N61331.AR.001770
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

AGENDA FOR CONFERENCE CALL MEETING DATED 6 JUNE 2007 CSS PANAMA CITY FL
6/6/2007
TETRA TECH

NSA Panama City Agenda
Conference Call
June 6, 2007

Leader: Bill Gates
Scribe: Denise Slowick

Check-In – Announcements, action items, approve minutes, agenda changes (Bill)

Petroleum:
G300 - update (Larry, Arturo, John)

AOC 2 Draft RAP
- Response to comments/revised RAP status (Larry)
- RAC contract status (Bill)

Sites 278 and 325 AS/SVE - monitoring update and contract status (Bill)

Non-Petroleum:
SWMU 2 Groundwater
- Fieldwork status (Tom)
- GW report, CMS, SOB, CMIP strategy and schedule (Tom/Bill)

SWMUs 3, 10 and AOC 1 Final SOB
- Public comment and SOB approval status (Tracie)
- CMIP schedule (Tom)

SWMU 10 and AOC 1 - monitoring status (Bill)

SWMUs 2, 3, 9, 10, AOC 1 - permit mod for SOBs and permit extension request strategy and schedule (Tom)

Closeout – Action items, consensus items, next agenda (Bill)

**NSA Panama City Meeting Minutes.**
**Conference Call**
**June 6, 2007**
**10:00 AM Eastern**

**Leader:** Bill Gates
**Scribe:** Tom Johnston
**Attendees:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tracie Bolanos | FDEP | Arturo McDonald | NSA PC |
| Mike Clayton | NSA PC | Bill Gates | NAVFAC SE - Leader |
| Tom Johnston | TtNUS TOM and Scribe | Larry Smith | TtNUS TOM |
| Rich May | TtNUS Tier II Link | | |

These minutes incorporate the comments form Partnering Team members as of July 1, 2007.

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|---|
| **Check-In** | Bill volunteered to lead the meeting. Denise Slowick was on vacation so Tom scribed. Comments on last meeting's draft minutes were sent from Bill Gates to Denise and Denise must still incorporate those comments into the meeting minutes. All members approved the minutes.<br>**Action Item #1:** Denise will incorporate Bill's comments into last meeting's minutes and Denise will issue the minutes as final to the team. Completed by T. Johnston in July, 2007.<br>**Action Item #2:** Tom will verify that all action items from January and March are completed. If not, he will share a list of the incomplete items with the team. Completed 5/18/07. List of outstanding items is at bottom of these minutes. |
| **G300 - update (Larry, Arturo, John)** | Larry indicated that TtNUS put a well boom in one Site G300 well on 16 January 2007. The first boom was in place for 3 months with negligible reduction in contamination. The boom was removed on 17 May 2007 and TtNUS asked the manufacturer why the boom was not working. The manufacturer said the failure was due to >1 inch of free product which deprives the boom of oxygen. Larry suggested bailing the well to remove product and continue using the well boom. Based on history we know there is more product during drought and the amount of product in the well should |

| | |
|---|---|
| | decrease with increased rain. Rain fall appears to be increasing now. Larry proposed that the booms continue to be used as follows:<br>• Bail well periodically as necessary to reduce product level (this may occur multiple times)<br>• Each time after bailing, re-insert the boom.<br>• As long as free product level is low enough we will continue using the boom, otherwise re-evaluate effectiveness of the boom.<br>This approach will allow us to move forward with remediation and allow the booms another chance to reduce contamination under more favorable conditions. If this approach does not work, we will re-evaluate and potentially use the ineffectiveness to demonstrate that active remediation is not feasible.<br>Tracie asked whether there was another option to well booms and the previously the drum technology discussed in previous meetings? Larry indicated well booms and the drum technology were the only two options reviewed to date. Well booms were selected based on cost and because microbiological action would spread from the well boom to provide a potentially a more effective treatment of product. Now that we know oxygen deficiency is the cause of failure, we think there is a chance we can perform a work around by bailing the product to keep it below the 1-inch thickness level.<br>Tracie asked whether the drum technology was not selected because the drum would have to be left in place? Larry replied no, when it rains and the water table rises, product flow seems to be cut off from the well. Therefore, the drum would only work a fraction of the time. Well booms would work all the time and the microbial action should spread, thus providing better remedial coverage than the drum. Booms were also less expensive. This accommodated low funding levels and the fact that free product was not always present in significant quantity. Larry suggested that we could monitor for one more year. We should know after the first quarter of monitoring whether the system is working. At that point we |

| | |
|---|---|
| | could re-evaluate whether to continue with this remedial strategy.<br>Tom asked how many sampling rounds (1 or 2) would be required to determine the effectiveness of the well boom. Larry offered that the boom effectiveness will be evident in the physical appearance of the boom and in the GW data (as a reduction in contaminant concentrations) after the first sampling round.<br><br>Recently (Fall 2006) there was more than 3 inches of free product in well. Free product had not been detected in the first three quarters of quarterly monitoring. In the fourth quarter free product was detected. NFA with monitoring was proposed in the final GW monitoring report. FDEP did not accept this recommendation because contaminant plume size was unknown and it is close to a water body. Tracie mentioned that she wanted to understand whether well booms are working before asking for closing the site with controls. |
| **AOC 2 Draft RAP**<br>Response to comments/revised RAP status (Larry)<br>RAC contract status (Bill) | Comments were received by TtNUS from FDEP on the AOC 2 RAP. TtNUS is planning to address the comments by the end of this week or early next week and will then resubmit the RAP as final to FDEP. Tracie will be in Key West after next week until the 22nd of this month.<br>**Action Item #3:** In Tracie's absence Larry will take the final version of the RAP to the engineer in Tracie's office. He will also provide a copy to Tracie. Done.<br>Bill indicated that he has initiated action to get CH2MHILL to implement the RAP. The award for this should be made in the next week or so. As of today Bill will not have money for award of physical remediation until next fiscal year. Funding is a fluid situation, however, and money could become available late in this fiscal year. In summary, the work plan development will be funded but funding of remediation is uncertain for this fiscal year. Bill is not sure who the CH2MHILL project mgr will be. |
| **Sites 278 and 325 AS/SVE -** | The GW monitoring contract expired in early April and in April |

| | |
|---|---|
| **monitoring update and contract status (Bill)** | the contract was extended for one more year. A sitewide one-time sampling event was done in April. Data from this sampling just came back recently and is being tabulated for review. Bill will forward the data to Tracie as soon as it is available and will want to discuss the historic and recent site-wide data collection to determine how to proceed. Tracie wants Bill to include a list of recommendations for future activities in the package he sends to her.<br>Concerning the remediation system, it was supposed to have been shut off but it somehow was turned back on.<br>**Action Item #4:** Bill will look into the remediation system change in status (currently turned on). Proposal for 278/325 to Tracie was that while system was tuned on but wells were isolated. So, systems have not really been on since December.<br>**Action Item #5:** Bill will also send data via e-mail with tables, and figure(s) showing detections, plus recommendations for what to do next for these sites. Done. |
| **SWMU 2 Groundwater**<br>Fieldwork status (Tom): | • Tom indicated that Tracie had approved the strategy for field work but the draft work plan was not formally approved by FDEP. Tracie indicated that her approval of the strategy document was sufficient and should be used as approval of the work plan.<br>• Tom indicated that field work was completed according to plan with the following significant changes:<br>o Well PCY-2-11S was moved northwest a few hundred ft. because of access problems. This will provide better GW level estimates than the original location.<br>o No surface water sample could be collected at location 02SW/SD07 and this location was close enough to the next downgradient location that moving it did not make sense. Although 02SW/SD was supposed to be somewhat of an upgradient SW sample, the SW samples are pretty clean so the need for an upgradient sample is lessened. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | o Figure scales were found to be incorrect on all four figures of the work plan and TtNUS wants to update figures to have correct scales (current scales off by a factor of about 2x). Revised figures are finished and ready to be submitted. Tracie suggested issuing the corrected figures only with the Technical memorandum summarizing the recently generated GW and SW data.<br>• Tom asked for clarification on how to use the GCTLs and SWCTLs when comparing to data. Tracie indicated that GCTLs are used first for comparison with GW data. If GCTL concentrations are not exceeded in GW, no further action is required. If GCTLs are exceeded, then either fresh or marine SWCTLs are used, as applicable, for comparison of GW and SW. If SWCTLs are exceeded, FDEP frequently asks for installation of wells closer to the water body. Tom indicated that there is not much room between the most downgradient wells and St. Andrew Bay . Perhaps more importantly, there is also not much room between these wells and the creek north of SMWU 2 that drains into the marina on the edge of St. Andrew Bay. No one knew what constitutes marine (as opposed to fresh) surface water.<br>• Tom indicated that he will replace "SWSD" with "SW" in the surface water sample numbers (samples can only be surface water or sediment but not both).<br>• Tom asked the lab to re-analyze sample 02GLM0203 for antimony to verify whether the antimony is a real detection. He also has asked the lab to re-analyze two surface water samples (from locations 02SW/SD05 and 06) for iron because they had elevated iron detection limits.<br><br>**Action #6:** Tom will send the technical memorandum with correct figures to Tracie and Bill. This memo will summarize the May 2007 data. Tracie does not want change pages for |

| | |
|---|---|
| | the work plan to correct figures scales – she just wants to be sure the figure scales are correct in the new reports. Done.<br><br>Tracie suggested that if it will work for metals, we might want to use the Trident probe to determine whether there is an impact from GW to SW.<br><br>**Action Item #7:** Tom will determine whether the creek northeast of SWMU 2 is marine or fresh based on salinity and other appropriate factors, regulations, etc. **Action completed 06-07-07**. **Based on salinity readings for the three SW samples collected in May (0.05 % for sample farthest from Marina to 29.8 % for sample next to marina, it is clear that the water is marine. One knowledgeable TtNUS person indicated that Florida has a 1,500 mg/L chloride cutoff for fresh versus marine. Tracie indicated that 10,000 TDX is a Florida cutoff. The tech memo completed in June 2007 converts sp. Conductance to TDS to demonstrate that the sample closest to St. Andrew Bay, in particular, is saline.**<br>**Action Item #8:** Tom will determine whether the Trident probe works for metals as well as organics. **Action completed 6-6-07** (the Trident probe will work for metals).<br><br>Tracie indicated that benzene concentration in SWMU 2 GW are acceptable because they do not exceed the fresh and saline SW standards of 71.28 µg/L. The GCTL is 1 µg/L for benzene. |
| **GW report, CMS, SOB, CMIP** strategy and schedule (Tom/Bill) | • Tom indicated that the SWMU 2 report for May 2007 data is about 40% complete. We still need well coordinates and elevations to be able to complete the report. The surveyor is on site today and expects to provide well coordinates and elevations early next week. The lab data have been completed except for the re-analyses.<br>• The SWMU 2 CMS about 70 % complete and remediation costs are being worked up now. Based |

| | |
|---|---|
| | on what we've seen, Tom did not expect the proposed remedy to change.<br>• The SMWU 2 SOB is about 50% complete and its completion is pending completion of the CMS report.<br>• Tom is trying to get these finished ASAP.<br>• The SOB requires 45-day public comment. Bill emphasized to Tracie that quick reviews will be very important for SMWU 2 because this is a navy expedited site. Tracie indicated that receiving a lot of documents at once for review can actually delay the reviews and suggested that we work on one document at a time. Bill is only asking for extraordinary handling on SMWU 2. The team agreed to try to time the submittal of documents to Tracie in a way that expedites the reviews.<br>Tracie indicated that inclusion of Trident probe work as part of the CMS might be appropriate, depending on the GW flow lines and contaminant concentrations.<br>**Action Item #9:** Before finishing the technical memorandum for SMWU 2 May 2007 data, Tom will provide to Tracie and Bill a figure of Panama City for Al, Fe and Mn concentrations in GW across the base to show whether Al, Fe and Mn concentrations at SMWU 2 are consistent with basewide concentrations. A brief analysis with observations/conclusions will be included. When this has been sent to Tracie and Bill, discuss with her and Bill if not others. Tom will also include this analysis in an Appendix of the Technical Memorandum. Done.<br><br>**Action Item #10:** The team will eventually need to decide whether the Trident probe is useful based on this analysis and GW flow directions. Done. |
| **SWMUs 3, 10 and AOC 1 Final SOB**<br>Public comment and SOB approval status (Tracie) | • Bill and Arturo indicated that the public comment period ended on May 31. No comments were received by NSA PC or FDEP for either SOB. Tom noticed that there were incorrect scales on some of the SOB figures. Tracie |

| | |
|---|---|
| CMIP schedule (Tom) | needs the concurrence letter and summary letter for the SOBs. She asked that we handle the SMWU 3 summary and concurrence letters first; then we'll do AOC 1/SWMU 10 summary and concurrence letters.<br>**Action Item #11:** Tom will resend the summary letter and concurrence letter for SMWU 3 SOB to Tracie along with a revised SOB showing the correct figure scales. He will follow this with the same for the SWMU 10/AOC 1 SOB. Done.<br><br>• Tracie indicated that more approvals are required for each SOB once she gets the final copy with the two letters.<br>• CMIP Schedule – Tom and Bill indicated that SMWU 2 is taking precedence over the other CMIPs but Tom is working those into the schedule as time permits.<br>• TtNUS is working on CMIPs for AOC 1, SMWU 10, and SWMU 2.<br>• Tom would like to finish revision 02 to RFI Addendum for SWMUs 3/9/10 and AOC 1 to incorporate additional 2003/2004 data and any required risk evaluation before completing the CMIPs. This is somewhat of a formality, however, and is being fitted into the schedule as time permits. |
| SWMU 10 and AOC 1 - monitoring status (Bill) | Bill indicated that the 3rd Qtr sample data will be available by June 8, 2007.<br>**Action Item #12:** Bill will share these data with Tracie. Done. |
| SWMUs 2, 3, 9, 10, AOC 1 - permit mod for SOBs and permit extension request strategy and schedule (Tom) | The team is hoping to combine all AOC 1 and SWMU 2, 3, 9, and 10 permit mods/extension request into one action. Tom and Bill are tentatively planning to be ready to do this in the Fall of 2007. |
| Closeout – Action items, consensus items, next agenda (Bill) | • There was no Tier II update.<br>• **Next meeting:**<br>o **July 10, 2:00 PM Eastern time.**<br>o **Tracie will be next meeting leader.** |
| **Old Action Items from Previous Meetings, and Their Status:** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **From January, 2007 Teleconference** | • On the RFI Addendum Tracie has given comments and Gerry has drafted responses. Bill said the response to comments should be returned to Tracie by today or tomorrow. Tracie said that FDEP does not accept the poor quality aquifer position taken by the Navy and Bill understands. Arturo asked about an e-mail he sent about trees to Bill asking if we can we remove them? Bill will check with Van and see what is in the contract. Gerry/Bill will get the response to comments on the SWMU 2 RFI Addendum to Tracie (completed 1/18/07) and Bill will check with Van to determine what is in the contract regarding tree removal (funding for tree removal provided 4/27/07) |
| **From March, 2007 Teleconference** | • Bill was unable to get one-time site-wide sampling contracted for March so Aerostar did normal March sampling. The contract is renewed with them. Site wide – one time sampling will be done and the data used to determine whether to do quarterly monitoring. Tracie says the Navy needs to submit a MOP (monitoring only plan) or an MNA (monitored natural attenuation) plan (this action is in-progress). One-time event completed in May; rest of action item completed.<br>• Tracie would like color figures from OHC in future LTM reports. (this action in-progress). Done. |