

N61331.AR.001782
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES AND AGENDA FOR PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 10 JUNE 2009 CSS
PANAMA CITY FL
6/10/2009
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
JUNE 10, 2009
TALLAHASSEE (TTNUS OFFICE), FLORIDA
(Draft, revised)**

**Leader: Arturo McDonald
Scribe: Katie Newman
Timekeeper: Tom Johnston
Guests: Rico Latham, Larry Smith, Rich May
Facilitator: Gus Campana**

	Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Eastern)	Category
	1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/ Proposal to Incorporate Petroleum Site Member	Arturo	10:00 – 10:30	Info
	2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules	Arturo	10:30 – 10:50	Info
	3	Partnering Training	Gus	10:50 – 11:15	Training
	4	Building 278 GW LTM and Soil Sampling Results and Pier Renovations	John S.	11:15 – 11:40	Status
	5	Building 325 Update	John S.	11:40 – 12:00	Status
		Lunch	All	12:00 – 1:15	Fun
	6	G300 Update (path forward), Bldg 89 Elevator Shaft petroleum release RAP	Larry/Rico	1:15 – 1:35	Status/Plan
	7	AOC 2 Update (new wells and soil sampling)	Larry/John S.	1:35 – 1:55	Status
	8	SMWU 10/AOC 1 GW LTM and Soil Sampling (new free product detected at AOC 1)	John S.	1:55 – 2:25	Status/Discussion
		Break	All	2:25 – 2:40	Needed
	9	Well Decommissioning	Larry S./John S.	2:40 – 3:00	Status
	10	Tier II Update	Rich	3:00 – 3:15	Info
	11	Corrective Action implementation at AOC 1 and SMWUs 2, 3, 10; SB revisions for SWU 2 and AOC 1	Arturo	3:15– 3:30	Status
	12	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	Tom/John S.	3:30 – 3:50	Concur
	13	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	Arturo	3:50 – 4:00	Info

NA = Not applicable

Meeting Schedule:

Next Leader/Time Keeper:

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
PANAMA CITY BEACH, FL
JUNE 10, 2009**

Leader: Arturo McDonald
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl/ Katie Newman
Timekeeper: Tom Johnston
Location: Tallahassee, FL

Attendees:

Mike Clayton	NSA PC	Tom Johnston	TtNUS
Larry Smith	TtNUS	Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Gus Campana	Facilitator
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE	Erico Latham	NAVFAC SE
John Winters	FDEP	Jacqueline Strobl	TtNUS (scribe)
Curtis Mills	Aerostar	Chuck Metz	TtNUS

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Check-In – Arturo McDonald</p> <p>Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/ Proposal to Incorporate Petroleum Site Member</p>	<p>The NSA Panama City Partnering Team check-in was completed.</p> <p>Arturo introduced Pat Franklin’s substitute facilitator, Gus Campana.</p> <p>Gus provided a brief self-introduction, noting that this is his 9th year of facilitating Navy partnering teams.</p> <p>Opening Remarks: John Winters noted that he, Erico, Larry, and John Schoolfield had taken a site walk the day prior to the meeting. The site walk went well and included observation of the dock area and elevator issue that will be discussed later on today.</p> <p>No proxies necessary. Guests: Larry Smith – TtNUS Erico Latham – NAVFAC SE Chuck Metz – TtNUS Curtis Mills – Aerostar</p> <p>Proposal to Incorporate Petroleum Site Member:</p> <p>The team discussed the proposed of adding Erico and Larry to the team as members. Tom noted that as his work was phasing out, and as there are more petroleum sites now, he felt that it was time to propose team membership for both Larry and Erico.</p> <p>Erico expressed concern, stating that he did not know if he would always have the funding to attend the meetings. He explained further that IR has been partnering, the petroleum side has not.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Upon further discussion and consideration it was determined that both Erico and Larry would be added to the team as full members, and that they would use proxies or attempt to attend meetings via meeting place when unable to attend themselves.</p> <p>Consensus Item #C-06-09-01: Rico and Larry will be added to the NSA PC Partnering Team.</p> <p>The team reviewed the Ground Rules, taking turns to reach each rule aloud.</p>
<p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve Minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules – Arturo McDonald</p>	<p>Consensus Item #C-06-09-02: March Meeting minutes approved.</p> <p>The team reviewed the ongoing Action Items and Parking Lot.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-01: Tom Johnston – Update the Exit Strategy/Camp (due June 12 - midmorning).</p> <p>The team discussed the issue of the elevator shaft. Mike Clayton noted that a release had been filled out.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-02: John Winters – Look into Building 89 as a possible site for the NSA PC Partnering Team.</p> <p>No changes were made to the agenda.</p>
<p>Break</p>	<p>10 minute break</p>
<p>Partnering Training – Gus Campana</p>	<p>Gus briefly explained that he had recently published a book, during which he had researched heraldry, which led to his development of the exercise he had prepared for the team today.</p> <p>Gus stated that since there had recently been an influx of new people to the team, he thought it might be beneficial to do an exercise that relates to who each team member is as an individual. Gus explained that he viewed the team as a Swiss army knife, with each member having a specific function. He then handed out a coat of arms template with instructions on how to fill it out.</p> <p>Each team member created their coat of arms and shared it with the team.</p> <p>Gus concluded the exercise with the big picture quote, “Those who know how usually end up working for those who know why.”</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Building 278 GW LTM and Soil Sampling Results and Pier Renovations – John Schoolfield</p>	<p><u>Building 278</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield distributed handouts to the team and provided an overview of the figures and conclusions from Aerostar’s draft quarterly groundwater sampling and monitoring report for Building 278. Sampling event info and results were summarized. Aerostar recommended continued monitoring; if 2 quarters of clean samples are collected then they recommend a Site Rehabilitation Completion Order (SRCO).</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield stated that the “fly in the ointment” is the sheen. Contract modifications are currently in progress to permit the involvement of Larry Smith (TtNUS) in issues related to the sheen/product currently scheduled to be sampled by Aerostar, which will also require a contract modification for additional monitoring. These contract modifications have been held up in acquisitions for approximately a month.</p> <p>Larry noted excavation had occurred within the vicinity of wells involved in quarterly sampling, expressing concern over the possibility of missing a quarter so sampling.</p> <p>Further team discussion concerning sampling noted that due to the ongoing construction work onsite, there will be a need to coordinate sampling events accordingly. The issue of consecutive quarterly sampling was discussed further; Mr. Winters stated that he did not believe it had to be consecutive quarters, but that he was not sure considering the rise and fall in the groundwater. Mr. Schoolfield confirmed that fractionation had been performed.</p> <p>John Winters stated that SPLPs should be done. Larry asked whether or not there was leachate there, and if there was potential concerning groundwater leaching to soil. Larry stated that it was possible that the soil had been excavated and might not be an issue. Mr. Winters replied that an excavation wasn’t planned, instead the old concrete was going to be pulled up and new concrete would put down. Mr. Winters stated that he was hoping to get a sample, if not in June, perhaps in July.</p> <p>Further team discussion determined that Aerostar should provide some tentative sampling dates (per Arturo) so that the project can be worked around. Hopefully none of the wells will be damaged; there are not plans to abandon these wells at this time.</p> <p>The team discussed the possibility of disposing of or replacing the SVE system. Mr. Schoolfield noted that he would need to have the system evaluated and looked over by an electrician and confirm that it doesn’t work prior to making that decision. Larry noted that if this was included in the scope of work, TtNUS could handle the SVE system evaluation.</p>
	<p><u>325</u></p> <p>Schoolfield passed out handouts.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Building 325 Update – John Schoolfield</p>	<p><u>325</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield distributed handouts to the team and provide a summary of the site history including the removal of a UST and associated piping, operation of an air sparging system, and sampling results and trends. Monitoring will most likely need to continue. Aerostar has recommended the installation of 4 additional wells.</p> <p>Mike Clayton asked whether or not any correlation had been drawn between groundwater level fluctuations and the exceedances.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that when the water table is at a certain level there tend to be exceedances, but that if it is above or below that level, you don't. Mr. Winters expressed concern that even if 2 quarters of clean samples are observed and technically meet the requirements for closure, the site may not actually be clean. Mr. Winters expressed interest in taking the opportunity to collect samples prior to the replacement of the concrete.</p> <p>Further team discussion concerning the possible correlation between groundwater level and the exceedances took place. Groundwater fluctuations relative to seasonal and tidal influences should be considered, and sampling may need to be adjusted to coincide with the tidal influence so that it is not an unknown. Mr. Schoolfield stated that the next round of sampling would not take place until September.</p> <p>Arturo noted that these two sites needed to be updated on the exit strategy.</p>
<p>Lunch</p>	<p>1 hour & 15 minutes</p>
<p>G300 Update (path forward), Bldg 89 Elevator Shaft petroleum release RAP – Larry Smith & Erico Latham</p>	<p><u>G300</u></p> <p>Product is occasionally observed, with a weak correlation drawn between water level and free product thickness.</p> <p>Recommendations: What do we want to do at G300?</p> <p>Implement LUCs and monitor for a year. Sampling would take place once, and if product is found, it could be bailed for a couple of weeks. If product is not found, sampling should occur for an additional quarter in order to obtain 2 consecutive clean quarters so that site closure with LUCs could be requested.</p> <p>In order to obtain an SRCO, soil sampling data needs to accompany this in order to better define the soil situation. With these two sets of data in place, we can determine what type of closure is acceptable. Ten samples would need to be collected at each elevation to apply for State of Florida UCLs.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>The team discussed this further, noting that a UFP-SAP would be required prior to implementing the plan. Proposed sampling should take place in January 2010 because the last sampling took place in January 2009. UFP-SAPs are now required for sampling and monitoring.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed regarding the UFP-SAP, which was not included in the costing.</p> <p>The basis needs to be well defined to make sure the UFP-SAP is able to be completed. DQOs need to be finalized and sample locations need to be well explained.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-03: Tom Johnston – To determine the average cost for a long term monitoring plan UFP-SAP (Due June 19).</p> <p>Tom recommended setting up the UFP-SAP so that the initial plan was laid out with the understanding that the site will change over time, and then allow for additional rounds of sampling, which could be taken care of via an addendum to the UFP-SAP. Tom explained that one of the most critical elements is determining how you know you are finished. This UFP-SAP requirement is DOD-wide, but the level of implementation varies from organization to organization. This site is facility funded, so it may not need a UFP-SAP. The memo corresponding to the UFP-SAP requirement was signed in April of 2005. (It was subsequently determined a facility funded site is not required to have a UFP style SAP).</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-04: Tom Johnston – Send the power point presentation on the UFP-SAP and the DOD secretary memo that led to the UFP-SAP to the team (Due June 19).</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-05: Erico Latham – Determine whether or not this site is required to follow the UFP-SAP process. (It was subsequently determined a facility funded site is not required to have a UFP style SAP).</p> <p><u>Building 89</u></p> <p>Those who took part in the site walk (previous day) took a tour of Building 89, in which hydraulic oil was spilt in the elevator shaft. At some point in future this elevator system will be changed out because it has a leak. Once they pull out the 20 foot pipe out, the cement floor will need to be removed in order to collect samples to determine whether or not contamination exists beneath the concrete floor. A soil vacuum truck will be used to remove the contaminated soil, then additional drilling will be performed to determine the extent of the contamination and to install the new elevator system. The new shaft will be reinstalled in a pvc casing to contain any possible future spills.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>There was some discussion concerning which FDEP regulatory framework applied to the elevator contamination. Possible FAC 70 - 780 because the site contamination is not petroleum based.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-06: John Winters – Determine what FDEP regulatory rules apply to Building 89 contamination and whether or he will actually end up reviewing this report.</p> <p>Mr. Winters explained that IR funds have been used on all sites prior to 1986. Mr. Winters stated that he was not familiar with the funding source for sites after 1986.</p>
<p>AOC 2 Update (new wells and soil sampling) - Larry Smith & John Schoolfield</p>	<p>John Schoolfield provided a summary of previously completed work at AOC2. Plans to install additional monitoring wells were postponed, pending plans to observe whether or not free product was found in the piezometers (December 2008). No product was observed in the piezometers at that time.</p> <p>No significant changes were observed relative to surficial changes. Monitoring wells PCY- AOC2- MW 37 (source area) and 38 will be installed (occurred July 8th). It has been 2 years since the baseline. A decision will need to be made to either move forward (since nothing was found), or re-do the baseline. Smaller sets of wells will be sampled quarterly, then at year end, a larger set will be sampled. Wells will be installed in the 1st or 2nd week of July; everything will be surveyed and then sampled. Depending on the results, a presentation may be made at the next the subsequent partnering meeting.</p>
<p>SMWU 10/AOC 1 GW LTM and Soil Sampling (new free product detected at AOC 1) – John Schoolfield</p>	<p><u>SWMU10</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided a summary of site activity history, noting petroleum product found at the surface, the operation of an SVE system until 1999, and the MNA; organics, arsenic and manganese remained. OHC was unable to locate one of the wells. This well needs to be located.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield noted that he wanted TtNUS to continue monitoring at this site.</p> <p><u>AOC1</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided information regarding the site history, noting that a vacuum system had been used to remove product. In MNA was established in 2004. The site had DCE contamination, which slowly decreased between 1997 and 2002. During a well abandonment survey floating product was discovered around Buildings 538 and 399, the original source area. This area needs to be studied further. Mr. Schoolfield stated that TtNUs would be involved with this site. Further efforts will be made to determine what is happening.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>The team discussed how this might change the Statement of Basis. It was decided that the Statement of Basis would remain as is until a change in remedy is decided upon. John Schoolfield and Larry Smith will work together to determine what changes need to be made to the remedy. The CMIP may need to be revised as well.</p>
<p>Break</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Implementation at AOC 1 and SMWUs 2, 3, 10; SB revisions for SWU 2 and AOC 1 – Arturo McDonald</p>	<p>The team discussed whether or not the Statement of Basis would need to be revised (due to the LUC boundary definition). The team also discussed whether or not this would need to be submitted for public review again, and how any additional changes might be handled.</p> <p>Larry suggested the addition of a figure to indicate the old and new boundary so that it could be handled as an addendum instead of making it look as though the whole plan was changing. Notation could be added to report stating that the new boundary was changed.</p> <p>Tom replied that he was not concerned about the difficulty of changing the Statement of Basis, but rather wanted clarification on whether or not this would trigger another comment period.</p> <p>Further team discussion occurred, covering the issues addressed with opening another comment period, which would incur added costs associated with preparing and procuring newspaper notices, figure updates, etc.</p> <p>John Schoolfield replied that a fact sheet might be sufficient. Tom asked whether or not the fact sheet would still need to have a public comment period.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-07: Tom Johnston – Contact John Schoolfield to determine how to proceed concerning the Statement of Basis in relation to the LUC boundary definition changes (funding & details).</p> <p>Arturo asked how this would be beneficial to the base. Mike explained that removing concerns regarding groundwater exposure would make working in those areas much easier.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Well Decommissioning – Larry Smith & John Schoolfield</p>	<p>There is currently no funding in place to pursue this issue further.</p> <p>Larry noted that TtNUS had completed a well inventory; afterwards a site walk revealed approximately 35 wells that had not been noted on any existing report or records. Larry also described the conditions of the wells he had observed.</p> <p>John Schoolfield stated that Aerostar had decommissioned 24 wells and had come across product at AOC1.</p> <p>Further team discussion concluded that some sort of administrative system for tracking well installation and decommissioning should be in place in order for the base to maintain an accurate well inventory. It was suggested that a well inventory could be included as part of a five year review in order to make sure that changes are tracked.</p>
<p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p>	<p>The last Tier II meeting took place before the NSA PC virtual partnering meeting teleconference; the next Tier II teleconference will take place next week. The updated exit strategy and CAMP need to be completed as soon as possible.</p>
<p>CAMP/Exit Strategy Review – Tom Johnston</p>	<p>The team reviewed and updated the CAMP/Exit strategy (See attached files).</p>
<p>Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda – Mike</p>	<p>John Schoolfield stated that he would like to incorporate the pipeline locations into some of the figures.</p> <p>Action Item #A-06-09-08: Larry Smith – Track down the pipeline identification and closure report into to determine pipeline locations and send to the team.</p> <p>Erico noted that he needs the G300 final recommendations by a week from Friday. Larry replied that he would send an electronic copy of the report as soon as possible, and would get the final report in to Erico by a week from Friday.</p> <p>The next virtual meeting will be held on:</p> <p>Wednesday, September 16th via teleconference Leader – John Schoolfield Time keeper – Arturo McDonald</p> <p>The team reviewed their schedules discussed the next proposed meeting date:</p> <p>Tuesday, November 10th @ the TtNUS Office in Tallahassee, FL</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>A draft agenda will be sent out to the team 2 – 3 weeks prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>Tom facilitated the Team Meeting closeout. Jacqueline read the new action items aloud for the team.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Good communication Very focused (a lot accomplished in one day) Good locations Good participation in the partnering training lunch good substitute facilitator snacks and drinks</p> <p>-</p> <p>Projector color Fragmented towards the end Didn't allow enough time on the exit strategy</p>

Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
June 10, 2009

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-06-09-01	Tom Johnston	Completed	6/12/09	Update the Exit Strategy/Camp.
A-06-09-02	John Winters	Ongoing		Look into Building 89 as a possible site for the NSA PC Partnering Team.
A-06-09-03	Tom Johnston	Completed	6/19/09	Determine the average cost for a long term monitoring plan UFP-SAP. Overtaken by events (UFP-SAP not required for petroleum sites according to Robbie Darby of NAVFAC).
A-06-09-04	Tom Johnston	Completed	6/19/09	Send the power point presentation on the UFP-SAP and the DOD secretary memo that led to the UFP-SAP to the team.
A-06-09-05	Erico Latham	Ongoing		Determine whether or not this site is required to follow the UFP-SAP process.
A-06-09-06	John Winters	Ongoing		Determine where this will occur in FDEP and whether or he will actually end up reviewing this report.
A-06-09-07	Tom Johnston	Completed		Contact John Schoolfield to determine how to proceed concerning the Statement of Basis in relation to the LUC boundary definition changes (funding & details)..
A-06-09-08	Larry Smith	Ongoing		Track down the pipeline identification and closure report into to determine pipeline locations and send to the team.

Consensus Item No.	Consensus Item
C-06-09-01	Erico and Larry will be added to the NSA PC Partnering Team.
C-06-09-02	March Meeting minutes approved.