

N61331.AR.001787
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

DRAFT MINUTES AND AGENDA FOR PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 14
SEPTEMBER 2010 CSS PANAMA CITY FL
9/14/2010
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
September 14, 2010
PANAMA CITY (ST. ANDREWS STATE PARK), FLORIDA**

Leader: Larry Smith
Scribe: Juanita Sapp
Timekeeper: Arturo Mc Donald

TtNUS TOM
TtNUS Support Staff
Contractor Dude/NSA PC

Other Attendees:

Michael Clayton	NSA PC	John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE RPM
Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link	Richard Lee	NSA PC
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	John Winters	FDEP RPM
Gus Campana	Facilitator	Erico Latham	NAVFAC SE RPM
Tom Johnston	TtNUS TOM	Juanita Sapp	TtNUS Scribe

 Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Local)	Category
1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/	Larry	9:00 – 9:30	Info.
2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules	Larry	9:30 – 9:45	Info.
3	Building 278 Update	John S./Larry	9:45 – 9:55	Status
4	Building 325 Update	John S./Larry	9:55 – 10:05	Status
5	G300 Update	Larry	10:05 – 10:15	Status
6	AOC 2 Update/Path Forward	Larry/John S.	10:15 – 10:30	Status
	Break	All	10:30 – 10:40	Needed
7	Annual Inspections?	Larry/John S.	10:40 – 11:30	Decision
	Lunch	J. Michael's	11:30 – 1:00	Fun
8	Training	Gus	1:00– 1:45	Educational
9	Tier II Update	From Rich	1:45 – 1:55	Info
10	AOC 1 Update/Path Forward	Tom/John S.	1:55 – 2:25	Info
	Break	All	2:25 – 2:35	Needed
11	Navy Operations Support Center: UST Closure Assessment	John W./John S.	2:35 – 2:50	Status
12	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	John S./Tom	2:50 – 3:20	Concur
13	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	Larry	3:20 – 3:40	Info.

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
Partnering Meeting
September 14, 2010**

**Leader: Larry Smith
Timekeeper: Arturo McDonald
Scribe: Juanita Sapp
Location: Panama City, Florida**

Attendees:

Mike Clayton	NSA PC	Larry Smith	TtNUS
Tom Johnston	TtNUS	John Winters	FDEP
Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link	Erico Latham	NAVFAC SE RPM (Call-in)
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Richard Lee	NSA PC
Gus Campana	Facilitator	Juanita Sapp	TtNUS (Scribe)
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE		

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Check-In – Larry Smith</p> <p>Check-In/Introductions/New Members/Opening Remarks/Head Count and Proxies/ Guests</p>	<p>The meeting began with an introduction of new member Richard Lee and new scribe Juanita Sapp.</p> <p>Each meeting attendee provided a brief personal update.</p> <p>Erico Latham was unable to attend this partnering meeting, but will call in for the G300 presentation/discussion.</p> <p>Introductions: None New Members: Richard Lee, Juanita Sapp Opening Remarks: None Proxies/Guests: John Winters for Rico Latham, if necessary. Larry Smith for Rich May.</p>
<p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/Approve Minutes/Agenda Changes/Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules – Larry Smith</p>	<p>Larry S. reviewed the action items from the last meeting.</p> <p>Building 98: Arturo McDonald found the Building 98 Closure Report dated Dec. 1977. John Winters will review the document in order to determine if the site is eligible for closure.</p> <p>Meeting minutes from June 2010 were approved. Team chartering ground rules, last revision 2008, Vision – approved Mission – approved Standard agenda – approving action items should be done last, ground rules should be done first. Ground rules – approved John Schoolfield updated the Team with his new contact information.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>Building 278 Update - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided an update on Building 278. Larry Smith handed out copies of the Site Rehabilitation Completion Report for Building 278. Larry Smith showed figures of Building 278 where underground storage tanks (USTs) were removed (near Building 278). A Site Rehabilitation Completion Report was issued to Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).</p> <p>A-0910-01: Building 278: John Winters will review the SRCR by 9/30/10.</p>
<p>Building 325 Update - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided the Team with an update on Building 325.</p> <p>Building 325 previously had subsurface tanks, and currently has above ground diesel tanks (ASTs). Larry Smith presented a map highlighting areas of groundwater concern. The continual cause of detections exceeding Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels (GCTLs) needs to be investigated.</p> <p>One possibility of continued contamination was that soil contamination still exists just above the water table. As the water table rises, groundwater becomes contaminated by the contaminants from soil.</p> <p>Another possible theory for the continued contamination was that a plugged drain near the diesel tanks may be contaminating the groundwater. If trucks spilled fuel while filling the ASTs and then subsequent rain carried contaminants toward the old drain, the drain may be the source of contamination.</p> <p>One possible remediation solution discussed was releasing ORC - Oxygen Release Compound which react with contaminates in groundwater. Another possible remedial approach discussed were the installation of ISOCs which, introduce oxygen into the water using a diffuser (micro bubbles of oxygen are released). ISOC technology costs more money than ORC. Both technologies provide clean up of contamination with minimal destruction of concrete. John Winters suggested that the remediation would need to be thorough or contamination might be missed.</p> <p>The site at Building 325 consists of a lot of concrete and gravel. If gases can move ten feet either side of the center area of the site, ISOC wells could be installed at four or five points. John Winters, suggested that contamination may be further from the wells than what is known. He suggested eight locations versus four or five,</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>and to conduct further testing where higher hits have been found., He also suggested the installation of a temporary well where higher detections were found.</p> <p>The oil water separator at the facility has a reserve tank, below which is a wash rack. The wash rack should be included in the contamination investigation. John Winters would prefer to test 15 or 20 locations at the site to further delineate the contamination. <i>Used to be underground heating tank 15 yrs ago but not contamination but could be still showing up on drawing.</i></p> <p>Larry Smith will determine the investigation approach and review types of systems (i.e. active soil vapor passive – 2-day test or a combination of soil vapor tests, use FID and generate map). It was discussed that problems may be encountered relative to subsurface utilities. It was also noted that there will be a need to be careful around paved areas, which show higher readings under the concrete. It is possible that samples could be collected below the concrete and tested.</p> <p>A-0910-02: Building 325: Larry Smith will determine the investigation approach and review various testing methods that could be performed. Due 11/30/10</p>
<p>G300 Update – Larry Smith</p>	<p>Larry Smith provided the Team with an historic overview and current update on Site G300.</p> <p>The UST was removed. Floating product was previously found in the wells installed near the building There has been no free product in well for almost 18 months. Rico suggested that the Team think in terms of the path forward in order to close the site. A proposal had been made to John Winters to close the site. There are still low levels of contamination. The path forward would include soil samples. Soil samples from the 0-4 foot depth were clean, soil contamination from the 5 -6 foot capillary zone might be interfering with the groundwater., From 5 feet below land surface to the water table, a Land Use Control (LUC) could be placed on the soils and groundwater. Restrictions might include that groundwater would not be used for any source water, and no digging deeper than 4 ft without special OSHA training (allows for normal construction). Tetra tech has been monitoring the wells for two quarters. Ground water flow is generally the same direction (southeast). Tetra Tech resampled wells last week and found no free product, however, a light sheen was noted in one of the wells. Analytical data from the lab should be in later this month. The annual report will include recommendation that LUCs be placed and the wells be sampled annually</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>or bi-annually.</p> <p>Erico had no additional comments on the site. John Winters suggested checking the wells for product every 5 yrs to make sure there is no free product. For every year with the LUC certificate, the wells would be checked for free product. John Winters suggested that wells not be abandoned, but have a maintenance plan. He also suggested sampling at least three wells every five years. He indicated the Team could keep only the wells to be sampled and abandon the others. Helen Lockard suggested that it needs to be paid for by NAVFAC, (no date suggested but should roll over by 2016).</p>
<p>AOC 2 update/Path Forward - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith presented the Team with an update on AOC2. Larry Smith projected a map of the initial excavation area. He indicated all of the proposed excavation area could not be removed. Product was found in the junction box and fuel lines. Quarterly samples were taken for a year, and did not find significant product after cleanup. Larry Smith presented detailed AOC2 history and a history of what was implemented at the site. Larry Smith also brought maps depicting the number of samples taken in the area over a 10 year period. One proposed option to move forward was to sample soil in the 4-6 foot below land surface range at approximately 15 previously known contaminated sample locations. Methods could be run for FL-PRO and MADEP to determine if natural attenuation has occurred and COCs are below clean up criteria SCTLs <u>and WGM</u>.</p> <p>Samples would be screened using a flame ionized detector (FID). Screened samples that exceeded the project action limit (PAL) would subsequently be sent to a fixed based laboratory and analyzed by the FL-PRO method; those samples that exceed FL-PRO criteria would then be analyzed by MADEP (or equivalent).</p> <p>AOC2 is north of Southdock. Problems surrounding the LUC at Southdock in relation to AOC2 include how much further north should sampling extend, and if the area around AOC2 should require LUCs. Clear distinctions of where to sample south of AOC2 and north of Southdock should be determined.</p> <p>Once samples are collected at the 15 locations, the goal would be to write a SAR with recommendation of no further action (if the issue is resolved). Only 15 of the 38 wells would be sampled due to inaccessibility of the other 23 wells. A report would need to be written stating that these locations can't be accessed and need to have LUCs. Then, if the problem arose that the wells had to be</p>

Comment [t1]: Need to explain what issue.

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>accessed, it would be done in the recommended way.</p> <p>If the inaccessible areas are made accessible by demolition, they need to be sampled.</p> <p>One main concern is how far north does the LUC extend from the Southdock area.</p> <p>More samples may need to be collected to show that they are clean along that line.</p> <p>Piezometers were checked about a month ago and did not find anything.</p> <p>A0910-03: AOC 2: Larry Smith will email the path forward so John Winters can review and comment. Due 11/15/10</p>
Break	
Annual Inspections – Larry Smith & John Schoolfield	<p>LUC certificate submittal is due in November 2010. An outside contractor checked facility LUCs and some signs need to be replaced or installed. All LUC sites may need to be in the Base Master Plan with locations and a map of sensitive areas. Suggested signage should be placed reasonably. John Winters stated that warning signs should be placed as quoted in the 62-730 FAC.</p> <p>Signs should be visible within 75 feet of the LUC. The rule does not indicate the number of signs you need. John Winters will review and present his findings about signage to make sure it is acceptable for everyone.</p> <p>J. Schoolfield installed some signs by nailing them to trees. He asked whether this is permitted. Mike Clayton indicated that “Joanie” is the person to talk to about the tree questions.</p> <p>John Schoolfield brought some locking well caps because some of the wells were not locked. He will be replacing them or putting a lock on if there is currently no lock in place. He reminded the Team to make sure contractors are locking the wells as the NAVFAC thinks they should be secured. TtNUS should be involved in the decision about the locking process.</p>
Lunch	
Training – Gus Campana	<p>Gus Campana gave a presentation to the Team on partnering training. Gus Campana indicated the expectations for Richard Lee about other Team members:</p>

Comment [t2]: Which line?

Comment [t3]: Which piezometers?

Comment [t4]: What does anything refer to? Oil? Dissolved chemicals?> Etc?

Comment [t5]: Sensitive in what way?

Comment [t6]: Is there an action item here?

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>John Winters – be prepared to communicate, call if he has questions.</p> <p>Mike Clayton - be prepared, reasonable response to communications, Arturo – attend partnering training – John Schoolfield – observe Arturo, keep John informed about base issues. Construction plans on controlled areas need to be made known in advance , especially concerning budget issues.</p> <p>Tom Johnston– don't be afraid to disagree, voice your issues, know the sites, and view Arturo as a valuable resource regarding site histories.</p> <p>Larry Smith - getting response to emails, part of being on partnering team is communication. Keep an interest and learn as much as possible. Partnering is opportunity for everyone to communicate and voice their suggestions.</p> <p>Gus Campano – expects the Team to be fair, open and honest, and abide by ground rules.</p> <p>Richard Lee – likes the partnering approach because it communicates everything and no one is blindsided. Does not like to miss dates, wants to know more about when things are due. Believes more communication is better.</p> <p>A-0910-04: Training: Gus Campano will email the Team his training presentation next week.</p>
<p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p>	<p>Larry Smith, as proxy for Rich May, presented the Team with a Tier II update.</p> <p>Larry Smith read through the notes to discuss how it would impact Tier I. He highlighted the importance of exit strategies (due in November 2010).</p> <p>Rich May usually goes to Orlando to present the Team's report. If the Team goes to Orlando, they may need pictures for the PowerPoint presentation.</p> <p>Mike Clayton said the Panama City base will implement RapidGate. It was originally thought to be delayed, but is still on schedule for Oct 1, 2010. Contractors and vendors will still be able to get one day passes. One option is to send an email to the gate each day, as there has not been any written directive yet. Camille will be working to discuss how regulators will access installations. This information was up to date as of August 30th 2010. Mike Clayton will stay in touch to keep the Team up to date on this issue.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Update CAMP, addressed in this meeting.</p> <p>Richard Lee is point of contact for Rapidgate</p> <p>A-0910-05: Tier II: John Winters will review review what needs to be in CAMP. Due 9/30/10</p>
<p>AOC 1 Update / Path Forward – Tom Johnston & John Schoolfield</p>	<p>Tom Johnston and John Schoolfield gave a presentation on AOC 1. AOC1 was a former fire fighter area. Tom Johnston gave a brief history of AOC 1. There is still some free product at AOC 1. Free product thickness increases and decreases based on rainfall.</p> <p>AOC 1 is currently in a monitoring phase. John Schoolfield informed Tom Johnston about potential plans to construct a new building that would overlap areas of AOC 1. Tom showed where this potential overlap would be. Some AOC 1 buildings are scheduled for demolition (in master plan), and there were some questions about where firefighter pit was. Team members indicated they thought it was west of Building 399. Tom Johnston mapped the soil contamination based on field screening data. The west edge is where highest oil contamination level was. but the area of greatest contamination level has moved around over the years. Mike Clayton said the field screening data would be helpful to delineate dig area limitations. Based on field screening contours, LUC boundaries need to be expanded,.</p> <p>Larry Smith and OneStop contractors have scheduled collection of groundwater levels and free product thickness twice a week at six locations around Building 399. Values have varied from non-detect to 1.5 feet of product thickness. When free product is found, the well is bailed to remove product. In one piezometer (PZ-3), the product thickness recovered 50 percent in about 20 minutes during a January field event but that piezometer has been dry lately and is not being monitored. Six locations are currently monitored</p> <p>Larry Smith spent time with OneStop employees to show them how to use the oil water interface equipment. The OneStop employees are all OSHA trained. Since OneStop personnel have been measuring the six locations, the Team has accumulated more data . Tom Johnston and Larry Smith plotted the free product thickness data. In January 3, 2010, product levels were a half foot in thickness. Larry Smith asked if there had been significant rain fall in the area recently. Mike Clayton answered yes there had been significant rainfalls several days in a row. August was very wet, but September has been fairly dry. Changes in water levels</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>have been significant and uniform. It is a goal to eventually look at rainfall and free product thickness relationships. If water levels get higher, it is possible to see the free product thickness increase. After January 2010, free product thickness appears to be fluctuating in a narrow range, and right now the Team doesn't have a predictor.</p> <p>Given what is known, the boundary at AOC 1 may need to be expanded. The Team needs to decide what and the frequency of monitoring. One consideration is whether bi-ennial sampling would be sufficient, including some key wells near St. Andrew Bay</p> <p>Ideas proposed included: Picking one or two wells to sample at the source and pick several at the bay, every so often throwing in more wells into the monitoring group.</p> <p>The Team asked "What are we learning from the data collected?" Wells in between the bay and AOC 1 do not provide a significant amount of information, and wells in the source area have the highest concentration.</p> <p>Tom Johnston would like to see the number of wells decrease and the frequency be changed to bi-ennial, (with wells reporting the highest contamination being sampled).</p> <p>Tom Johnston will include the discussion about AOC 1 in the recommendations and send it to John Winters.</p> <p>Tom Johnston will write the report and the next sampling event should happen after the knowledge of whether the new building being added impacts AOC 1. If the new building is added, then the monitoring schedule may need to change.</p> <p>The monitoring of site wells will be eliminated until after the new building construction is completed. Only wells on the other side of the road will remain intact the construction. All that will be left are the coastal wells. Larry Smith thought there may be a spike, and the Team should be able to install wells to verify the source. Larry Smith also suggested not sampling anything except the bay wells until after the building is completed. One large sampling event will occur before demolition is started, then sampling will be reduced.</p> <p>A-0910-06: AOC 1: Tom Johnston will incorporate the discussion about AOC 1 in the recommendations of the monitoring plan. Due 12/15/10</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
Break	
<p>Navy Operations Support Center: UST Closure Assessment – John Winters & John Schoolfield</p>	<p>John Schoolfield projected a map on where the UST was removed, then switched to a Google Map of the facility area. Tank B was the one with the contaminants. John Schoolfield projected some excerpts from the report. No contaminants were reported in the soil underneath the tank. The report showed a summary table of the analytical lab results. Groundwater parts per billion (ppb) has changed. John Schoolfield proposed to go back to the original location of the USTs and install one well and collect a groundwater sample to see if contamination still exists. If no contaminants are detected then it may be possible to close the site. If there is contamination, further sampling assessment may be necessary.</p> <p>John Winters suggested installing four monitoring wells and collecting soil samples for further testing to investigate if the contaminants are coming from off site.</p> <p>From FDEP's standpoint, the information and data has to show the site assessment with historic data if a No Further Action ruling is desired.</p> <p>A-0910-07: UST Closure Assessment: John Schoolfield will draft the Closure Assessment Work Plan. Due 9/30/10</p> <p>A-0910-08: Tier II: Rich May will put together a presentation on this Partnering Team meeting to present at the next Tier II meeting.</p>
<p>CAMP/Exit Strategy Review – John Schoolfield & Tom Johnston</p>	<p>Corrective Action Management Plan (CAMP)</p> <p>In order to submit an application, Team members need to know what to put in it and start working on applications in January 2011. John Schoolfield will need to start working on applications now in order to receive program money for future projects.</p> <p>The CAMP lives outside the permit.</p> <p>The Team talked about putting other sites on the CAMP.</p> <p>Arturo McDonald suggested this may not work because this document is not enforceable. Larry Smith suggested using the same format so that the partnering Team can track the applications.</p> <p>CAMP should be updated as needed.</p> <p>Tom Johnston indicated that , according to the Corrective Action permit, the CAMP must be updated</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>when requested by FDEP.</p> <p>Arturo McDonald suggested that the CAMP should be discussed at partnering meetings and updated accordingly.</p> <p>It was suggested that a review of the permit should also be on the CAMP. John Winters said anything enforceable needs to be included on the CAMP.</p> <p><i>Mike Clayton suggested it would be good to have a Monitoring Project Team event schedule.</i></p> <p>A-0910-09: CAMP: John Winters to look at the what needs to be included on the CAMP and relay the information to the Team. Due ???</p> <p>The Exit Strategy and CAMP documents need to be completed by end of November 2010.</p> <p>Tom Johnston suggested putting permit and LUC dates on the CAMP.</p> <p>LUC inspection for the facility was completed August 25, 2010.</p> <p>The LUC inspection certificate needs to be submitted to FDEP by 11/ 25/10.</p> <p>Tom Johnston will make edits to the unofficial CAMP and send it out to everyone for consensus.</p> <p>Tom Johnston will issue the official CAMP after John Winters has checked on what needs to be included.</p>
<p>Meeting Closeout – Review Action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda – Larry Smith</p>	<p>The team began meeting closeout Next partnering meeting scheduled for December 15th or 14th</p> <p>2011 Partnering proposed meeting dates</p> <p>March 9th or 8th PC June 8th or 7th September 14th or 13th</p> <p>+</p> <p>Good efficient meeting Meeting Room was good Good communication Good discussion Richard joining team Arturo at meeting</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	Δ Arturo leaving Meeting ran an hour over

New Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
September 14, 2010

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0910-01	John Winters		9/30/10	Building 278: Review SRCR
A-0910-02	Larry Smith		11/30/10	Building 325: Larry to determine how to approach reviews what kinds of tests to be performed.
A-0910-03	Larry Smith		11/15/10	AOC2: email Path Forward
A-0910-04	Gus Campano		09/30/10	Gus Campano to send out training notes
A-0910-05	John Winters		9/30/10	Tier II: look at what needs to be in camp
A-0910-06	Tom Johnston		12/15/10	AOC1: Write up recommendations on monitoring plan.
A-0910-07	John Schoolfield		09/30/10	Navy Operations Support Center: John to draft sample work plan.
A-0910-08	Rich May		11/01/10	Put together Partnering Team Presentation for Tier II meeting
A-0910-09	Tom Johnston		11/15/10	CAMP updates (John Winters to see what needs to be in the CAMP before this is completed)

**Ongoing Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team**

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0610-02	Larry Smith	Ongoing	7/20/10	AOC2 – Develop CSM and proposal Strategy for aOC2.
A-0610-03	Larry Smith, Arturo MacDonal, and John Winters	Ongoing	8/6/10	South Dock – Provide environmental constraint boundary in CADD drawing for South Dock and submit to FDEP for concurrence.
A-0610-04	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	7/16/10	AOC1: Review data from AOC1 and bring proposal to the team for baling strategy, monitoring strategy, (wells, COCs, etc) and soil LUCs.
A-0610-06	John Schoolfield	Ongoing	8/30/10	Complete report on current softball field northwest of AOC1 (future BFQ location).
A-0610-09	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	7/16/10	Complete CAMP/Exit Strategy.
A-0610-11	John Schoolfield	Ongoing	9/30/10	Contract action to do groundwater sampling at NOSC UST removal site. Share scope/plan with partnering team.
A-0310-05	Larry Smith	Ongoing		South Dock Update and Path Forward - Produce a straw man CADD map of the LUCs for the team to review. **To be discussed today
A-1209-02	Tom Johnston & Larry Smith	Ongoing	12/15/10	Respond to FDEP comments (See previous meeting minutes for previous action items). This refers to comments/recommendations **See TJ for comments on action items. Respond to John Winters' comments regarding AOC1 *Combined w/ former A-08-09-07.
A-0809-07	Larry Smith and John Schoolfield	Ongoing	12/15/10	Respond to John Winters' comments regarding AOC1.