

N65928.AR.003055
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING ON 10 JULY 2013 NTC
ORLANDO FL
7/10/2013
RESOLUTION CONSULTANTS

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

Date: 10-11 July 2013
 Location: Resolution Consultants (RC) Orlando office
 Team Leader: David Grabka
 Gatekeeper/Timekeeper: David Criswell
 Recorder: Krista Sommerfeldt

OPT Members	Support Members	Guests
Art Sanford, BRAC PMO* - by teleconference	David Criswell – Tier II Link *	Krista Sommerfeldt, RC
Dave Grabka, FDEP*	Jessica Keener – Solutions IES	
Marianne Sweeney, RC*	Amy Twitty – CH2MHill - by teleconference	

**Partnering Team voting member*

Check-In – Welcome.

Action Item Review

Discussion A-0012-004 – David C elevated the concern of outdated Navy contact information to Tier II during the Fall 2012 Tier II meeting. David C also contacted Navy’s BRAC real estate contracting officer and they have taken this issue as an action item. We now wait until we hear from NAVFAC. This action item was closed.

Discussion A-0712-018 – David G discussed with his management the concern of updating the FDEP Institutional Controls (IC) Registry. FDEP understands the issue; however, currently there are no dedicated personnel to complete updates. The registry cannot be assumed to be current, although Tetra Tech filled out the forms for all LUC sites for the FDEP registry. This action item was closed.

Discussion A-0712-029 – Jessica is seeing discrepancies in surveyed vertical elevations between Adesso and the Well Inventory logs (example SA 17), and NGVD29 mixed with NAVD88 vertical datum. This action item was closed.

Discussion A-0113-012 – David C elevated the EPA ID # concern to Tier II during the fall 2012 Tier II meeting. Marianne found reference to the EPA ID # being archived; however, we still can put the number on manifests for disposal. This AI has been closed since there is no longer an outstanding issue.

Partnering Training – Marianne shared the “When to Use Teams” list.

- When everyone’s buy-in is needed
- When there is no clear answer
- When the task is complex
- When there is too much or not enough information

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

- When there is a strong bias
- When creative ideas are needed
- When the problem crosses function
- When the solution affects many people

Business Plan – (Art Sanford joined this discussion via conference call)

RC completed updates to the Business Plan and submitted the Draft to the team prior to the partnering meeting. If errors are identified, let Marianne know so she can resolve for the Final revision. The Business Plan will be updated again next year.

A-0713-023 – Marianne will confirm Business Plan Appendix D, IC Summary, with the data in NIRIS 2.0 LUC Tracker.

Currently there are eight active Long Term Monitoring (LTM) sites (Site 39 is included in the eight and is expected to receive NFA soon). Site OU 1 is no longer an active site in the Business Plan because groundwater is no longer monitored.

RC is tasked to complete the LUC inspection forms in 2013, but Marianne proposes having the City and US Army Representative (Lidia Bonilla) complete the forms and RC provide assistance when needed. David C and David G agree. However, the LUC inspections on private property will continue to be completed by the Navy.

SA 54 was a Federal to Federal property transfer under a MOA; therefore the military is responsible for LUCs. There is no deed restriction.

Lori Botts may know if the OU 3 green space property ownership was transferred from Baldwin Park to the City.

OU 1 is partly owned by the City (Blue Jacket Park), Orange County (Glenridge Middle School), and private owners (residences)

A-0713-024 – David C will ask the City in reference to the LUC inspections who will be responsible for inspecting the property, signing the certification form, and providing completed forms to FDEP (copied to the Navy) before the deadline, January 2014.

OU 1 - In March 2011, the Baldwin Park neighborhood requested a reduction of the area of OU 1 groundwater use restriction. David G recalled going through this evaluation of reducing the area under ICs when the developer initially made the request. He recalls the determination that the area could not be completely unencumbered, therefore the developer dropped the request. At one point FDEP requested the developer put something together to make the case to reduce the area under ICs. The case was never made and the request was dropped and became a non-issue.

David G asked if the OU 1 groundwater use restrictions extend onto the county's school parcel (Glenridge Middle School)?

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

Logos – Any documentation going to the public will include the NAVFAC and DON logos. Contractor reports prepared for the Navy can have NAVFAC logo. Any internal partnering team documents can have the Orlando Partnering Team (OPT) logo. David C recommends not using the BRAC logo any longer.

SA 17 – (Art Sanford joined discussion via conference call)

Jessica gave a presentation of SA 17, including an update of April 2013 monitoring results. Site history includes characterization completed in April 2011, substrate injections completed in February 2012, and performance monitoring and reporting which is ongoing. The fourth quarterly post-injection monitoring was completed in April 2013. Chlorinated VOCs were treated in the source area Zones B and C (25-35 ft bls). Recirculation wasn't effective except to clean the wells.

Solutions plans to submit the SA 17 Monitoring Report in the next couple weeks. The team would like to start seeing plume maps, with dashes where inferred, in future reports.

Marianne recommended annual reports for all LTM sites to reduce documentation and review efforts, while providing an interim presentation of data and figures before the next partnering meeting. This recommendation is on hold pending the outcome of the following action item.

A-0713-025 – Jessica will review planned field events and deliverable schedules of all sites in Solutions' contract by 1 September 2013 with the objective to optimize field activity mobilization and reporting cycles.

A microbial population increase was observed at SA 17 in April 2013. Increased ethene levels indicate some reductive dechlorination activity. There was a general reduction in concentrations of TCE. The next sampling event is semi-annual LTM scheduled for September/October 2013.

The sheen that was seen in the surface water of the ditch during the previous sampling event was not seen during April 2013 activities. David G was of the opinion that if the sheen seen previously was EOS daylighting then there would have been a strong odor present. Jessica said an odor was not observed. The concentration of VC in replacement well -31AR exceeded the Freshwater Surface Water Criteria of 2.4 µg/L from April 2012 (7.2 µg/L) through April 2013 (16.7 µg/L). The team agreed that for the upcoming September/October 2013 event, a surface water sample will be collected adjacent to -31AR.

BFA's most recent SA 17 Monitoring Report for the March 2013 sampling event is expected to be submitted soon.

To address David G's comments on BFA's March and September 2012 Monitoring Reports regarding the groundwater elevation contour maps, Marianne presented figures re-contouring the March and Sept 2012 groundwater elevation data for SA 17 Zones A, B, and C.

- Zone A March and September 2012 – Elevations were re-contoured to reflect high groundwater levels in the middle of the site which have been observed historically. Previously this was suspected to be due to a leaking water supply line, but more likely it is the result of influence from the drainage ditch and swale on the SW and NE sides of the high, respectively, and by topographically low areas near Avenue C.
- Zone B – Elevations in March 2012 indicated flow to the NE, which is reversed from what has been observed historically. Elevations in September 2012 indicated flow to the SW toward the ditch consistent with previous data.

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

- Zone C March and September 2012 – David G pointed out that BFA did not use the data from several points. Re-contouring the September 2012 data using the omitted points indicates flow predominantly to the northeast consistent with historical data. Attempts to re-contour the March 2012 data using the omitted points, results in anomalous flow directions, inconsistent with historical data. Relative groundwater elevations were plotted for the monitor wells for sampling events from March 2010 to September 2012 and indicated anomalies in the March 2012 elevation data.

BFA has completed their contract for sampling and Solutions will begin sampling of the site during the next event. The team agreed a formal response to David G's comments will not be prepared; however, David G's comments will be kept in mind for future groundwater water level collection events and contouring. Water level collection should be in accordance with FDEP SOPs (i.e., open the well and allow to equilibrate prior to measurement, measure all wells at the same time, measure prior to purging).

The TOCs for -31AR, -32AR, and -33AR and the new deep wells have been surveyed.

Marianne presented the SA 17 plume map (Figure 2-2), which shows the locations of the two new Zone D wells, that was presented in the Draft Business Plan. The team agreed to hold off on telling the city the proposed area of land use restriction until the recommendations are complete.

The parcel ending in "34" was transferred with a commercial/industrial groundwater use restriction. The parcel ending in "04" does not have a groundwater use restriction. Preliminary recommended restrictions include a groundwater use restriction for SA 50 (located on the NE corner of site SA 17). Currently SA 50 only has a soil restriction. Based on the way the SA 17 groundwater plume is illustrated in Figure 2-2, two parcels are affected. No monitoring wells are located within the parcel ending in "04", but the plume was interpreted to enter this parcel.

Marianne has concerns regarding the proposed reduction in the number of wells to be sampled in the SA 17 Draft Optimization Report, since the groundwater data is not well understood at this time. Therefore, the team will put the SA 17 optimization recommendations on the back burner for now.

Bollards were installed around the flush mounted monitoring wells south of the ditch so the City does not stockpile soil on them when dredging.

OU 2 – (Art Sanford joined discussion via conference call)

Jessica gave a presentation of OU 2, including an update of April 2013 monitoring results. Site history includes characterization completed in April 2011, substrate injections completed in February 2012, and performance monitoring and reporting which is ongoing.

Results show microbe populations have been observed in the source wells. There has not been evidence of large microbial changes in downgradient wells. But, reductive dechlorination has been observed based on ethane levels and chemical concentrations. Injection wells were flushed so they may be reusable if needed.

Solutions is not using the PVC monitoring points in the stormwater conveyance ditch for injection monitoring sampling. BFA was using some for LTM monitoring. Marianne will continue to look at the PVC points and determine if any can be abandoned.

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

A-0713-026 – Marianne will provide the team more information on the OU 2 ammonia concentrations in groundwater compared to the GCTL by 31 Aug 2013.

SA 36 NW – (Art Sanford joined discussion via conference call)

Jessica gave a presentation of SA 36 NW, including an update of June 2013 monitoring results. The highest concentrations in groundwater included naphthalene in MW-38C at a concentration of 14 µg/L and isopropylbenzene in monitoring well OLD-38-63C at a concentration of 0.84 I µg/L. Because the isopropylbenzene concentration was I flagged, it is below the PQL of 2 µg/L and therefore the June 2013 event can be considered clean.

In the SA 36 NW SAP, a decision tree was presented which mentions that the shoreline wells need to be below the Freshwater criteria. The team agrees that the existing SA 36 NW wells are not considered shoreline wells. David G recalls that the term “shoreline wells” was included in the SAP because at that time there was thought that shoreline wells may have been needed, but they were not.

Groundwater sampling at SA 36NW should be in strict accordance with the SAP, and generally in accordance with the NAM Plan. Since the NAM Plan was only provisionally approved, following two consecutive quarters of monitoring where detections are below screening criteria, NFA can be recommended. A SRCR will be required, including figures and tables demonstrating that the site meets the FDEP criteria of two consecutive events below GCTLs. The SRCR should also identify all property owners affected. FDEP would then draft the SRCO, with an appended property owner list and figures. Following the SRCO, the Navy would then notify property owners.

A-0713-027 – Marianne to review all SA 36 NW groundwater data for all wells to verify two consecutive events <GCTLs in accordance with 62-780 NFA by 1 August 2013. Check that acrolein was reported in the lab packages. The objective is to identify all MWs still requiring sampling for NFA before Solutions goes into the field in September 2013.

A-0713-028 – Art will contact BFA for a deliverable submittal date for all five spring 2013 monitoring event reports. The April 2013 SA 36 NW report requires the laboratory package be resubmitted to include acrolein.

SA 36 – (Art Sanford joined discussion via conference call)

Marianne presented the March 2013 monitoring results. Monitor wells OLD-36-08BR and OLD-36-23CR are the only wells with detections above screening criteria. OLD-36-07AR still has vegetable oil present.

Marianne questioned whether the site was close to NFA, and wants to sample OLD-36-07AR for TRPH. The team reviewed some historical TRPH analysis of groundwater samples from OLD-36-07AR. In April 2009, TRPH was detected at 30.9 µg/L by FL PRO. In September 2009, TRPH was detected at 18.9 µg/L (the method was not FL-PRO). In March 2010, TRPH was not analyzed.

A-0713-029 – Marianne to review all SA 36 groundwater data for all wells to verify two consecutive events <GCTLs in accordance with 62-780 NFA by 1 August 2013. Check in detail the TRPH methods

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

used. The objective is to identify all MWs still requiring sampling for NFA before Solutions goes into the field in September 2013.

OLD-36-07AR is not currently sampled due to vegetable oil in the well.

A-0713-030 – Marianne will brainstorm what would be involved to complete a pump test with the objective to remove the vegetable oil from SA 36 well -07AR.

Discussion was that the best way to insure all the oil was removed from the well would be to excavate the well and surrounding soils, and then replace the well. However, the well is in a front yard. Also, vegetable oil remaining in the well will not stop site closure – we just want to get a groundwater sample.

The team agreed to the objective of closing SA 36 NW and SA 36 in addition to SA 39. Closing of these sites could lead to the development of an award nomination.

OU 3 (SA 8 and 9) – (Art Sanford joined discussion via conference call)

Jessica presented the OU 3/SA 8 quarterly monitoring results from June 2013.

At SA 8 the three drive point (DP) wells along the shoreline (OLD-08-DP01 through –DP02) were previously installed to verify if arsenic concentrations in water were less than the surface water criteria of 50µg/L. This event concludes the one year of quarterly sampling planned for the DP wells. The team discussed and decided to discontinue sampling these three wells unless any of the wells downgradient from the treatment wall exhibit concentrations above 50 µg/L. Solutions will prepare a report for the June 2013 monitoring data with the recommendation to not sample DP wells for FDEP to review and either agree or request continued sampling. The next event for OU 3 is the annual comprehensive event scheduled for September 2013.

Marianne presented Figure 2-2a, OU 3 – SA 8, from the Well Abandonment Tech Memo, dated June 5, 2013. This figure presents the SA 8 wells proposed for abandonment. There is a red line for the arsenic plume >10 µg/L. There are not delineating clean wells sidegradient or upgradient of the plume. David G reminded the team when the treatment wall was installed the GCTL for arsenic was 50 µg/L and had not yet reduced to 10 µg/L. At time of the treatment installation there were delineating wells. Also, the developer built ponds which altered the typical flow direction to the lake, resulting in plume movement. Figure 2-2a shows two unknown wells to the south in addition to other wells which are recommended for abandonment.

Marianne presented Figure 2-2a, OU 3 – SA 9, from the Well Abandonment Tech Memo, dated June 5, 2013. This figure presents the SA 9 wells proposed for abandonment. There is another unknown well in addition to other wells recommended for abandonment. There are also two wells with bollards that are current eyesore located along the walkway (OLD-09-12R and OLD-09-17R). These wells are recommended to be converted to flush mounts.

Well abandonment activities need to get underway so not to conflict with the CTO JM22 period of performance (POP).

The team had a brief discussion about the age of the treatment wall, arsenic saturation in the alumina, and possibility to remove or replace the wall. There may be opportunity to optimize the remedy at this site.

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

A-0713-031 – In order to avoid abandoning any non-Navy wells during MW abandonment activities, Marianne will ask PSI if they have wells on Navy property.

David G is currently preparing the OU 2 Proposed Plan (PP) deliverable review letter.

SA 2 – (Art Sanford joined the beginning of the discussion via conference call)

Jessica gave a presentation of SA 2. In Zone D there is a 5 foot drop in the water table measured from OLD-02-40D to -68D and -70D. The lake is the main influence on the groundwater flow, the ditch is secondary. It is odd that the plume has gone to the east of the ditch. Surface water elevations could be collected from the ditch, which would require a survey of staff gauges.

OLD-02-46DR has concentrations of PCE. This well is on the corner of a previous landfill area which was capped. Could there be materials leaching from the landfill? David G recalls that wells were installed on the airport property which had higher concentrations than -46DR. And he recalled the landfill waste was construction and demolition (C&D) materials. To cover the daylighting waste, a 2 foot cover was put on top. Bhate and USACE conducted the activities in this area.

David G. referred to the 2005 Site Investigation Report; and said -54D, which no longer exists, was installed approximately 600 to 800 feet south of -46D. Well -54D had a PCE concentration of 398 µg/L in 2004. Well -46D had a PCE concentration of 54.2 µg/L in 2004. (See SA 2 Fact Sheet dated July 2004 showing upgradient contamination.) Benzene seems to be more associated with the Navy property. Historical studies did not find a ‘smoking gun’.

David G recommended for this site to first figure out why the two remedial actions that were tried failed (ORC and PHOSter). Second, check that we have wells where we need them. For example, should there be a well downgradient from OLD-02-68D; location is dependent on how you show the groundwater flow... N, NW, or NE. There could be more groundwater delineation.

The SA 2 fact sheet needs to have Navy review completed. This fact sheet should be written to convey all information to the public and then distributed by walking out to property owners again. The team should look into having a representative from the Department of Health or the FDEP district to walk these flyers out with us. There is a land use restriction for the site, but not for the neighboring residences. This site was grandfathered in before the site notification rules. The new 62-780 ‘one rule’ says to notice off site property owners every five years.

Marianne presented Figure 2-2, SA 2, from the Well Abandonment Tech Memo, dated June 5, 2013. Five monitoring wells and one unidentified well were recommended for abandonment, but following the team’s discussion today some wells may need to stay (-09A, -08C, -12C, -63D) for further assessment.

OU 4 – Jessica gave a presentation of OU 4, including an update of April 2013 monitoring results. For the shallow surficial aquifer, PCE and TCE have reduced with increases in cis-DCE and VC. Concentrations of VC have increased significantly in DP103. For the intermediate surficial aquifer, TCE in upgradient well OLD-13-39B went from 3.1 µg/L in October 2012 to 150 µg/L in April 2013. For the deep surficial aquifer, high concentrations of PCE and TCE in source area well OLD-13-DPT1A. No other detections

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

above GCTLs. For the Hawthorn aquifer there are high concentrations including 165 ppm in OLD-13-62D, which is indicative of DNAPL. The next sampling event will be conducted in October 2013.

Well UVB-2 is still present, but is not operational. If it is needed, it would have to be replaced. David G pointed out that when these wells are replaced but continue to have the “UVB” name there is confusion because they no longer have two hydraulically separated screened intervals installed within a single permeable zone. UVB-1R is a continuous screened well.

David G read the Proposed Plan the evening before the partnering meeting and has some editorial comments. Comments include, OU 4 site history is missing certain things that were done at the site that would have explained later on why certain remedies were not selected. The document needs explanation in the text why alternatives were considered not implementable. The nine CERCLA evaluation criteria are only discussed in the very last part of the plan, but should be mentioned earlier.

The team discussed if it is better to have David G temporarily agree with the PP/ROD and have to readdress later or have FDEP reject the PP/ROD so Navy can budget for active remediation of the Hawthorne zone. The team agreed that David G would reject the OU 4 PP/ROD since remedies for the Hawthorne zone will need to be evaluated.

There are 146 wells existing at OU 4, which are in various stages of integrity and are not all well marked. This causes confusion during sampling events. Solutions proposed to remove 19 shallow surficial, 10 intermediate, 10 deep, and 4 Hawthorne wells from water level measurements. Jessica mentioned that a lot of the wells proposed to be removed are damaged and therefore the top of casing (TOC) elevations may be off. For example, there is confusion why well OLD-13-DZ1-OW4 in the intermediate zone has been a high point since after injections and wells -41B, -42B, -44B, and -45B are not clearly labeled.

In reference to the contouring figures, David G asked that the groundwater elevations considered anomalous are in red font or similar so they are different from the groundwater elevations used for contouring.

A-0713-032 – Jessica will create a spreadsheet for OU 4 listing MWs that are sampled, proposed MWs to eliminate from water level measurements, and proposed MW abandonments by 31 July 2013 and email to team.

The OU 4 conceptual site model (CSM) needs to be improved for geology, contamination levels and locations, concerns of pushing or the plume migrating to adjacent properties. Audubon Park Elementary is to the north and they have wells which they could be using for irrigation. Need to complete a database search (SWIM or FDEP’s well database) for wells.

Tier II Update – David C provided an update from the Tier II meeting. Agenda items discussed included:

- Cecil Field Team is presenting at the next Tier II meeting in Jacksonville on 18-19 September 2013;
- EPA will probably not review the PP/RODs. Not sure about the 5 year reviews, Tier II is looking into this;
 - OPT discussion - NTC Orlando 5 year reviews are due December 2015 (per Exit Strategy).
- Points of contact on deeds;

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

- OPT discussion - SA-54 is the only NTC Orlando site with signs. Five signs were installed. RC has two signs left to put up, but there were issues with gate access. In January 2014 RC can give the signs to Lidia Bonilla to install. David G is the point of contact on the signs.
- PFOA/PFOS;
 - OPT discussion - The team agreed that NTC Orlando does not have any locations of possible PFOA/PFOS.
- Go to (webinar) meeting discussion. One pro that it's cost effective and then one whole page of cons. Tier II is still looking into other call-in possibilities;
- Exit strategies are in flux. Arne Olsen is working to put these into Microsoft Project. Pdf reports will be developed for the different users. No dates were given for transition from the old format to the new;
- Bob Fisher presented NIRIS 2.0;
 - OPT discussion - David G recalled one of the main reasons FDEP did not request NIRIS access was because EPA chose not to.
- Tier I team accomplishment recognition was agreed to be important. Thank you letters will be sent to the Tier I teams after they present.

Sequestration – David C's typical furlough day is every Friday. Art does not have a furlough day. Furloughs are not expected for 2014.

A-0713-033 – Marianne will update the Exit Strategy by 1 September 2013 and email to the team.

NIRIS/AR Discussion – (Art Sanford and Jessica Keener joined the discussion via conference call)

Krista and Marianne gave a presentation of all the documentation databases used by OPT. Currently NTC Orlando documents can be found on NIRIS, Document Warehouse (DWS), Orange County Public Library (OCPL), BRAC PMO Website, and OCULUS. The OCPL is considered the Administrative Record (AR).

FDEP has more than what is on the DWS but the DWS has quick and easy access. FDEP is working to pre-index hardcopy files before sending out to the prisoners for scanning. Pre-indexing includes creating a cover page which identifies the OCULUS number (DOD_14 for NTC Orlando), date of document, date stamped in, and document type. The pre-index cover page includes a barcode and is printed to accompany the hardcopy document when FDEP ships documents to the prison. It is time consuming for FDEP site managers, but there is not much the contractor can do to help the pre-indexing method.

Current deliverables coming into FDEP are tracked well. There can be confusion when one CD with numerous documents (some documents already in OCULUS) is received. It is best to submit one document per CD.

For the AR at the OCPL, the following items would be helpful:

- A document index (possibly include the OCPL catalogue number on the index)
- Adobe reader (Adobe may have guidance about various versions of the reader)

RC will ask Teresa to provide a CD of anything Tetra Teach would need included in the AR from July 2010 to the end of their contract. RC will work to update the AR by the end of the fiscal year.

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

In reference to the BRAC PMO website, David C would prefer the NIRIS public AR website as the AR rather than the BRAC PMO site.

NTC Orlando will be moving away from ADESSO. Data currently in that database will be archived.

From 2009 to 2013 Solutions has not submitted any deliverables to the Navy's RDM for NIRIS upload.

A-0713-034 - Art will talk to Glen Wagner by 15 Aug 2013 to identify which Solutions ER documents (between 2009 to present) are still needed in NIRIS.

Area C SW – (Art Sanford and Amy Twitty joined the discussion via conference call)

Marianne met with Lisa Prather, Permitting FDEP Central District, at Area C SW on 8 July 2013 to flag the wetlands. Lisa identified the wetlands further into the area of proposed excavation. Lisa did not think that would change the approval of the de minimums permit, which she said would be a couple of days for review time. Lisa mentioned that saving some of the tree canopy may help the wetlands recover. Amy Twitty said after marking the area of proposed excavation in the field, it would be a field call about what trees to save. CH2MHill currently does not have the permit in the scope currently. Art and David C think they can add that during the negotiation (Art will review the contract on 15 July 2013 for his technical evaluation. Negotiations will occur within the following two weeks).

In preparation for the meeting with the City at 3 PM today, the team discussed the proposed schedule of excavation events:

- July – Award contract
- August – CH2 to map wetlands.
- End of August – A site fact sheet will be provided to the City for review prior to public distribution
- August – WP to Navy for review. (Stormwater and wetlands permitting concurrent with work plan review)
- September – FDEP WP Approval (the Navy will provide the City the WP only upon request)
- October – Mobilize to the site (September will be best case scenario. Amy's proposal has a November mobilization schedule)
- One to two months of field work – Large volume of trucks during excavation (~650 trucks of contaminated soil, ~632 trucks of backfill, ~1300 trucks total).
- December – Best case scenario excavation end date
- Following excavation – well installation (RC), bike pump track installation, hydroseeding. After seeding is in place and takes, then the City can come in for asphalt removal. Hydroseeding will require 6-8 weeks of watering 2-3 times per week.

Does the City have a desired route for the trucks? Or a seed preference? The Cady Way trail will not be removed, digging will occur without disturbing the trail. However a portion of the trail will be closed during excavation.

Area C SE property owner needs to be notified about the large number of trucks that will be going through his property during Area C SW excavation activities.

Ask the city where they want the bike pump track. Amy talked to the pump track designer. He said he would come down to supervise at \$5K per week plus travel and materials separate. If he can bring one

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

more guy with him the schedule may be reduced at \$8K per week. He expects to have more availability in the in fall.

Marianne will start to determine monitoring well locations and prepare Technical Memorandum for FDEP approval. Wells will be flush mounted and monitored for a period of time. David G reminded the team that 62-780 requires evaluation against the least stringent of the GCTL, background, or the PQL.

SA 39 – FDEP is still reviewing the Draft SRCR dated May 2013. An SRCO is expected to be received. That SRCO is FDEP’s instrument for releasing the deed restriction. David G will add language to the SRCO cover letter stating restrictions are released. The Navy will then put together their real estate document with the SRCO as an exhibit (FDEP does not need to review any of this package. Following the SRCO, there will be no more FDEP review). Marianne is tasked to help Navy with the real estate document. Due to the task order period of performance, Marianne will work on this in advance of receiving the SRCO.

David G will write a 62-780 SRCO which will require exhibits. Exhibits will include a site location figure, soil sample and monitoring well location figures, and table with soil and groundwater analytical results showing that the site is unrestricted (groundwater results with two consecutive events below GCTLs). David G requested that the tables are limited to just COCs, to reduce pages that would be appended to the SRCO and then the deed. Figures showing the excavation areas can be helpful but are not required.

The title “DOD and Brownfields Partnerships” is replacing the “Federal Programs Section” in FDEP.

A-0713-035 – David C will talk with real estate work group to determine the process or identify templates for the real estate document needed to release the deed restriction.

For an example, the deed restriction for the NTC Orlando golf course was removed. This deed could possibly be accessed on the Orange County Property Appraiser website.

Prioritize David G’s deliverable review -

Priority	Deliverable	Deliverable Status	Report Objective
1	SA39 SRCR	Submitted May 15, 2013	SRCO/release restrictions
2	Draft PP for OU 4	Submitted May 31, 2013	Document comments/ reject Hawthorne remedy
3	Well Abandonment WP	Submitted June 5, 2013	Review recommendations
4	Optimization Rpts for multiple sites	Submitted March 29, 2013	Review recommendations
5	Business Plan	Submitted June 20, 2013	No response required from FDEP, but informal comments to improve
6	Draft Final LTM SAP for OU 2	August 2012	Identify concerns prior to RC finalizing
	Construction Completion Rpt for OU 2	March 8, 2013	Review

FINAL ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM – MEETING MINUTES

Priority	Deliverable	Deliverable Status	Report Objective
	Construction Completion Rpt for SA 17	March 14, 2013	Review (Not on FDEP tracking list – was it received?)

Basewide Well Inventory Rpt is a resource – no response required from FDEP.

LUC Compliance Forms – no response required from FDEP.

Navy received an email from EPA which stated not to send them documents. Therefore LUC forms will not be sent to EPA.

David G mentioned that when he approves the Optimization Reports it seems the proposed scope is set. Why then would you revise the SAP?

Check-out

AI Teleconference – 5 September 2013, 10AM EST Leader: Marianne

Next Meeting – 14-15 January 2014, location Charleston, SC Leader: David C, Timekeeper: Marianne

Agenda Item	Time	Leader
SA 17 – Revisit flow direction in deep aquifer		
SA36 NW, SA 36, SA 39 – Closeout status with objective to draft brownfields award nomination		
Area C SW (note: David C and an inspector will come down during excavation activities)		
ADD AGENDA ITEMS DURING ACTION ITEM CALL		

A-0713-036 – Team will add to the Agenda Item list for the 14-15 January 2014 OPT meeting at the end of the Action Item Teleconference.

Critique

+’s	Δ’s
small team makes decisions and progress easier	Art not present in person