, even though we knew the time would be short.</p> <p>Recommendations: The preliminary calls were a good way to make deadlines for the presentations and got us thinking about what we were going to do ahead of time. All participants should attend all calls as we made several decisions on these calls that were critical to the theme. If a person needs to drop out, then they should let the committee know that they will not be participating, and thereby be replaced. There should have been more time allocated to the Hurricane Response session as it held quite a bit of interest for all the RPMs that were required to respond or had an interest in the Response Support Corps.</p>
<p>Partial Deletions Panel (Melissa Friedland)</p>	<p>This panel session was a broad ranging discussion, with a great deal of audience participation on Regional experiences in using different approaches. While no conclusions were reached, it was clear that there are a number of different approaches and that some further clarification would be helpful. Removing a parcel of land from an NPL site has several implications for the reuse potential of the property, such as reducing lenders' concerns and making the property eligible for Brownfields funding.</p> <p>Currently there are four approaches EPA Regions are using to remove parcels, including 1) partial deletions; 2) ROD amendments; 3) ESDs; and 4) memoranda to the Administrative Record. Presenters discussed site specific examples as well as a review of the Partial Deletions policy.</p>
<p>Perchlorate Panel (Kevin Mayer)</p>	<p>From General Email Comments: At NARPM, I filled out a form for comments as the Panel Moderator, which I will try to reproduce here.</p> <p>I was most pleased that the panel strongly demonstrated the extraordinary depth of experience dealing with perchlorate at many sites over many years. We clearly have tremendous talent for technical and regulatory innovation and problem solving in the ranks of RPMs. NARPM seeks to tap into this vital resource through sharing the fruits of those talents. I had hoped that the presentations would be shorter than they were, although responding to questions as they arose was both valuable and time-consuming. As a consequence, there was little or no time for open discussion among panelists and the attendees. I think the attendees were not inhibited at all from participating with thoughtful questions when those thoughts occurred to them. I do not have a solution other than limiting the number of panelists, which reduces the thoroughness of the subject coverage. I believe we had made the time expectations clear via email and teleconference.</p> <p>Somehow, I had missed the expectation that panel moderators were expected to provide a session summary even though the presentations were provided electronically.</p> <p>From the Summary Write-up: The objective of this session was to share experience from around the country in addressing what has been termed an "emerging contaminant". We successfully demonstrated that both the engineering and regulatory solutions to perchlorate contamination are quite mature and well-established, despite acknowledged uncertainties affecting the formal regulatory status of this contaminant. A range of treatment approaches are currently in operation. Six different sites or groups of sites were featured, representing five EPA regions. Many other sites in these and other regions are also actively addressing perchlorate contamination. Perchlorate is rarely the sole contaminant or even the major contaminant of concern at most sites EPA encounters.</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>Remedy Optimization Information Session (Greg Fraley)</p>	<p>EPA has amassed an impressive level of experience and expertise in addressing perchlorate contamination in many types of settings. Sharing of the nationwide experience provides clear benefits. Panel discussion time was very limited due to the breadth of material covered, although some thoughts on future developments were brought up. Questions from the attendees were addressed during the presentations.</p> <p>Massachusetts Military Reservation – Region 1. This site covers a wide area with multiple plumes of perchlorate in addition to numerous other contaminants. Thermal processing of contaminated soil and ion exchange treatment of groundwater has been implemented successfully. Although military activities appear responsible for most contamination, there is evidence that community fireworks may be the source of a plume along the northwestern boundary. Massachusetts has a 2 ppb standard for perchlorate, with considerable public concern.</p> <p>Aberdeen Proving Grounds – Region 3. Maryland has a drinking water advisory of 1 ppb. Despite groundwater levels in the single ppb range, the community is very concerned about degradation of their water source from military activities. The Army has steadfastly avoided addressing perchlorate at Aberdeen, so the community has financed and implemented two ion exchange treatment systems.</p> <p>Hills, Iowa – Region 7. This emergency response to detection of perchlorate in dozens of shallow residential wells began with supplying bottled water to homes with concentrations exceeding 18 ppb. Currently, in-home point-of-use water filters are installed and working satisfactorily. EPA investigations are not complete, but seem to focus on an area where community fireworks displays have been held.</p> <p>Arizona and Nevada sites – Region 9. Using Arizona’s 14 ppb action level, two NPL sites in that state have investigated biological systems (constructed wetlands and wastewater system for reducing nitrate biologically). Two large sites in Nevada are dealing with extremely high concentrations of perchlorate through an above-ground anaerobic bioreactor and an in site biological system.</p> <p>San Gabriel and Rialto, California – Region 9. These large and complex groundwater plumes are in important water supply aquifers. EPA, the State and local water purveyors have many years of experience treating large volumes of groundwater to potable standards – currently 6 ppb in California. Ion exchange is the preferred method, with continual improvements in resin and decreases in cost.</p> <p>Pacific Northwest - Region 10. A range of sites in Oregon and Washington include a chemical manufacturing plant (Akema, Portland); Open Burn disposal sites (Bonneville and Bangor WA, Umatilla OR) a bombing range in Oregon, a Nike missile site in WA and Umatilla Basin natural occurrence.</p> <p>EPA OSWER Perchlorate Guidance - In January 2006, EPA signed a guidance for OSWER responses to perchlorate based on the 2005 IRIS value published by EPA. The guidance calculates a Drinking Water Equivalent Level of 24.5 ppb, assuming an adult body weight, water intake and exposure entirely from drinking water.</p> <p>Chamjit Bhullar and Jen Hovis were very well prepared. Their individual levels of experience and knowledge seemed to enhance their teamwork. The audience seemed to be engaged and stimulated. This engagement was evidenced by the number and depth of the questions that were submitted by the audience. The optimization training along with the case study involving optimization made for a perfect example of theory versus application.</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>Sediment Paper Session (Ravi Sanga)</p>	<p>Presenters for the session were Lynda Priddy, Region 10, presenting on the Todd and Lockheed Superfund site cleanup at Region 10; Humberto Guzman, Region 4, Presenting on the Enhanced Sedimentation Project for Mercury Contaminated Sediments at the Olin Corporation Macintosh Plant in Macintosh Alabama; and Dave Dickerson, Region 1, presenting on the New Bedford Harbor Underwater Capping Study. Overall the session was well attended and went very well. Speakers kept to their time allocated. Discussion included whether the large clam shell bucket used with the Todd and Lockheed Shipyards was efficient for the final over dredge overpasses and whether the sediment around the cad pit was characterized sufficiently post placement during the New Bedford Harbor Capping pilot.</p> <p>The session was very informative. All three presentations were well done.</p>
<p>Soil Paper Session (Maria Pino)</p>	<p>The session itself went very well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The presentations were interesting, thorough, and well reasoned.</li> <li>▪ The audience, though sparse, was attentive and had insightful questions.</li> </ul> <p>Prior to the conference, my role as a moderator was not clear to me.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I served as a moderator last year in Phoenix. For that NARPM, moderators were charged with:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- introducing the presenters,</li> <li>- making sure the session stayed on schedule, and</li> <li>- summarizing questions and parking lot issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ This year, the moderators' responsibilities were expanded to include being a liaison between the presenters and the contractors. In addition to the first two items listed above, we had to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- find out what audio/visual equipment each presenters needed,</li> <li>- make sure the presenters submitted their papers and presentations on time, and</li> <li>- determine the order &amp; length of the presentations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ The new responsibilities were not difficult. However, I really didn't know they were my responsibilities until it was almost too late to do anything about them. In the future, please clearly define the moderators' roles and responsibilities.</li> </ul>
<p>Superfund Redevelopment Initiative (Melissa Friedland)</p>	<p>This panel session explored the nuts and bolts of redevelopment from a regional and national perspective, providing case specific examples as well as a national policy overview. The panelists described how they managed Redevelopment in Region 4, gave updates on national redevelopment trends and policies, and provided a synopsis of current and planned redevelopment guidance. Q and A was lively and engaging and a great deal of information was exchanged.</p>

<b>Session &amp; Moderator</b>	<b>Moderator Feedback</b>
<p>TRIAD (Matt Jefferson)</p>	<p>The overall presentation material of the course material went well and was good. This paper session should be repeated for next year – I see a lot of value in this course. As far as structure, we choose to give a 15 minute introduction to the Triad, followed by 2 case studies and discussion session. The structure of the presentation went well, but we never got to the discussion session. We only encountered problems with getting the material out the audience because some of the presenters had waited until the last day to pull their presentations together.</p> <p>The original intent of the course was to make the relationship between applying the Triad method to the RPMs site. Two of the presentations hit their intended target audience. Of the successful presentations, the presenters were on-time, had a clear message to deliver and generated many questions from audience regarding their site-specific situations. Unfortunately, there wasn't enough time to field all the questions following the presentation.</p> <p>Recommendations: Presenters need to be prepared (I know, this is nothing new). Either the moderator or the lead presenter needs to take charge and make sure that the materials are out to the audience before the start of the session. I recommend having the final presentations in at least a week the NARPM conference. This would also solve the problem with the one unprepared presenter in our group.</p> <p>I would also recommend that this course be a 180 minute course, instead of 90 minutes. We simply ran out of time for discussion, which was the main focus of the course. I would recommend the same structure. We could add on an extra case study that looks at a soils/groundwater case study or even an air example and leave a 30 to 45 minute window for discussion. I think the attendees would get more out of this course if they had time to discuss their own experiences with the experts.</p>