

N61331.AR.001786
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

FINAL MINUTES AND AGENDA FOR PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 24 MARCH
2010 CSS PANAMA CITY FL
3/24/2010
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
MARCH 24, 2010
PANAMA CITY (ST. ANDREWS STATE PARK), FLORIDA
FINAL**

Leader: Mike Clayton
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Tom Johnston
Location: Panama City, Florida

Attendees:

Michael Clayton	NSA PC	John Schoolfield	NAVFAC
Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link	SE	
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Larry Smith	TtNUS
		Jacqueline Strobl	TtNUS
Pat Franklin	Facilitator	(Scribe)	
Tom Johnston	TtNUS	John Winters	FDEP

	Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Eastern)	Category
	1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/	Mike	10:00 – 10:20	Info
	2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules	Mike	10:20 – 10:40	Info
	3	Building 278 Update - SRCR	John S./Larry	10:40 – 10:55	Status
	4	Building 325 - Parking Lot (focusing on AOC-1)	John S./Larry	10:55 – 11:10	Status
	5	G300 update and path forward	Rico/Larry	11:10 – 11:20	Status
	6	AOC 2 update on Ground Water data – (LUCs to be a future focus item)	Larry/John S.	11:20 – 11:50	Status
		Lunch	All	11:50 – 1:00	Fun
	7	Training	Facilitator	1:00 – 1:40	Educational
		Break	All	1:40 – 1:50	Needed
	8	South Dock update and path forward	Larry	1:50 – 2:00	Status
	9	AOC 1/free product detected at AOC 1 and path forward	Tom /Larry	2:00 – 2:40	Status
	10	SWMU 2 CMIP revision	Tom/Larry	2:40 – 3:00	Status
	11	Tier II Update	Rich	3:00 – 3:10	Info
		Break	All	3:10 – 3:20	Needed
	12	Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator	Arturo	3:20 – 3:30	Status
	13	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	John S./Tom	3:30 – 3:45	Concur
	13	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	John W.	3:45 – 4:00	Info

Meeting Schedule? Next Meeting's Leader and Time Keeper are?

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
Partnering Meeting
March 24, 2010**

**Leader: John Winters
Timekeeper: Michael Clayton
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Location: Panama City, Florida**

Attendees:

Mike Clayton	NSA PC	John Winters	FDEP
Larry Smith	TtNUS	Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Pat Franklin	Facilitator
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE		
Jacqueline Strobl	TtNUS (Scribe)		

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Check-In – Michael Clayton</p> <p>Check-In/Introductions/New Members/Opening Remarks/Head Count and Proxies/ Guests</p>	<p>Each meeting attendee provided a brief personal update.</p> <p>Introductions: None New Members: None Opening Remarks: None Proxies/Guests: None</p>
<p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/Approve Minutes/Agenda Changes/Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules – Michael Clayton</p>	<p>The team reviewed and updated the action item list. Changes to the meeting minutes were reviewed, approved, and finalized.</p> <p>The agenda timeslot for the G300 Update and Path Forward discussion was adjusted slightly to allow Rico Latham to join the meeting via teleconference at 11:15am.</p> <p>Pat Franklin led the team in review of the team vision and mission (as stated in the charter); the team took turns reading the ground rules aloud for the team.</p>
<p>Building 278 Update SRCR – John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided a status update on Building 278 and corresponding SRCR.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield noted that the electrical disconnect for the system on site had been completed. The system will not be decommissioned; instead, parts of the system may be utilized at other locations (e.g. NAS Whiting Field).</p> <p>Mr. Smith stated that the SRCR has been written as is currently undergoing internal review. The SRCR will be submitted to Mr. Schoolfield soon.</p> <p>Arturo McDonald asked whether or not quarterly sampling was still ongoing at the site. Mr. Smith replied</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>that it would depend on FDEP's comments on/approval of the SRCR.</p>
<p>Facility 325 - Parking Lot (focusing on AOC-1) - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided a status update on Facility.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield noted that the system/equipment there would be decommissioned, but that monitoring would continue.</p> <p>Further discussion took place on the details concerning tank removal. It has not yet been decided whether or not the tanks will be re-used or scrapped. If the tanks are to be scrapped, they will need to be tripled rinsed, and a hole will need to be cut out of them. It was noted that in order to dispose of them, a waste contractor would probably be necessary.</p> <p>Mr. Smith stated that they were still in the process of determining how to respond to FDEP comments from John Winters.</p> <p>Larry Smith also noted that during the last partnering meeting. Mr. Schoolfield had requested that a brief history for each site (one page per site) be put together. TtNUS is still reviewing these to determine data gaps in order to move forward. A conceptual site model figure may need to be added to the one page summaries. The conceptual site models should be reviewed and updated each year to reflect what is happening at the site (remediation, etc.).</p> <p>Mike Clayton asked for the inclusion of footnotes to provide document references. Mr. Smith responded that while there is currently a list of documents, there are some to which we don't have access.</p> <p>Tom Johnston noted that in the process of compiling the administrative record, there have been issues because the administrative record focuses on IR sites. NSA Panama City includes petroleum sites, so there have been some problems. Mr. Smith noted that in the attempt to determine a united path forward, as requested by Mr. Schoolfield, we are in a better position now; we are looking for things that we previously were unaware were missing.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that he would need to review things data and reports to make sure that we are really looking in the right wells. Details concerning the location of areas that had undergone remedial actions will need to be reviewed to determine whether or not we need to re-evaluate which wells need to be sampled. Mr. Winters went on to say</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>that it is important to have a clear goal, and then to obtain pertinent data that will allow us to reach that goal and to make sure that money isn't spent unwisely.</p> <p>Mr. Smith replied that after this sampling event, the data can be reviewed and the situation re-evaluated.</p>
<p>Break – 10:00</p>	<p>The next agenda item was postponed in order to allow Rico Latham to participate via teleconference at 11:15am.</p>
<p>AOC 2 update on Groundwater data – (LUCs to be a future focus item) - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>Mr. Smith provided an AOC 2 update on the groundwater data. The 2nd quarter of sampling has been completed; the corresponding monitoring report has been completed and submitted. The next sampling event is scheduled to be conducted in May. There have not been any exceedances. Additional discussion and review of the site history is necessary.</p> <p>Mr. Latham joined the NSA Panama City discussion via teleconference. The AOC 2 update was put on hold in order to allow time for the G300 Update and Path Forward discussion to take place.</p> <p>Further discussion on AOC 2 was postponed until after the facilitator training session.</p>
<p>G300 Update and Path Forward - Larry Smith & Rico Latham</p>	<p>Mr. Smith and Mr. Latham provided an update on G300 and path forward.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that they have now had 2 quarters of monitoring without free product. There have been some SCTL exceedances, but samples were collect a few inches above and a few inches below the water table. We did fractionate those; 1 or 2 were in exceedance, and we know that we have floating product. Six soil samples were collected; of those that were in question were submitted for fractionation, only 1 of the 12 was in exceedance (and not by much).</p> <p>In summary, we know that we don't have contamination from 0-5 feet. Down at the water table, we do have contamination, and fractionation shows that it is still a concern. Based on what we see now, and pending the 4th quarter sampling results, we'll probably submit an SRCR to FDEP. There will be LUCs due to remaining product. This appears to fit under RMO 2 so far. Any type of construction under 5 feet shouldn't be an issue. The LUCs could include monitoring the down gradient well every 2 years or so. Then we could try to close it to any further remedial activity. It appears to fit under RMO2 based on what has been observed so far.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Winters noted his concerns over the smear zone and stated that the LUC should restrict digging in addition to restricting the use of groundwater. He also suggested that due to the change in the direction of groundwater flow, MW3 should be sampled, noting that it had hits in the past.</p> <p>Rich May asked for further clarification on the anticipated monitoring that would be apart of the LUCs. Mr. Smith stated that it monitoring may need to take place ever 2 years; Mr. Winters commented that it may sufficient to conduct monitoring every 5 years instead.</p> <p>Mr. May noted that this was essentially a LTMP then, and that there will need to plans to include funding for monitoring in addition to the inspections of the LUCs.</p> <p>The team briefly discussed the possibility that these sites will be eligible to qualify for ERN funding. Mr. Latham stated that these were being reviewed on a case by case basis. Furthermore, Mr. Latham noted that the LUCs and the monitoring would have separate funding.</p>
<p>Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Arturo McDonald</p>	<p>Mr. McDonald provided an update on the Navy Operations Support Center Closure Assessment.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald explained that a few months ago, they had come across some USTs. In the process of trying to determine details corresponding to these USTs, they found a discharge report submitted to FDEP. Mr. Winters had assisted in helping them obtain a corresponding closure report. One of the conclusions had been that it wasn't likely that the contamination was related to the tank, because the contamination was from chlorinated solvents, while the tank had been used for gas. It had been suggested that it was more likely that the contamination had a different, nearby source. The possibility also existed that the tank may have stored chlorinated solvents at one time. Unfortunately, this site fell through the cracks. Nothing was ever done about it, and it is outside the current permit. The issue now is how to go about addressing this.</p> <p>Mr. Clayton stated that they would need Mr. Latham and/or Mr. Schoolfield to determine which program this will need to be handled under.</p> <p>Mr. Latham stated that this had been taken off his desk, and was now in the hands of Robbie Darby and Helen Lockhard. He also noted that it was important to determine what they are required to do in order to determine what needs to happen.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Winters noted that in his review of the closure report he had noticed that there weren't any soil samples collected. Furthermore, he stated that realistically, we don't know whether or not any soil contamination remained. It was noted that both MTBE and 1, 1 DCE were above the standard, groundwater would be an issue, and that soil may need to be assessed as well.</p> <p>Mr. Winters provided some background information on the issue noting that the districts and cities were supposed to be overseeing these closure reports to go to a federal closure report. The report was never formally submitted to FDEP, but it did get entered into the FDEP database.</p> <p>Mr. Clayton noted that this had started when they had been in the process of performing some field work, when they had noticed a day tank and associated piping. It was then assumed that at some point a tank must have been there, so they investigated further.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted again, that the issue was that several discharge notifications were not followed up on. No one knew who was supposed to be working on these. Miscommunication concerning who had responsibility has led to several of these types of issues. The regulatory agents in the districts were supposed to oversee the tank closures, but they didn't say what needed to happen next. When this became a 770 case it should have come to FDEP. No one knew who needed to claim responsibility for the next step.</p> <p>Further team discussion concerning what would be necessary to proceed as well as the issue of funding. Mr. Latham noted that he hadn't been involved in this situation and stated that they may need a letter or further instruction in order to proceed with remedying the situation.</p> <p>Further discussion led to the following action items:</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-01: John Winters - Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Eric Nuzzi and Jim Crane to determine how this process is supposed to work. (Due 4/2)</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-02: Rico Latham - Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Mike Davenport and Bill Burns to determine whether or not this site should be declared a 770 or 780 site, and determine who to contact (county/district).</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Action Item # A-03-10-03: John Schoolfield - Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Robbie Darby to determine whether or not this will be considered a new official site, and whether or not a letter from FDEP will be required to proceed (Tank Closure – Tallahassee) NOS Location.</p> <p>Team discussion then turned to the issue of the skimmer/separator on the reserve center in Tallahassee. Mr. Clayton provided details concerning the skimmer/separator and noted that though this was not a regulated system, they wanted to make sure they closed it out properly. The proposed plan is to fill it in, not remove it entirely.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that he would be concerned about how much oil may have soaked into the concrete. While its nowhere near the water table (which means there shouldn't be a groundwater issue) it might be a good idea to take some soil samples if the plan is to close it in place. This topic will require research.</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-04: John Winters – Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Determine whether there are regulations on close out for the oil skimmer/separator. (Due 4/2)</p>
<p>Lunch</p>	
<p>Facilitation Training - Pat Franklin</p>	<p>Pat Franklin led the team in facilitation training on consensus. The team split into two groups to review a team exercise on consensus, then returned to discuss each groups responses.</p>
<p>AOC 2 update on Ground Water data – (LUCs to be a future focus item) - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>The team resumed discussion on AOC 2.</p> <p>Mr. Smith continued the AOC 2 update, noting that at the last partnering meeting Mr. Winters had made comments about the AOC 2 South Dock area, which seems to have contamination. We know that at one time we had free product; we know we have soil contamination in the vadose zone. The Navy has had a SAR and 3 RAPs completed in an attempt to resolve things. At the last meeting it became apparent that we had differences in what some team members thought was the end goal.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that at the last meeting Mr. Winters asked whether or not it was possible to put together a comprehensive map that would assist in understanding all possible sources for petroleum. In response, Mr. Smith produced a map; the basis of the map is utilities,</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>and shows the past distribution pipelines used to move material from the 2000? Gallon tank (check w/ LS on pipe dimensions mentioned). Mr. Smith noted that on this map, the point of connection of the 3" diesel piping and the 3" gasoline piping to the system was not shown. Theoretically, these lines closed properly. The area where CH2M Hill was digging in AOC 2 appears to match. This shows that a significant number of pipelines may have leaked in the past. Mr. Smith noted that he had included USTs on the map, but not ASTs. (See attached map).</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that he had found the SAR, which said that AOC 2 was located in a developed area. The SAR mentions all of the surrounding sites.</p> <p>Mr. May noted that since the new team members, Mr. Schoolfield and Mr. Winters, had joined, the team had neglected to specifically mention and make them aware that AOC 2 was not the issue, but instead the area as a whole.</p> <p>Mr. Smith provided a map of the fixed based groundwater analytical results from 2006; groundwater exceedances were noted. Mr. May noted that this was the data that was used for the design and removal, and that it was likely that it was the last bit of data prior to the removal.</p> <p>Mr. Smith then began covering the fixed base soil analytical results, noting several were marked "NS" (not sampled) due to FID screening.</p> <p>Mr. Smith went on to say that in his opinion this site, like many other sites that have been going on for 40 years, should have microbes eating things away. Additional work may need to be performed to have a better understanding of the big picture. We need to keep in mind that while this site had free product, biodegradation may have gotten it to the point where we need to do another study. Possible options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassessment of the areas to see if they meet the criteria • Focus funding on LUCs • Extend LUCs for the South Dock area down to AOC 2 since it's nearby. <p>Mr. Clayton noted that the LUCs were a part of the long term planning at South Dock, but the other areas might need to be reassessed. Upon further discussion,</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Clayton stated that the LUC areas would need to be defined both vertically and horizontally.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that because most of the area is covered in black-top, its not surprising to find clean samples, because infiltration is not an issue. The area that would need to be investigated would be huge, so it may be more cost effective keep a 3 foot deep LUC active on the entire area, and then to investigate specific areas as needed, instead of doing an extensive assessment.</p> <p>Mr. Clayton replied that in the master plans, whenever a LUC is put in place, they take the whole area out of the realm of being a possibility for construction, so an as needed approach wouldn't really work.</p> <p>Further team discussion on creating more defined LUCs noted that the main concern was soil, not water. The team determined that the goal would be to define/limit the area of the LUCs, sample soil, examine hotspots, and then confirm that contamination is below SCTLs and leachability in order to reduce the size of the LUC area.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted that the main focus should be on soil and that there was no need to worry about the water, which we know is not clean, until the soil above it has been addressed.</p> <p>Consensus Item # C-03-10-01: The AOC 2 Path Forward will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better define/identify the LUC area • Examine historical data to determine where to sample • Confirmatory soil sampling • Don't worry about groundwater for now
<p>South Dock Update and Path Forward - Larry Smith</p>	<p>Mr. Smith noted that this was the same type of scenario as AOC 2 and that it was acknowledged that the necessary funding/technology to address the contamination beneath the platform was not available. LUCs will be necessary.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald asked whether not the LUC boundaries could be defined and drawn up yet.</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-05: Larry Smith – South Dock Update and Path Forward - Produce a straw man CADD map of the LUCs for the team to review.</p>
<p>AOC 1/Free Product Detected at AOC 1 and Path Forward - Tom Johnston & Larry Smith</p>	<p>Tom Johnston noted that the LUCs have changed, and that Chuck Metz was in the process of updating the CMIP because it contained some old data. The document will be reissued.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p data-bbox="721 264 1398 352">Action Item # A-03-10-06: Tom Johnston - AOC 1 – Send updated SWMU 2 boundary to Arturo McDonald.</p> <p data-bbox="721 390 1398 659">Tom Johnston provided handouts to the team and began reviewing site history details. Specifically it was noted that there were conflicting reports concerning the actual location of the pit used in the fire fighter training area, which had solvents and non-chlorinated solvents dumped and burned in it during the 1970s. Mr. Johnston noted that the aerial photographs seem to suggest that the location may have been a little further west than the area currently assumed to be the pit location.</p> <p data-bbox="721 695 1398 1083">Bioslurping removed 53,000 lbs of product. It was predicted that free product might return. The 1996 RFI report noted that the free product had been determined to be heavy oil, and that the highest COC concentration was at 25 feet below the area. Predominant groundwater flow was eastward; recent measurements have shown the same. Most of the free product removed was near the northwest corner of Building 399 at piezometer location PZ-3. The Statement of Basis states that this site was MNA with LUCs. The issue of free product had been over-looked, as it was a distant memory by that time. When we tried to perform the well abandonment, free product was encountered.</p> <p data-bbox="721 1119 1398 1297">The current situation is that now we know we have free product in the ground; some sampling and DPT screening of the site has been performed. Mr. Johnston provided a DPT figure, based on a grid of results from a 2004X sampling event. It appears that at the time more field screening data was collected than lab data.</p> <p data-bbox="721 1333 1398 1388">Mr. Smith noted that most of the info was looking at methane and included both filtered and unfiltered data.</p> <p data-bbox="721 1423 1398 1724">Mr. Johnston stated that there had been a lot of OVA investigation. The contours are consistent with other contours for free product contamination. Mr. Johnston went on to state that the highest OVA readings were in the 5' to 25' range <u>below land surface</u>. The water table is at approximately 7' and most of the wells are shallow or intermediate. The COC concentrations have decreased significantly near St. Andrews Bay. The extended flow path provides sufficient time for the contaminants to become diluted or attenuated.</p> <p data-bbox="721 1759 1398 1850">Mr. Johnston reviewed the conceptual site model, noting that the model proposed in the 1996 RFI appeared to be correct. While there doesn't appear to be a significant</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>amount of chlorinatedd contamination present, it is likely that there if free product under the water table, and under the building. The probe study determined that the free product<u>groundwater contamination</u> was not entering the St. Andrews Bay.</p> <p>Based on the presence of free product near the building, confirmed during groundwater sampling, this site cannot be closed. The current LTM program focuses on the wells near St. Andrews Bay. The majority of the wells were placed by the bay because the focus had been on protecting the bay. The latest data from the OHC report from March 2009 indicated that the NFA <u>GCTL</u> was exceeded for 2<u>multiple contaminants</u> in groundwater and soil.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston went on to say that NFA could not be recommended. Following additional efforts to investigate the free product, the proposed recommendation is to conduct LTM in select wells (see Figure 2, which shows current free product thickness). Mr. Johnston went on to state that he would propose keeping some of the wells that we currently have, but also adding a few additional wells.</p> <p>Further discussion took place concerning proposed sampling locations. Mr. Winters noted that he was more concerned about what may be leaching rather than the free product itself. He also noted that he'd reviewed the contaminants of concern for petroleum sites and had noted that he wasn't sure if we'd ever looked at EDB. Mr. Winters recommended adding a couple more constituents to the list. Mr. Smith replied that EDB may not have been an additive at the time. This may need to be looked into.</p> <p>Mr. Winters expressed his concern that the site as a whole be considered, not just small sections, in order to be protective of human health and the environment.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that there is a lot of information spread over several reports. The RFI report suggests that the surface is pretty clean, however, fill had been brought in when the surface was covered with blacktop. This may have diluted things a bit, which would explain why its only-clean to <u>about 2" ft bls</u>. What we are left with is that we still have contamination in the soil, we still have free product, and there may be some leaching. Mr. Johnston went on to say that what he'd like to do is come up with and agreed list of wells to monitor. Mr. Johnston proposed that the existing wells be used first, then a determination can be made on whether or not additional wells will be necessary.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. McDonald asked whether or not air quality was a concern. Mr. Clayton replied that there had been an air quality study performed a while back. Mr. Smith noted that if there is an existing document concerning air quality, he would like to make sure it is included as an appendix.</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-07: Rich May & Larry Smith – AOC 1 - Ask Gerry Walker about the Indoor Air Quality Study on Building 399.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston led the team in review of the well sampling list. An effort will be made to use the existing wells, then to take a look at what might be leaching into the groundwater. Following this round of data, the list would be updated to drop out old wells and include new wells as necessary.</p> <p>Consensus Item # C-03-10-02: AOC 1 – Proceed with sampling listed wells.</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-08: Tom Johnston - AOC 1 – Send the team a list of the recommended wells and analytes.</p> <p>The team began to discuss what analyses to run. Mr. Johnston suggested including the entire degradation chain in order to address determine whether or not chlorinated solvents are an issue. This would be an expansion of the current organic analyte list. Mr. Winters requested the addition of EDB and suggested dropping the geochemical parameters.</p> <p>Consensus Item # C-03-10-03: AOC 1 – Analyte list agreed upon <u>with eh junderstanding that Tom Jhonsnto would review all pertinent data and alter the list to meet the expectations of the partnering team.</u>(see Tom Johnston for details).</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted that <u>62-770 F.A.C.</u> includes a table of COCs to look for in soil and groundwater, as well as methods to use.</p> <p>Further team discussion took place on whether or not Building 98 had a close out document and whether or not an SRCO could be obtained. It was noted that AOC 1 is considered to be separate from Building 98; LUCs are only in place for AOC1. Mr. Smith noted that <u>the main</u> concern was to make sure that the soils weren't affecting the groundwater.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Johnston noted that the free product <u>extent</u> had been pretty well defined. Mr. Winters stated that the blacktop appeared to fall into a low area, which may cause a more westerly flow <u>of groundwater</u>.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted contour line errors on Figure ?</p> <p>Mr. Johnston recommended continuing bailing the free product as it is encountered. In addition to that, bailing free product should take place at the piezometers.</p> <p>Mr. Winters requested that these recommendations be included in the next report.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston suggested going to an FTMR, then discuss in depth which wells to use for LTM.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston asked whether or not dioxin—EDB, and dioxane should be included in this round, or if they should wait until the next round. Mr. Winters replied that this could wait.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that for the next report, it would be worthwhile to add in the DPT data. Mr. Johnston expressed that he was uncertain about mobile lab data quality. The info did not seem to make senses compared to the screening results. It may be more confusing to add this info rather than leave it out.</p> <p>Mr. May noted that the air quality discussion had taken place between September 2003 and August 2004. It was unclear whether or not the air quality study was ever actually performed.</p>
<p>SWMU 10 - Tom Johnston</p>	<p>Mr. Johnston stated that the recommendation was to discontinue monitoring, but to retain the groundwater LUCs due to the arsenic/manganese exceedances. It may help to see how these metals are being handled at other sites.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that currently SWMU 10 is on annual monitoring. If monitoring could be held in conjunction with AOC 1, it could be monitored quarterly. The source area well as well as one down gradient should be sampled; consecutive rounds of data will be necessary.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald asked whether or not this would allow LUCs to be lifted.</p> <p>Mr. Winters replied that it would have to be shown that arsenic was no longer an issue <u>and that soil would have to be demonstrated to be free of leachable contamination</u>; sampling should be semi-annually, but quarterly would be fine.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Consensus Item # C-03-10-04: SWMU 10 – Quarterly sampling will be conducted to monitor arsenic.</p>
<p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p>	<p>Mr. May provided a brief Tier II update. Specifically, he noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exit Strategy needed by noon on Monday • Mr. Smith will be attending basic of partnering training in April • There is an interim replacement for Earl Bozeman.
<p>CAMP/Exit Strategy Review - John Schoolfield & Tom Johnston</p>	<p>Mr. Johnston lead the team in review of the CAMP/Exit Strategy. No updates were made to the CAMP. The Exit Strategy was updated as follows (see updated Exit Strategy):</p> <p>SMW10 – Added text to comments: “limited number of wells remaining in the program”</p> <p>AOC 1 – No new concerns. Typo corrected. Added text to comments: “interim monitoring strategy has been devised.”</p> <p>G300 – No change.</p> <p>UST 1 – Building 278 - Added text to comments: “SVE equipment removed/transferred. Site has met NFA, SRCR in review.”</p> <p>UST 2 – Building 325 - Added text to comments: “SVE equipment removed/transferred.”</p> <p>AOC 2 - Added text to comments: “Reviewing/re-evaluating contamination boundaries. Considering additional investigation to establish LUC boundaries. Confirming south dock as part of AOC2.”</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-09: Tom Johnston – Exit Strategy – Send Exit Strategy to the team.</p> <p>Action Item # A-03-10-10: Larry Smith – Revise Path Forward with CSM figure for active sites.</p>
<p>Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda –</p>	<p>The team began meeting closeout by reviewing all the new action items.</p> <p>Proposed meeting dates:</p> <p><u>June 30th (Alternate date June 29th)</u></p> <p>Tom Johnston = Leader Rich May = Time Keeper</p> <p>Proposed Topics:</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>AOC2 Update AOC1 Review Data & Revise Monitoring Strategy G300 Status – 5 min update Building 278 Tallahassee Status Building 325</p> <p><u>September 15th (Alternate date September 14th)</u></p> <p>Rich May = Leader Arturo McDonald = Time Keeper</p> <p>Pat Franklin provided facilitator feedback noting that timing had been an issue. In order to improve capture of action/consensus items bring flip chart.</p> <p>+ Deer Lunch was good Good discussion John Schoolfield came date early to help dismantling SVE system Good meeting room Thorough review of AOC1 Several paths forward established</p> <p>Δ Rico not in person State should keep comment brief AOC1 needed additional time Figures on AOC1 got confusing Presentation not projected on screen. Larry's screen saver</p>

New Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
March 23, 2010

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-03-10-01	John Winters	Ongoing	4/2	Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Eric Nuzzi and Jim Crane to determine how this process is supposed to work.
A-03-10-02	Rico Latham	Ongoing		Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Mike Davenport and Bill Burns to determine whether or not this site should be declared a 770 or 780 site, and determine who to contact (county/district).
A-03-10-03	John Schoolfield	Ongoing		Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Contact Robbie Darby to determine whether or not this will be considered a new official site, and whether or not a letter from FDEP will be required to proceed (Tank Closure – Tallahassee) NOS Location.
A-03-10-04	John Winters	Ongoing	4/2	Navy Operations Support Center: Closure Assessment/Oil Water Separator - Determine whether there are regulations on close out for the oil skimmer/separator.
A-03-10-05	Larry Smith	Ongoing		South Dock Update and Path Forward - Produce a straw man CADD map of the LUCs for the team to review.
A-03-10-06	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	<u>4/8</u>	AOC 1 – Send updated SWMU 2 <u>groundwater LUC</u> boundary to Arturo McDonald.
A-03-10-07	Rich May & Larry Smith	Ongoing		AOC 1 - Ask Gerry Walker about the Indoor Air Quality Study on Building 399.
A-03-10-08	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	<u>4/8</u>	AOC 1 – Send the team a list of the recommended wells and analytes.
A-03-10-09	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	<u>4/8</u>	Exit Strategy – Send Exit Strategy to the team.
A-03-10-10	Larry Smith	Ongoing		Revise Path Forward with CSM figure for active sites.

Consensus Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
March 23, 2010

Consensus Item No.	Consensus Item
C-03-10-01	The AOC 2 Path Forward will be as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better define/identify the LUC area • Examine historical data to determine where to sample • Confirmatory soil sampling • Don't worry about groundwater for now
C-03-10-02	AOC 1 – Proceed with sampling listed wells.
C-03-10-03	AOC 1 – Analyte list agreed upon (see Tom Johnston for details).
C-03-10-04	SWMU 10 – Quarterly sampling will be conducted to monitor arsenic.

Ongoing Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-12-09-01	John Winters	Ongoing	3/26/10	Send out the example (PARM/SRCR) to the team.
A-12-09-02	Tom Johnston & Larry Smith	Ongoing	6/1/10	Respond to FDEP comments (See previous meeting minutes for previous action items).
A-08-09-07	Larry Smith and John Schoolfield	Ongoing	6/1/10	Respond to John Winters' comments regarding AOC1.