N00204.AR.001966
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

FINAL
PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES

DATE:	**Feb 26-27, 2002**
TEAM LEADER:	**Greg Wilfley**
SCRIBE:	**Barbara Albrecht**
GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER:	**Brian Caldwell**
PROCESS FACILITATOR:	**Gus Campana**

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:
Allison Harris – EnSafe Inc.
Brian Caldwell – EnSafe Inc.
Terry Hansen – TTNUS
Bill Hill – SouthDiv
Ron Joyner – NAS Pensacola
Gena Townsend – USEPA
Tracie Vaught – FDEP
Greg Wilfley – CH2MHill

Support Members:
Barbara Albrecht – Site 2 Support
Tom Dillon – NOAA
Phil Hardy – Site 41 Support
Paul Stoddard – Tier II Link
Lynn Wellman – USEPA

1. Check-In

The meeting began at 8:00 AM each day. Every one is doing fine. The ground rules and processes were reviewed.

2. Meeting Discussion Items

The following items were reviewed as priority discussion topics for the given day during the meeting:

Topics	February 26	February 27
Training	X	
Sites 15/43 Review	X	
OU-1 Review	X	
Pre/Post RAB	X	X
Site 40 Review	X	
Site 41 Review	X	X
OU-11 Review		X
Tier II Update		X
OU-13 Review		X
OU-2 Review		X

3. Training

G. Campana took the Team through a review and a practical application of the Critical Path Method; a performance measurement tool for analyzing and managing projects. He was able to use Site 2 for his training exercise which proved helpful to the group.

Action Item: B. Hill to update schedules to reflect training exercise results.

4. Sites 15/43 Update

G. Wilfley anticipates mobilization for the removal work at Sites 15 and 43 by April 9, 2002. G. Townsend said that the Site 15 cleanup goals are changing (the remediation goals are changing based on a 95% calculation of the risk) and that this should be documented in a letter to the file. The change will be a minor change to the ROD that goes straight to the AR.

When the work is documented in a report, the Navy would like to receive a hard copy and a CD, NAS Pensacola would like a hard copy and three CDs, EnSafe would like a CD, and USEPA would like a hard copy and a CD.

Action Item: G. Wilfley will draft the letter with the minor change to the Site 15 ROD.

5. OU-1 Review

Vinyl chloride has been detected in intermediate wells at OU-1. G. Townsend pointed out that monitoring is not solving the problem because vinyl chloride is not degrading at OU-1. The Team, has been asked to look at ways to address this problem.

6. Pre/Post RAB

Prior to the RAB Meeting (held Tuesday night), R. Joyner discussed that B. Hill would provide an update of CH2Mhill's remedial actions at Sites 15 and 43. In addition, B. Hill will present the same Power Point presentation on Site 2 that was recently presented at Port Hueneme, California.

On Wednesday, a debriefing of the RAB meeting pointed out that the only people in attendance the previous evening were the RAB members and not members of the general public. The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 27, 2002.

7. Site 40 Review

Based on the reviews of the August, 2001 sediment and fish tissue mercury sampling, Site 40 appears to be within the acceptable risk range.

Action Item: P. Hardy and A. Harris will refine the Final Site 40 RI Addendum of April 24, 2000 to reflect a recommendation of NFA for the site.

8. Site 41 Review

B. Hill discussed the Navy/Marine Corps Sediments Policy, and compared it to the EPA sediments policy. The Navy's policy appears to be more specific than the EPA's policy. Lynn Wellman agreed with this statement. Central to the Navy sediments policy are: (1) all sediment investigations shall be directly linked to a specific Navy CERCLA/RCRA site; (2) Navy storm water drains, outfalls, and other rainwater conveyances that are not directly linked to a Navy CERCLA or RCRA site shall not be investigated using ER, N, or BRAC funds; (3) cleanup goals shall be risk-based, and will not be based on ecological screening values.

The following Site 41 wetlands were reviewed for their current NFA status: Wetlands 4D, 49, 56, 57, 63B, 79, and W2. Wetland 12 was to be transferred to the UST program, based on a Tier 1 Team decision from September, 1996. The Team must verify what needs to be done to facilitate the transfer and how the wetland will be incorporated into the petroleum program.

Action Item: T. Hansen will verify that Wetland 12 is or isn't included in the pending investigation of the former Bilge Water Plant of the NAS Pensacola waste water treatment plant.

An intensive review of the Site 41 Matrix prepared by P. Hardy was conducted by the Team:

Wetland 1. Team members have previously been concerned with high PAH HQs found at sample locations 0103 and 0104 during the 1996 Phase II sampling. P. Hardy provided information to the group about how these sample locations are not hydraulically connected to Wetland 1, but are in a storm water drainage pathway below twin outfalls that discharge storm water from the Building 3561 area. There is upland between the ditch and the actual wetland. The ditch may have been included in the investigation due to difficulty in finding the actual boundary of Wetland 1 as defined by Parsons and Pruitt. G. Townsend said there may be nothing to remediate in the ditch if it is going to recontaminate itself from further storm water deposition. T. Dillon stated yes we can remediate it if it is part of an active spill. L. Wellman suggested the Team define a basewide total PAH number for storm water outfalls and compare total PAHs at Wetland 1 to this number to see where we stand. B. Hill suggested the Team separate Wetland 1 from the storm water outfall (which is an NPDES permitted discharge) and eliminate samples 0103 and 0104. If samples 0103 and 0104 are not a part of Wetland 1, it was suggested that Wetland 1 be redrawn to remove the ditch and not consider those samples in the refinement of the decision for the wetland. T. Vaught said she would check with Tim Bahr on the acceptability of the total PAH approach, but that taking a background sample from a storm water feature similar to Wetland 1 and comparing the data may be sufficient.

Action Item: P. Hardy and A. Harris will develop a basewide total PAH screening value for

sediment samples collected in storm water pathways.

Action Item: P. Hardy and B. Albrecht will field check Wetland 1 to see if there is a connection between the drainage ditch and the wetland.

Wetland 3. The Team discussed how to possibly include Wetland 3 in the current OU-1 monitoring plan. Currently, TTNUS only samples for iron in conjunction with ongoing OU-1 monitoring. Other inorganics and pesticides would need to be included in a comprehensive monitoring plan for Wetland 3. G. Townsend discussed how the OU-1 ROD could be modified to include the other monitoring parameters for Wetland 3. G. Townsend said there are unanswered questions from the Phase II data for Wetland 3, and confirmatory samples should be collected to see what has changed since 1996. T. Dillon discussed how there was a decrease in contamination at Wetland 3 between the Phase II and Phase III sample results. Tom suggested that a difference in rainfall patterns between these two events may help explain the decrease. A. Harris said we should take Wetland 3 through the DQO process before we collect additional data to see how it will be used. A. Harris wondered what the point would be in moving the wetland to another program. B. Hill could also agree to resample the wetland as long as the Team knows how the new data will be used. L. Wellman pointed out that the bioaccumulation endpoint was never addressed during the Wetland 3 sampling event. The Team decided to develop a DQO process for Wetland 3, with an exit strategy included up front.

Action Item: G. Townsend will review the OU-1 ROD to see how it will be affected by moving Wetland 3 into the OU-1 monitoring plan.

Wetland 5A/B, 6, and 64. A DQO process needs to be developed for these interconnected wetlands. The Team needs to verify that sources from OU-2 are not contributing to these wetlands. B. Hill said that storm water is a contributing source to all of these wetlands and needs to be addressed.

Wetland 10. P. Hardy showed the Team aerial photos of the wetland, as well as the 1939 map of the Naval Air Station, which depicts Wetland 10 as an "open ditch." The concern is the Phase II results for cadmium, chromium, and 4,4-DDT, which all had elevated HQs. P. Hardy said that when the NATTC was built at Chevalier Field, an outfall for storm water from the school was added to the east end of Wetland 10A. P. Hardy also brought up ABB's 1992 UST removal and investigation at Building 3810, which may have contributed contamination to this wetland. B. Caldwell said that the 1992 spill at the adjacent Bilge Water Plant might also have contributed contamination to Wetland 10. B. Hill said there was no known discharge of chemicals in the wetland. B. Caldwell related that there has been much anthropogenic activity at this site and at Magazine Point in general. B. Hill said that the wetland is a good candidate for the Navy/Marine Corps Sediments Policy, as it is not near a CERCLA site and is a storm water conveyance. The team decided that a DQO process needs to be developed for Wetland 10. We also need to verify that Wetlands 10 and 13 are not interconnected. T. Vaught

suggested that data from this wetland be compared to a storm water background sample.

Action Item: B. Hill will review ABB's Building 3810 report and provide feedback to the Team concerning whether a UST at this location contributed contamination at Wetland 10.

Wetland 13. P. Hardy reminded the Team that the collection technique used to gather the surface water sample from this wetland likely contributed to the high inorganics found in the sample results. There was high turbidity in the surface water sample. The constituents found in sediment and surface water compare, indicating turbidity may have contributed to the high inorganics results in the surface water sample. T. Dillon/L. Wellman said we should normalize the data, and approximate the TSS from turbidity and conductivity. If the issue is still unresolved, then return to the wetland to resample surface water. If there is no surface water in the wetland to be sampled, then keep the sediment data, drop the surface water data, and move the wetland into refinement.

Action Item: A. Harris and B. Caldwell will do a desktop to normalize the surface water data for Wetland 13.

Wetlands 15 and 16. The Team recommended DQO processes for both wetlands to address sediment and/or surface water contamination in each.

Wetland 17. P. Hardy reviewed the wetland for the Team, and showed a map of the OU-1 area to show how the wetland is more than 1,200 feet downgradient from the Site 1 boundary. The wetland is also regularly flushed by tides from Bayou Grande. The Team recommended that a confirmatory sample is needed to be able to move this wetland into refinement.

Wetland 18. P. Hardy reviewed the wetland for the Team. 4,4-DDx in sediment is the concern, but DDx was not detected in adjacent Site 1 surface soil samples. There is also concern that the VOC plume in groundwater from Site 1 is moving toward the wetland. Inorganic and organic constituents from adjacent wells have been showing up in surface water at the wetland, which originates from seeps near Site 1. The wetland could become a conveyance for constituents to Bayou Grande. G. Townsend recommends adding Wetland 18 to the Site 1 monitoring plan. B. Hill related that before we do this, a DQO process needs to be established for the wetland.

Wetland 19. P. Hardy reminded the Team that the collection technique used to gather the surface water sample from this wetland likely contributed to the high inorganics found in the sample results (similar to Wetland 13). This wetland is also a conveyance for storm water from Forest Sherman Field (Outfall DD directly discharges to Wetland 19). There are no known sites from which contamination can be linked. G. Townsend asked if any literature might be available to provide evidence that the mercury, lead, and beryllium found in surface

water might have come from airfield operations? B. Hill stated that the wetland might be a candidate for consideration under the Navy/Marine Corps Sediments Policy. The Team suggested doing a desk top calculation to write off the surface water contamination; or, go collect a confirmatory surface water sample.

Wetland 48. The Team reviewed the wetland, which had very high 4,4-DDx in the single Phase II sediment sample collected. It was recommended that a confirmatory sample be collected, along with closely upgradient and downgradient samples to better delineate any contamination found.

Wetland 52. The concern is sediment PAH exceedances at sample location 52E3. This sample was collected from a storm water drainage pathway coming from the transient aircraft parking area of Forest Sherman Field. It was suggested that the Team look at the PAH levels at all storm water outfalls to determine a Total PAH number for comparison. Look at developing a basewide PAH level if the Total PAH comparison doesn't work. B. Hill stated that the wetland might be a candidate for consideration under the Navy/Marine Corps Sediments Policy. It was recommended that an upgradient sediment sample be collected to try and narrow down the source of contamination for 52E3. T. Vaught said she would check with Tim Bahr on the acceptability of the total PAH approach, and recommends comparison to storm water background data.

Wetland 58. The concern is sediment PAH exceedances at sample location 5801. There are no storm water outfalls that discharge into this wetland, which is an interdunal swale connected to perched groundwater. T. Vaught will address earlier FDEP comments about confirmation sampling. Concentrations are not different enough to warrant a deviation from background levels. B. Hill stated the wetland is a candidate for the Navy/Marine Corps sediments policy. L. Wellman suggested the PAHs may have come from adjacent boat traffic and aircraft exhaust. It was recommended the Team examine Total PAHs for the wetland, and possibly collect confirmation samples.

Action Item: A. Harris will respond to FDEP comments on Wetland 58.

Wetland 63A. P. Hardy reviewed the wetland for the Team, and showed a 1951 aerial photo of NAS Pensacola which contains the Chevalier Field area. Wetland 63A/B and Site 14 do not exist in this photo. The wetland came into existence in the 1960s on deposited dredge spoil as a discharge area for storm water outfalls. Three named outfalls discharge into Wetland 63A, one of which is a NPDES discharge point. G. Townsend is not worried about the wetland since the only concern was from sample location 63A3 (one out of five samples). T. Vaught recommended confirmation sampling at Wetland 63A, and comparison of data to storm water background information. L. Wellman suggested doing a model PCBs for the Heron.

Wetland 72. P. Hardy reviewed the wetland for the Team. Wetland 72 has four storm water outfalls discharging rain water gathered from 179 acres of the western portion of Forest Sherman Field. The concern was the high silver concentration collected from sample location 7201. The Team recommended a confirmation surface water sample be collected for silver analysis only.

Wetland W1. This wetland is adjacent former Site 3/current UST-18, the former crash crew training area. The wetland is a storm water drainage pathway for the southwest side of Runway 13/31 at NAS Pensacola. It is mowed and kept free of thick vegetation so it can be used as an over-run area for aircraft operations. It is saturated to the surface and has ponded water in several places. According to G. Wilfley, UST-18 is currently undergoing in-situ land farming to remove soil PAHs. The Team decided to find how to ensure that the remediation and monitoring effort for UST-18 encompasses the adjacent Wetland W1. Upgradient surface water could be sampled to see if there is a connection. B. Hill asked if this wetland can be included in a CERCLA exclusion for airfield operations? The team decided to see how to get the UST program to bring W1 into the UST-18 remediation effort. The connection between past activities and present conditions should be examined to check the potential for further contamination of the wetland. If all parties can agree to the transfer, then the wetland should be moved from the Site 41 RI.

Site 41 Decision Synopsis			
NFA Wetlands	**Wetlands Requiring DQO Process**	**Wetlands Requiring Confirmatory Sampling**	**Wetlands Requiring Other Considerations**
Wetland 4D	Wetland 3	Wetland 17 (surface water)	Wetland 1-Redraw minus 0103/0104
Wetland 49	Wetland 5A/B	Wetland 48 (sediment)	Wetland 12-Transfer
Wetland 56	Wetland 6	Wetland 52 (sediment)	Wetland 13-Normalize data
Wetland 57	Wetland 10	Wetland 72 (surface water)	Wetland 19-Desk-top calculation
Wetland 63B	Wetland 15		Wetland 58-Examine TPAHs
Wetland 79	Wetland 16	*Possible Resampling*	Wetland 63A-Model PCBs
Wetland W2	Wetland 18	Wetland 13 (surface water)	Wetland W1-Transfer
	Wetland 64	Wetland 19 (surface water)	Wetland 15
		Wetland 58 (sediment)	
		Wetland 63A (sed./surface water)	

Tom suggested possible further evaluations of surface water data by modeling water concentrations assuming all contamination was due to the resuspension of bedded sediments. This scenario appears plausible given collection methods described by EnSafe. A hypothetical example, provided by Tom after the meeting, is provided below:

Assume: observed surface water cadmium concentration = 250 μg Cd/L observed TSS concentrations in surface water sample = 100 mg TSS/L observed sediment cadmium concentration at this location = 2 mg/kg

Assume all cadmium in surface water sample is associated with TSS.

250 μg Cd/100 mg TSS or 2.5 mg Cd/ kg TSS

Modeled 2.5 mg Cd/kg approximates observed sediment concentration of 1.5 mg/kg.

The greatest uncertainty in this model for NAS Pensacola is the lack of TSS data and having to estimate TSS from turbidity readings. Tom comments that because some level of resampling will probably occur for Site 41 wetlands, it may be more advantageous to resample rather than model.

Before further action can be taken, the Navy will need to submit a matrix following the new Navy policy indicating the status of each wetland. The Navy will request authority to proceed with further investigation.

9. OU-10 Review

A new permit was issued for the NAS Pensacola waste water treatment plant on January 16, 2002. A draft letter has been written to transfer the WWTP from CERCLA to RCRA. The letter will go into the Administrative Record.

10. Tier II Update

In response to the Dec/Jan meeting, P. Stoddard relayed to Tier II that Tier I had three RODs signed in 2000 and one in 2001. P. Stoddard said that the general view is that the NAS Pensacola program is not making progress, and could be more efficient.

P. Stoddard said that the Air Force and EPA now have position papers out on land use control. The Air Force is falling back to LUCIPs to keep their programs moving forward, with LUCAPs covering an overall base. A. Harris asked for an example of a proposed plan. EPA wants the descriptive language in the LUCIPs to include the responsible parties. The Navy is taking a wait and see attitude on LUCIPs/LUCAPs, while the Air Force is moving forward.

P. Stoddard also talked about the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, which established a baseline of facilities nationwide on which EPA will focus corrective action efforts through 2005. In 1999, EPA released its Interim-Final Guidance for RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicators (EIs). Under this guidance, only exposures that can reasonably be expected under current land and groundwater use conditions must be considered, and unacceptable levels of human exposure are tied to appropriately protective risk-based levels. However, EI determinations are to be made on a reasonable, site-specific basis considering current conditions.

P. Stoddard noted that the State of Georgia has not signed a cooperative agreement under the

Defense and State memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) Program. Citing a lack of resources, the State EPD has not been participating in DOD environmental issues.

P. Stoddard discussed the new Navy/Marine Corps Sediments Policy. The Navy's position is that sediment contamination must be linked to a Navy source to be investigated/corrected using ERN or BRAC funds. The new policy has overlap with EPA's recently issued sediments policy. On Navy bases, storm water processes not related to CERCLA or RCRA sites may not be investigated with BRAC or ERN funding. A first-step in looking at such sites is to do a pre-DQO process to see if they even qualify for funding before beginning an investigation. ERN or BRAC funds will not be used to look at storm water runoff or sediment issues not directly tied to a Navy site. The State thus far has not bought into the issue.

B. Hill requested that Tier II develop a study to see where the trend is for storm water issues on various bases, to include NAS Pensacola; and where state and EPA opinions overlap on storm water issues.

11. OU-13 Review

B. Hill requested a timeline to identify when the Barrancas National Cemetery will begin to encroach on the site. Approximately 900 burials a year are occurring at the cemetery. A Phase III estimate is needed to get the process moving, then a work plan. The Phase III work will be awarded before June of 2002. If everything goes as planned, the funding award will be given 90 days after the estimate is submitted, at which point the subcontract for the work can be authorized. Hopefully, the work will be completed by July. Currently, CH2MHill has money for Phases I and II.

OU-13 will proceed. The soil removals and confirmatory sampling will be referenced in the ROD.

12. OU-2 Review

EnSafe is in the process of responding to comments received from the regulators. There is a question about groundwater contamination at the OU-2 sites. The first sampling event (in 1993) used the bailer sampling technique, resulting in high detections of inorganics. A second sampling event in 1995 used the low-flow sampling method; however, not all wells were removed from suspicion. NADEP facilities at the Building 649 complex and at Buildings 3220/3450 ceased operating in 1995. Many questions remain as to whether the sources of groundwater contamination still exist or whether natural attenuation has removed constituents over the past seven years. There is overlap between CERCLA sites at OU-2 and former UST sites. Also, it still has not been determined if OU-2 groundwater contamination is impacting nearby wetlands (Wetlands 5A/B, 6, and 64).

EnSafe proposes to go back and sample select OU-2 wells based on exceedances detected during the last sampling round. G. Townsend wants to be sure that wells between the sites and wetlands are included in the sampling. T. Hanson said that TTNUS has been investigating

Facilities 681 and 682 (former fuel storage tanks south of Buildings 3450/3220), and the last full sampling of wells surrounding this site was about a year ago.

The purpose of this meeting's OU-2 discussion is to present a concept for approaching groundwater resampling at OU-2. A formal Technical Memorandum describing the resampling proposal will later be presented to the Team by EnSafe. TTNUS will continue monitoring USTs 681 and 682. Hydrocarbons and chlorinated solvents are still being detected at the site. A. Harris requested the monitoring reports for 681/682 from TTNUS.

B. Caldwell discussed the surface soil/leachability question, which is still valid. B. Caldwell asked A. Harris if she was comfortable with the surface soil delineation; the answer was yes. According to Rule 62-770, F.A.C., if constituents are detected in surface soil and in groundwater, then the leachability issue must be addressed. If contaminants are in both soil and groundwater, calculate a site-specific SSL and determine the appropriate remedial action. EnSafe is looking for a policy to use to develop an approach that will be useful. B. Caldwell previously recommended using spiked SPLP samples at OU-2, but has since decided this is not the best approach. The Team needs to develop criteria that can be applied to site-specific situations. These criteria will need to interact with cleanup and leachability goals.

An objective during the next meeting will be to explain the process using a step-by-step example, with a flow chart showing fate and transport of contaminants.

No funding has been provided for the OU-2 groundwater resampling yet.

13. Review of Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
Old Action Items				
0105-A2	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Pending		Find out which Wetlands can be separated from the Site 41 RI into an IROD. **Still looking at possibilities.**
0105-A4	B. Hill	Pending		Develop proposed schedule for IROD.
0108-A1	B. Albrecht	Complete		Review appropriate techniques for collecting surface water samples from very shallow water bodies. **Consensus holds that if water is < than 1" deep, sampling is difficult; if > than 1" deep, it can be done using conventional methods.**
0108-A6	B. Caldwell	Pending		Compare FDEP 62-777 CTLs to federal criteria, note differences.
0110-A3	G. Townsend and J. Fugitt	Complete	11/16	Provide comments on draft Site 15 technical memorandum.
0110-A3	CH2Mhill	Complete		Make a recommendation for Site 43 as to whether the site should undergo a soil removal or be capped.
0110-A5	B. Caldwell	Complete	11/30	Write SOW for soil removal at OU-13.
0110-A6	A. Harris	~~Pending~~ Complete		Submit Site 38 Final RI Addendum containing comment responses.
0201-A1	T. Dillon and L. Wellman	~~Pending~~ Complete	2/22	Review Site 2 RI Addendum and provide comments. ~~**Still waiting for FDEP comments.**~~
0201-A2	R. Joyner	Pending	2/26	Check the status of the LUCIPs for OUs 01, 10 and 15. **In process of getting out LUCIP letters.**

Submitted 4/18/01 Concurrence emailed 5/3/02

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
0201-A3	G. Townsend	Complete		Discuss Site 40 Mercury Sampling Report with L. Wellman.
0201-A4	P. Hardy	Pending	2/26	Incorporate T. Dillon's comments into the Site 40 Mercury Sampling Report. **Still waiting for FDEP comments.**
0201-A5	B. Caldwell	Dropped		Write tech memo explaining the SPLP method he wants to use at OU-2 sites adjacent Site 41 wetlands. **Brian rethinking requirement.**
0201-A6	B. Hill	Pending		Obtain execution plan for OU-13 interim removals.
0201-A7	A. Harris	Pending		Compile OU-11 RI Addendum 3 that ties Site 2 to OU-11.
0201-A8	T. Vaught	Complete		Provide formal comments for OU-11.
New Action Items				
0202-A1	B. Hill	Pending		Update schedules to reflect training to be performed at each meeting.
0202-A2	G. Wilfley	Pending	4/9/02	Draft letter for the minor change to the Site 15 ROD.
0202-A3	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Pending	5/15/02	Refine the Final Site 40 RI Addendum ~~of April 24, 2000~~ to reflect a recommendation of NFA for the site.
0202-A4	T. Hansen	Pending		Verify that Wetland 12 is or isn't included in the pending investigation of the former Bilge Water Plant of the NAS Pensacola waste water treatment plant.
0202-A5	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Pending		Develop a basewide total PAH screening value for samples collected in storm water pathways.
0202-A6	P. Hardy/B. Albrecht	Pending		Field check Wetland 1 to see if there is a connection between the drainage ditch and the wetland.
0202-A7	G. Townsend	Pending		Review the OU-1 ROD to see how it will be affected by moving Wetland 3 into the OU-1 monitoring plan.
0202-A8	B. Hill	Pending		Review ABB's Building 3810 report and provide feedback to the Team concerning whether a UST at this location contributed contamination Wetland 10.
0202-A9	A. Harris/B. Caldwell	Pending		Do a desktop to normalize the surface water data for Wetland 13.
0202-A10	A. Harris	Pending		Respond to FDEP comments on Wetland 58.

14. Proposed Agenda for February 2002 Tier 1 Meeting

Next Meeting: May 7 - 8, 2002 at EnSafe's Pensacola, Florida Office. The meeting will be held from 8:00 am - 5:00 PM each day.

Leader: B. Caldwell

Scribe: B. Albrecht/P. Hardy

Time Keeper: Terry Hansen

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
May 7 – 8, 2002			
Check-In	B. Caldwell	1 hour	How is everybody doing?

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
~~Training~~	~~G. Campana~~	~~1 hour~~	To be announced.
OU-2	A. Harris/B. Caldwell	4 hours	Develop sampling strategy.
Site 41	A. Harris/P. Hardy	2 hours	DQO Process review.
~~Tier II update~~	~~P. Stoddard~~	~~0.5 hour~~	Latest Tier II activities/information/Tier II deliverable goals.
Site 2	B. Albrecht	1.5 hours	Update/response to comments
~~Facility update~~	R. Joyner	~~0.25 hour~~	Update on currents at NAS Pensacola.
CH2MHill/TTNUS update	G. Wilfley/T. Hanson	0.75 hour	Site update/status.
OU-13 update	B. Hill/B. Caldwell	0.25 hour	Status.
Site 43 update	G. Wilfley/T. Hanson	0.25 hour	Status.
Facilitator	G. Campana	0.5 hour	Team improvement process.
Check-Out	B. Caldwell	1 hour	Tie things up.
Lunch	Team	2 hours	Refresh.
Breaks	Team	40 min.	Relax.

Note: Meeting agenda will be reprioritized if necessary. Members should plan on staying until 5:00 PM each day.

15. Parking Lot

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
9903-A13	B. Hill will submit a letter to EPA and State requesting that OU-10 be handled under RCRA authority.
9802-A14	B. Caldwell to follow-up on the list of wells to be kept for future modeling.
9806-A44	Review Tier II deliverable packages (rev. 9) for corrections and respond to B. Hill.
9811-M03	Bring MBTI materials to all meetings.
0003-A12	T. Hanson will be copied on all correspondence henceforth for the AR.
NA	The following is the proposed bi-monthly meeting schedule through August 2002: May 7 - 8, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (EnSafe's office). June 26 - 27, 2002 — Tallahassee, FL (TTNUS's office). August 27 - 28, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (EnSafe's office; a RAB meeting will also be held).

16. Perform +/Δ Criteria

+	Δ
L. Wellman and T. Dillon were in attendance. P. Hardy's Site 41 Matrix and presentation. B. Albrecht as a scribe/P. Hardy's minutes. RAB-B. Hill's Site 2 presentation. Lodging at the Victorian/New World Landing. Group moved ahead. Day 2 solved.	Learning dynamics/key players should have been sitting at the table. Agenda times not realistic. Reprioritize agenda for Day 2 as necessary.