

N61331.AR.001788
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 22 JUNE 2010 CSS PANAMA CITY
FL
6/22/2010
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
JUNE 22, 2010
PANAMA CITY (LA QUINTA INN, THOMAS DRIVE), FLORIDA
FINAL**

Leader: Tom Johnston TtNUS Task Order Mgr.
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl TtNUS Support Staff
Timekeeper: Rich May TtNUS Tier II Link

Other Attendees:

Michael Clayton	NSA PC	John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE RPM
Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link	Larry Smith	TtNUS Task Order Mgr.
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	John Winters	FDEP RPM
Pat Franklin	Facilitator	Erico Latham	NAVFAC SE RPM

	Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Local)	Category
	1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/	Tom	9:00 – 9:20	Info.
	2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules	Tom	9:20 – 9:40	Info.
	3	Building 278 Update	John S./Larry	9:40 – 9:55	Status
	4	Building 325 Update	John S./Larry	9:55 – 10:05	Status
	5	G300 update	Rico/Larry	10:05 – 10:15	Status
	6	AOC 2 update	Larry/John S.	10:15 – 10:30	Status
		Break	All	10:30 – 10:40	Needed
	7	South Dock update and path forward	Larry/John S.	10:40 – 10:55	Status
	8	AOC 1 Data review/recommendations	Tom/John S.	10:55 – 11:30	Status/Decision
		Lunch	All	11:30 – 1:00	Fun
	9	Training	Facilitator	1:00– 1:35	Educational
	10	Potential New Site NW of AOC 1	John S./Larry	1:35 – 1:40	Status
	11	Tier II Update	Rich	1:40 – 1:55	Info
	12	Proposed softball field at SWMU 2	Arturo	1:55 – 2:15	Info
		Break	All	2:15 – 2:25	Needed
	13	Navy Operations Support Center: UST Closure Assessment	John W./John S./Rico	2:25 – 2:40	Status
	14	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	John S./Tom	2:40 – 3:10	Concur
	15	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	John W.	3:10 – 3:30	Info.

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

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
Partnering Meeting
June 22, 2010**

**Leader: Tom Johnston
Timekeeper: Rich May
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Location: Panama City, Florida**

Attendees:

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

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 meeting began with an introduction of guest, Melissa Young, an FSU Environmental Sciences undergraduate student volunteer. Each meeting attendee provided a brief self introduction and a summary of their role on the partnering team; an overview of the benefits of the partnering process was provided for the benefit of the guest.</p> <p>Each meeting attendee provided a brief personal update.</p> <p>Introductions: None New Members: None Opening Remarks: None Proxies/Guests: Melissa Young (Guest)</p>
<p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/Approve Minutes/Agenda Changes/Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules – Tom Johnston</p>	<p>The team reviewed and updated the action item list.</p> <p>Building 399: Debate continued as to whether or not Building 399 had an Indoor Air Quality Assessment performed. Further review will be necessary to determine whether or not this took place.</p> <p>A-0610-01: Tom Johnston: Building 399 - Review Administrative Record to attempt to find info on the indoor air quality on Building 399. (Due 7/9/10)</p> <p>Brief discussion took place noting that Buildings 290, 399, and 200 will be transferred to FISK.</p> <p>Changes to the meeting minutes were reviewed, approved, and finalized.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<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 - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided a status update on Building 278.</p> <p>Larry Smith stated that the SRCR will be submitted to FDEP upon approval by the NAVFAC RPM. If the SRCR is accepted, this site will be considered complete. Following approval of the SRCR, the associated site wells will need to be abandoned; the monitor well inventory list will need to be updated to note their status as "inactive".</p> <p>Brief discussion took place concerning the old and new sea wall. John Winters stated that it may be necessary to wait and see whether or not the new sea wall was working as intended (to make sure no sheen is observed). Larry Smith noted that while the old sea wall had holes in it (cathodic protection had been lost causing it to rust through), there is now a foot and a half of new soil between the old and new sea wall.</p>
<p>Building 325 Update - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield and Larry Smith provided a status update on Facility.</p> <p>Larry Smith distributed a handout including a brief overview, history, and synopsis of historical documents for Site 325.</p> <p>Overview: Contamination is from a leak in piping associated with two 20,000-gallon USTs The contaminant is JP-5 jet fuel The media of concern is soil and groundwater</p> <p>Goal: Determine the current level of groundwater and soil contamination. What is the source for the continued groundwater contamination? Is soil leaching?</p> <p>Path Forward: Review currently available data, design investigation to resolve current data gaps with aim of site closure.</p> <p>Larry Smith noted that there are three wells with detected contamination (MW-23, MW-8, and MW-26). Figure 6 was projected for the team; it was noted that historical TRPH trends showed two years of climbing contamination levels for these three wells. The</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>groundwater appears to be nearly clean, with the exception of these three wells. We need to determine why we have a hot point and a hit at these three wells. We are also trying to determine whether or not the water table fluctuations may be moving the contamination.</p> <p>Larry Smith noted that in a personnel interview that he'd conducted a week ago it was noted that drain adjacent to <u>an AST had previously drained to the St. Andrews Bay</u>. Because the drain has been sealed, during rainfall events, the area previously drained backs up and pools over exposed soil allowing infiltration to groundwater. It may be that this allows contaminated water to moved across to the three wells in question. No correlation to significant rainfall events has been determined.</p> <p>Mike Clayton noted that the drain had been plugged because there had been a fuel spill at one time with fuel channeled to the bay. He noted further that while the area does tend to pond, no sheen has been observed during rainfall events.</p> <p>Further team discussion took place concerning possible sources (i.e. a leak or break in piping or an oil-water separator leak). Further investigation is necessary in order to resolve this issue.</p> <p>John Winters reminded the team, as he has said in several comment letters that while collection of groundwater data may produce two consecutive quarters of clean samples, this really won't satisfactorily determine that the area is clean. There appears to be an ongoing issue, which will need to be resolved.</p> <p>This area is currently under semi-annual monitoring by Aerostar.</p>
G300 Update – Larry Smith	<p>Larry Smith provided a brief G300 update noting that a potentiometric surface map and relatively short report was on target for completion. The next report will be a semi-annual report which will include groundwater results.</p>
Break	
AOC 2 update on Groundwater data – (LUCs to be a future focus item) - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith	<p>Larry Smith provided an AOC 2 update with background info, noting that a the wells around the area were sampled (approximately two years ago) for a baseline survey. Following the baseline survey, an excavation was conducted. The original excavation plans had to be modified due to a utilities issue. CH2M Hill encountered a subsurface 3'x3'x8' tank (concrete vault) containing</p>

Comment [t1]: Please have Larry verify that I didn't get this wrong and it really should be UST instead of AST.

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>residual product during the excavation. Following this tank removal, monitoring wells PCY-AOC2- MW-30 and PCY-AOC2[MW-37] were installed. These wells, along with PCY-AOC2-MW-31, PCY-AOC2-MW-11, and PCY-AOC2-MW-13 have been sampled for the three previous quarters. These are considered the core area wells; contamination has not been detected in any of these wells. The fourth quarter sampling even took place last week, but the sampling results haven't been delivered yet.</p> <p>If the results from the fourth quarter's sampling event do not show FDEP exceedances, the site will have had a full year of monitoring data showing no groundwater contamination at AOC 2.</p> <p>Larry Smith stated that he recommending closing the site relative to groundwater. The next issue will be addressing the soil contamination. The original plan (years ago) was to have TtNUS resolve the issue of floating product via removal, then to proceed with LUCs. Considering that there is no intent to go NFA at this point, the possibility of a recontamination event due to a rise in groundwater will need to be kept in mind.</p> <p>John Schoolfield noted that one of the wells was currently covered with a pile of dirt due to ongoing construction related to a building addition nearby. Mike Clayton stated that the foreman would need to be made aware, so as to avoid the possibility of causing damage to the well.</p> <p>Larry Smith noted that when CH2M Hill performed the excavation, they had expected to see some product, but didn't. Product isn't currently observed in monitoring wells. The issue at hand is how to proceed when the groundwater doesn't appear to be contaminated, while we still have the likelihood of contaminated soil.</p> <p>Further team discussion took place on how to proceed. John Winters stated that he was concerned about sampling locations, depths, and procedures corresponding to the existing soil data. Furthermore, he stated that he didn't think going back to the ten samples that were below were sufficient for going NFA. John Winters stated that he was concerned that contamination had potentially been missed.</p> <p>Larry Smith noted that the sampling areas were chosen based on information from the SAR. The contamination was spotty, not an evenly spread, obvious pattern like a bulls-eye. This meant that cleaning it up would have been cost prohibitive, which is the reason the plan had been to go for LUCs.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Larry Smith stated that a SAR and RAP had been completed. While the site was assessed, there was never any follow through due to multiple staff changes concerning the decision on the path forward. Mike Clayton noted that due to funding issues, things had been performed piecemeal.</p> <p>Larry Smith proposed taking John Winters' concerns into consideration and then forming a conceptual site strategy to see if he is open to it. Further discussion led to the decision that a feasible CSM and possible path forward would need to be prepared and presented to attempt to address FDEP concerns.</p> <p>A-0610-02: Larry Smith – AOC2 – Develop CSM and proposal Strategy for AOC2. (Due 7/20/10)</p> <p>Tom Johnston stated that considering all of the construction that has occurred and that continues to go on, the soil contamination should have been evident in the groundwater if any of the soil had been disturbed during construction events. John Winters stated this would be significant in light of an SRCR.</p> <p>The issue of funding was briefly noted; while there is likely enough funding to put together a plan and discuss it with FDEP, there may not be funding to develop and execute a work plan.</p>
<p>South Dock Update and Path Forward – Larry Smith & John Schoolfield</p>	<p>Larry Smith provided a South Dock update, specifically noting that while there is product under each 12'x7' cell below the relief platform, there was currently no concern that the contamination would get into Alligator Bay. This contamination cannot be easily accessed not only because of the concrete, but also because of the pilings.</p> <p>Currently there isn't an official LUC on this area (it is still financially tied to AOC 2). It is likely that a LUC will include the area below 4 feet bls. Once an agreement on LUCs has been reached, this will need to be noted in any subsequent report.</p> <p>Further discussion noted that LUC boundaries for South Dock and for AOC 2 would need to be mapped and included in the base master plan to designate it as an environmentally constrained area. Arturo MacDonald requested that CADD drawings on these LUCs be provided</p> <p>John Winters noted that he would like to have formal concurrence on these LUC drawings in order to have a</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>record of the decision for future reference.</p> <p>A-0610-03: Larry Smith, Arturo MacDonald, and John Winters: South Dock – Provide environmental constraint boundary in CADD drawing for South Dock and submit to FDEP for concurrence. (Due 8/6/10)</p>
<p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p>	<p>Rich May provided an update regarding the June 2nd & 3rd Tier II meeting (see handout). Specifically, he noted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reorganization and Funding Updates EPA Emphasis on Enforcement: fines may be issued without being preceded by a warning letter. Five Year Reviews: The thirty-day review period isn't sufficient review time for the EPA.</p> <p>Next Tier II meeting is scheduled to take place on September 1st.</p>
<p>Lunch</p>	
<p>AOC 1 Data- John Schoolfield & Tom Johnston</p>	<p>Tom Johnston provided background information on AOC 1, noting that the unlined pit had contained miscellaneous flammables (including organic solvents), which were burned and used for fire training exercises. Tom Johnston went on to note that there had been multiple investigative and remediation events, soil borings, groundwater monitoring events, etc. It was also noted that the trident probe study, which had been conducted to map out the contamination in the groundwater, had determined that the groundwater flow had a downward vertical gradient that then moved laterally, then upwards again, due to the influence of saltwater, which impedes the flow. The wells near the bay near are pretty clean.</p> <p>Tom Johnston then began leading the team in review of the preliminary data gathered during the April monitoring event.</p> <p>Figure 1 displayed the outline of the SMWU in red. The grid of borings installed in 2002/2004 were used to map out the contaminated area. When the highest vapor readings were plotted across the entire AOC the high readings were, for the most part, within the boundaries of the AOC.</p> <p>Figure 2 displayed the free product thickness contours concentrated on the western edge of the building. The groundwater flow in this area is from west to east. The</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>figure shows that the contaminated area is primarily west of or under Building 399. The actual fire pit training area has not been exactly determined; however there is a noted location on where free product is usually encountered (see cross-hatched area on the figure).</p> <p>Originally quarterly monitoring was conducted, but we are now performing annual monitoring. Tom Johnston provided a groundwater monitoring table, noting the COCs and their degradation products. It was noted that the data shows few exceedances in regard to the chemicals listed as COCs. The bottom line is that contamination detections are observed in the expected locations. Degradation products of chlorinated compounds are also present, indicating that natural attenuation of these contaminants continues. It was noted that shallow wells near St. Andrew Bay best represents groundwater conditions near the bay.</p> <p>Tom Johnston stated that since there is evidence that the groundwater contamination is cleaning up, he would recommend biennial monitoring. LUCs are in place and groundwater is not used, so there is no reason to monitor very frequently. The soil and groundwater LUCs should remain in place unless something can be done about the soil contamination.</p> <p>If the monitoring program is to change, a decision will need to be made on which wells will need to be monitored. Plans have been made for One Stop Environmental, LLC to go out a couple times a week (initially) to bail free product and determine the recharge rates. Their observations will drive the bailing frequency thereafter with more frequent bailing if large amounts of product are detected. This isn't considered to be a remediation strategy, but rather a maintenance strategy.</p> <p>After the April data are validated, TtNUS will propose which wells to continue monitoring. When the corresponding report is written, the situation concerning the soil will be clearly stated. It will be important to convey that the site cannot go NFA even if the water appears to be clean. The soil would need to be addressed in order to attain NFA.</p> <p>The team briefly discussed the LUC boundaries and base plans. It was noted that if the parking lot is to be repaved, the base will need to avoid paving over the monitor wells.</p> <p>A-0610-04: Tom Johnston – AOC1: Review data from AOC1 and bring proposal to the team for bailing strategy, monitoring strategy, (wells, COCs, etc) and soil LUCs. 7/16/10</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Tom Johnston noted that it was important to make sure clarifications were made on the LUCs, specifically that they cannot be lifted even if groundwater is considered clean. Past reports have been lacking in details; it has been determined that some of the data was never incorporated. We are nearing the budget ceiling for this project. Right now, the SRCR is ahead of the GW monitoring report for AOC 1 for obvious reasons, but it is unknown how much budget will be left for this report.</p> <p>John Winters asked that Site 98 (UST site) be reviewed to determine whether or not it had been closed out. Arturo MacDonald noted that he thought that this site had been incorporated into AOC 1. John Winters replied that he believed they had combined it for groundwater, but not necessarily for soils.</p> <p>A-0610-05: Tom Johnston – Site 98: Look in admin record for documentation of Site 98 closure & soil contamination. (Due 6/29/10)</p>
<p>Facilitator Training - Pat Franklin</p>	<p>Mrs. Franklin led the team in a facilitator training exercise concerning the role of trust in a team's success.</p> <p>A "Team Effectiveness Assessment" handout was distributed to the team members. Each team member was asked to answer the following questions in respect to their fellow team members:</p> <p>What is that person's single most important behavioral quality that contributes to the strength of the team? (i.e. their strength).</p> <p>What is that person's single most important behavioral quality that detracts from the strength of the team? (i.e. their weakness or problematic behavior).</p>
<p>Potential New Site NW of AOC 1 – John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>John Schoolfield projected a figure for the team to review, noting that there are plans to put in a new dormitory close to the training facilities. A petroleum substance was detected during a geotechnical survey, but not investigated at the time of discovery. Ten of the fourteen bore holes, ranging from 10 to 90 feet deep, were reported to have the detected petroleum substance. An environmental investigation was recommended.</p> <p>When the civil engineers began putting together the SOW for the design, they realized they'd need to address the environmental issues. Planned expansion of a galley/cafeteria was located in one of the areas that</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>the geotechnical team detected the substance.</p> <p>The information reported by the geotechnical team reported that they encountered the substance at a depth of 1 foot in several locations; this data may be a bit off (the substance was also reported in one location at 30 feet).</p> <p>Further investigation into the area history did not show usage of fuel tanks or anything else that might be associated with the reported petroleum substance. A site visit to further investigate via hand auger failed to find evidence of the petroleum substance. Natural, deteriorated material was encountered; it may be that this methogenic, methane smell, was mistaken for petroleum odor. While there was an odor, no soil staining was observed.</p> <p>Mike Clayton asked whether or not there was anything in writing yet to state that these geotechnical claims had been investigated; documentation of associated field work would address any concerns that may be raised for future building projects.</p> <p>John Schoolfield replied that a report was being worked on. He also noted that SWMU 2 and its current LUCs, surface soil data, etc. were being reviewed to see if it would be possible to move the softball field.</p> <p>A-0610-06: John Schoolfield – Complete report on current softball field northwest of AOC1 (future BFQ location). (Due 8/30/10)</p>
<p>Proposed Softball Field at SWMU 2 – Arturo MacDonald</p>	<p>Arturo MacDonald projected a figure of the proposed softball field location. The question is whether or not is feasible to put the softball field within the LUC area.</p> <p>John Winters stated that for something this large a report or data may be necessary to determine whether or not this should be allowed; that it may be possible as long as there are plans to stay within the first 2 feet of soil and as long as those involved are wearing the proper PPE.</p> <p>Tom Johnston noted that the proposed location would require tree removal, which will require them to go further down than 2 feet. A clarification of the risks will need to be made.</p> <p>As far as timing, they want this RFP out in December.</p> <p>Further team discussion took place concerning the proposed location. The plan was to avoid the creek in order to prevent the destruction of the wetland area. The</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>base has a “no loss of wetlands” policy, so if it was destroyed, a new one would have to be created elsewhere. It was noted that it may be easier if the siting location was adjusted/moved.</p> <p>A-0610-07: Arturo MacDonald & John Schoolfield – Talk to Chad & Roberto regarding the siting for the relocated softball field. (Due 6/30/10)</p> <p>A-0610-08: John Schoolfield - Funding for signs at LUCs. (Due 9/30/10)</p> <p>Arturo MacDonald noted that the warning signs for access points associated with the LUCs were six to seven years old. Arturo Johnston stated that if there are standards concerning spacing, font, etc., they need to be followed. John Winters replied that the requirements details on signage were under 62.730.225(3).</p> <p>John Schoolfield noted that funding most likely would not be available until the next fiscal year.</p> <p>Discussion momentarily turned to the remaining agenda item topics. The team decided not to discuss the CAMP/Exit Strategy.</p> <p>A-0610-09: Tom Johnston – Complete CAMP/Exit Strategy. (Due 7/9/10)</p> <p>Discussion concerning the softball field resumed. It was noted that this may need to be re-evaluated for risk assessment purposes and exposure scenario evaluation. The main concern is the tree removal area; a risk assessment will need to be prepared in order to approach the planning people.</p> <p>A0610-10: Tom Johnston – Get an estimate to review risk assessment in regards to ball player/recreational users. (Due XX/XX/10?)</p> <p>Tom Johnston stated that because of the proposed tree removal, he anticipates that they will be required to put down a cap.</p>
<p>Navy Operations Support Center: UST Closure Assessment – John Schoolfield & John Winters</p>	<p>John Schoolfield stated that back in 1991 a couple tanks were removed. Soil samples collected showed not contamination detections. A well installed resulted in the discovery of DCE contamination. Review of the areal photographs suggests that this was an industrial area. DCE and TCE travel rapidly in groundwater; it may be that this was the result of a spill upgradient/off-base from the industrial area.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>It appears that there was no follow up on the closure report, so progress came to a halt. The process was never completed. We tried to add it as a site, but headquarters has requested that confirmation soil sampling take place first to confirm that this really should be a site.</p> <p>John Winters stated that he'd like to see 2 or 3 monitor wells to determine what is upgradient. Larry smith noted that the water table is relatively deep in this area; probably 70 feet.</p> <p>A-0610-11: John Schoolfield – Contract action to do groundwater sampling at NOSC UST removal site. Share scope/plan with partnering team. (Due 9/30/10)</p> <p>John Winters asked that proposed plans be communicated prior to contracting completion in order avoid wasting time/money.</p>
<p>Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items, Consensus Items, +/-, Next Agenda – Tom Johnston</p>	<p>The team began meeting closeout by reviewing the new action items.</p> <p>Rich May noted that he had received information concerning Indoor Air Quality Assessment (A-0610-01) for Bulding 399 discussed earlier. This would have been OSHA regulated; Pete's submittal to Earl Boseman was an evaluation of vapor intrusion that concluded the effects were negligible. This evaluation was calculation based, not a result of monitoring. As far as the EPA and the partnering team was concerned, by May 2004, this became a non-issue. Rich May forwarded the email with this information to the team.</p> <p>The issue of how to proceed and what is required was discussed. Tom Johnston stated that he would discuss this with the TtNUS vapor intrusion experts and Ron Kotun to seek their guidance/input. The admin record will also be reviewed for corresponding information.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Good team exercise A lot done Meeting on schedule Meeting room was good Productive meeting Coherent discussion People at the hotel have been very nice Got finished with lunch on time Nice to have guest here</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Visitor felt welcomed</p> <p>Δ</p> <p>Miss being at the state park Didn't complete exit strategy</p> <p>Mrs. Franklin provided facilitator feedback, noting that the team discussion wandered a bit, but that it always got back on track. She suggested that all agenda items be allotted at least 15 minutes, unless they are related to really quick status updates, since shorter timeslots limit feedback.</p> <p>Next proposed meeting dates:</p> <p>September 14th</p> <p>Rich May = Leader Arturo McDonald = Time Keeper</p> <p>It may be necessary to reserve this meeting room again. John Winters check with the front desk to see if the meeting space is available.</p>

New Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
June 22, 2010

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-0610-01	Tom Johnston	Review completed	7/9/10	Building 399 - Review Administrative Record to attempt to find info on the indoor air quality on Building 399. After an exhaustive search of the Administrative Record that was recently updated (June 2010), no record could be found of vapor intrusion considerations.
A-0610-02	Larry Smith	Ongoing	7/20/10	AOC2 – Develop CSM and proposal Strategy for aOC2.
A-0610-03	Larry Smith, Arturo MacDonald, 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-0610-05	Tom Johnston	Completed	6/29/10	Site 98: Look in admin record for documentation of Site 98 closure & soil contamination. Letter from N. Ugolini to D. Grabka on 3 Sep 1999 indicates transfer of Site 98 from UST Program to IR Program as part of AOC 1 because Site 98 upgradient wells exhibited dissolved hydrocarbon concentrations greater than Site 98 downgradient wells. AOC 1 was identified as likely source for a portion of contaminated Site 98 GW. Bldg 98 later NFA'd in 2003 and 2008 Corrective Action permits. "Site Assessment Report for Site 98" is mentioned in Admin Record but that report is not in the Record.
A-0610-06	John Schoolfield	Ongoing	8/30/10	Complete report on current softball field northwest of AOC1 (future BFQ location).
A-0610-07	Arturo MacDonald & John Schoolfield	Ongoing	6/30/10	Talk to Chad & Roberto regarding the siting for the relocated softball field.
A-0610-08	John Schoolfield	Ongoing	9/30/10	Funding for signs at LUCs.
A-0610-09	Tom Johnston	Ongoing	7/16/10	Complete CAMP/Exit Strategy.
A-0610-10	Tom Johnston	Completed	7/16/10	Get an estimate to review risk assessment in regards to ball player/recreational users. 40 to 100 hrs would be required but other options

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
				(covering with 2 ft of clean fill) should be considered.
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.

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

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
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. **To be discussed today
A-03-10-07	Rich May & Larry Smith	Ongoing		AOC 1 - Ask Gerry Walker about the Indoor Air Quality Study on Building 399. - **still some debate as to whether or not this occurred. LS asked GW and he didn't remember doing this.
A-03-10-10	Larry Smith	Ongoing		Revise Path Forward with CSM figure for active sites. **To be discussed later today.
A-12-09-01	John Winters	Complete	3/26/10	Send out the example (PARM/SRCR) to the team.
A-12-09-02	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-08-09-07	Larry Smith and John Schoolfield	Ongoing	12/15/10	Respond to John Winters' comments regarding AOC1.