

N61331.AR.001783
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES FOR PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 23 MARCH 2009 CSS PANAMA CITY
FL
3/23/2009
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
PANAMA CITY BEACH, FL
(TELECONFERENCE)
MARCH 23, 2009
(Final)**

Leader: Tom Johnston
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Rico Latham
Guests: Rico Latham, Larry Smith, possibly Curtis Mills (Aerostar)

	Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Eastern)	Category
	1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/	Tom	2:00 – 2:15	Info
	2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules/	Tom	2:15 – 2:30	Info
	3	Building 278/325 GW LTM and Soil Sampling	John S.	2:30 – 2:45	Status
	4	SMWU 10/AOC 1 GW LTM and Soil Sampling	John S.	2:45 – 2:55	Status
	5	Well Decommissioning	Larry S./John S.	2:55 – 3:10	Discussion/ Plan
	6	Tier II Update	Rich	3:10 – 3:20	Info
	7	Non-Petroleum Site Update (permit, reports, plans, field work, CNO Award Application)	Tom	3:20 – 3:30	Status
		Break	All	3:30 – 3:40	Needed
	8	SWMU 2 LTM update (data review and recommendations)	Tom	3:40 – 3:50	Status
	9	G300 update (data review and Projected Work)	Larry	3:50 – 4:10	Status
	10	AOC 2 Update	John S.	4:10 – 4:20	Status
	11	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	Tom	4:20 – 4:40	Concur
	12	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	Tom	4:40 – 5:00	Info

NA = Not applicable

Meeting Schedule:

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
PANAMA CITY BEACH, FL
(TELECONFERENCE)
MARCH 23, 2009**

**Leader: Tom Johnston
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Erico Latham**

Attendees:

Mike Clayton	NSA PC	Tom Johnston	TtNUS
Larry Smith	TtNUS	Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Pat Franklin	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 – Tom Johnston</p> <p>Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/</p>	<p>The NSA Panama City Partnering Team check-in was completed.</p> <p>Tom Johnston introduced his new Deputy TOM Chuck Metz, and noted that his contact info had been added to the Team Charter.</p> <p>Chuck Metz noted that he was familiar with the partnering process, and expected the transition to go smoothly.</p> <p>Tom also noted that Curtis Mills from Aerostar, was an additional guest in attendance.</p> <p>In the interest of time the team decided to forego opening remarks normally made during the check in.</p> <p>No proxies necessary. Guests: Larry Smith – TtNUS Erico Latham – NAVFAC SE Chuck Metz – TtNUS Curtis Mills – Aerostar</p>
<p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve Minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules - Tom Johnston</p>	<p>Consensus Item #1- December 11, 2008 Meeting minutes approved.</p> <p>Due to constraints on time, the Team did not review the Team Charter and Ground Rules.</p> <p>Action items from the December 11, 2008 meeting minutes were reviewed:</p> <p>All action items had been completed, with the exception of Action Item #12-08-04. Arturo explained that he had been unable to get the LUC maps updated due to a translation problem between CADD and GIS.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Action Item #03-09-01: Tom Johnston will contact Arturo McDonald to provide support and attempt to resolve the CADD/GIS translation problem for the LUC maps update.</p> <p>No changes were made to the agenda.</p>
<p>Building 278/325 GW LTM and Soil Sampling - John Schoolfield</p>	<p><u>Building 278</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided an overview of the figures and conclusions from the Draft Aerostar Fourth Quarter Report for Building 278. Sampling event info and results were summarized. A PAH GCTL exceedance was noted in the sample collected from MW-6. Mr. Schoolfield noted that MW-6 is located near the dock area. All soil samples collected passed the Florida Working Group Criteria, analysis of the soil samples showed no exceedances of the TRPH SCTL.</p> <p><u>Building 325</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided an overview of the figures and conclusions from the Draft Aerostar Fourth Quarter Report for Building 325. Sampling event info and results were summarized. TRPH GCTL exceedances were detected in MW-8 and MW-23; both wells have shown a slight upward trend of increasing TRPH concentrations. All soil samples collected passed the Florida Working Group Criteria, analysis of the soil samples showed no exceedances of the TRPH SCTL.</p>
<p>SMWU 10/AOC 1 GW LTM and Soil Sampling - John Schoolfield</p>	<p><u>SMWU 10</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided an overview of the figures and conclusions from the Draft OHC Annual Monitoring Report for SMWU 10. Sampling event info and results were summarized. A GCTL Arsenic exceedance was detected in the PCY-10-MW-2 well.</p> <p><u>AOC1</u></p> <p>John Schoolfield provided an overview of the figures and conclusions from the Draft OHC Annual Monitoring Report for AOC 1. Sampling event info and results were summarized. Mr. Schoolfield noted that there were several GCTL exceedances for iron and hydrogen sulfide; one well sample showed a GCTL exceedance for 1,1-DCE. The recommendation is to continue monitoring.</p>
<p>Well Decommissioning - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>Tom Johnston opened discussion concerning well decommissioning at Panama City, stating that he and Larry had compiled a list of potentially eligible wells. He noted that the list was not complete and that they did not have GPS coordinates for all the wells listed. The discussion was at this point turned over to Larry.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Larry Smith explained that he and Ms. Strobl examined old reports and figures and compiled a list of wells. He then took the list out to the site and tried to verify the existence of the wells. A figure was generated from available data to map out the known wells approximately 160 wells from the compiled list, but Larry's site visit noted 20 to 30 wells on site that were on no list generated from the review of the existing reports and figures. While this site visit helped to provide an idea on the level of effort needed in order to proceed with compiling an accurate well inventory list, further discussion is necessary in order to determine how to proceed with well abandonment. Issues that may need to be discussed include: damaged wells, deteriorating well casings, the lack of GPS coordinates for determination of accurate locations for wells that will be kept or refurbished, determining well depths for wells to be abandoned, on site versus off site disposal of removed wells, etc.</p> <p>Tom Johnston noted that TtNUS had done what they could to kick start the process, but TtNUS is not scoped to follow through any further at this point. This should at least provide a good starting place in determining how to proceed.</p> <p>John Schoolfield expressed his appreciation of the TtNUS well list compilation efforts. Mr. Schoolfield went on to ask John Winters if a formal letter/memo from FDEP would be necessary in order to proceed with well abandonment. Mr. Winters replied that this would not be necessary, but that permitting would be required. Larry Smith informed Mr. Schoolfield that this was usually handled by the well abandonment contractor.</p>
<p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p>	<p>Rich May provided an overview of the last Tier II Meeting, held in Tampa March 11th and 12th. He noted that John Schoolfield's boss and Camille Destafny were present. Camille has been welcomed as a team member, but will only be able to attend Tier II Meetings once or twice a year due to her busy schedule.</p> <p>Mr. May continued his Tier II updated noting topics of discussion that are relevant to the NSA PC Partnering Team. With regard to exist strategies, there was discussion of getting them in line with the Navy and EPA dates as well as discussion concerning the addition of MMRP sites to the exit strategy. The only thing that came up in discussion concerning Panama City was the determining the status of the Permit Mod; this has been squared away. We had been carrying in our 2008 – 2009 goals that all the Statement of Basis with permits is taken care of for 2009.</p> <p>Mr. May stated that after the meeting he would send the team members an email concerning clarifications on what the columns on the exit strategy mean (for example RIP dates for IR, Petroleum, etc). Mr. May noted that Jim Crane had proved the Tier II Team some good remedy in place guidance, which he would send along to the PC Partnering Team members via email, so that it could be used in order to update the exit strategy. Exit strategies will be due in May.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p data-bbox="597 258 1442 317">Action Item #03-09-02: Rich May will send an email with clarifications on Exit Strategy column meanings and RIP guidance.</p> <p data-bbox="597 348 1390 407">The next Tier II Meeting will be held in Orlando on June 16th. Tier II teleconferences will be conducted in April and May.</p>
<p data-bbox="167 474 557 590">Non-Petroleum Site Update (permit, reports, plans, field work, CNO Award Application) – Tom Johnston</p>	<p data-bbox="597 474 1422 621">Tom Johnston provided a Non-Petroleum Site update noting that the Permit Mod had been completed September 24th and was written out for five years. Tom noted that the Round 3 Monitoring Report was out and pending FDEP approval. All reports and plans have been completed.</p> <p data-bbox="597 657 1442 772">The NSA PC Partnering Team completed a CNO award application, but did not win the award. The team discussed the possibility of finding and reviewing the winning application in order have an idea of what could be done better for the next award application.</p>
<p data-bbox="167 842 245 867">Break</p>	
<p data-bbox="167 905 553 989">SWMU 2 LTM Update (data review and recommendations) – Tom Johnston</p>	<p data-bbox="597 905 1422 1234">Tom Johnston provided a SWMU 2 LTM Update. Tom noted that he had recently become aware of FDEP-approved human health risk-based screening values (Table 7 of 62-777 FAC). The published GCTLs (Table 1 of 62-777 FAC) had groundwater and surface water cleanup levels that were much higher, which hadn't made sense since the background levels were so high. The background wells for the SWMU 2 groundwater investigation have concentrations that range from non-detect to thousands of ug/L. The highest background iron concentration is near 4,000 ppb, which is consistent with the human health risk-based screening values. The risk-based criterion is 4,200 ug/L.</p> <p data-bbox="597 1270 1438 1780">The highest iron concentration in site wells outside of SMWU 2 during LTM sampling was on the order of 6,500 ppb for the three most recent sampling rounds. The highest groundwater iron concentrations, in general, are within the footprint of SMWU 2 or directly down gradient. For example, the highest iron concentration reported during LTM at PCY-2-7S (which is located immediately down gradient of the One-Time Base Cleanup Area) was 5,440 ppb. Concentrations vary a lot in that well, but the highest iron concentration is within 30 percent of the 4,200 ug/L human health risk-based criterion and it is within 42 percent of the highest background iron concentration (3,830 ug/L). Wells further from the SMWU do not exhibit such high concentrations in recent sampling. For example, the highest iron concentration in well PCY-2-10S, which is located about 300 ft down gradient of PCY-2-7S, was about 1,800 ug/L. This Value is within the background iron concentration range and is less than half of the human health risk-based criterion. Many wells have iron concentrations less than 1,000ug/L.</p> <p data-bbox="597 1816 1438 1900">There are a few more wells outside the SMWU with concentrations exceeding 300 ug/L (the GCTL), but the iron concentrations are within the range of background iron concentrations. The bottom line is that it</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>doesn't look as though there is a significant iron contamination coming from SMWU 2. It's questionable whether the sporadic high iron concentrations reflect contamination from the SMWU since the data vary a lot. Of particular note is that the iron concentration during the last monitoring round was 1,770 ug/L at well PCY-2-10S (the associated duplicate result was to 1890 ug/L).</p> <p>In the past, FDEP has expressed concern about the potential impact of groundwater iron contamination on surface water but it does not appear that groundwater is affecting surface water.</p> <p>TtNUS recommends keeping the LUCs in place, but discontinuing the groundwater and surface water monitoring; TtNUS also recommends revising the groundwater LUC boundaries to span less area, as presented in the draft LTM Round report. Tom noted that he wasn't looking for consensus at this meeting, but wanted to refresh the Team Members memories.</p> <p>John Winters stated that he believed the argument to be sound, but that he would need to review the document and bring it to his management before he could get the ball rolling.</p> <p>The team discussed how this might affect the current course of action, since another round of sampling was scheduled to occur in a month or so, and debated continuing with the current course of action until FDEP approval was attained. John Winters stated that he believed there was enough data at this time to postpone the next semi-annual sampling event.</p> <p>Action Item #03-09-02 – John Winters will review/approve the SWMU 2 Report within 3 weeks (due April 13th).</p>
<p>G300 update (data review and Projected Work) – Larry Smith</p>	<p>Larry stated that the G300 site had been in existence for 10 years. Due to the thickness of the concrete foundation of the building, removing the diesel underneath the building is not feasible. On January 20th, 3/100 of an inch of free product was measured in the source well. There are wells in the area that were sampled and groundwater analysis results were non-detect, or had no GCTL exceedances. TtNUS made a recommendation that instead of doing additional groundwater sampling, a LUC be used as an alternative. The LUC would require that the product level in the source well be checked annually, and that if product was found, that it be bailed. This would need to occur annually for a total of five years. If the LUC began this year the LUC inspection would fit into the other 5 year site reviews.</p> <p>Tom and Larry asked John Winters whether or not formal documentation concerning remediation attempts and/or application for use of LUCs would be necessary.</p> <p>John Winters replied that he was not aware of any such necessary steps. He agreed that this appeared to be a case in which it was necessary to leave the free product there and that it would likely be best to proceed to LUCs. John noted that he would make sure to see what would need to be done in order to handle this correctly.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Action Item #03-09-03 - John Winters will check to see if additional documentation concerning the reasoning behind the proposed LUCs at G300 (as an alternative to additional sampling) is necessary, and then document approval (Due April 13th).</p>
<p>AOC 2 Update – John Schoolfield</p>	<p>John Schoolfield provided an overview of the soil sampling and data collection activities that Aerostar conducted at AOC-2. All soil samples collected passed the Florida Working Group Criteria for TRPH.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield noted that at the last meeting there had been discussion concerning installation of additional groundwater monitoring wells in the area that was excavated. Consensus at that time was to wait until the piezometers had been checked for free product; Larry Smith checked the piezometers during his last visit to the site, and found no free product. Mr. Schoolfield asked Aerostar to check the piezometers during their last site visit; no free product was observed in the piezometers at that time, either. Installation of new wells and quarterly monitoring following the excavation activities had been discussed previously; however, because the excavation could not be completed due to the utilities corridor issue, this plan has not yet been put into action. At this point it would probably be best to proceed with installing a few more wells anyway.</p> <p>Larry Smith agreed that this was the right course of action to pursue. Larry also suggested checking the piezometers when on site to sample for the first year. This could be included in the report.</p> <p>John Winters asked whether or not anyone could say at this point that there was no longer free product at the site.</p> <p>Curtis from Aerostar stated that ground penetrating radar was used all the way out to the dock, and all lines that had been located had been cleaned out. This had taken place 6 to 8 years ago. Curtis stated that he didn't know if they could find any more contamination sources.</p> <p>John Winters expressed concern about the possibility of meeting enough criteria to satisfy the FDEP rule, without actually being finished and leaving free product behind. Mr. Winters noted that though he did not expect every last molecule of product to be removed from the site, he was concerned about the high TRPH levels. There had been a sheen in Alligator Bay adjacent to the pier, which suggests that contamination is migrating. The sheen on the water is a source of contention with the water district, and this is a matter that needs consideration regardless of the fact the team doesn't know what site this contamination is migrating from.</p> <p>Tom Johnston noted that this merited further team discussion outside the boundaries of this teleconference. He encouraged additional discussion before John Winters has to write up the letter.</p> <p>Action Item #03-09-04 – John Winters will write up a review letter for the verbal approval of recommendations (due April 3rd).</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>CAMP/Exit Strategy Review – Tom Johnston</p>	<p><u>Exit Strategy</u></p> <p>Tom Johnston led the team in a review of the Exit Strategy, noting that changes had been highlighted in yellow. Tom noted that for SWMU 2 (cell V13) there was a note stating that the Round 3 LTM Report is pending approval. Other than that, approval has been received for non petroleum site documents. Tom stated that he had not updated the UST sites.</p> <p>Rich read off the new RIP Guidance for the Team. The guidance is specific but is detailed enough that further work will have to be done to update the Exit Strategy.</p> <p>Action Item #03-09-05 - Tom, Rich, and Larry will discuss/review the Exit Strategy and will update it according to the new RIP Date guidance; proposed revisions will be sent to Rico and Schoolfield by the end of next week (April 3rd). The Exit Strategy must be completed by May 22nd.</p> <p>The team discussed the dates currently entered and noted that some might need to be adjusted.</p> <p><u>CAMP</u></p> <p>Tom stated that he had updated the CAMP with John Winter's document approval dates.</p> <p>Mike noted that SWMU 9's section was incomplete, and suggested that it at least needed a corrective action date.</p> <p>Tom stated that it would be beneficial to have everyone look at the CAMP and make sure of agreement on the dates. Since work is really winding down, it would be a shame to have inaccurate dates listed.</p> <p>Pat asked if Tom planned on highlighting changes to the CAMP as he had with the Exit Strategy. Tom replied that he would highlight the changes.</p>
<p>Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda – Mike</p>	<p>Tom facilitated the Team Meeting closeout. Jacqueline read the new action items aloud for the team.</p> <p><u>Parking Lot</u></p> <p>Concern over source of product in the AOC2 – Winters, Schoolfield, Larry will discuss.</p> <p>Conflict over Panama City/Pensacola Partnering dates for John Schoolfield.</p> <p>There may be a travel funding issue for John Winters.</p> <p>John Schoolfield proposed holding the November meeting in Tallahassee instead of Jacksonville.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Action Item #03-09-06 – Jacqueline will review the TtNUS Tallahassee conference room schedule to check for availability and will look into the possibility of hosting the November NSA Panama City Partnering Meeting.</p> <p><u>Next Agenda</u> Pat asked if any changes would need to be made to the next agenda. Tom noted that SWMU 2 would probably be completed and would therefore be deleted from the schedule.</p> <p>-/+</p> <p>Tom - The meeting could have been a little longer. The timing worked out well, but if we want to look harder at data we might want to have a webcast instead of a teleconference.</p> <p>Chuck - Things went smoothly, we didn't really get stuck on anything. I agree with Tom that it'd be nice to have it as a webcast.</p> <p>Winters - Happy that things moved right on time. No negatives</p> <p>Rich - Agreed a webcast would have been nice.</p> <p>Schoolfield – Everything was easy to follow; it would have been easier to follow on a webcast.</p> <p>Rico - Glad everyone sent out their stuff on time to review, there was a lot more discussion early on, which helped things flow smoothly. I was just glad everyone was able to make it.</p> <p>Pat - I think you all did really well on time.</p> <p>Mike - Ditto on everything, everyone sending their stuff in advance was very helpful, it was easy to keep up, I wish we'd all been together to look at AOC2 to see the layout of the site and areas of discussion.</p> <p>Tom asked for feedback on timeliness of material distribution. Rich replied that most teams have a 1 week/3 days in advance general distribution rule. The team agreed that this approach might be beneficial and agreed to consider this for future meetings. The team thought a 3-day rule as proposed by Rico would be worth trying for the next meeting.</p>

**Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
March 23, 2009**

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
03-09-01	Tom Johnston			Tom Johnston will contact Arturo McDonald to provide support and attempt to resolve the CADD/GIS translation problem for the LUC maps update.
03-09-02	Rich May	Completed		Rich May will send an email with clarifications on exit strategy column meanings and RIP guidance.
03-09-03	John Winters		4/13/09	John Winters will check to see if additional documentation concerning the reasoning behind the proposed LUCs at G300 (as an alternative to additional sampling) is necessary, and then document approval.
03-09-04	John Winters		4/3/09	John Winters will write up a review letter for the verbal approval of recommendations – AOC2.
03-09-05	Tom Johnston, Rich May, & Larry Smith		4/3/09	Tom, Rich, and Larry will discuss/review the Exit Strategy and will update it according to the new RIP Date guidance; proposed revisions will be sent to Rico and Schoolfield by the end of next week (April 3 rd). The Exit Strategy must be completed by May 22 nd .
03-09-06	Jacqueline Strobl	Ongoing		Jacqueline will review the TtNUS Tallahassee conference room schedule to check for availability and will look into the possibility of hosting the November NSA Panama City Partnering Meeting.

Consensus Item No.	Consensus Item
1	December 11, 2008 Meeting minutes approved.