

N61331.AR.001764
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

DRAFT MINUTES FROM PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 16 NOVEMBER 2006 CSS
PANAMA CITY FL
11/16/2006
TETRA TECH

Draft Web Conference Minutes
Naval Support Activity Panama City Partnering Team
November 16, 2006

Attendees:

Tracie Bolanos, Bill Gates, Tom Johnston, Arturo McDonald, John Robinson, Denise Slowick, Gerry Walker, Larry Smith (for UST update only)

Absent:

Mike Clayton, Rich May, Pete Paznokas

Check-In

Tom did an abbreviated check in to get the meeting discussions started. All agreed that Bill's notes, which were distributed to the team on November 15, would be followed to keep the call as short as possible.

Petroleum Update – given by Larry Smith

AOC2

Larry has not been able to contact the remedial engineer but everything is on schedule for an internal draft review for the work plan. It is on schedule. Bill asked who was doing the internal review and Larry said TtNUS will and then it will be sent to the Navy for their internal review.

G300

Larry discussed site conditions with Tracy and John. It's projected that with free product in the well, free product removal will start all over. The WellBoom in the well takes care of free product when it's there – booms will be installed in the next few weeks. Larry asked Arturo if they have anyone to check the WellBooms – Larry will train their people to do this because it is more cost efficient. John talked to the lieutenant and he indicated that they could do it.

SWMU 10

RFI Addendum

The Addendum is labeled to address SWMUs 3, 9, 10 and AOC 1 but it was only updated to addresses changes for SWMUs 3 and 9. This document is in Tracy's hands for review. Tracie was asked when her review can be completed and she indicated that she should have it done by the end of December.

Bill indicated that figures from Tom showing exceedances of GCTLs were sent to the team. Tom indicated that they were visible via the web conferencing capability. Tracie could not access the web conference part of this meeting. Tom reviewed these figures with the team, taking care to describe to Tracie what he was seeing in the figures. He identified GCTL exceedances but only small ones. He confirmed to Traci that groundwater GCTL exceedances were separated from the shore by locations where no exceedances were shown. He asserted that the team has seen this data before and decided to go on with the SOB for SWMU 10 and AOC 1. The data had simply not been formally presented.

Tom asked whether we can we go on with the SOB and write a technical memorandum summarizing these exceedances. Tracy indicated that that would be OK but she does have some comments that need to be addressed. She also indicated that she preferred revising the RFI Addendum to generating a technical memorandum.

Tracie indicated that the LUC language needs to be slightly more specific. It needs to state that if there is contaminated soil then no soil will be dug up. If there is contaminated water no wells will be put in. Tracie wanted to clarify what "MN" means on the figures. Tom explained that MN stood for manganese whereas 1-MN and 2-MN stood for 1-methylnaphthalene and 2-methylnaphthalene, respectively. Tracie asked that this be made clearer in the future.

Tom said there were no exceedances in SWMU 10 soil and that he would verify this, sending out an update if there were exceedances.

SWMU 10 SOB – the technical memorandum will include 2004 data and will be scheduled to come out first. Bill will have to contract with TtNUS to get this technical memorandum written. He expects it to be awarded by Jan. 2007.

Bill received the 1st round of sampling data from the contractor currently doing field work and the participants agreed that this data should be rolled into the technical memorandum. Gerry added that the data needs to be looked at quickly because if we get 2 quarters of clean data it can be MNA. Tracie added that land use controls would still be required.

Gerry added that the 2004 data show exceedances of GCTLs but the site may be clean now. Tracie was skeptical that the site would be clean now

The technical memorandum will delay the permit modification. Tracie asked if the technical memorandum would be for just SWMU 10 or also AOC1 and Tom indicated that it will be for both sites.

Bill asked if a stand alone technical memorandum is enough for these sites to address the new data or should we do a revised RFI? Bill thinks the navy legal department will say an evaluation needs to be done to reach a preferred alternative.

Tracie asked how much data would be included in the technical memorandum. Tom indicated that it would not be very much compared to previously collected data but he could not estimate a data record count. Appendix H of the RFI Addendum is the only place that has the new 2004 data and the data presentation is not user friendly because it is in the form of laboratory data packages. In addition, the data have not been interpreted.

AOC1

SOB figures have been provided to the team. The RFI Addendum does not include AOC1 updates, which is a situation similar to SWMU 10. One well in 2004 had a GCTL exceedance and Tracie is concerned with protection of the shore line. Tracie wants trident probe to be included to explain it better – Tracie asked if the trident probe data is described in the report and Gerry indicated it was a separate report. Tracie would like it to be referenced or included as an appendix in the RFI report.

ACTION ITEM #1 – Tom will find out if the soil data collected in 2004 is in the RFI documents. Action Item completed 11/27/06 – No 2004 soil data are included in the RFI report Addendum for SWMUs 3, 9, and 10, and AOC 1. The 2004 soil data are included in the SWMU 2 RFI report Addendum.

Tom tried to get back on topic stating that the AOC 1 groundwater exceedances were small and no more than 3 times the GCTLs. Tracie made it clear that on GW if it exceeds the GCTL then it does exceed it. GW is not like soils.

SWMU 3

Tom reviewed the exceedances on screen.

ACTOPN ITEM # 2 - Tom will look at exceedances for metals and locate them on a figure. Tracie does not want to see any of this until the technical memorandum is issued.

SWMU 9

NFA for this site – In the interest of full disclosure Tom indicated that there was a bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate exceedance in groundwater and it was addressed in RFI Addendum Rev 1 as being not site related. The team was already aware of this – the NFA is pending Tracie's review.

Tracie affirmed that no SOB is required for this SWMU.

SWMU 2

The RFI Addendum was completed and submitted and Tracie is reviewing it. Tracie agreed to have this done in December. Tom asked if it will be finished before the SWMU 3, 9, 10 and AOC 1 RFI Addendum because SWMU 2 is the hot item and Bill agreed with him. Bill also added that by Sept 30 2007 monitoring needs to be in place so this RFI Addendum review needs to be expedited. Tom indicated that the 2004 data issues are summarized in the RFI Addendum and no tech memo will be needed for SWMU 2.

Tom had an action item from the last Partnering meeting to review the Building 455 data to determine whether those data would support a position that elevated iron concentrations in groundwater at SWMU 2 were representative of background. Tom reviewed the data and it will not support that SWMU 2 Fe is not background contamination.

Tom also talked to a groundwater modeler about whether it would be worthwhile to model the iron in groundwater. Tom relayed that it would be better to just collect the data. Bill is taking care of this with new money to get to a remedy in place. Bill asked that Tracie put SWMU 2 at the top of the stack because it needs attention now.

CMS for SWMU 2

Gerry said initially there would be no more work out there but then upon resampling found exceedences and that yes a CMS needs to be done. Bill wants it done in a streamlined fashion.

Tracie had an appointment and left the meeting 11:21.

Bill asked Gerry about the Administrative Record which was last one done in 2001. Bill asked if the public library has to be a repository for this. Gerry said that maybe a living CD would be accepted by the repository. Maybe Gulf Coast College would accept them? Bill will talk to Steve on this issue.

ACTION ITEM #3 – Bill will find out whether the AR can be located on the base only or posted on the web.

Future Partnering Meeting Dates

***Jan. 17th 12:00 – 5:00 and 18th 8:00 – 12:00 – next meeting
In Tallahassee***