Pensacola Partnering Team
March 25 and 26, 2003
Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:		**Support Members:**	
Brian Caldwell	EnSafe Inc.	Greg Campbell	NAS Pensacola
Allison Harris	EnSafe Inc.	Gus Campana	ICLD - Facilitator
Bill Hill	SouthDiv	Paul Stoddard	EnSafe Inc - Tier II Link
Gena Townsend	EPA	Jamie Pelt	TtNUS - Scribe
Tracie Vaught	FDEP - Leader		
Gerry Walker	TtNUS		
Greg Wilfley	CH2MHill - Timekeeper		

Guests: Erik Nuzie, FDEP
Jim Crane, FDEP

1. Check-In/Opening Remarks/Approve Minutes/Action Item & Parking Lot Review

The meeting began at 8:00 A.M. everyone checked in and the Ground Rules were read.

Corrections to the January 2003 meeting minutes were discussed in detail. Jamie will make the changes to the January 2003 meeting minutes and send them out with the draft minutes from this meeting.

Consensus #1: Approval by the Team of the January Meeting Minutes.

The Team Reviewed the Action Items from the January 2003 meeting:

A-10103: Tracie to check with group on how SPLP information is used on other sites in relation to clean groundwater over a long period. Soil has exceedences and what is the effect of SPLP
This action item is complete

A-20103: Brian will review data and send out proposed SPLP sampling location within 2-weeks. Areas where leaching samples will be taken sent to us by Brian will be done by January 31, 2002.
This action item is complete

A-30103: Bill will include removal of drums in the scope of work to get rid of the drums. Contractor will be determined by how much money has in contracts.
This action item is complete

A-40103: Gerry will put together the information for OU-1, to demonstrate to the team how to survey the boundaries for the rest of the CERCLA. To team bring all necessary information to perform this task.
Action completed, Topic is an agenda item for this meeting.

A-50103: Tracie was asked if she had check with Hugo about ECO tables for site 41.

This action item is complete

2. Changes to the Agenda

Site 2 discussion was removed from the Agenda.
Site 41 discussion was removed from the Agenda.
Five-Year Review was removed from the Agenda.
The time allotment for the SCAP discussion was changed to 2 hours.

3. OU 2 - Brian

The field work was started on March 10, 2003 and completed on March 20th. A total of 80 GW samples and 30 soil samples were collected. They identified 2 locations at Site 30 that had some fairly strong odor in the soil above the water table, EnSafe collected soil samples from both locations. The odor did not smell like petroleum. Two of the wells at Site 11 were determined to be dry; one of the wells may be at a critical location adjacent to the water body. Three wells were located and sampled from the fenced area behind site 3220. EnSafe was fortunate to be able to collect these samples considering that the wells sit immediately under the radar. Because of this, marine escort was needed.

It was the first time using the Geo Probe which is not the ideal equipment for the sugar sand at the facility. The Geoprobe compacts the sand which requires adjusting for the compaction, all in all, they did ok with it.

Greg asked about the amount of IDW that was generated during the investigation. Brian replied that they had collected 4 drums of soil cuttings and an additional 6 drums on Wednesday (2 days before sampling ended) purge waters. Purge waters were mixed within drums but the drums are labeled as the source of generated waters.

Brian indicated that a PID was used for field screenings of the various soil depth intervals. However, the soil IDW generated during the new well installation was not sampled. The drums may need to be sampled for IDW disposal. The groundwater in each new monitoring well was sampled, however no soil samples were collected The groundwater data can be used for IDW disposal and will be available in 30 days. Brian will forward the information to Greg C. when it comes in.

4. Guidance Criteria for 95% UCL:

Tracie suggested that the Team select one site and apply the 95% UCL as a test or example before applying it to multiple sites; there have been numerous mistakes and misunderstandings in applying the guidance. Gena asked why only one site when there are several sites it could be used on? Tracie replied that although there are several sites on hold right now, the final guidance has not been published yet and there is no clear guidance on how to do it. By picking one site the Team will learn how to calculate the correct numbers. Tracie said that she understands the need to proceed with the method the right way, but that FDEP will not be coming out with specific guidance on the 95% UCL method until later. The site schedule is a concern with the Team picking one site. Gena does not think we should wait for the state's guidance but we should proceed with our best estimate of what is to come. Tracie is waiting on the information to come out, she could tell us what she knows thus far, but the guidance could change. Bill asked

why the Team has not been given any information on the guidance changes, Tracie said she has given comments on Site 15 and on Amy Twitty's presentation 3 months ago. The FDEP comments were concerned with the use and calculations of non-detect values and hot-spot values.

Greg W. suggested that CH2M Hill look at data from Sites 43 and 15 and apply Tracie's comments on that data set to recalculate the 95% UCLs. Tracie explained her understanding of the hot spot definition and criteria for the 95% UCL value itself.

There are two options for evaluation of surface soil when using the 95% UCL approach:

The exceedance must be 3x the SCTL or calculate the background as 2x the mean site-specific background concentration (minimum of 2 samples)

Bill said that he did not think we could use the site specific mean background. Tracie said yes, but we need a minimum of 2 background samples.

Also, Tracie mentioned that the background study completed for NAS Whiting Field cannot be used specifically for NAS Pensacola. However, because the NAS Whiting Field study included four outlying fields: Pace Field, Spencer Field, Santa Rose Field and Harold Field; parts of it may be included. Tracie indicated that she needs to know where the outlying fields are in relation to NAS Pensacola and requested a PDF map showing the locations.

Action Item A10303: Greg C. will send a PDF map to Tracie with the locations of outlying fields for her to review for background study. Tracie will evaluate the background locations. Greg will forward the map to her by April 4, 2003.

Action Item A20303: If OLF background locations are approved by Tracie, Greg W. will review the background study data from NAS Whiting Field and see if it can be incorporated with the NASP background data, by next partnering meeting in the Site 15 and 43 Action Item.

5. Close Out Reports-Sites 15-43

Gena did not have too many comments. Site 43 is an SI type site. To close out an SI, you need to make sure all the contamination above remedial levels has been removed, if it is not removed, the site can not be closed out as an SI but must complete a RI/FS. Gena said that we also have to keep in mind how Site 43 was initially described and started. Basically, it is labeled as a miscellaneous drum site; however the investigation determined it to more of a disposal area or dump including scrap metal and debris.

With that in mind the data was presented for an area that showed subsurface soil that exhibited leaching. Amy sent out a 5 page memo and some of the leaching data was not in it.

Following the removal action contaminated soil above leaching concentrations was left in the hole at 5 to 6 feet below land surface. Removal actions were taken at the top 2 feet. In addition, there is no groundwater data to confirm that leaching is not occurring.

Greg W. had written responses regarding Gena's questions but had not yet sent them out to the Team. Greg indicated that the soil did show leaching, but not in the groundwater, you would expect to find it in the groundwater, because of the age of the site since original disposal.

Gena said that she had reviewed the monitoring well placements that Terry did in the SI, they are located in the perimeter of the entire site, not in the excavated areas, and only 1 out of 5 monitoring wells are considered within the excavated areas. The groundwater data at the perimeter of the site indicates that the problem may be isolated at the excavation area. The perimeter wells only came up with iron. The excavation soil data indicated copper, lead and nickel, and the groundwater was only sampled and monitored for iron. Gena said you should identify the soil contamination and take it with you, do not leave it. Contaminated soil exceeding leachability limits was left in the hole and was covered up.

Greg W. read his written response for comment #1. He apologized for not getting them to Gena sooner. Greg W. will give Gena a copy of the hard written responses.

Gena mentioned that there are numbers that exceed leaching in an excavated area, and no groundwater data to support it in those areas. The well placement does not show a groundwater plume. however, all of the source material was not removed. Contaminated soil was left in the hole that exceeded the leachable limits. The source was not removed; contaminated soil was left in the hole that is leachable.

Brian stated that Well 4305 showed only iron leaching out, is this sufficient? Gena answered that she cannot relate Well 4305 to the other excavated areas. This was a removal for an SI, not an RI/FS.

Greg W. read comment #2 response. Greg mentioned that the source has been removed, Gena disagreed, the source has not been removed. Some of the material has been removed, but the source is the contaminated soil and some is still present in the hole. Gena suggests going in with a GeoProbe to sample the groundwater for the leachable contaminants, quick and dirty. Additional work is needed to close the site out. We need to make sure that what was remaining in the hole is not leaching and is not present in the groundwater.

Bill asked if the leachability values are the same as the soil cleanup target levels. Tracie said they are usually higher. Tracie said that if you have an exceedance of an SCTL, you have to determine if it is leaching or not, if it fails the leaching test, you have to do something about it, dig it up or put a deed restriction on it, before FDEP will NFA the site.

Bill asked if there is anything we could add to the response to help. Gena said they are pretty good. Do the responses need more detail? Gena said no, that is not needed. Gena will review the comments and determine if they are supported by the data and will get back with the Team. Tracie indicated that she has not yet submitted comments on Site 43, but they will basically be the same as the comments on Site 15.

Site 15

Gena requested to be updated on what's been happening with Site 15. The Team has not formally responded to Tracie's comments. We need to clarify what other comments there are and resolution and if there is something else we should be doing. Gena suggested developing a plan

of action of where we need to go with them. A lot of the comments were on how the 95% UCL was calculated. The team needs to move forward regardless that the guidance is not yet out from FDEP.

Gena would like the group to focus on OU4, site 15, it is EPA's only target for 2003, and the target is a remedial action completion report. If the report is not completed this year, there will have been no targets accomplished. If the target cannot be made, she needs a good explanation why not. Gina also stated that this Remedial Action Completion Report is not the final action for this site. It is just an Interim Completion Report for soils, the groundwater clean up goals have not been met yet.

Tracie says the state cannot sign off on a document that has a remaining hot-spot; this has been the biggest stumbling block we would have to get past.

Assuming that the arsenic numbers from the state are going to change, we would be in good shape, the removal will meet the new clean up goals. There are 2 areas that will fall outside of that scope; we will need to do something about those. The other remaining areas, depending on the change in regulatory standards, should be ok. The team has a high confidence level that the arsenic regulatory number will increase in the near future and is willing to take the chance to wait and give them the interim approval.

Tracie needs a clear explanation. The letter would have to be written to say that. Tracie asked what the next report following the Interim Completion Report will be. Gena said that it will be the Final Close-out Report.

There are 3 soil contamination areas that lie outside if the level changes - need to discuss those 3 areas. The only option for those 3 areas is removal. This is an industrial area. An option is covering the hot-area with hot asphalt, which will create a heavier control. Gena summarized that the two options are to remove it physically or to cap it with a parking lot.

Consensus #2: To go forward with the interim RA Completion Report with the 16.2 arsenic number. Acting as if FDEP will promulgate the 16.2 arsenic number. If different than that, something else will be done.

6. Tier II Update - Paul

At the last Tier II meeting, Whiting Field and Cecil Field gave presentations and subsequent discussions.

Ted Simon did a presentation on the conversion of Cecil Field's golf course to residential use including, a statistical analysis on the greens area and their use. They were trying to show the overall effect of the greens relative to the entire course and determined that if they wanted to use the golf course for residential uses, they would have to do something with the Tee boxes and greens. The Navy will go back to the City of Jacksonville and tell them that they have to use the golf course as a golf course or they don't get it. If the city of Jacksonville does not agree they will put it back on the street. The property will be restricted to a golf course if not cleaned up similar to Orlando.

The next item discussed was SCAPs – Earl Bozeman brought to the meeting the compilation list of all SCAP dates that the teams have developed, some of the teams are not up to date, they will go back to EPA and review the SCAPS. In the next meeting in June, Tier II will use the database and establish the baseline for future measurement of the Tier I Teams.

Tier II wants to stress that the Tier I Teams need to have exit strategies for the future and that exit strategies will be a future deliverable. Exit strategies have to be done by December 2003. Tier II plans to use Region 6's exit strategy to use as a model.

Erik mentioned in January they had a Grant training session, SouthDiv was well represented, Air force and Navy was not. Maybe we could do training at the State Level. This will be discussed at Tier III. For example, they will discuss the grant process; this is something for the Team to think about. The Team decided no, they did not need the training.

On January 9th EPA had a preparedness meeting. In general they discussed, as an agency being less reactive and more pro-active and how to develop priorities on sites if funding gets cut.

7. OU 13

Bill went over an email sent by Amy Twitty regarding the report - items mentioned included; develop a work plan to include the anticipated action, identify the new well installations; SPLP Analysis; and delineation of the area to be remediated. The remediation should be performed based on the work plan, and then complete the interim removal report.

Gena said that areas of the site had leachability standard exceedances and could represent continued contaminant leaching to groundwater. Either a SPLP test needs to be completed or a remedial action to cover the areas is required. It is easier to justify leaving leachable soil in place if you collect SPLP samples from the same hole. She suggests getting the sample from the same hole.

Gerry stated that he needed clarification; He thought that if you have soil leachability exceedances there must be some action. Even if the groundwater is clean an action is needed because continued leaching may show up in the groundwater later. His understanding was that either a removal or impervious cover was required.

Gena says if this is correct it changes our previous discussion on Site 43. Impervious cover (paved) or covered with 2 feet of clean fill were discussed as options. The site would need to be properly maintained and left undisturbed. If you ever have digging, you have to have everyone notified of OSHA requirements and if excavated, you need to properly dispose of it. However the comment was made those 2-feet of soil is not an impervious cover, only a physical barrier to limit direct exposure.

Gena stated that a work plan is required that will identify the removal areas, and then an interim removal report will be completed which will document that the site is clean and finished. Tracie asked when we should expect to get a report from Amy. Bill has not seen the report yet but it should be available in April.

8. Site 40

Greg C. is concerned that the whole site 40 is in the CERCLA process and wanted to know why it was included. The Team discussed this issue but was not real clear on why it is included. PCB fish tissue data was taken – the PCB data from that fish concluded that we had an edible health risk. Literature needs to be generated and information concluded on why this site is not a risk. That is what we are tying to do now.

The Bayou data is in - the fish tissue had a PCB at concentrations higher than the reference. Allison said that there is one localized spot of PCB contamination in the Bayou. Gena suggested following the risk assessment procedures, to generate the risk number and then the RPM can make a Risk decision on the site. Allison asked Gena where she would like to see the Risk Assessment, Gena suggested a paragraph summary on the front of the report of what risk was found.

Gerry disagreed, he says it doesn't happen that way, would be nice if it did, but it doesn't. The Regulatory RPMs rely on the Risk Assessors for the decisions and are not able to make a separate risk decision. The risk assessors can only do it one way, they then give us the information and that cannot change. Gena says it does happen that way with her and her other RPM's.

Bill asked Tracie if there is something he can give to her to help her with Hugo. Tracie said she is not a risk assessor, she suggests the Team sit down to discuss the site with Hugo. Bill asked Tracie if she can give Hugo advanced notice about the fish sample results and what was in the original RI Report. Gerry suggests writing an email using summary paragraphs like Gena suggested. Tracie told Bill to include a question asking Hugo what is it that he will need from us to be able to discuss this topic with us. Tracie said that Hugo will be at the next Partnering Meeting.

A30303: Allison will send Hugo and the Team an email with a summarized paragraph of Site 40's history. Tracie will question Hugo on what he needs to discuss the Team's generalized position at the next partnering meeting May, 2003.

A40303: Allison will combine all RI/FS Reports and Data for Sites 38 and 40 and burn onto a CD, and will send to the Team by April 30, 2003.

9. Facility Update – Greg Campbell

Security is tightening up on the contractors, you now have to come in the back gate with a decal on your vehicle and an escort is required to open and shut the gate to get into the Sherman Field area.

RAC Update

Greg C. is in the process of revising the Closure Report per Gena's comments. Greg C. asked if there is a need to revisit Site 43. The areas where the leachable soil was left, needs to be looked at, if there are trees, this need to be documented. Gena suggests that we may need to create a fact sheet to explain why we should leave the contamination in place.

A50303: for site 43, Greg W. is to revisit the 95% UCL calculation in light of FDEP input and see what changes that has to the Site 43 report.

A60303: Greg W. will research the basis for regulatory guidance concentrations and how they apply to the data that presented for Table 3.2 in the Site 43 report and inform Tracie.

Meeting close out of 1st Day:

The agenda was discussed for the next day. The remaining items were prioritized.

Second Day – March 26, 2003

10. Training – Gus
Topic: Who Moved My Cheese? Dealing with change

Based on the Story by Spencer Johnson, MD

Summary:
Change Happens, they keep moving the cheese
Anticipate Change; get ready for the cheese to move
Monitor Change, smell the cheese often so you know when it is getting old
Adapt to Change Quickly
Change, move with the cheese
Enjoy Change; savor the adventure and the taste of the new cheese
Be ready to change quickly, somebody keeps moving the cheese

11. Validate the Charter

Gus led the Team in discussing changes and/or additions to the Team Charter.

Bill suggested
Acknowledging the Customer -
- Communicate with the customer
- Inform the Customer
- Expectations from the Customer

Exit strategies –
- Seeing an end game based on the appropriate regulatory guidance

Greg C. suggested
Move Faster -
- Challenge to schedules
- Look outside the box
- Be more flexible

Gus made the changes on the Charter with the Team's input. Jamie will email the updated Charter with the Draft Meeting Minutes to the Team.

Consensus #3: The Team achieved consensus on the Charter changes and additions.

12. SCAP/Schedule

Gena put in the dates as was discussed in the last meeting. She suggested the Team discuss the dates and she will change them one last time if needed.

The completion date is the date when the document is signed by everyone: When the state signs the ROD, they send it to EPA, now EPA has 3 copes of the ROD, EPA signs it and sends it back to the base.

The Team reviewed the dates for - Site 11, 25, 26, 27, 30, OU12, OU13.

Bill asked Gena what her definition is of RA completion. She said that the RA is complete when your remediation goals have been attained. Bill put it in his budget to monitor for 30 years; Gena said she did not recommend that. Once the monitoring begins and the LUC are in place, there needs to be a remedial action close out report.

Bill wants to add a 2 year period between RD and RA. Bill asked Gena if that is a problem. Gena wants to think about it, she may be able to stop this at Remedial Design. She has to go back to the definitions. Bill explained that they have to allot One year for monitoring and complete the report. The contractor has 6 months to finalize the report. This will be a cushion if we add a two year period between the RD and RA.

The Team reviewed the dates for - Site 41, OU1, OU2, U3, OU4, OU 10, OU 11, OU 13, OU 15, and OU 16.

There was a discussion regarding OU1 Funding. South Div prioritizes funding in February of every year. The Team needs to decide what changes to the budgets are necessary prior to February. Bill explained that the report comes out in September, if the funding is approved in February, the funding will be ready October 1st for execution for the following year.

13. Review Site Boundaries for LUCIP Survey – Gerry

Gerry reviewed the LUCIP Requirements. Gena wants to change the wording to "Media specific", to put control on the media.

Restrict by Media:

- Groundwater – restrict use; restrict contact, need site boundary for that
- Soil – restrict intrusion into the Landfill

Gena suggested taking the worst case by area distribution. Gerry stated that currently the groundwater restrictions were stated as 300 feet from the site boundary. In contrast, Gena said that the groundwater restrictions are defined by the edge of the groundwater plume. That means you would need to stay outside 300 ft. from the edge of the plume. This will free up more space.

Tracie mentioned that groundwater plumes change, how will you handle that? Bill does not see a significant change of the plume possible.

After a Team discussion the following criteria were decided on.
The LUC for the groundwater plume should be as follows:

- 300 feet from groundwater plume
- the groundwater plum will be extrapolated using the ROD concentration goals to integrate all COC's

Gena mentioned that if we cannot specify the landfill area, we need to get someone out there to identify the landfill boundary and get some coordinates. Gerry said we have the landfill boundaries defined, but he is not sure of the accuracy. He mentioned that at some point during the investigation a geophysical survey was completed that defined the landfill boundaries and the results were plotted or surveyed, should be very tight. It is probably within 50 ft. of the scale, Gerry guessed. However, the point of the LUCIP is not to have a definitive landfill boundary marked but for the Facility to know the landfill area and to understand that if they construction or intrusion proper precautions are taken. We need permanent mapping for the LUCIP inspections to define if intrusions could occur and evaluate the decisions.

A70303: Gerry will plug in the LUC boundaries for OU 1 and present it to the Team at the May 2003 Meeting.

14. Meeting Closeout - plus/delta (at the end of the meeting minutes)/review action items and consensus items/next meeting agenda

There were seven new action items from this meeting and 1 working action item from the January meeting:

New Action Items

A-10303: Greg C. will send a PDF Map to Tracie in an email with the locations of outlying fields for her to review of background study. Tracie will give a thumbs up or thumbs down. Tracie will get it to her by April 4, 2003.

A-20303: If OLF background locations are approved by Tracie, Greg W. needs to look at the background study data from NAS Whiting Field and see if it can be incorporated with the NASP background data, by next partnering meeting in the Site 15 and 43 Action Item.

A-30303: Allison will send Hugo and the Team an email with a summarized paragraph of Site 40's history. Tracie will question Hugo on what he needs to discuss the Team's generalized position at the next partnering meeting May, 2003.

A-40303: Allison to combine all RI/FS Reports and Data for Sites 38 and 40 on CD and send to the Team by April 30, 2003.

A-50303: For site 43, Greg W. is to revisit the 95% UCL calculation in light of FDEP's input and see how it affects the Site 43 report.

A-60303: Greg W. will research the basis for regulatory guidance concentrations and how they apply to the data that presented for Table 3.2 in the Site 43 report and inform Tracie.

A-70303: Gerry will plug in the LUC boundaries for OU1 and present it to the Team at the May 2003 Meeting.

Summary of Consensus Items

1. Approval of the January Meeting Minutes.
2. To go forward with the interim RA Completion Report with the 16.2 arsenic number. Acting as if FDEP will promulgate the 16.2 arsenic number. If different than that, something else will be done.
3. Approval of the Charter changes and additions. The updated Charter will be attached to the March meeting minutes.

The Team discussed the upcoming meeting dates, times and locations:

Proposed NASP Partnering Team Meeting Dates and Locations:

- May 13 and 14, 2003 in Pensacola, FL
- August 19 and 20, 2003 in Knoxville, TN
- October 21 and 22, 2003, location TBD
- December 9 and 10, 2003 in Charleston, SC

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
Action Items from January, 2003 Meeting				
A-010103	Tracie	Complete		Tracie to check with group on how SPLP information is used on other sites in relation to clean groundwater over a long period. Soil has exceedences and what is the effect of SPLP.
A-020103	Brian	Complete		Brian will review data and send out proposed SPLP sampling location within 2-weeks. Areas where leaching samples will be taken sent to us by Brian will be done by January 31, 2002.
A-030103	Bill	Complete		Bill will include removal of drums in the scope of work to get rid of the drums. Contractor will be determined by how much money has in contracts.
A-040103	Gerry	Working		Gerry will put together this information for OU-1. To demonstrate to the team how survey the boundaries for the rest of the CERCLA. To team bring all necessary information to perform this task. **Discuss in the March Meeting.**

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-050103	Tracie	Complete		Tracie was asked if she had check with Hugo about ECO tables for site 41.
New Action Items from March, 2003 Meeting				
A-10303	Greg C.	Working	4/3/03	Greg C. will send a PDF Map to Tracie in an email with the locations of outlying fields for her to review for background study. Tracie will give a thumbs up or thumbs down. Tracie will get it to her by April 4, 2003.
A-20303	Greg W.	Working	5/13/03	If OLF background locations are approved by Tracie, Greg W. needs to look at the background study data from NAS Whiting Field and see if it can be incorporated with the NASP background data, by next partnering meeting in the Site 15 and 43 Action Item.
A-30303	Allison	Working		Allison will send Hugo and the Team an email with a summarized paragraph of Site 40's history. Tracie will question Hugo on what he needs to discuss the Team's generalized position at the next partnering meeting May, 2003.
A-40303	Allison	Working	4/30/03	Allison to combine all RI/FS Reports and Data for Sites 38 and 40 on CD and send to the Team by April 30, 2003.
A-50303	Greg W.	Working		For site 43, Greg W. is to revisit the 95% UCL calculation in light of FDEP's input and see how it affects the Site 43 report.
A-60303	Greg W.	Working		Greg W. will research the basis for regulatory guidance concentrations and how they apply to the data that presented for Table 3.2 in the Site 43 report and inform Tracie.
A-70303	Gerry	Working	5/13/03	Gerry will plug in the LUC boundaries for OU1 and present it to the Team at the May 2003 Meeting.

Parking Lot Issues

There were no new parking lot issues.

Agenda for May 2003 Meeting

Topic	Leader	Time	Category
Check In	Gerry	1 hr	info
OU2	Brian	.5 hr	info
Site 2	Bill	1 hr.	info
Site 40	Allison	1 hr.	info
Site 38, review data related to 95% UCL for team to review Non-detect topic	Tracie	1 hr.	info
Training Management Concepts, Part II	Gus	1 hr.	required
Close out report Site 15	Greg W.	.25	info
Close out report Site 43	Greg W.	.25	info
OU13 Progress Report		1 hr.	info
Review Charter	Gus	.5 hr.	info
Initiate Gerry	All	.5 hr.	required
Site Spec. Background	Bill	1 hr.	info
SCAP Update	Gena	1 hr.	info
Tier II Update	Paul	.5 hr.	info
Facility Update	Greg C.	.5 hr.	info
RAC Update	Greg C.	.5 hr.	info
Site 41 Wetland Tables – schedule	Allison	1 hr.	info
OU1 – LUC Boundary Presentation	Tracie/Gena	1 hr.	info
Check Out	All	1 hr.	info