

**FINAL
PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM
MEETING MINUTES**

DATE:	May 7-8, 2002
TEAM LEADER:	Brian Caldwell
SCRIBE:	Phil Hardy/Barbara Albrecht
GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER:	Terry Hansen
PROCESS FACILITATOR:	Jean 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
 Amy Twitty – CH2MHill
 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	May 7	May 8
Training	X	
Facility Update	X	
CH2MHill Sites 15/43 Review	X	
TTNUS OU-1 Review	X	
Site 41 Review	X	X
OU-13 Review		X
OU-2 Review		X
Site 2 Review		X

3. Training

J. Campana took the Team through training on perceptions and coping. She taught how perception controls reality. What we tell ourselves are the most important words we will hear. If we don't see it, we won't believe it. She showed the group the video *Celebrate What's Right with the World*. The theme of the video is that people should look for possibilities and perspectives that transform the ordinary into the extraordinary.

4. Facility Update

R. Joyner discussed the planned repairs to the seawall that parallels the Intercoastal Waterway. The pavement behind the seawall recently collapsed near the McDonald's. The plan is to repair the entire length of the seawall. R. Joyner hopes that the extent of the repairs will be limited to the western portion of the seawall, which is not near any IRP site. T. Hansen asked if the repair work would impact Site 2. B. Hill related how the east end of the seawall is constructed differently from the west end, and has a 50-foot long concrete apron that extends into the bay. The eastern end was constructed before the western end was. G. Townsend is worried that there may be environmental problems at various points along the length of the seawall. She also expressed concern about how the ongoing monitored natural attenuation (MNA) processes at Site 38 may be negatively affected by excavation and backfilling along the seawall downgradient from the site. R. Joyner said that the repair project is currently in the design phase and that he is recommending that only the affected portion be repaired. He feels the project will be trimmed back from what is currently advocated. The Team concurred with Ron's proposal.

5. CH2MHill Site 15/Site 43 Update

Site 15: G. Wilfley said that during the excavation at Site 15, an old sprinkler system for the golf course was encountered. A fitting was broken off the excavated pipe, causing a leak. An uncharted septic tank was also found. After the excavation at the site, confirmation samples were collected and the area was backfilled and reseeded. G. Wilfley said that the work at the site went well and a removal report documenting the work will be sent to the Navy. G. Townsend said that the letter CH2MHill sent to EPA documenting the change to the Site 15 Record of Decision (ROD) was too detailed, and provided G. Wilfley a marked-up copy of what was originally submitted. G. Townsend said all she wants is a two-paragraph note to the ROD. T. Vaught suggested that a draft be e-mailed to G. Townsend for review prior to submission.

Action Item: G. Wilfley to e-mail CH2MHill's change to the Site 15 ROD to G. Townsend for review prior to submission to USEPA.

Site 43: G. Wilfley discussed how during the first day of digging at Site 43, CH2MHill found discarded artillery shells that were later determined not to be unexploded ordinance (UXO). They later found a 12-inch cannon ball from a Civil War era mortar. The cannon ball was

split open at Eglin Air Force Base, and was found to be hollow, and not packed with an explosive charge. CH2MHill found other items that may have been UXO, including a solid cannon ball, and for a while was concerned that Site 43 would become a UXO site. G. Wilfley said the fact that the second cannon ball appeared to be an ornamental item made the difference in determining that Site 43 was not a UXO site. Soil trucked off-site for disposal prior to finding the artillery items had to be checked for UXO, and no ordinance was found. G. Wilfley said that Site 43 is definitely a former dump site. Some of the debris excavated included about a dozen drums; some of which had an oily liquid in them. The drums did not have bungs and could have leaked whatever residue was remaining in them. The oily liquid found in them is awaiting analysis. The excavated soil from Site 43 failed toxicity characteristics leaching procedure (TCLP) analysis for lead, so was disposed of as hazardous waste. B. Hill related how the Site 43 removal effort is costing the Navy several hundred thousand dollars more than what had been originally been planned. B. Hill, R. Joyner, and G. Wilfley all indicated that the excavation at Site 43 extended to native soil in spots, but did not go through it. The site is now complete. G. Wilfley said a completion report will be forwarded to the Navy in a month or two.

T. Hansen suggested that Site 43 will need a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) because it will have a Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) for groundwater. The LUCIP will be for groundwater secondary standards. G. Townsend said no RI/FS is necessary for the site, since Site 43 is only a screening investigation (SI) site; just add the site to the institutional control plan for the base. T. Vaught said she will need to check to see if this action is acceptable to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

Action Item: T. Vaught to see if FDEP is agreeable to keeping Site 43 as a SI site instead of an RI site.

6. TTNUS OU 1 Review

G. Townsend said that the Team needs to make plans for proceeding at OU-1. The problem to be addressed is the vinyl chloride in intermediate groundwater. All intermediate wells have vinyl chloride detections, indicating that attenuation of TCE has progressed to this slowed stage of the breakdown process. The Team needs to begin scoping out remedial alternatives for containment. T. Hansen said that TTNUS is in the third year of monitoring at OU 1. The 5-Year Review for the site is upcoming, and this review will have to reflect that OU 1 is not meeting its remedial objectives for groundwater. G. Townsend said that the levels of vinyl chloride are consistent, whether from the compound not breaking down, or from new migration from the source. T. Vaught feels that MNA is not occurring at the site. G. Townsend said that a scope needs to be written to show remedial options available, to include enhancing MNA somehow at the site. B. Caldwell said G. Townsend is providing the Team a "heads-up," and that the Team needs to come up with something now, before the 5-Year Review approaches. T. Hansen said there needs to be a re-evaluation of the OU 1 Monitoring Plan and the parameters being sampled for. B. Hill said any additional scoping for OU 1 will need funding; The Team can write the scope of work and put it on the table, but he is not sure

where the funds will come from.

Previously, the Team had considered placing Wetland 3 in the OU 1 Monitoring Plan. G. Townsend said that Wetland 3 has pesticides (T. Dillon is also concerned about sediment metals [Cd]) which need to be addressed, and will not fit into the OU 1 Monitoring Plan as it is currently scoped. Both G. Townsend and T. Vaught feel that Wetland 3 is a separate issue and should be kept with Site 41 and not moved to OU 1.

7. Site 41 Review

B. Albrecht had been previously tasked with developing the first three steps of the Data Quality Objectives (DQO) process as it relates to the Site 41 Wetlands. This exercise proved more difficult than expected for a number of reasons, including: (1) each wetland is unique and has site-specific characteristics; (2) the chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) which have triggered further investigations are both ecological and human health driven, but which way should they be addressed?; and (3) to what level and for whom should the Site 41 wetlands be protected? B. Albrecht said she was having difficulty answering these questions and grabbing a hold of the objective the Team wants for Site 41.

T. Dillon informed the Team that the DQO process is intended as a study plan and is best applied to new sites where very little data exists. In addition, the DQO process details how the data collected will be used in making decisions on the particular site. For the Site 41 Wetlands, there are several steps which must take place before triggering application of the DQO process. It may not be as easy for the Team to apply the DQO process to Site 41 as it was for Site 2.

L. Wellman began by explaining there are no hard and fast rules for the direction to proceed for Site 41. He said we are not protecting a wetland, but rather the assessment endpoints. L. Wellman and T. Dillon suggested taking each wetland through the refinement process by starting with any exceedances over a screening level of 1 (HQs > 1). A table showing constituents for sediment and surface water will be developed that includes their benchmark values, PELs and TELs, TOC, and particle size. After these tables are developed, they need to be compared to the assessment endpoints identified in the Site 41 RI. The assessment endpoints focus on the organisms that live within a wetland. This differs between wetlands holding year-round fish populations versus seasonal wetlands. The classification of these wetlands is a risk management decision.

Utilizing the data tables, ratios between sediments and surface waters need to be developed. T. Dillon and L. Wellman suggested focusing on ecological issues first and human health protection thereafter. When reviewing the data, several constituents may drop out based on the conditions in which they were collected. The reason they are being dropped should be explained in detail in the text developed for a particular wetland. Constituents that do not drop off should be evaluated with an appropriate model. For example, the simplified food web model for the green heron would examine if pesticides are a problem for a wetland.

Based on the initial refinement steps, confirmation samples should be collected to re-evaluate COPCs still in question, and only then should they be considered for the DQO process. Confirmation sampling will prove whether a COPC is still a problem or not. Confirmation sampling for metals in surface water (especially where there is little surface water to collect) may require that both filtered and a non-filtered sample be collected concurrently. A filtered sample would not be useable for risk analysis, but would be useable for COPC confirmation. Turbidity (<10ntu) and depth of water would need to be measured at each station.

B. Hill asked what constitutes surface water? Which prompted a lively display of opinions, but no one at the table was able to answer the question.

The Team agreed that Wetlands 5A/B, 6, and 64, are interconnected, and should be evaluated together. This approach may present some complexity which the Team will need to overcome. The simpler wetlands will be looked at first.

The Team agreed to go through Wetland 3 for initial refinement as a group to provide an understanding of the method and highlight possible obstacles. Constituents which exceeded benchmark levels and were potential causes for concern (somewhat subjective) were identified from the August 2000 Site 41 Final RI. Sediment and surface water data are shown for total DDT and Cd (the identified COPCs) on the following table:

Total DDT, DDE, and DDD		Cadmium	
Sediment	Surface Water	Sediment	Surface Water
32.3	0.15	2.2	2.3
10	0.15	0.495	2.3
740	0.15	0.45	2.3
42.5	0.15	0.52	1.5
33.15	Rejected	5.8	3.4
2.62	0.15	2.9	3.8
2.82	0.15	0.095	1.5
4.6	No Data	2	No Data
12.1	No Data	1.8	No Data
8.18	No Data	72.7	No Data

Notes:

Total DDT Sediment Benchmark Values = 3.3 ppb
 DDT for Surface Waters = 0.001 ppb.
 Basewide level for DDT = 20 ppb.

High turbidity was noted when the samples were collected. Sample location 001M000303

exhibits a high level of total DDT in sediment, and 041M030701 exhibits a high level of cadmium in sediment. It should be noted that neither of the two locations are near one another and neither exhibits a correlation between sediments and surface water. A nearby shallow groundwater monitoring well (01GS64) exhibited a cadmium exceedance in 1993 (5 ppm), which increased in 1994 (30.5 ppm). A groundwater interceptor trench was installed in 1999 to address high iron levels in site groundwater, which was believed to be impacting surface water in Wetland 3. This interceptor trench is located roughly upgradient from 01GS64, and may be acting to reduce cadmium in the same manner. The trench, an 800-foot long modified French drain, is deeper than the well. The Team asked if there could be leachate from the landfill contributing to the problem?

T. Vaught informed the Team that FDEP will only recognize total polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (TPAHs) on a site-by-site basis, and will not acknowledge a basewide TPAH number. The Team also considered Wetland 58, and ran into the same questions and issues. B. Caldwell said the sediment PAH contamination found at Wetland 58 could have come from low flying aircraft. For wetlands fed by storm water conveyances or outfalls, T. Vaught suggested collecting a "background sample" from a similar feature on the base that is not near any source. P. Hardy mentioned that EnSafe has data from 1996 from a number of places which could be used to develop such background data. This discussion came up over Wetland 1, where two Phase II sediment samples were collected in a storm water conveyance that was included in this wetland's investigation. T. Vaught said that FDEP will likely allow comparison of this site to a similar site at the base.

Action Item: P. Hardy to identify Site 41 wetlands with storm water features.

Many issues came up as the Team discussed the disposition of several wetlands. It was decided to bring T. Dillon and L. Wellman to Pensacola for two days prior to the next meeting to see if better headway can be made concerning the wetland issues. B. Albrecht and P. Hardy will study wetland data and issues before meeting with T. Dillon and L. Wellman, and will meet with them to go through the Site 41 issues wetland by wetland. The results of this meeting will be presented to the Team.

8. OU 13 Review

B. Hill has awarded Phase II for OU 13 to CH2MHill. The original removal volume at OU 13 was based on FDEP Rule 62-777 industrial soil cleanup target levels (SCTLs). EnSafe then re-evaluated the site based on the 95% upper confidence limit (UCL) for residential SCTLs. If the 95% UCL scenario is used at the site, the Navy will only need a LUCIP for groundwater. Under the 95% UCL, arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene contaminated soil will need to be removed from Site 24 near John Tower Road, along with dieldrin contaminated soil at Site 8 on the northeast side of Building 3651. G. Townsend and T. Vaught wanted to know what changed from before the 95% UCL calculations? B. Hill wants to delineate the areas proposed for removal to the residential 95% UCL. If this does not work, the Team will use the industrial SCTLs and apply a LUCIP for soil. B. Hill also indicated that several wells on Site 24 need to be abandoned at the same time the removal is conducted. B. Caldwell said if the removal at

Site 8 extends too close to Building 3651, the building will need to be shored to protect its foundation. G. Townsend and T. Hansen both indicated that a LUCIP for groundwater will be needed even though contaminated soil has been removed at OU 13. T. Vaught asked what will be done for groundwater? G. Townsend answered that removal of the source will eventually facilitate natural attenuation of site groundwater. A. Harris wanted to ensure this was clear with everyone.

The question was asked how the removals will be addressed in the OU 13 ROD? G. Townsend noted that the soil removal action should be discussed in the nature of contamination section. The ROD should also have language for the LUCIP. A. Harris said the draft Proposed Plan will be submitted to the Team by May 17, 2002. A. Twitty asked if the removals at OU 13 were being treated as an IRA? Gena wants a brief notification to be submitted that everyone will buy into. She noted that the Navy has removal authority, but it is better to have approval on the front end instead of after-the-fact. G. Townsend wants to make sure everyone is happy with the proposed removal locations and delineation sampling. A. Twitty proposed submitting a short sampling plan showing methods and figures for the Team's approval. Once the approach is approved, a formal sampling and analyses plan will be submitted. Delineation sampling is to be done prior to submitting the formal plan.

Action Item: A. Twitty to prepare a sampling plan for the OU 13 soil removals for Team approval.

9. OU 2 Review

A. Harris related how the question remaining for OU 2 is the leachability of contaminants from soil to groundwater; the Team must develop a strategy to address this. B. Caldwell said leachability is an issue because the FS used the SCTL for leachability based on groundwater of low-yield, poor quality for comparison. Now the Team is using the SCTL for leachability based on groundwater criteria. B. Caldwell has looked at the data to see what has changed using the standard criteria instead of the low-yield criteria. B. Caldwell wants to walk through each site to see what can be written off, and what needs to go through a DQO process. G. Townsend wants to identify problem areas in soil by comparing data to groundwater leachability criteria to see what has been exceeded. Also, look at any co-located groundwater data. B. Caldwell asked if the Team was comfortable with the soil data originally obtained at OU 2, or are additional soil samples needed to address leachability at the OU 2 sites? G. Townsend said that if the Team is planning additional groundwater sampling at OU 2, she would like to see all wells resampled, and not just those which were previously "hot". The Team should sample groundwater first, then look at soils as possible sources, if necessary. The Team needs to see if soil and groundwater can be tied together. B. Caldwell said that EnSafe did prepare a proposal to sample all wells that had prior exceedances and those adjacent wetland areas. T. Vaught said the Team can't use 1993/1995 sample data to determine what needs to be resampled. She feels that something may have occurred in groundwater during the last several years at the site. B. Caldwell related how there are soil leachability exceedances and co-located/downgradient groundwater data that do not compare (no groundwater

exceedances) in some places at OU 2. How does this phenomenon get addressed in the final FS? T. Hansen related that those constituents must not yet be leaching. Source removal may be needed, but the Team must decide at some point that soil is not leaching contaminants to groundwater. T. Vaught does not agree. She states contaminants can be mobile, and data that is six years old is too old to use for site disposition. The data from the RI show areas of contaminated soil and groundwater plumes. Are the concentrations still present? T. Hansen and B. Caldwell agreed that all wells need to be resampled at OU 2 to satisfy the concerns of T. Vaught and G. Townsend.

B. Caldwell feels that the Team can use the 1990s soil data, but needs to walk through each site individually. G. Townsend agrees this needs to be done for all six OU 2 sites prior to randomly collecting more data. She feels we can't overlook the fact that groundwater plumes can be moving, and hits could be only incidentally finding the edge of a plume. B. Caldwell asked about the possibility of there being soil exceedances with no hits in groundwater? G. Townsend said the Team is not just looking at leachability, which is only one issue among other issues. B. Caldwell said the FS could be revised to reflect the standard leachability SCTL instead of the low-yield SCTL. We could sample wells that previously had exceedances and those by wetlands. Compare the new results to leachability results, and if constituents are not in the new groundwater results, they would not be addressed in the FS. G. Townsend wants to look at detections to see what is there and compare the data to downgradient areas to identify hot spots from potential plumes. B. Hill understands that there might be isolated hot spots, but if they are less than 20% of the total hits, they do not have to be addressed. B. Hill asked if sample locations should be treated by OU or by site? G. Townsend said this could be done with soil but not with groundwater. The Team cannot just write off information; further, groundwater might be discharging to adjacent wetlands, which is a concern. T. Vaught said her superiors have indicated a newer set of groundwater samples is needed in order to make a decision at OU 2. B. Caldwell said the Team needs to make an analysis from existing data, and use this information to provide an overview of the site so a decision for resampling can be made. P. Stoddard asked if this was an action item?

Action Item: B. Caldwell to analyze data, outline assumptions, and produce maps to show at the next meeting to facilitate recommendations for OU 2 resampling.

10. Site 2 Update

B. Albrecht asked if all Team members received the response to comments she recently completed? She said she would address the University of Florida (UF) comments separately. B. Albrecht said she saw no "show stoppers" in the UF comments. T. Vaught wanted the figures from the RI Addendum revised to show sample locations. B. Albrecht showed the Team the maps to be modified. The modified maps will display both the EPA and EnSafe terminology, storm drains along the sea wall, as well as the submerged seawall found during the 2000 sampling effort. T. Vaught also said that FDEP had concerns about subsurface sediment data. B. Albrecht said subsurface data exists from the 2000 sampling and will be addressed in the revised Site 2 report. It should be noted that the subsurface data set is not

complete, since difficulty was encountered while collecting the cores. G. Townsend did not like reference to PAHs coming from vessel traffic, and wants supporting information for this statement. She feels that storm water run off may have contributed more to these PAHs. R. Joyner related how vessels are a likely contributor to the PAHs at Site 2; there is quite a lot of boat traffic in this area. T. Dillon feels that the metals found in Site 2 sediments could have come from industrial discharges as well as vessels. G. Townsend said the report should not state that the site has improved since the 1996 sampling effort. L. Wellman said we must develop protective levels. T. Dillon said the site needs to be examined as a whole. A. Harris said the Team should do what it agreed to task itself with at Site 2 through the DQO process by comparing the data collected at Site 2 to the two agreed upon reference stations. T. Dillon would like to see if a relationship exists between the surface and subsurface sediment data.

G. Townsend does not concur that an FS is not required for Site 2, and does not agree with any no further action (NFA) recommendations for the site. Two decision units (DUs) show impact. A. Harris wants to develop remedial goals for sublethal effects before moving ahead with an FS for the site; this may help on the decision to write an FS. T. Hansen asked if there was any way out for doing an FS? G. Townsend does not want to just prove there is no problem at Site 2. B. Caldwell asked if it were possible for remedial goal options to be above the data results? If this is unlikely, the Team should proceed with an FS. A. Harris asked what the recommended remedial action might be? G. Townsend does not want to monitor the site, and would agree to small sediment removals where necessary. T. Dillon would like to see a comparison between surface and subsurface sediment data. G. Townsend said we should pull all of the data together, whether it is good or bad.

Action Item: B. Albrecht will develop tables of the subsurface sediment data and relate it to the surface data. In addition, a comparison of the 1996 overall mean of Site 2 data will be compared to the 2000 mean data to determine if any changes (degradation or improvements site-wide) have occurred.

T. Dillon felt that the responses to his Site 2 comments were adequate.

11. Review of Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
Old Action Items				
0108-A6	B. Caldwell	Complete		Compare FDEP 62-777 CTLs to federal criteria, note differences.
0110-A6	A. Harris	Complete		Submit Site 38 Final RI Addendum containing comment responses.
0201-A1	T. Dillon and L. Wellman	Complete	2/22	Review Site 2 RI Addendum and provide comments.
0201-A2	R. Joyner	Pending		Check the status of the LUCIPs for OUs 01, 10 and 15. To be done by 5/20.
0201-A4	P. Hardy	Pending		Incorporate T. Dillon's comments into the Site 40 Mercury Sampling Report. Will submit by 5/20.
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. Awaiting funding.
0202-A1	B. Hill	Pending		Update schedules to reflect training to be performed at each meeting.

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action To Be Taken
0202-A2	G. Wilfley	Complete	4/9/02	Draft letter for the minor change to the Site 15 ROD.
0202-A3	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Pending		Refine the Final Site 40 RI Addendum of April 24, 2000 to reflect a recommendation of NFA for the site. Will submit by 5/20.
0202-A4	T. Hansen	Complete		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. No such investigation pending.
0202-A5	A. Harris/P. Hardy	Complete		Develop a basewide total PAH screening value for samples collected in storm water pathways.
0202-A6	P. Hardy/B. Albrecht	Complete		Field check Wetland 1 to see if there is a connection between the drainage ditch and the wetland. No connection found.
0202-A7	G. Townsend	Complete		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	Complete		Review ABB's Building 3810 report and provide feedback to the Team concerning whether a UST at this location contributed contamination Wetland 10. Did not investigate wetland with Building 3810.
0202-A9	A. Harris/B. Caldwell	Complete		Do a desktop to normalize the surface water data for Wetland 13.
0202-A10	A. Harris	Complete		Respond to FDEP comments on Wetland 58.
New Action Items				
0502-A1	G. Wilfley	Pending		E-mail CH2MHill's change to the Site 15 ROD to G. Townsend for review prior to submission to USEPA.
0502-A2	T. Vaught	Pending		Find out if FDEP is agreeable to keeping Site 43 as a SI site instead of an RI site.
0502-A3	P. Hardy	Pending		Identify Site 41 wetlands with storm water features.
0502-A4	A. Twitty	Pending		Prepare a sampling plan for the OU 13 soil removals for Team approval
0502-A5	B. Caldwell	Pending		Analyze data, outline assumptions, and produce maps to show at the next meeting to facilitate recommendations for OU 2 resampling.
0502-A6	B. Albrecht	Pending		Develop tables of the subsurface sediment data and relate it to the surface data. In addition, a comparison of the 1996 overall mean of Site 2 data will be compared to the 2000 mean data to determine if any changes (degradation or improvements site-wide) have occurred.

12. Proposed Agenda for July 2002 Tier 1 Meeting

Next Meeting: July 17 - 18, 2002 at EnSafe's Pensacola, Florida Office. The meeting will be held from 8:00 am - 5:00 PM each day.

Leader: T. Hansen

Scribe: P. Hardy/B. Albrecht

Time Keeper: A. Harris

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
<i>July 17 - 18, 2002</i>			
Check-In	T. Hansen	1 hour	How is everybody doing?
Training	G. Campana	1 hour	To be announced.

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/Expectation
Site 41	A. Harris/P. Hardy/B. Albrecht	4 hours	Make progress.
Site 2	B. Albrecht	2 hours	Make progress.
OU-13 update	B. Hill/B. Caldwell	0.25 hour	How LUCIP dispute between USAF/EPA will affect OU 13 ROD.
Tier II update	P. Stoddard	0.5 hour	Latest Tier II activities/information/Tier II deliverable goals.
OU-2	A. Harris/B. Caldwell	4 hours	Make progress.
Facility update	R. Joyner	0.25 hour	Update on currents at NAS Pensacola.
CH2MHill/TTNUS update	G. Wilfley/T. Hanson	0.5 hour	Site update/status.
Facilitator	G. Campana	0.5 hour	Team improvement process.
Check-Out	T. Hansen	1 hour	Tie things up.
Lunch	Team	3 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.

13. 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: July 17 - 18, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (EnSafe's office). August 27 - 28, 2002 — Pensacola, FL (EnSafe's office; a RAB meeting will also be held).

14. Checkout

J. Campana made several comments about the conduct of the meeting. She related that the Team made good use of the parking lot. There was generally a good exchange of information, and people didn't hesitate to ask questions and give answers. She felt that B. Caldwell provided good leadership to the group. She said that in advance of future meetings, each presenter needs to ask what needs to be accomplished in order to get consensus (one way or the other) from Team members. She felt there was lots of meandering during the meeting. She felt that future meetings need to include maps of the area to refresh members about the areas of concern. Lots of time was lost during this meeting while members tried to figure out what was done at a particular site. Overall, the Team needs to strengthen the development of the time allotted for each agenda item.