

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
PANAMA CITY BEACH, FL
DECEMBER 11, 2008**

N61331.AR.001012
NSWC PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

**Leader: Mike Clayton
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Tom Johnston**

Approved

Attendees:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Mike Clayton | NSA PC | Tom Johnston | TtNUS |
| Larry Smith | TtNUS | Rich May | TtNUS Tier II Link |
| Arturo McDonald | NSA PC | Pat Franklin | Facilitator |
| John Schoolfield | NAVFAC SE | Erico "Rico" Latham | NAVFAC SE |
| John Winters | FDEP | Jacqueline Strobl | TtNUS (scribe) |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|--|
| <p>Check-In – Mike Clayton</p> <p>Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/</p> | <p>Each meeting attendee provided a brief self-introduction with a summary of their background and/or experience on the NSA Panama City Partnering Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Clayton: NSA PC - Been on the team since the beginning • Tom Johnston: TtNUS - G300 Project Manager - Relies heavily on Larry, been a part of the team for 2 years – flight in was brutal • John Winters: FDEP - Been with FDEP since October of 1998, been a part of the team since January 2008 • Arturo MacDonald: NSA PC - Been on team since the beginning • Rich May: TtNUS - Tier II link and Task Order Manager for AOC2 • Erico Latham: NAVFAC SE - Newly on board in Jacksonville, been there about a month. Glad to be here to pitch in, good to meet in person. • Pat Franklin: Management Edge, Inc. - Recently retired from NAVFAC SE • Larry Smith: TtNUS - Geologist – Has worked on G300 over the last 3-4 years and AOC2 on and off, not a team member just a visitor. • John Schoolfield: NAVFAC SE - Previous experience with Region 4; has worked for the Air Force. Has been working with the Navy for 4 ½ months. <p>No proxies necessary. Guests: Larry Smith – TtNUS Erico Latham – NAVFAC SE</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|---|
| | <p>Referenced: Jim Crane FDEP Eric Nuzie FDEP Helen Lockard NAVFAC</p> <p>Abbreviations: PT = Partnering Team</p> |
| <p>Action Item & Parking Lot Review/Approve Minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules - Mike Clayton</p> | <p>Consensus Item #1- August 29, 2008 Meeting minutes approved.</p> <p>The Team reviewed the ground rules aloud, each by turn around the table. Action items from the August 29, 2008 meeting minutes were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Item: 080802 - complete per Tom • Action Item: 080803 - complete per Tom • Action Item: 080804 - complete per Mike • Action Item: 080805 - complete per Mike <p>Mike led the team in review of the Roles & Responsibilities section of the charter. The team discussed changes in wording:</p> <p>Consensus Item #2 – The team agreed to change text in charter to “regulatory requirements”.</p> <p>The team agreed to delete the EPA RPM section. Per Pat's suggestion, the team reviewed that section to make sure that there weren't any responsibilities listed that would need to be reassigned.</p> <p>Further discussion took place regarding wording, multiple changes were noted on Mike's handout.</p> <p>Action item #12-08-01 – Jacqueline will update the charter roles and responsibilities per Mike's notes on the handout.</p> <p>The team reviewed the Partnering Team contact info and noted changes necessary.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-02 - Everyone will send their contact info updates to Jacqueline via email address provided (Jacqueline.Strobl@tetrattech.com).</p> <p>The team reviewed the agenda. Arturo requested that a well abandonment discussion be added. Larry noted that he and Rico would be leaving after the Tier II update for a G300 site visit but would be back by lunch.</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|---|
| | <p>Larry asked, "What entitles someone to be on the team, rather than just a frequent guest?" This prompted team discussion on whether or not to add Larry and Rico to the team. It was decided that this was not necessary – Larry and Rico will continue to attend meetings as guests. Larry is the tech lead on G300, so he will attend the calls and meetings that include G300 on the schedule.</p> |
| <p>Facilitator Training – Pat Franklin</p> | <p>Pat noted that one of the things she liked to do with a new team is to reiterate where the team is heading, noting the positive things as well as any barriers that may get in the way in order to help the new members get acquainted and acclimated with the team, and to assist the facilitator in planning additional training. Pat asked each team member to share their answers with the group.</p> <p>Pat asked the team members to write out responses to the following questions, and then proceeded to asked each team member share their answers with the group:</p> <p>1. Complete the statement: "My ideal for the success of this team is _____"</p> <p>Mike - maintain the momentum of the past 2 years Tom - continue the great deal of cooperation and achieving site closeout while protecting human health and the environment. Winters - good communication and participation by all members and guests to achieve site closures. Arturo - reach consensus on critical items, and implement the HSWA Permit Rich - timely participation of the members based on the needs of the team. Rico - work our way out of our job, and be prepared for the next (team excellence). Schoolfield - to agree to cost effective solutions to achieve site remedies. Larry - move efficiently to site closure</p> <p>2. What positive things does the team have going for it?</p> <p>Larry - we have an intelligent, knowledgeable group; infinite resources; developed industry, and we don't have a situation where we don't have the support of the community. Schoolfield - we have a cooperative state and navy program; team members are experienced with the site; team members are experienced with state regulations. Rico - commitment; data – quantitative & qualitative. Rich - proactive regulator; mature program; welcoming Arturo - goodwill; technical expertise; good communication.</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|--|
| | <p>Winters - site closure has already been achieved for many of the sites; rarely have conflicts; currently do foster an environment for good communication</p> <p>Tom - flexible; new blood (new team members) = new ideas; the team as a whole really looks out for the base, we want what's best for the base.</p> <p>Mike - good synergy, respect for each other, and comfort level/trust; we have the advantage of having a small group.</p> <p>8. What are some of the barriers that could keep us from being successful?</p> <p>Rico - GWOT</p> <p>Schoolfield - not so much as a group, but for me, not fully understanding state regulations; unaware of past agreements; some people are new to the partnering process.</p> <p>Larry - funding; we all represent different institutions and therefore have different viewpoints/paths to the goal</p> <p>Mike - physical obstructions at the sites (move that building/utilities); workloads – we all have pretty heavy workloads</p> <p>Tom - the technical complexities of the problems themselves.</p> <p>Winters - getting new members up to speed with sites and regulations (mainly for the navy and DEP RPMs)</p> <p>Arturo - problems with consultations with the Indian tribes – cultural conflicts.</p> <p>Rich - variation on a theme, we have a lot of new relationships, by that I mean that new relationships are de facto a bit of a barrier on communication factors and trust. New relationships take a while, this isn't a bad thing, it's just a real thing. These things take time.</p> <p>Changing mission – if the tenants change, the use of the property/base.</p> <p>Pat noted that the responses to the question considering barriers to success suggested that it might be a good idea to discuss how the team brings new people up to speed. Pat asked what the process has been in the past.</p> <p>Rico noted that he made it a point to talk to each person and felt that it was important to discuss expectations and history. Everyone has had an open door policy for questions.</p> |
| <p>Tier II Update – Rich May</p> | <p>Rich May presented a Tier II update for the team. Rich stated that two Tier II meetings had taken place since the last NSA Panama City Partnering teleconference meeting. Panama City was the Tier I guest for the September Tier II</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|--|---|
| | <p>meeting. Tom Johnston had performed the majority of the legwork in providing information, but requested that Rich present the information due to a scheduling conflict. Tier II recognizes that this is a high performing team.</p> <p>One of the Tier II topics of discussion in September was in relation to the trouble we've had with RIP dates in our strategies. To different teams it means different things, it is categorized differently, and some definitions are more permissive. We've provided some guidance for CERCLA and RCRA bases. For RCRA the RIP date for an active remedy should be when a Final Corrective Measures Implementation Report or equivalent documentation has been completed. For LUCs it should be when the final CMIP has been completed and the facility has sent a letter to the regulator that the LUC has been implemented.</p> <p>Rich explained that the definition for NORMs is related to funding.</p> <p>Rich stated that Eric, Helen, Jim, & Robbie are waiting for Tier I to resolve AOC2 as a team.</p> <p>Rich stated that the Tier II meeting discussed reorganizations and will come up with RIP date guidance for petroleum. The petroleum sheet is different than the IR sheet; the Tier II team is waiting for Eric and Jim on this. These all get consolidated for Florida Navy bases into a site management plan (Florida wide basis). This is why the PT is deferring to Eric and Jim – we should have this by March.</p> |
| Break | Fifteen minute break. |
| Non-Petroleum Site Update (permit, reports, plans, field work) – Tom Johnston | <p>Tom distributed figures and presented a Non-Petroleum Site Update to the PT. Tom stated that his main objective was to update the team on the status of the IR sites. Everything has been finished, with the exception of the LUC implementation and possibly long-term monitoring at SMWUs 2 and 10 and AOC 1. TtNUS has been performing monitoring at SMU2; a different contractor has been conducting sampling at SMWUs 10 and AOC 1.</p> <p>AOC1 – Completed the SOB and CMIP SWMU 2 – SI, 2 rounds of monitoring; CMIP completed SWMU 10 – Statement of basis, CMIP are finished Along with CMIPs, the PT completed a lot of documents, which have all been put through the public comment period and FDEP. NSA PC has obtained a 5 year extension on the permit.</p> <p>All that is left at the IR sites is implementing the LUCs at SWMUs 2, 3, and 10 and AOC 1 and, where appropriate, monitoring at AOC 1, SWMU 2, and SWMU 10. The PT should have already gotten all of the GIS files from</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|------|--|
| | <p>TtNUS for LUC implementation.</p> <p>Rich noted that whenever a LUC is in place the station should send an implementation letter to FDEP. This submittal starts the clock, the facility is supposed to issue a report annually.</p> <p>Mike asked whether or not this would be considered the RIP date there, to which Rich replied that it would. Tom stated that they had been using the remedy in place date as the RIP date.</p> <p>Rich stated that when the LUC is implemented the letter needs to go to the state. Sometimes it involves a physical barrier/signage. It's basically a LUC completion report.</p> <p>Mike asked Arturo whether or not they had updated the environmental constraints. We need a copy.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-03 – Arturo will place a tickler on his outlook to remind him of the annual LUC report.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-04 – Arturo will confirm LUC maps have been updated.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-05 – John Winters will verify whether or not a letter is needed following LUC implementation. He will see if permit approval will satisfy the requirement – check the start date.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-06 - John Winters needs to verify when the year begins for monitoring each of the sites (this will depend on whether this is the signature date of the CMIP or the permit).</p> <p>Arturo asked who has signature authority.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-07- Mike - Signature authority for signing the LUC Compliance Certificate.</p> <p>Tom noted that the team used to have a long document tracking list, but that it wasn't really necessary for the non-petroleum sites (reports are all periodic now and there are only a few of them). Tom asked if there were any questions on the status of the sites.</p> <p>Mike – The LUCs on SWMU2, the area will be so large, what type of work/protection do we need to write into contracts?</p> <p>Tom replied that in regards to groundwater the only thing being monitored for now is iron. Tom moved to decrease the frequency of monitoring and maybe even move to LUCs.</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|--|---|
| | <p>Mike asked whether or not LUCs were necessary since the water won't be used. John Winters replied that since it's a G2 aquifer LUCs will need to be put in place.</p> |
| <p>SWMU 2 LTM update (data review and recommendations) - Tom Johnston</p> | <p>Tom presented a SWMU 2 LTM update.</p> <p>Aluminum was not collected during the last sampling round, it has already been eliminated. Tom explained the table formatting and explained the exceedances. Aluminum as the background, compared to the site wells – that was our basis for stating that the wells were within range for aluminum background levels.</p> <p>However, this was not the case for iron; it's generally higher at the site than the background concentrations. The highest concentrations are occurring at the wells that are in the SWMU or pretty close to the SWMU.</p> <p>Tom pointed out SWMU 2 on the figure – monitoring well 2-2 had a result was 6,580 µg/L which is pretty high. Tom pointed out other levels on the figure and stated that generally when you look at the data you see high (2,000 µg/L range and higher) and low (below 2,000 µg/L). We know what went on out there, household waste, bilge water, etc. was dumped. It's not a surprise to see these levels at and down-gradient of SWMU 2. It looks like the background concentrations in the NSA PC concentrations are below 3,000 µg/L. Tom recommended not using the 300 ppb as the criterion for establishing the presence of contamination. We need to represent a real background and use that as a basis for determining whether or not the wells are contaminated. Tom requested feedback on his recommendation, so that he can come back and propose a number for that.</p> <p>Arturo asked whether or not the numbers highlighted in pink were the ones that are contaminated.</p> <p>Tom replied that those highlighted were surface water data; FDEP is concerned about contamination of surface water by groundwater. Some of the fluctuation may be due to particulates in the water, or tidal differences, or time of data collection (weather dependant – e.g., after a rainfall). As we moved downstream we measure decreasing readings. It looks like the concentrations vary a lot from location to location and round to round, but the surface water seems consistent with the proposed background levels; 2,000 may be the approximate cutoff point. TtNUS does not recommend putting in any new wells. TtNUS also recommends discontinuing surface water monitoring; discontinuation of GW monitoring might also be warranted, or reducing the frequency and leaving the LUCs in place until completion of monitoring. No matter what the course of action, the number of wells monitored should be</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|---|
| | <p>reduced.</p> <p>The team discussed the number of wells being monitored, the monitoring frequency, and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Mike asked whether or not there was a regulation requiring continued sampling.</p> <p>John Winters stated that technically the FDEP could say that since levels are above 300 ug/L, something has to be done. He agreed with trying to do something else – do we really want to put a number to something that might trigger having to do some kind of remedial action. He went on to say the only thing he thought would need to be done would be LUCs for GW until something else can be done, and either no monitoring, or some type of monitoring schedule at the point of discharge to the surface water. This could be included in the 5 year review. John Winters stated that he was hesitant to set a number because it might trigger unwarranted remediation.</p> <p>The team discussed monitoring details and turbidity issues.</p> <p>John Winters requested the minutes reflect that Tom made recommendations for SWMU 2.</p> <p>Tom stated that he thought the most cost effective thing would be to discontinue monitoring, then move to LUCs.</p> <p>John Winters responded that the only issue would be well PCY-05, which is higher, but still may be within background levels. It may be a point of contention. He asked if anything was known about St. Andrew Bay's chemistry and suggested including something about the iron content in St. Andrew's Bay.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-08 – Arturo & Tom – Check with the Bay Environmental Study Team – look up St. Andrew's Bay data.</p> <p>Tom stated that he would be concerned if there was no sampling at all; it would be necessary to sample prior to a land use change. However, he explained he didn't believe continued monitoring of the site would be beneficial.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-09 – Tom - Finish the SWMU 2 LTM Round 3 report, send to John Schoolfield first for review.</p> |
| Lunch | |
| G300 update (data review and Projected Work) – Larry Smith | <p>Larry distributed copies of the power point presentation slides for the G300 update (see attached ppt file).</p> <p>Larry explained that this was a UST investigation that due</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|---|--|
| | <p>to funding problems has been going on for about 10 years. Larry stated that since there were new team members he had decided to provide a more comprehensive presentation in order to provide the new members with a bit more information. Larry provided a historical overview of the site, noting the known discharge event details, the reports submitted, and attempted remedial actions. He went on to review Figure 3 and Chart 1 from the 3rd Quarter Report. He explained these depicted the relationship between the water level in the well and the level of product in the well, noting that when the water level increases at a steady level, the product starts to decrease; then when you see a water level decrease, you often see product. There is a weak correlation. One of the things we can look at is that the level of product has decreased over time. What is happening? Is it decreasing or spreading out? In hindsight it can be seen that when the AFVR was in operation the water level was high and there was no product in the well.</p> <p>Larry noted that if 4 quarters of sampling in a row are clean, then the site could be closed. Larry explained that unfortunately, we went through 3 quarters of clean samples, but then we observed free product in the 4th quarter. At the end of the PARM TtNUS recommended LUCs; however, FDEP wouldn't accept LUCs, and wanted to try passive remediation instead. Larry stated that they looked into cost effective remediation methods, which led to the use of wellboom bioaugmentation. Larry brought one in as a visual aid, and explained how the product works. He noted that though the material in the product is supposed to be used up, it instead just soaked up the free product.</p> <p>The question is where do we go from here? There is the funding issue, as well as what is technically feasible.</p> <p>The team discussed the situation. Larry noted that because of the nature of the product in the well, it just seems problematic to apply a solution that only works a small part of the time (depending on the water table level).</p> <p>Further discussion led to the general consensus to move towards proposing LUCs in the next annual report.</p> |
| <p>Site 278 Discussion – John/John</p> | <p>John Schoofield informed the team that samples were just collected at Site 278 Monday, so they do not have results yet. Aerostar collected soil and groundwater samples.</p> <p>Arturo brought up well abandonment, stating that the contractors need guidance. Further team discussion concerning well abandonment came to the following consensus agreement:</p> <p>Consensus Item #2: The team agreed on directing a contractor to abandon and remove the wells in</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|--|--|
| | <p>accordance with state of Florida regulations.</p> <p>The topic of discussion moved on to the procedure for sample collection. John Winters stated that the problem before was that they weren't sampling close enough to the water table. It needs to be dependent on the water level at the time of sampling, not a specific depth. John Winters and Rich May provided a diagram on the flip chart to explain what was required. John Winters acknowledged that the way 62-780 FAC is written is somewhat vague, but that they were making an effort to get everyone on the same page. What the FDEP requires is to sample as close to the water table as possible, but obtain a dry soil sample.</p> |
| <p>CNO Award Application</p> | <p>Review of the CNO Award Application was not performed due to time constraints. Arturo noted that it had only been sent to John Winters.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-10 – Team - Send comments on CNO to Tom or Jennifer Choich by next Tuesday the 16th.</p> |
| <p>AOC2 Update – John Schoolfield</p> | <p>John Schoolfield (John S.) presented an AOC2 Update. He provided a handout and proceeded to discuss the figures included. He went on to say his main interest was in whether or not any free product was going to show up. He had also been interested in the oxygen concentrations, however O₂ concentrations were high so . . . it's not really a point of interest so much now. They should have the data back in a week or two.</p> <p>John S. stated that monitor well installations and how to address the utilities section were things that needed to be discussed.</p> <p>John S. noted there are 3 layers of wells between the former source area and Alligator Bay from which a round of samples was collected before the source was removed. The analytical results were all below GCTLs. He stated that he didn't think there were going to be any exceedances. He went on to say that he didn't think the ground water moved there, because the groundwater flow is pretty slow, didn't expect anything to move offsite. He then went on to ask Larry his opinion.</p> <p>Larry replied they haven't had the opportunity to monitor the free product area since 2004; at that time they had free product. Larry stated that he had looked in the remedial excavation pit and it didn't look like he thought it was going to look. However, when they took the side wall samples, they were higher than SCTLs would allow in order for us to just leave it there. Bill Gates directed the generation of a work plan, which had been viewed by John Schoolfield.</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|--|--|
| | <p>Larry went on to say that one well would be needed as a point of compliance for the state, as well as another per John Winters request. We still need to sample the wells for a year to pass the point of compliance with the state of Florida. We can continue to monitor those piezometers. He suggested having another conference call in 3 months to see where we are.</p> <p>Rich suggested holding off well installation until free product measurement had provided more information.</p> <p>Further team discussion led to the decision that Larry would be able to check the piezometers for free product during G300 event with an oil/water interface probe.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-11- Larry will check the piezometers for free product (during the next G300 sampling which has been deferred to January).</p> |
| <p>CAMP/Exit Strategy Review – Mike Clayton</p> | <p>The team reviewed the exit strategy table.</p> <p>Rich noted that columns L & M are in question right now and asked whether or not the Remedy In Place dates were correct. The next submittal is not due until February. Rich asked if these dates needed to be reconsidered, and stated that this may be something Arturo and John Winters would need to think about.</p> <p>Tom agreed with Rich's position – this can't be answered until we have those action items addressed and should be deferred.</p> <p>Rich went on to say with regards to the UST sites, John Schoolfield and Rico own that page for NAVFAC SE; as far as he knew, FDEP doesn't consider the site management plan (SMP) as fully complete. What's going to happen is, Eric & Jim have asked that it be submitted in the next 60 days to be the 2009 SMP. From TtNUS' standpoint, unless the Navy have questions, Larry, Tom, and Rich are just resources on this.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-12 – Rich will distribute the most current exit strategy to the whole team.</p> <p>Rich requested that the formatting on the UST page, specifically the columns need to stay where they are since they are used in a Tier II macro.</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|--|--|
| <p>Well Abandonment</p> | <p>The team began discussing the Parking Lot Item concerning monitoring well abandonment procedures.</p> <p>Tom recommended abandoning as many inactive wells as possible. What we need to do is get an inventory of all the facility wells because we can't abandon them unless we know where they all are.</p> <p>Action Item #12-08-13 –Tom will compile a well inventory and a recommendation for abandonment for all NSA PC wells.</p> <p>Further team discussion noted that well abandonment would have to be performed by a licensed well driller.</p> |
| <p>Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda - Mike</p> | <p>Jacqueline read all action and consensus items aloud for the team, and made minor adjustments per team comments.</p> <p>The facilitator lead the team in discussion of the +/- for the meeting:</p> <p>+ Got a lot achieved Good communication/no conflicts Integration of the new members Full team Enjoyed lunch Welcoming team Enjoyable meeting/good progress on sites New Facilitator</p> <p>- Took a little longer at lunch than we had planned Too cold, so we had to go off property for lunch Weather Rico and Larry got wet on the site tour Scribe adjusting to new group's manner of speaking</p> <p>Pat asked for feedback on being more or less intrusive. She noted that for a team with a large amount of turn over, you still seem to be in a high performing stage. Any time you think of a particular topic that you think you'd like additional training on, let me know.</p> <p>The team proceeded to discuss meeting dates and locations for 2009.</p> <p>Monday, March 9, 2009 – Virtual Meeting 1pm Central (2pm Eastern) – plan for 3 hours. Tom Johnston will be the team leader, Arturo McDonald will be the timekeeper</p> |

| Item | Discussion/Status/Actions |
|------|--|
| | <p>Rich requested that John Schoolfield and Rico test on NMCI to see if meeting place can be used. Rich suggested having a practice run with meeting place prior to the actual meeting.</p> <p>John Schoolfield noted a possible scheduling conflict due to MRP training. He believes it will be held in April, but will check to make sure it isn't in March when he gets back.</p> <p><u>Wednesday, June 10, 2009 – Face-to-Face Meeting</u> Tallahassee - Arturo McDonald will be the team leader, John Schoolfield will be the time keeper.</p> <p>Rich noted the TtNUS Tallahassee office location has changed :</p> <p>1558 Village Square Blvd., Ste. 2 Tallahassee, FL 32309</p> <p><u>Wednesday, September 16, 2009 – Virtual Meeting</u> 1pm Central (2pm Eastern) – plan for 3 hours. The team leader will be John Schoolfield, John Winters will be time keeper.</p> <p><u>Wednesday, November 18, 2009 – Face-to-Face Meeting</u> <i>in Tally</i> Jacksonville - John Winters will be the team leader, and Mike Clayton will be the time keeper.</p> <p>Pat asked if there would be any additional agenda topics. The team responded that it would basically be the same as this meeting. Discussion for LUCs, well abandonment, and the G300 would be added to the agenda.</p> |

School field conflict

*Pensacola Mtg 18-19 Nov.
Friday Nov 20?*

Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
June 17, 2008

| Action Item No. | Responsible Party | Status | Due Date | Action Item |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 12-08-01 | Jacqueline | Ongoing | Done | Jacqueline will update the charter roles and responsibilities per Mike's notes on the handout. |
| 12-08-02 | Team | Ongoing | Done? | Everyone will send their contact info updates to Jacqueline via email address provided (Jacqueline.strobl@tetrattech.com). |
| 12-08-03 | Arturo | Ongoing | Done | Arturo will have a tickler on his outlook to remind him of the annual LUC report. |
| 12-08-04 | Arturo | Ongoing | work request → confirm | Arturo Confirm LUC maps have been updated. |
| 12-08-05 | John Winters | Ongoing | John Done Not to be repeated | John Winters will verify whether or not a letter is needed following LUC implementation. He will see if permit approval will satisfy the requirement – check the start date. |
| 12-08-06 | John Winters | Ongoing | Done | John Winters needs to verify when the year begins on the monitoring on each of the sites (this will depend on whether this is the signing date of the CMIP or the permit) |
| 12-08-07 | Mike | Ongoing | Mike in Authority - Delegated | Signature authority for signing the LUC Compliance Certificate. |
| 12-08-08 | Arturo & Tom | Ongoing | Done | Arturo & Tom – Check with the Bay Environmental Study Team – look up Andrew's Bay data. |
| 12-08-09 | Tom | Ongoing | Done | Finish the SWMU 2 LTM Round 3 report, send to John Schoolfield first for review. |
| 12-08-10 | Team | Ongoing | Done | Send comments on CNO to Tom and Jennifer by next Tuesday the 16 th . |
| 12-08-11 | Larry | Ongoing | Done Done | Larry will check the piezometers for free product (during G300) |
| 12-08-12 | Rich | Ongoing | Done plus Tom list same | Rich will distribute the most current exit strategy to the whole team. |
| 12-08-13 | Tom | Ongoing | Done | Tom will compile a total well inventory as well as a recommendation list for well abandonment for all NSA PC wells. |

Call 125

NSA Panama City Partnering Team Consensus Items

| Consensus Item No. | Consensus Item |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | August 29, 2008 Meeting minutes approved. |
| 2 | The team agreed to changed text in charter to "regulatory requirements" |

NSA Panama City Partnering Team Parking Lot

| Parking Lot No. | Parking Lot Issue |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| | |

Meeting Minutes Attachments: