PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Date - December 9-10,1998
Location - Charleston, **SC**
Team Leader- Allison Harris
Gate Keeper/Timekeeper - Ron Joyner
Recorder - Bill Hill
Process Facilitator - Ron Joyner
Facilitator - Jerry Arcaro

ATTENDEES:

TEAM MEMBERS:	SUPPORT MEMBERS:
Karen Atchley	Tier II Link, Paul Stoddard
Brian Caldwell	Tier II Link, Jon Johnston
Charlie Donahue	
Allison Harris	Jerry Arcaro (Facilitator)
Bill Hill	
Ron Joyner	
B. K. Moring	
Gena Townsend	
David Grabka	

Check-in

Everyone was notified Mr. Arcaro had been admitted to Roper hospital on the 9th with chest pains. Ron crashed at the Pensacola Snowball Derby but survived with a few bumps and bruises. Bill reported he had been diagnosed with pneumonia the week before. B.K. had the flu. Other than that everyone stated they had been doing fine.

Bill passed out the revised team processes and ground rules. The team reviewed them.

No comments were added to the plus/deltas from last meeting.

Tier II update

Tier II meet in Orlando the first week in December. The following was relayed:

1) The MOA can be used for CNET activities that were developed for CINCLANTFLT. A regional instruction is being put into place by the Navy that will be applicable to Pensacola. It is not known when it will happen.

9812-A 96: Karen to prepared a Draft MOA for discussion at our January meeting.

2) Transition to CLEAN **3** – Tier II has mandated that all paper documents/data generated by CLEAN 1 & 2 will become the responsibility of **CLEAN 3.** CLEAN 1 & 2 will not be allowed to store "paper".

3) Team Survey Test – The Test has been revised from 150 to 75 yes/no questions. It should be completed in the spring. The Pensacola Team questions the value of the survey since none was received from the first.

4) Facilitator Evaluation Form – It was brought to our attention that this form was to be a team effort from Tier II's prospective. The following decision was reached:

9812-D54: Since the facilitator is a Navy contract, the Navy representative shall provide the evaluation.

5) Empowerment – An observation from Tier II was that the Pensacola Team is the only Team to bring this up from the State's structure. No explanation was asked for; therefore, no discussion was held.

6) Partnering Training – Tier II stated Partnering Training for new Tier I members would be conducted in Charleston on March 2 & 3, 1999. Additional information will be forth coming.

RAB Presentation

B.K. passed out a point paper to be in response to Mr. Ucci's letter to Ron. Comments were received and improvements will be incorporated. Ron will present this at the RAB meeting in January.

5 – Year Review

Gena explained if contaminates are left above non-restrictive criteria, a 5-year review is required to insure restrictions are still in place. The guidance also recommends that when a 5-year review is started, the status of all sites should be included. David asked if there was a specific format to be followed? Gena's response was not at this time. The Navy would like to use the 5-year review report as a tool to obtain "NO FURTHER ACTION' for sites once remedial goals are obtained. For example OU 10, the ROD was signed which required a limited amount of surface soils to be remeidated and that the groundwater be transferred to the RECRA program. The surface soils have attained the unrestricted land use status and the groundwater is being treated under the RECRA program. This generated the following action item:

9812-A97: Charlie to verify the RECRA part B Permit has incorporated the CERCLA requirements.

After this we need to consult with Jim Crane if a 5-year review can be completed and the site be granted "NO FURTHER ACTION". Bill identified the term "NO FURTHER ACTION' means "NO ADDITIONAL EXPENDURE OF CERCLA FUNDS" to the Navy for a given site.

Finalize FY99 Goal's

Everyone participated and grouped the similar goals which were broken out into two major topics; Technical and Team Processes:

Technical Topics were:

- Finalize Action on Site 2
- Finalize Site 15 ROD
- Finalize OU **2** ROD
- Finalize Action on Site 41
- Finalize Action on Site 40
- Finalize Site 40 ROD
- Complete Evaluation for Site 15 and Select Recommended Alternative
- Innovative Technologies to be used for Corrective Action at "Two" Sites
- Identify which Receptors we are trying to Protect
- Establish Acceptable Rates of Recovery (Site Specific)
- Establish Exit Strategies
- Explore all Options Available to be the Most Cost Affective
- Make the most Cost Effective Decisions Possible to be Protective of the Environment and Human Health

Team Processes were:

- Documents to be reviewed within two months 90% of the time
- Make a smooth transition to CLEAN **3**
- Regulator Comments are Anticipated rather than Reacted to
- Team Commits to Active Remediation
- Ecological Environmental Concerns are Given the Same Weight as Human Health
- Team Members have Respect for Each Others Agencies
- Team Receives Better Documents with Conclusions Already with Team Buy-in
- To have Each Agency provide Suggestions on How to Complete Sites
- Make Win-Win Decisions
- Maintain a Positive Attitude

Site 15 –FS

A review of the Remedial Alternatives was presented by Allison. This was conducted to insure everyone was in total agreement of the Selected Alternatives the Team had made previously. The selected Alternative for the Ground Water was Monitored Natural Attenuation (w/IC) for **30** years at a cost of $740,000 vs. a less costly alternative of installation of a Ground Water Recovery System (w/IC) to remove a calculated volume of ground water over a five year period at a cost of **$603,000** assuming the FOTW can accept the anticipated levels of arsenic. This lead to an the following Action Item:

9812-A98: Ron to contact the FOTW to confirm if they can accept the anticipated levels of arsenic without violating their permit.

The selected Surface Soil Alternative was to Cap with Limited Excavation (w/IC) over a 30 year period at a cost of $332,000 vs. a less costly alternative of Limited Excavation without capping (w/IC) over a **30** year period at a cost of **$230,000.** This lead to the following Decision Item:

9812-D55: Change the selected Alternative to the less costly alternative, Limited Excavation without capping (w/IC).

Site 2 – FS

Gena stated USEPA was in agreement to proceed with the double contingency ROD. FDEP was not sure. State's position on an acceptable recovery rate is five years. The following Action Item was developed.

9812-A99: Gena shall develop a flow chart with all contingencies. Gena to check with their Engineering Support Division to see if they can provide assistance in obtaining additional field samples.

Natural Attenuation

Gena presented a case study from Camp Lejeune and stressed that **EPA** requires supporting data as outlined in their guidance before a natural Attenuation Alternative will be considered. This was received very well from everyone. We assured this approach was being applied at Site **38** with the additional sampling conducted the first week in December.

Site 1 RD

Karen informed the Team that the work plans they have prepared to date did not include parameter monitor sampling or well abandonment. She asked if they could proceed with the work plan in a phased approach? This would allow Bechtel time to develop the QC requirements, Sampling and Analysis Plan, well abandonment, and report writing requirements with exit strategies. The following decision was agreed:

9812-D56: Proceed with the work plan to prevent delaying the installation of the Groundwater trench system **as** a phased approach. This will allow Bechtel time to develop the additional work plan to include monitoring requirements, **QC** Plan, Sampling and analysis Plan, well abandonment, required report writing, **and** exit strategies.

Questions came up as to weather or not an Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) would be required if the alternative to divert the effluent to the FOTW in lieu of that outlined in the ROD. The following decision was agreed:

9812-D57: An ESD would be required if the alternative to divert the effluent to the FOTW were selected.

The following action item was generated to help support the alternative:

9812-A100: Bechtel shall develop cost for offsite disposal of the iron sludge generated if a lagoon was to be constructed. **A** conference call is scheduled for Tuesday Dec 15 at 10:30 Eastern.

Site 1 Conference Call

I tried to jot down the key issues that were discussed during the conversation. I know I may not have captured everything but this may help.

1) Max iron concentration detected in the intermediate portion of the upper surfacial aquifer was 25,000ppb in 1994.

2) Background for iron at this depth was 1,700ppb.

3) GW flow model indicated a recharge rate to wetland **3** was 69gal/min

4) The head pressure is greater in the intermediate zone than the surface, thus indicating continuos upper water flow into wetland **3.**

5) Cost to install a settling lagoon, offsite sludge disposal, and monitor for **30** years - $ ***6.6*** million

6) Cost to connect to the FOTW and monitor for **30** years - $4.5 million

7) Ron's concern - What are we getting for the cost? Will we ever achieve clean-up goals?

8) Disposal of sludge if lagoon is constructed - 50,000 gallon/year to be removed twice a year at a total of 76,000 per year **(2.28** million over **30** years)

9) Gena's concern - Wetland 3 will not achieve **an** appropriate amount of recharge if a FOTW direct line is installed which will change the wetland characterizes. This would not be acceptable.

10) Additional alternative agreed upon to be considered - installation of the FOTW line with an alternate water recharge to wetland **3.**

11) Action item for Charlie - Check on the State's position of what the characteristics are between a freshwater and an estuarine wetland.

12) Action item for Charlie - Determine the State's position on how the Coastal Zone Management Act affects the wetlands across NAS Pensacola since they are all influenced by coastal conditions.

13) Action item for Allison - research the exceedances for surface water standards in wetland 4. Find out what the salinity levels were detected at in wetland **3** & **4.** Find out what concentrations of iron are in the deep-water wells on the base.

14) Action item for Karen - Develop rough costs for each alternative recharge scenarios, from wetland 4, from the deep-water aquifer, from off site (Cory Station).

Follow-up Conference call will be Thursday December 17th at 10:30Eastern (9:30 Central).

I just want to add one thing. I am getting confused with all the various alternatives as to what our point of compliance is. (Yes I am thinking of possible exit strategies for the Navy.) Is it the effluent of the GW to the FOTW, the surface water from wetland **3,** an adjacent GW well sample to meet surface water criteria, or to meet background?

Allison provided the following:

Here is some info.

The two deep production wells near the comer of Duncan and Radford Blvd. were sampled in **1993.** Organics were not detected in either sample. Iron was detected in both wells at **1,660** ppb and **4,050** ppb. Two times the mean is **5,710** ppb. Remember the freshwater standard is **1,000** ppb and the shallow groundwater reference concentration is **1,707.8** ppb.

At Site 1, deep groundwater samples were collected at **GM-43, GM-44** and **GM-45.** Iron was detected in each monitoring well at **3,100** ppb, **1,690** ppb, and **4,130** ppb. Organics were not detected in deep groundwater samples.

Salinity was measured in Wetland 4 at **0.83%.** Field observations indicate that Wetland **4D** stays pretty fresh in its upper reaches, as typified by the cattails and other fresh water aquatic plants there. In its lower reaches, it is more salty, typified the black needle rush, and other estuarine type plants growing in these portions.

The samples locations in Wetland 4D were in the upper reaches of this water body, directly adjacent to where Wetland **3** discharges into **4D** (sample location **01),** and directly below Wetland 4C (sample location 04).

That's what I got so far. Talk to you Thursday **12/17** at **9:30** a.m.

Allison

Brian's input:

Team:
Here are some points from Brian that he would like to clarify in the minutes. He asked me to forward them to the Team.

The model was designed to address the FULL aquifer thickness, not a portion of it. As a result, its difficult to quantify exactly what the behaviour of the shallow vs. intermediate flow systems will be once design is completed. I believe however, based on the concept that the wetland serves **as** a drain for the shallow surficial, that eliminating shallow recharge to the wetland will solve the surface water issue. This belief also assumes that little to no intermediate water enters the wetland under normal conditions, but flows underneath it towards Golf Course Pond. Some pertinent data to support these ideas:

1) Long-term synoptic events show a consistent 1+ foot positive head of shallow over intermediate in the vicinity of the wetland **(GS64** and **GI65).**

2) Long term synoptic events also show a consistent 10+ feet positive head of shallow over Wetland **3** (staff guage **8).**

3) Site 1 RD water levels show a marked drop in head (9+ feet) in the shallow from the **GS64** upgradient location to the shallow along the edge of the wetland (measured by piezometers), indicating the wetland is a discharge area for the shallow.

4) We lack the data to define the behaviour of the intermediate along the same flow path described in **3),** but we think that the drop in head is not as dramatic, meaning that the water in wetland **3** is suppilied mostly, if not in whole, by discharge from the shallow. I suspect the impetus for the intermediate to vertically discharge to the wetland is curtailed by a combination of pressure head maintained on top of it by the shallow **as** well as the low permeability sediment lining the base of the wetland.

Based on these ideas, the design that stops shallow discharge to the wetland, then maintains the positive head over the intermediate by returning that water to the wetland after treatment should be effective at restoring surface water quality in the wetland. However, the design which eliminates the head over the intermediate may allow the untreated intermediate to discharge to the wetland and foil the design efficiency. I would like to be able to say definitely what the behaviour of the intermediate would be in either case, but the model was not intended to discriminate between the two depths in the aquifer, thus the data is simply not available....Having said all this, I believe that we are headed in the right direction by moving forward with the proposed design, with a contingency for providing additional water to the wetland if need be.

9812 –D58: As a result of the above information the team collectively greed in the follow-up conference call on Dec 17 that the most cost effective alternative was to direct the GW effluent directly to the FOTW. Recharge of Wetland **3** would not be implemented at this time but will be included in the work plan as a contingency. AN ESD will be prepared and submitted. Bechtel will proceed on the Phased work plan approach.

ROD Progress

Rod's for OU 1, 14, and 17 have been submitted. EPA has provided concurrence for each. FDEP stated all are acceptable to date and are going through the chain of command for approval.

Site 38

Gena stated she needs an additional copy of the Final Remedial Investigation Report. Allison stated she would send her one.

Site 40/41

A discussion on background concentrations was held. The approach to resolve DDT background levels at NAS Pensacola will be conducted by conference call between NOAA, FDEP, and EnSafe on Dec21 at 1:30 Eastern. Mercury was decteted in sediments very randomly.

9812-A101: Allison will discuss level of effort to include higher trophic fish model. If it does not require a great effort we will include the model. Also the report should include data to discuss the frequency and levels of concentrations concerning mercury to eliminate it as a COPC. The following are various correspondences on this subject:

CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES
December 21, **1998**
NAS Pensacola Sites 40 **&** 41

Participants: Tom Dillon, David Grabka, Allison Harris, Ron Joyner, Chuck Mason

Upper Trophic Level Fish Model

Action item: Chuck will call John Connolly at Quantitative Environmental Analysis to get a reference to support the transfer factor of 3 and the apparent effects level of 50 to 60.

Action item: Tom to call chuck Mason and provide paper developed by the EPA lab in Duluth Minn. Concerning No Effects Level And Lower Effects Level of DDT residues.

Decision: Model is appropriate to present to the team if the above numbers can be supported.

DDT Background

Decision: Make the DDD background 50 ppb for Sites **40 & 41** based on the results of the NOAA study and the highest detect in the "blue" wetlands.

Decision: Make the DDT background **20** ppb for Sites 40 & 41 based on the results of the NOAA study and the highest detect in the "blue" wetlands.

Decision: Make the DDE background 40 ppb for Sites 40 & **41** based on the highest detect in the "blue" wetlands.

NOTE: The above numbers are derived from the upper range of the "blue" wetlands and are not to be multiplied by a factor of **2.**

Action: Chuck will research the background levels that is being proposed, search for a spiked sample study and how the background levels relate to probable effects levels.

1) David Grabka replied on **12/22/98** by E-mail

Team,

Here are some comments **I** have concerning yesterday's conference call. *I* think we did a damn good job of coming up with the numbers. I have already begun the process of trying to get management buy-in to the formula we used in coming up with the numbers. However, after having slept on it, I have some concerns about the usage of the numbers. They are below.

I have a bit of a problem with using the Site 41 data to come up with levels for Site 40. **I** have some confidence in the applicability of the numbers we came up with for terrestrial wetlands, but much **less** confidence that those numbers are directly applicable to Bayou Grande. However, I do feel numbers can be derived from the data we have in hand **in** conjunction with the NOAA study. The same sort of process

would be used, but with different inputs. I feel a substitute for "blue" or reference wetlands may be assessment zone AZ-1. I think this has been proposed in the past, but hasn't received much support, probably because of us. The Site 42 Pensacola Bay data may also be of some use as well. What does the rest of the team think? In particular, what does Tom think?

I also have a problem with the term "background" in conjunction with the numbers that we came up with. I feel a more accurate statement is that the numbers derived reflect the highest levels at which anthropogenic levels of DDD, DDE and DDT from standard basewide pesticide use would be expected to be found in Site 41 sediments. Truly background levels of DDT and its metabolites I believe would be much, much lower. I know that this is just semantics, but I feel that we might avoid some headaches by avoiding the word "background". I would suggest a new term, like anthropogenic maximum or something else.

I hope my comments don't give anyone any heartburn. After all, I realize I was in on the teleconference and probably should have thought of it then.

Dave

2) Allison Harris provided the following on 12/23/98 by E-mail

Just to give you food for thought. I will be back in the office on Monday January 4, 1998. We are shooting for a January 14 submittal date so decisions need to be made quickly. We've had some really good conference calls lately so if y'all would like, I would be happy to set one up.

AZ 1
DDT was not detected in any of the samples collected in AZ 1.

DDD was detected at 1 of 36 locations (two samples were rejected) at 1.6 ppb. The TEL is 1.22 ppb. The PEL is 7.81 ppb

DDE was detected at 13 of 37 locations (one location was rejected) at a range of 0.99 to 4.4 ppb with a mean of 2.4 ppb. The SSV is 2.07 ppb. The PEL is 3.74 ppb.

Detected cocentrations in Bayou Grande are the lowest of any of the bayous in the NOAA study of the Pensacola Bay System.

3) Allison Harris provided the following on 1/6/99 **by** E-mail:

I haven't heard from anyone about Dave's email or my food for thought response. The report is due very soon. Thoughts, comments are encouraged.

4) Bill Hill provided the following on 1/12/99 by E-mail:

I haven't seen any responses to the on the subject of DDT background to be used for Sites 40 & 41. I had not responded because I was not on the conference call and do not know the equations or how the numbers stated in the conference call minutes were derived. I understand were David's concerns are but it seems like sometimes you have to start believing in the data collected and not let your beliefs rule. I personally endorse the generic values derived outlined in the minutes. Unless someone can scientifically prove why these are unacceptable I recommend the documents should be completed using these values. EnSafe has been working diligently to comply with the schedules agreed upon and would only have one day to make corrections before the document goes to printing. This is my position on David's concern. What is your position? Please respond ASAP. Patrnering means open communication and we are not communicating.

As for a another term for "background" I thought we were to use "reference". A definition will be placed in the glossary regardless of what it is called.

5) B.K. Moring provided the following on 1/13/99 by E-mail:

I feel that the members of the subcommittee who participated in the meeting are the most qualified on our team to determine the appropriate reference values . I fully support the decisions (there's that word again!) that were made during the Dec. 21 conference call. BK

6) David Grabka provided the following on 1/13/99 by E-mail:

The problem as I see it is in terminology and the ways in which the numbers are to be used. Reference concentrations, which are only truly applicable to naturally occurring compounds (generally only inorganics), are used as a screening tool to remove particular compounds as COPCs. However, DDT and its metabolites can in no way be considered naturally occurring and the numbers that we came up with would not be applicable as a screening tool at the various wetlands. However, in the ecological risk assessment portion of the RI, it would be used as one of several lines of evidence to discuss whether or not to address DDT at a wetland. The main line of evidence to decide whether to address DDT at a particular wetland would be whether a particular wetland is associated with a site where DDT was handled, stored, disposed of, etc. These would be sites such as landfills, pesticide mixing areas, pesticide storage areas, locations that have had documented spills in the past, pesticide rinsing areas, pesticide disposal areas, etc. The concentrations that I believe we came up with represent the maximum DDT concentration that a particular wetland would have if it is (1) not associated with a site, (2) from normal DDT application by the base or local mosquito control agencies and *(3)* from natural accumulation from stormwater runoff as the wetland acts as a sink. I discussed the methodology we used with management on Monday, but didn't get a straight answer from them. Pretty much, their idea is if it is a stormwater problem and can be shown to not be site related, the DDT can be addressed as a stormwater problem. Otherwise, they had little input on the numbers that we have come up with when I spoke with them, although they said they have confidence in our NOAA representative and his interpretation of the data. I

still haven't seen anything from Tom since the teleconference. What are his views on this? He is the one who understands ecorisk assessments best of our group.

7) Allison Harris provided the following on 1/13/99 by E-mail:

Thanks for responding but the response addresses Site 41, not Site 40 which is the more immediately due document (within the next few days). What are the thoughts/concerns for that? **I** will be happy to set up a conference call to facilitate the discussion, but **I** need to do it now (today or tomorrow) so the deadline can be met.

8) Karen Atchley provided the following on 1/13/99 by E-mail:

Allison,
My suggestion is for you to just set up a conference call and tell everyone the time but first call Tom to assure that he will be on it from somewhere. I feel from all the e-mails a lot of frustration because we are not as a team helping each other.
Karen

9) Allison provide the following on 1/13/99 by E-mail:

David,
From your email, I understand that if Tom finds the DDT background concentrations acceptable then it is okay. Is that correct?

I've talked to Tom this afternoon. He is available at 3:00 eastern on Friday afternoon (1/15) if a conference call is needed, but if the above understanding is correct then a call is not needed.

10) David Grabka provided the following on 1/14/99 by E-mail:

Allison,
You are correct in your understanding that if Tom finds from his NOAA study that the numbers generated during the teleconference are acceptable, then I have no further qualms concerning them. **I** don't find the same sort of supporting evidence that I think **I** found in the Site 41 RI data, but trust in Tom's understanding of the ecorisk assessment process and the NOAA study. I still find them unsuitable for use as screening criteria to remove DDT from the list of COPCs at the outset, but they should be usable at some point in the ecorisk assessment as a set of evidence to be weighed in determining if DDT should be further addressed. This sort of presupposes that those levels of DDT found are not specifically related to a site and don't also cause an unacceptable risk, but you know that already. From the little that I have been able to glean from the Site 40 RI, there only appears to be a few potential site sources for DDT, those being Site 1 landfill, a pesticide mixing area next to the golf course and possibly some wetlands that drain into Redoubt Bayou. Are there any others that **I** might have missed? Dave

This was the end of the correspondence on this topic.

NOAA's Participation

Discussion was held concerning NOAA's recent lack in participation. After this discussion everyone felt the solution is more open and constant communication.

New Member Check-in

Th Team preformed an entrance exercise for Charlie Donahue.

Action Items from Previous Meeting

Status of Action Items	Status
9810-A69: Dave to get with management and ecosystem management personnel concerning the double contingency ROD to see if concurrence can be reached.	Pending
9810-A70: Gena to get with attorneys concerning double contingency ROD and whether samples can be collected as part of the RD.	Complete
9810-A71: Allison to determine which analytical parameters we will need to determine recovery rate.	Complete
9810-A72: Gena to find references for an ecological recovery rate.	Pending
9810-A75: Ron to get with MWR director to go over the allover remedial plan for Site 15.	Complete
9811-A83: All team members to review MBTI introduction material and other team members MBTI characteristics for discussion 11/4.	Complete
9811-A84: Gena will bring information to answer five-year review questions What is it? What is the process for creating it? How will the review be used? What is the impact of the five year review on the site?	Complete
9811-A85: All team members are to list their unrestricted goals for FY99 to bring to the Team on 11/5	Complete
9811-A86: Allison to submit an errata page for the Site 42 ROD **so** it can been sent to the Secretary for concurrence.	Complete
9811-A87: Allison to submit a letter explaining that none of the iron detections in surface soil exceed the SCTL of 23,000 mg/kg at Site 17.	Complete

9811-A88: Ron will phone the RAB member to tell him that we will address his concerns at the next RAB meeting.	Pending
9811-A89: Ron will add the member's concerns to the next RAB meeting agenda	Pending
9811-A90: BK will draft elements of the response to the RAB member's concerns and Ron will review. The elements will be presented to all Team Members at the next Partnering Team meeting in December.	Complete
9811-A91: Ron will present the response to the RAB member's concerns at the next RAB meeting	Pending
9811-A92: Allison to send a copy of the DDT memorandum to Tom Dillon.	Complete
9811-A93: Dave to check on locations in question and provide the data to Brian who will check the elevations of the soil.	Complete
9811-A94: Karen will email Dave and Gena a request for comments on the Completion Reports for Various Site Removals.	Complete
9811-A95: Each team member will write down goals on sticky notes (one goal per note) for compilation at the December meeting.	Complete
9802-A14: Brian to follow up on the list of wells to be kept for future modelling	Ongoing
9806-A44 Review Tier II deliverable package (rev. 8) for corrections and respond to Bill.	Ongoing
9808-A60: Chuck to check turbidity readings in Wetland 13 and 19 to help validate results.	Complete
9809-A65: Khafra to evaluate particulate emission factor that is acceptable for OU13.	Pending
9811-M03: Bring MBTI materials to all meetings	Ongoing

PENSACOLA TIER I MEETING AGENDA
January 26-27, *1999*
Place: EnSafe Office
Pensacola, FL

Team Leader:	Bill Hill
Recorder:	Ron Joyner
Timekeeper:	B.K. Moring
Process Facilitator:	Gena Townsend
Facilitator:	Jerry Arcaro
Tier II Link:	Paul Stoddard & Jon Johnston
Adjunct(s):	Tom Dillon

Start Time: 01/26 @ 0800
End Time: 01/27 @ 1700

ITEM	GOAL	TIME - hr.	LEADER
Check-in -Plus-Delta Review -Proc./Groundrules -Sharing -Review Action Items	Check-in	1.0	BH
Training	Learn	1.5	JA
New Member Training	Update: Who, When, Where?	0.5	JA/PS
New Member Check-in	Welcome Joe Fugitt	1.0	BH
RAB Update Day One	Review of Ron's Response	0.5	RJ
RAB Update Day Two	Meeting Cretique	0.5	RJ
Site 2 ROD (NOAA)	Agreement on Direction	1.0	GT
Site 1 Monitoring (NA-GW)	Develop Monitoring Plan	1.0	KA
Contingencies on ROD's	Why? Discussion	1.0	BH
Site 1 Conference Calls	Status	1.0	KA
Site 40/41 Conference Call	Status	1.0	DG

OU *6*	How much Dirt is at the Spots?	0.5	BC
Site **38 Risk** Assessment	Finalize	1.0	AH
OU 2 HHRA	Finalize	1.0	AH
Site Status (for RAB)	Info Share	2.0	BH
Checkout	Checkout	1.0	BH

Metrics
- Success Stories
- Review Action Items
- Draft Agenda
- Meeting Critique

Naval Air Station Pensacola

Plus/Delta Meeting Evaluation
December 9 & 10,1998

PLUS
Ron Participated Fully
Team Leader
Good Host
Good Fun
Tiny Tim (the horse)
Charleston – Great Location
Meeting Dialogue
Tom's Participation
Team Improvement
Team Led the Meeting
Self-facilitation
Jon's Absence
Not many Deltas

DELTA
No Facilitation
John's Absence

Future Meeting Locations

February 23 & 24,1999
Anchorage Inn
26 Vendue Range
Charleston, SC
Phone: (843)723-8300

March 23 & 24,1999
Tallahassee, FL
Location: TBD

April 27 & 28, 1999
St. Augustine, FL
Location: TBD

May 25 & 26
Pensacola, FL
Location: TBD