

2019 ITRC Project Proposal

TRAINING FOR VAPOR MITIGATION

Date

March 3, 2019

Proposal Contacts

Matthew Williams

Vapor Intrusion Specialist

Michigan DEQ

Remediation and Redevelopment Division

Email: WilliamsM13@Michigan.gov

Phone: 517-284-5171

Kelly Johnson

Brownfields Project Manager

NC Department of Environmental Quality

Division of Waste Management

Email: Kelly.Johnson@ncdenr.gov

Phone: 919.707.8279

Workplan Overview

As requested by ITRC, this is an expanded work plan to provide additional details and information on the new team concept that is proposed to develop an internet-based training (IBT) module that will be approximately two (2) hours in length; a module-based classroom training session that can be held either as a 2 day classroom based training or reduced to individual modules that can be held in a conference setting (CBT); and a supplemental written support document. These materials will be based on the mitigation sections of ITRC's successful 2007 document on VI [Vapor Intrusion Pathway: A Practical Guideline (VI-1)] and its subsequent 2014 Technical and Regulatory Guidance Web-Based Document [Petroleum Vapor Intrusion: Fundamentals of Screening, Investigation, and Management (PVI-1)]

ITRC has invested in a training program that has been well received for the 2007 and 2014 tech regs; however, those trainings were focused on the investigative process and not on mitigation, which was also included in the documents. As states have gained knowledge on the investigative process, and now are actively investigating sites where there is a potential for an unacceptable risk; a knowledge gap has formed and exists. This topic was identified in ITRC's 2018 survey as one of the top environmental issues that should be addressed.

The submitted training proposal is based on developing a series of presentations that would aid state regulators in understanding the various mitigation strategies, how they are installed and fundamentally work, and what factors to consider as part of the review process. The proposed training would not be used as a training program on how to install the various technologies but focus on the review. Members of the regulated community are in support of this training and it would lead to an increase in acceptance on alternate remedial strategies that are not commonly implemented. Appendix J in ITRC's 2014 Technical and Regulatory Guidance provides most of the supporting material for this training, so the development of a full tech reg document is not considered necessary at this time.

The training members and supporting state and federal staff of 2007 and 2014 tech regs consisted of multiple state contacts that were integral members; however, most have moved on either through retirement or obtaining employment in the regulated community. Therefore, one of the challenges that this proposal will need to address is the ability to address succession planning. Other challenges addressed by this proposal, in part because training teams are typically formed from individuals that were active in the development of the tech reg, includes the amount of time that has lapsed from the development of the tech reg and implementation of the team; the ability to solicit ideas and concepts from a larger group prior to developing the training and support documentation; and the development of a training course that can be presented either as smaller unique sessions or in sequence or individually on behalf of ITRC based on requests, space, and potential time limitations.

The project timeline is attached as part of the PowerPoint presentation and includes the following:

Curriculum Design, Development, and Testing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify existing members from the existing ITRC PVI Team and supplement with new members 	9 - 12 Months	Estimated for 3 meetings with monthly progress calls on module content. A generalized meeting overview includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting 1 – Introduction, roles, identify module content, coach SME Meeting 2 – Specific Module development, assistance and report Meeting 3 – Internal dry run of modules with presentation assistance and support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coach Subject Matter Expert (SMEs) from the ITRC PVI Team 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and design modules through a combination of meetings and web conferences 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop curriculum (based on Tech Reg content) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize curriculum and delivery 		
Dry Run		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide “practice” opportunity and support to assist trainer with an audience 	Single 2-Day Event	To be held at the ITRC Spring Meeting or at a state that may not be able to support a full classroom training that will involve bringing additional SMEs as part of the initial training event
Implement and Deliver Curriculum		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer knowledge and skills to Learners 	Estimated at 2-4 Years	Spring 2020 -?? (Specific Dates TBD)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Learner performance 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate Learner knowledge and skills to guide 		
Ongoing Evaluation and Improvement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incremental improvements based on Learner feedback and lessons learned 	Ongoing	

Though not specifically identified, and will be discussed, it is expected that part of the classroom materials that would be developed is likely to consist of checklists as a tool to aid in reviewing various mitigation technologies.

The following sections provide additional details and information on the tasks and resources necessary to implement the mitigation training proposal.

Team Support

Support requested for the Team in the development of the training sessions.

- *Program Advisor* – Similar to the PVI Classroom team, but on a different scale as a full tech reg is not proposed. The ITRC Contractor must be able to provide team support and coordination of meeting facilities; aid in slide development and review of content; assist in documenting for permissions of use of graphics and photos for ITRC; train SMEs not experienced with presenting; obtain and collect feedback on for the dry run; and begin the process of identifying various venues for which different modules and training sessions can be presented. It is not expected that the program advisor would continue past the development of the training and course material.
- *Technical* - Video and graphic editing to include the development of up to five (5) videos for use in the ITRC presentation(s) that show the installation, operation, and documentation necessary of various technologies. The videos are available and can be accessed, obtained and authorized for use by ITRC from various contractors. However, most of the videos appear to need to be edited prior to use to remove any marketing. In addition, it is expected that any video produced may also need to provide closed captioning of any spoken text.

In Person Meetings

- *Meeting #1 – Scoping*

Prior to the first in-person meeting, a singular conference-phone call would occur to introduce the team leaders, the training concept, and provide the background information necessary and the objectives as discussed further below. The initial in-person meeting is intended to be a larger and more inclusive meeting to confirm and agree upon the material that must be included and what the supplemental document will consist of. It is expected that after the initial meeting the group can be broken into smaller sections to begin the design of the training program and supplemental material. It is expected that this meeting will last 2 ½ - 3 days to ensure the time necessary to complete the proposed scope of work.

With this meeting, ITRC will begin to initiate training new state SMEs. This meeting should also aid in identifying existing or new SMEs from the regulated community that are interested in being part of the mitigation training team. It is proposed that ITRC include travel expenses of up to 10 state contacts to attend this meeting. The state contacts selected for travel would be identified and approved by ITRC. All other members would be responsible for their own travel costs and expenses. Costs would also need to include obtaining a conference room with a video projector and seating up to an estimated 80 people and the program advisor as identified above.

- *Meeting #2 – Content Development*

Content development and coaching SMEs on delivery and presentation. It is estimated that this group would consist of up to four (4) paid state travelers that have agreed to be

SMEs for the training classes with one being identified as the team co-leader. However, if during meeting #1 there are additional state contacts, this group may extend up to 6. A smaller room would be required to hold the meeting over the days as the group is likely to only consist of 20 total participants, though this group may extend up to 30 depending on the response received. Limited printed expenses are expected and can be provided by the co-leaders. All paid travelers would be pre-approved through ITRC and their travel approval process. The extra paid travelers allow for presentation back-ups, future succession planning if necessary, as well as increasing the ability to train by having additional state contacts that can lead future training classes. Estimated time is 2 days for this meeting.

- *Meeting #3 – Finalize Presentation Content*

Finalize content development and if time allows individual presentation dry runs. Travelers and meeting room requirements are expected to be the same as Meeting #2. Estimated time for this meeting is 2 days to allow for time to present the individual dry runs.

- *Meeting #4 (optional if necessary) – Internal Dry Run*

Prior to a larger dry run, if time and development of content does not allow a dry run during Meeting #3, an optional meeting is planned for the SME to practice timing and course delivery in front of the other trainers. Travelers are expected to be the same as Meeting #2. Estimated time for this meeting is 2 days.

- *Live Dry Run Training Session*

The ITRC PVI Class completed a dry run in a location that it was felt would not be able to be supported through classroom registrations. Therefore, a state was selected that agreed to provide staff for course feedback and improvement recommendations. This proposal includes a similar concept, though it could be held in conjunction with an ITRC meeting or at the state offices that is supporting the event.

If held at a unique location, it is estimated that ITRC would travel at least 15 people (which is less than the ITRC PVI Class) and is estimated to include the five (5) state SMEs plus five (5) additional state point contacts that were involved in Meeting #1 as well as five (5) additional personal as identified by ITRC. This concept would provide feedback from interested parties that may have some level of experience or knowledge. Regulated community members that participated in Meeting #1 would be invited to attend as well as potential future sponsors. It is estimated to last 2 Days, which allows each presentation to be presented once, as well as provide additional time for direct feedback from attendees.

Additional expenses include:

- Printed material for 100; and
- Limited snack and beverage service (morning and afternoon).

Lunch service is recommended though it could be identified as lunch service being on their own.

Phone Meetings

Phone meetings would be used to supplement the in-person meetings and to continue move the development of the training material forward. For budgeting purposes, it is estimated that there will be 10 -12 phone meetings. No travel expenses are necessary.

Supporting Documentation

The supplemental document that will be developed is proposed to be like the 2007 *Vapor Intrusion Pathway: Investigative Approaches for Typical Scenarios (A Supplement to VI-1) (VI-1A)*. In that document it describes applicable approaches for evaluating the vapor intrusion pathway in six typical scenarios, the support document would use a similar concept to provide applicable approaches for evaluating an installed mitigation system. The supporting document would be attached to both the 2007 and the 2014 tech regs.