

**Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes
August 19 and 20, 2003
Knoxville, TN**

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

Brian Caldwell	EnSafe Inc.- Leader	Greg Campbell	NAS Pensacola - Timekeeper
Allison Harris	EnSafe Inc.	Gus Campana	ICLD - Facilitator
Gena Townsend	EPA	Paul Stoddard	EnSafe Inc - Tier II Link
Tracie Vaught	FDEP	Jamie Pelt	TtNUS - Scribe
Gerry Walker	TtNUS	Greg Fraley	EPA
Bill Hill	SOUTHDIV		

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

The Team had check-in. Greg Wilfley will not be attending this meeting. Bill Hill will be proxy for Greg Wilfley.

Jamie will send out the May 2003 Final Meeting Minutes and the draft minutes from this meeting.

Consensus #1: Approval of the May 2003 Partnering Team Meeting Minutes.

The Team Reviewed the Action Items from the May 2003 Meeting:

Action Item A10503 - Greg W. will estimate cost for soil removal where soil results exceeded leach ability by June 13, 2003. **Closed**

Action Item A20503 - TtNUS will come up with costs to do an RIFS through remediation assuming long-term monitoring is the final remedy by June 13, 2003. **Closed**

Action Item A30503 - Amy will recalculate the 95% UCL on the remaining data at Site 15 by June 13, 2003. **Closed**

Action Item A40503 - Greg C. will fill out the facilitator evaluation form. **Closed**

Action Item A50503 – Ensafes will find out what the survey boundaries are of the landfill at OU 1 before the next partnering meeting in August 2003. **Closed**

Action Item A60503 – Allison will set up an ECO sub-group meeting with Hugo, Tom, Bobby Lewis and Gary B. to discuss Site 2 and Site 41. Meeting results will be presented at the next partnering meeting in August 2003. **Closed**

Changes to the Agenda

Some of the agenda items were moved for better utilization of time and resulting from Greg Wilfley not being here.

2. Team Assessment - Gus

Gus asked the Team to fill out a Team Assessment Survey. He will take the results from the survey and identify areas for improvement and then prioritize and develop action items for improving Team effectiveness.

3. Break

4. Greg Fraley's New Member Exercise

The Teams expectations of Greg:

- Be open and honest
- Support - Partnering and dedication
- Guidance - EPA policy interpretation
- Fair – Be open minded and balanced
- Give technical expertise
- Stay thru the hard parts
- Have a sense of humor
- Replace Gena
- Be considerate

Greg's expectations of the Team

- Work together as a team
- Truly partner together
- Solution oriented Team
- Prefers phone calls over emails
- Communication - put your phone number on emails
- Don't hold back when technically speaking
- No stonewalling

Greg's Comments

- He has a great deal of experience
- Greg has been with EPA since 1978, the only program he has not worked with is grants
- He has been partnering for 2 years
- Knows Jon Johnson well, knows what he wants
- Tends to not let things sit; let's move on if at all possible
- Chemical Engineer
- Open minded
- Not a morning person
- Likes to find solutions
- Prefers high-tech solutions

5. Site 2 Compensation

Allison gave a brief history of Site 2. The initial investigation was completed and they identified five areas of the site that had toxicity effects. Ensafe suggested a monitoring alternative and went back and designed a study. They then submitted an RI addendum based on the samples. There are two areas that had an adverse health effect condition. The decision was made to do an FS. The RI had already been submitted. The Response to Comments was sent to the Partnering

Team on July 9th. They have not received approval on the responses. Allison said that Tom Dillon of NOAA, is willing to approve the work if there is going to be some marine restoration somewhere else around the base. Allison explained that FDEP has a project Green Shores in Pensacola Bay. The Navy has contributed over 100K for that effort, supplying material and labor. There is additional information on the FDEP website about Project Green Shores.

Gena mentioned that EPAs position could possibly be to leave it alone and go through the FS addendum and determine what it would take to monitor or do removal. The adverse areas were found right along the seawall.

Paul suggests looking at the whole picture, not just one part of it. The FS addendum will cover capping, dredging, NFA and monitoring. Gerry confirms with Allison that the plan for the site will be NFA and the worst case scenario will be monitoring, however monitoring should be avoided if possible. Ensafe will await review of the Response to Comments.

6. Site 40

Site 40 is in the RI phase. The investigation was done in three phases. One area was identified as an AOC. They used a modeling program to estimate mercury in game fish. Allison will be submitting the RI Addendum as soon as she gets back. She will recommend that an FS not be completed.

Action Item A10803: Allison will send out the Site 40 RI Addendum by August 26th, 2003.

7. OU2

There are five sites involved, right in the heart of the base: Site 11, Site 12, Site 25, Site 27 and Site 30. Site 11 is an inactive landfill. Sites 25 and 27 are instrument cleaning and repair facilities, Site 30 is a transmission cleaning and repair facility. The initial RI work was completed in 1993 to 1995. The RI was submitted in 1996. The FS was submitted in late 1997. OU2 got put on the back burner for a while. The data was old by the time they got back to it a couple of years ago. There were fairly high concentrations of solvents in the groundwater. It was time to re-sample. The re-sampling was completed in April 2003. The data will be compiled into a formal RI Addendum which will be used to finalize the FS. The goal for today is to show Greg F. what has been compiled so far. In general, conditions have greatly improved over what they were. Brian passed out a data package to the Team and walked the Team through it.

Action Item A20803: The RI Addendum for OU2 will be out by September 30, 2003.

8. Close-out Report Site 15

Site 15 is an old former pesticide area. There are high concentrations of arsenic in this one area. The Remedial Action was implemented in June 2003 and the surface soil was removed with the highest accedances. The Group is currently holding off on doing any further remediation, to see if FDEP raises the cleanup value this fall as they are expected to do. In the interim they will monitor the area on a semi-annual basis. Bill is preparing a Statement of Work for a contractor to do this work. The contractor will remove all temporary wells and install new flush mounted wells. Bill then read the comments from Gena and Tracie on the monitoring plan:

Gena's comment: The objective of this groundwater monitoring plan is to monitor the contaminants until the remedial goals are achieved. The contract performance period is not an objective of the groundwater monitoring. Gena needs a monitoring plan for the site as stated in the ROD for Site 15, separate from the monitoring plan for the contractor.

2nd Comment: Page 4-1, First paragraph - The sampling frequency should be added to the text, "monitoring wells will be samples semi-annually...". The wells to be sampled should also be listed and identified by depth, (shallow, intermediate,...) and groundwater elevations should be collected.

Gena asked Bill how long will they wait for this regulatory information, while holding up the process. Bill says he will see what he can do, besides waiting.

Action Item A30804: Provide a groundwater map for OU4, Site 15, to meet the intentions of the Record of Decision by October 15, 2003.

Action Item A40803: Bill will meet with Greg. Wilfley, CH2M Hill to discuss remobilization to further excavate surface soil exceedances.

9. Close-out Report Site 43

This site is in the SSI stage not yet to The RI/FS or designated as an Operable Unit. The Team elected to try to do an interim removal action to remove those constituents during the site screening process and avoid the RI/FS stage. There was no risk to human health with surface soils to the residential standard, however FDEP leachability standards were exceeded. The Teams dilemma is do we continue to remediate subsurface soils to below the leachability criteria values as part of the SSI or do we go to RI/FS so we have the option of the LUC process? It was also stated that previous soil removal extended to the edge of the tennis courts and since that removal the tennis courts have been removed. That removed the cap and more removal may be needed. Regardless of what we do, we need more data. Bill has acquired funds to do either the RI/FS or some of the cleanup, whatever we decide. Gena suggests going towards the RI/FS, if there is not enough money to complete it as a whole.

Gerry mentioned that the Team does not seem to feel comfortable with making a decision right now. He suggests that when CH2M Hill comes to the next partnering meeting we could discuss it further. Tracie is concerned about the groundwater contamination. Bill is willing to take more samples to prove there is no groundwater contamination. Tracie mentioned a new regulatory law that if you can show the plume is not moving for a year, you can avoid cleanup without needing an LUC, but you still have to monitor it.

Gerry mentioned that with an SSI, you can either recommend an RI/FS or go NFA. Those are the only two choices.

The two options are:

1. Keep it as an SI, do additional delineation and removal and groundwater all at the same time. The risk is not getting it all and therefore the site would not qualify for an NFA. The benefit would be lower costs.

2. Move it to an RI/FS to do the additional soil and groundwater assessment. This way, you have more options because you leave it in place and do LUC or go ahead and do the removal at a later date and clean it up.

Consensus #2: The Team had a consensus to table the Site 43 decision until next meeting when CH2M Hill is available for the discussion.

Action Item A50803: Greg W. to prepare a presentation to the Team to illuminate us on what is lacking in the terms of delineation of the site.

10. Lunch

11. OU13 Progress Report

An additional monitoring plan was developed and it was agreed to collect composite samples adjacent to SO1 and SO3. Soil samples were collected at Site 24 in 3 locations, 10, 11 and 12. Seven permanent monitoring wells were installed, 4 at Site 8 and 3 at Site 24. The purpose was to determine whether we had leachability exceedances in the soils and groundwater exceedance from the previous data that was collected. According to Amy's summary, only SPLP exceedances for dieldrin were at Site 8 near well 08MW03. There was no dieldrin in the groundwater. They may need to excavate a small area based on leachability criteria. The additional 3 wells installed had no exceedances. The data has not been validated yet. Bill needs to look at the old data to see what the exceedances were. Bill says they need to address the dieldrin to the right of Building 3561.

Bill said this is an Interim Removal Action. Gena asked what was the rationale for putting those wells in? Tracie answered because the contamination exceeded leaching numbers. Tracie mentioned the choices are to use the 95% UCL or cap it. Tracie said the site would need to be monitored for a year to show that it is not migrating and it could then be called an LUC without monitoring.

Action Item A60803: Amy to send Tracie pertinent information relating to the BAP surface soil contamination found along the west side of Site 24, along the John H. Tower road. Include pictures of the samples taken with the asphalt found in it, pictures of the site where the samples were taken by the next partnering meeting.

Gena asked if the 3rd Qtr. ROD is still doable for OU13? Greg F. mentioned that the site has nothing to do with PAH's, they knew that coming in. There are ways to eliminate PAH's based on what you see in the data. The Team can make a definitive statement to say this. Tracie agrees, but it is impossibility from her point of view. PAH's have become a concern. Greg F. does not want to clean anything up the base did not do. Tracie needs a distinct explanation to present to Tim Barr. There was a very high hit of BAP. That's why Tim Barr has issues with the site.

Action Item A70803: Greg F. will research background data concerning roadways and PAH's and will report back to the Team by the next partnering meeting.

Bill suggests leaving the cover in place and proceed toward the LUC and monitoring for a year minimum and pursue the RI and complete the FS without the removal action. The remedy will be LUC and monitoring.

Greg F. asked if any other team member had found PAH's in their experience? Brian said yes, he had. Greg F. asked if there was something we could put together to show to the state regarding the PAH's? Will the Team go along with this?

Tracie said it would also help to get her a background sample, undisturbed and near the roadway, which is still getting a PAH hit to show to Tim Barr. Tracie will take the technical information to Tim and discuss with him the issue of when we put together an FS, if contamination is still there, what is to be done about it. Once the RI is done, and the team approves it, and it goes to EPA and the State and we comment on it formally, the RI is done.

Bill said that the funding for the proposed plan is done.

Gus asks if the Team is comfortable with the plan they have regarding Tim, ie. smoothing the way. Does the Team agree? Greg F. suggests giving Tim the PAH research data and move forward with the proposed plan. Allison will continue with the proposed plan.

Action Item A80803: Brian will research PAH data associated with Site 9 to see if it is appropriate for roadway comparison to road building activities. Brian will gather Amy's and Greg F.'s information, combine it with his research and get it all to Tracie by October 1, 2003.

Consensus #3: The Team had consensus to move along with the proposed plan.

Gena reminded the Team that the Draft Interim Removal Report is scheduled for Dec. 1, 2003.

12. SCAP Update

The OU4, Site 15, RA Complete Report, has been moved to September 30, 2004 because of the arsenic numbers. Gena sent the justification to her manager.

A90803: Jamie will send out the electronic copy of the Interim Report Tracking Document to the Team a week before the next partnering meeting. The Team will review the list to determine if it the due dates are still appropriate and will discuss this at the next partnering meeting.

EPA is the keeper of the SCAP, Greg F. will be putting the data in, Tier II will pull it up off the EPA's data system.

13. Tier II Update/Exit Strategy Assignment

Paul passed out the last Tier II Partnering Meeting Minutes. These were discussed.

Land sales money goes back into BRAC programs. Management of BRAC IC's is still the lucid issue at a different level. DOD does not want the responsibility of long term management of BRAC. They are looking at different alternatives. Trust programs, block grants, hasn't happened yet, may be a long time coming. There were presentations from Panama City and Mayport. There was discussion on the Cecil Field ROD, which is in Washington, the issue is

LUC's. They Went through the Tier II roles, looked at the mission statement, charter, etc. Exit strategies and site closeouts were also discussed.

Paul also passed out the Tier II Exit Strategy. This is in summary, a guidance and considerations to put together an exit strategy on a site by site basis.

Gerry pointed out:

Sites for NFA, need date of closure.

The cost and schedule.

What does "Generate potential strategies for cost" mean?

How is the end date for an LUC determined?

Allison asked Paul if he could bring these items up at his next meeting? He said he would. The Team will be able to discuss it at the December partnering meeting. The goal for the exit strategy submittal is December 2003.

Consensus #4: The Team will finish the draft table based on what Gerry's already put together. Once the table is complete, fill in if it's NFA information or costs information from DON.

Action Item A100803: Bill will get Gerry the cost information to use for the exit strategy document.

Action Item A110803: Allison will get Gerry the NFA data information and date and document information for the exit strategy document.

14. Facility UST Update

Not much has happened at the facility. At Bronson Field, Site 1107, soil removal action is completed. The funding ran out before completed. At Site 1116, they are getting ready to select a contractor, at Site 1159 CH2M Hill is set to begin remediation. TtNUS has treatability studies including Site 26 - ORC and Site 1140 NW using iSOC. The iSOC system has been working really well and includes an oxygen cylinder, putting oxygen directly into the water, and pushes the oxygen content way up. It is a little higher maintenance than the ORC but seems to be working well. ORC treatability studies are also being completed at Site 14, Site 17, and Site 1120.

Action Item A120803: Greg C. will follow up with RASO to take care of the RAD contamination at OU2.

15. Meeting Close-out

Meeting close out of 1st Day:

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

Second Day – August 20, 2003

16. Team Assessment Survey

Gus discussed the results of the survey. Generally the Team feels good about itself and its ability to meet the goals and how good the members are, and the Teams understanding of their individual responsibilities.

Almost one half (19) of the scores averaged 3.0 or less on a scale of 1-5. The lowest score averaged 2.4. The highest score was 3.9.

Dollar Voting was used to narrow down the top 4 areas most in need of improvement. The results were:

- Each member suggests ways of reaching goals – \$18
- We dig for root causes - \$17
- All members are active/engaged listeners - \$12
- We are considerate of others - \$11
- Closure on issues (was not on the original Team Assessment Survey-the Team agreed to add it)

Team Assessment Questions

1. Clear vision and understanding of our goals
2. Clear about steps to our goals
3. We have a master plan for achieving mission and goals
4. We have a reliable system for tracking progress
5. Documents describe our processes
6. Each member initiates discussion
7. Each member asks for information and opinions
8. All members are active/engaged listeners
9. All members are open and direct
10. Each member suggests ways of reaching goals
11. There are no hidden agendas
12. We have a well-balanced participation in meetings
13. We dig for root causes
14. We are self-policing of the ground rules
15. This is more commitment than a job
16. Dedicated to partnering procedures
17. We use statistical methods and controls in reaching goals
18. We are considerate of others
19. All members are fully prepared for each meeting
20. Closure on Issues – (was not on the original Team Assessment Survey-the Team agreed to add it)

The areas needing work were focused on in detail individually:

1. Closure on Issues

Stop Taking decision away from the table
Extending schedules
Forgetting previous decisions
Second guessing previous decisions
Not acting on decisions
Unrealistic scenerios

Start Acting like a team
Protecting team decisions
Making fully researched decisions
Get the data in early, have it summarized and bring all the data needed
Being more flexible – flexibility until the ROD process and then stick with the decision
Being more realistic about how to close things out
Beat schedules
Being more resolute
Making risk based decisions
Identify ARAR's under CERCLA

Continue Meeting minutes to track previous decisions
What was done on OU2
Training to assist in improvement

2. Dig For Root Causes

Stop False consensus
Holding back on full disclosure of all parameters of the situation
Partial data transfer

Start Make summary CD about the site we are working on
Start making complete evaluations of the data
Identify and investigate possible road blocks
Ask probing questions
Being more open about the sites

Continue Screening Comments based on Team's past decisions
Continue collaborative process as done with OU2
Being honest and open
To listen

3. Members suggest ways of Achieving Goals

Stop Providing problems without suggestions for resolution
Tuning out
Partial participation
Having ill-defined goals
Having decisions without follow-up
Stop fighting the system

Start Providing suggestions for solutions
Listening and staying involved
Being creative and offer your ideas
Leader needs to bring back people who are drifting away
Using system to our advantage
Defining goals better

Following up on decisions

Continue To use the Interim Report Tracking Document
Participation
Facilitator keeping people involved
Trust and Respect others

4. Consideration of Others

Stop Sidebars
Being late
Changing direction (topics) without resolution of the issue at hand
Talking about external Team influences
Interrupting
Pushing “buttons”
Ignoring personal issues
Taking it to heart
Coming on too strong
Using cell phones at the table
Making decisions without the consent of the Team

Start Being on time
Address root cause of personal baggage
Considering personality differences
Consider other persons perspective
Recognizing the value individual Team members

Continue Social Relationships
Using “I” statements
Professional Detachment

Tracking:

Jamie will print this information, enlarge them and they will be posted at the next 3 Partnering meetings.

The Team Assessment will be re-issued in 6 months. Brian – the next timekeeper will bring a timer at to the next partnering meeting to help keep everyone on time coming back to meetings from lunch, breaks, etc.

17. OU1 – LUC Boundary Presentation

Gerry mentioned that there are Land Use Restrictions for groundwater within 300 ft. of the site boundaries. They are trying to define those boundaries, instead of the original investigation boundary. For soils, they looked at where disposal activities had previously been completed and only those areas would be restricted for intrusion. For groundwater, they looked at the most recent contamination, and overlie all of the contaminants, moved out 300 ft. and drew the boundary. Greg C. will enforce these boundaries at the facility. They are using the EGIS and handheld GPS unit to get the coordinates. They will check the coordinates with the GPS and see

if it is within the 300 ft. restriction. At the last partnering meeting, the boundaries were defined. Due to computer problems, Gerry cannot project the EGIS this at this meeting.

Brian explained that initially a geophysical survey was done out there, and a superficial soil gas survey. The outer boundary of the grids were a conservative estimate. The surveys were done on 50 ft. spacing. It was started at the intersection of Taylor and John Tower roads and progressed from there. They compiled all the information and extended it from there. Physical evidence of the disturbance was taken and all of the information was overlaid on an historical aerial photo. Gerry asked Brian how accurate this was, Brian answered plus or minus 50 ft. During the investigation there was no intrusive activity. The Land Use Restriction does not actually restrict intrusion, only notification and approval of the environmental group prior to intrusion.

Gena said if they are confident with the plus minus 50 ft. and you have identified the boundaries that should be ok. If someone finds something outside the boundary, you would have to move the boundary. It's not an exact science. By using the EM 31 data, you know pretty close where the land fill boundaries are.

Gerry said there are two options: 1) Land Use Restrictions in which you would define the boundary, put a fence around it, and no one can dig inside that fence. This way is very specific and expensive; 2) Define the area using mapping and the EGIS system. This is the option the Team previously chose to use. Gerry suggests using the system how we currently have it, address them at that point if they run into problems. As Greg comes up with problems, we will address them at that time.

Action Item A130803: Bill will get the Team the web address for the Installation Restoration Program portal for EGIS.

Consensus #5: To use the existing Land Use Restrictions and EGIS process on OUI.

Jamie will send an updated contact list with the draft partnering meeting minutes.

15. Site 41 Wetland Tables/ECO/SubGroup Update

There was a meeting in Pensacola on July 29 and 30. The attendees were Barbara Albrecht, Gary Benfield, Tom Dillon from Noah, Paul Hardy, Allison Harris, Bobby Lewis from EPA, and Hugo Ochoa from University of Florida. They took a tour at the base and looked at most of the wetlands of interest. The focus was to develop the groundwork for the eco risk assessments. They looked at the excel tables that were established last year and reassessed those.

In the screening process, the mass detected concentrate was looked at and compared to the screening value. In the refinement process, average concentration will be compared for the POCCs and max detection will be looked at and compared to the PEL. This is not to say they will ignore the parameters below the PEL. The essential nutrients will be dropped out during refinement. Many revisions were made to the tables, data qualifiers were added, and alternative screening levels were renamed. VOC's will be retained as a classic contaminant, there were not that many that were detected. They cannot be thrown out only because there are no screening levels for them.

Further surface water samples will be collected to see if there are exceedances that might drive an action. Allison was unsure if the monitoring would need to be increased. Greg F. mentioned that the Team needs to consider the affect of having it hanging around and how it would affect something in the future; he does not want it just hanging around.

The pesticides will be looked at on a base wide level. There were two that were detected frequently, greater than 50%. The will use the mean ERM quotients to identify potential problems. Bobby Lewis had not received any Site 31 documents. He was unaware of a many of the things that were already done. Allison provided copies of the documents to him.

Allison relayed that Hugo Ochoa recommended to look at the wetland groups as an area, develop the receptors and end points based on that and present a mean for the whole area to get a more realistic intake of the contaminants. They are considering doing this.

Greg F. recommended putting the rational in the document. Allison said they would.

The meeting was very productive and they made a lot of progress. They will meet again in October 2003.

16. Exit Strategy Table

The Team discussed and reviewed the Exit Strategy Table that Gerry constructed.

Action Item A140803 – Paul will confirm with Tier II if the Exit Strategy should include the IR Program only

Action Item A150803 – Gerry will send the exit strategy table to Brian by October 1, 2003.

Action Item A160803 – Brian will complete the exit strategy document and email to the Team for review before the next partnering meeting.

17. FY04 Funding – 12 month duration

Bill updated the group on the planned SOUTHDIV funding for Fiscal Year 2004.

Site 43	either a RI/FS or IRA	-Funding
Ensafe Partnering Support (expires Dec. 20, 2003)		Funding – will carry through FY05
LTO		Funding
Site 1		Funding
Site 2		Funding
Site 8		Funding
Site 15		Funding
Site 24		Funding
Site 38	RA	Funding

18. Arsenic Background Study

Because of the remedial action and the uncertainty of the background of NASP, Greg C. thinks we should do remedial cleanup to expand the arsenic samples. Brian asked if the Team agrees that we need to evaluate the possibilities and proceed further for getting better background numbers for arsenic. Greg C. said yes. Greg F. thinks we should have a good rationale up front,

so we will not be wasting our time taking further arsenic samples. Gerry feels the Team needs to determine Why? and How?

Action Item A170803: Allison will go into the database and look for the soil samples collected in various areas of the NASP base.

Action Item A180803: Allison will get comments from the other participants in the ECO group and will then email the meeting minutes to the Team by August 28, 2003.

19. Gena's Departing Exercise

Gus led the group in Gena's Team member exit exercise.

Gena gave her parting comments to the Team. Gena will miss working with this Team.

New Action Items

A-10803: Allison will send out the Site 40 RI Addendum by August 26th, 2003.

A-20803: Brian The RI Addendum for OUT2 will be out by September 30, 2003.

A-30803: Bill will provide a groundwater map for OU4, Site 15, to meet the intentions of the Record of Decision by October 15, 2003.

A-40803: Bill will meet with Greg. Wilfley, CH2M Hill to discuss remobilization to further excavate surface soil exceedances.

A-50803: Greg W. to prepare a presentation to the Team to illuminate us on what is lacking in the terms of delineation of the site.

A-60803: Amy to send Tracie pertinent information relating to the BAP surface soil contamination found along the west side of Site 24, along the John H. Tower road. Include pictures of the samples taken with the asphalt found in it, pictures of the site where the samples were taken by September 22nd, 2003.

A-70803: Greg F. will research background data concerning roadways and PAH's and will report back to the Team by the September 22nd, 2003.

A-80803: Brian will research PAH data associated with Site 9 to see if it is appropriate for roadway comparison to road building activities. Brian will gather Amy's and Greg F.'s information, combine it with his research and get it all to Tracie by October 1, 2003.

A-90803: Jamie needs to send out the electronic copy of the Interim Report Tracking Document to the Team a week before the next partnering meeting. The Team will review the list to determine if the due dates are still appropriate and will discuss this at the next partnering meeting in October.

A-100803: Bill will get Gerry the cost information to use for the exit strategy document.

A-110803: Allison will get Gerry the NFA data information and date and document information for the exit strategy document.

A-120803: Greg C. will follow up with RASO to take care of the RAD contamination at OU2.

A-130803: Bill to get the Team the web address for the Installation Restoration Program portal for EGIS.

A-140803: Paul will confirm with Tier II if the Exit Strategy should include the IR Program only.

A-150803: Gerry will send the exit strategy table to Brian by October 1, 2003.

A-160803: Brian will complete the exit strategy document and email to the Team for review before the next partnering meeting.

A-170803: Allison will go into the database and look for the soil and groundwater samples collected in various areas of the NASP base.

A-180803: Allison will get comments from the other participants in the ECO group and will then email the meeting minutes to the Team by August 28, 2003.

A-190803: TtNUS will generate posters from the Team Improvement Program for use at the next partnering meeting including: the four top areas and one with the 19 questions.

Summary of Consensus Items

1. Approval of the May 2003 Meeting Minutes.
2. The Team had a consensus to Table the Site 43 Decision until the October Partnering Meeting.
3. The Team had consensus to move along with the proposed plan.
4. The Team will finish the table based on what Gerry's put together, finish on the 2nd day of the partnering meeting, once the table is complete, fill in if it's NFA information or costs information from Don.
5. To use the existing Land use Restrictions and the EGIS process on OU1.

Proposed NASP Partnering Team Meeting Dates and Locations:

- October 21 and 22, 2003, Pensacola, FL
- December 9 and 10, 2003, Charleston, SC

Parking Lot Issues

There were 3 new parking lot issues.

1. Arsenic background study locations.
2. Funding for FY04 project.
3. Gena's expectations to bring Greg up to speed on the overall scheme - add to next agenda.

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	Complete		Gerry will put together this 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. Discuss in the March Meeting. Gerry has them - he will give them to Greg and Bill.
A-050103	Tracie	Complete		Tracie was asked if she had check with Hugo about ECO tables for Site 41.
Action Items from March, 2003 Meeting				
A-10303	Greg C.	Working	9/2/03	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. Greg will get this to Tracie.
A-20303	Greg W.	Closed	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. Complete
A-30303	Allison	Closed		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. Complete
A-40303	Allison	Closed	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. Complete
A-50303	Greg W.	Closed		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. Complete - waiting on guidance numbers to change.

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-60303	Greg W.	Closed		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	Closed	5/13/03	Gerry will plug in the LUC boundaries for OU1 and present it to the Team at the May 2003 Meeting.
Action Items from May, 2003 Meeting				
A-10503	Greg W.	Closed	6/13/03	Greg W. will estimate cost for soil removal where soil results exceeded leachability by June 13, 2003. Discussed in conference call.
A-20503	Gerry	Closed	6/13/03	TTNUS will come up with costs to do an RIFS through remediation assuming long-term monitoring is the final remedy by June 13, 2003. Discussed in conference call.
A-30503	Amy	Closed	6/13/03	Amy will recalculate the 95% UCL on the remaining data at Site 15 by June 13, 2003.
A-40503	Greg C.	Closed		Greg C. will fill out the facilitator evaluation form.
A-50503	Allison	Closed	8/19/03	Ensafe will find out what the survey boundaries are of the landfill at OU1 before the next partnering meeting in August 2003. On the August Agenda.
A-60503	Allison	Closed		Allison will set up an ECO sub-group meeting with Hugo, Tom, Bobby Lewis and Gary B. to discuss Site 2 and Site 41. Meeting results will be presented at the next partnering meeting in August 2003. On the August Agenda.
New Action Items from August, 2003 Meeting				
A-10803	Allison	Working		Allison will send out the Site 40 RI Addendum by August 26 th , 2003.
A-20803		Working		The RI Addendum for OU2 will be out by September 30, 2003.
A-30803	Bill	Working		Provide a groundwater map for OU4, Site 15, to meet the intentions of the Record of Decision by October 15, 2003.
A-40803	Bill	Working		Bill will meet with Greg. Wilfley, CH2M Hill to discuss remobilization to further excavate surface soil exceedances.
A-50803	Greg W.	Working		Greg W. to prepare a presentation to the Team to illuminate us on what is lacking in the terms of delineation of the site.
A-60803	Amy	Working		Amy to send Tracie pertinent information relating to the BAP surface soil contamination found along the west side of Site 24, along the John H. Tower road. Include pictures of the samples taken with the asphalt found in it, pictures of the site where the

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
				samples were taken by the next partnering meeting.
A-70803	Greg F.	Working		Greg F. will research background data concerning roadways and PAH's and will report back to the Team by the next partnering meeting.
A-80803	Brian	Working		Brian will research PAH data associated with Site 9 to see if it is appropriate for roadway comparison to road building activities. Brian will gather Amy's and Greg F.'s information, combine it with his research and get it all to Tracie by October 1, 2003.
A-90803	Jamie	Working		Jamie needs to send out the electronic copy of the Interim Report Tracking Document to the Team a week before the next partnering meeting. The Team will review the list to determine if the due dates are still appropriate and will discuss this at the next partnering meeting.
A-100803	Bill	Working		Bill will get Gerry the cost information to use for the exit strategy document.
A-110803	Allison	Working		Allison will get Gerry the NFA data information and date and document information for the exit strategy document.
A-120803	Greg C.	Working		Greg C. will follow up with RASO to take care of the RAD contamination at OU2.
A-130803	Bill	Working		Bill to get the Team the web address for the Installation Restoration Program portal for EGIS.
A-140803	Paul	Working		Paul will confirm with Tier II if the Exit Strategy should include the IR Program only.
A-150803	Gerry	Working		Gerry will send the exit strategy table to Brian by October 1, 2003.
A-160803	Brian	Working		Brian will complete the exit strategy document and email to the Team for review before the next partnering meeting.
A-170803	Allison	Working		Allison will go into the database and look for the soil and groundwater samples collected in various areas of the NASP base.
A-180803	Allison	Working		Allison will get comments from the other participants in the ECO group and will then email the meeting minutes to the Team by August 28, 2003.
A-190803	Jamie	Working		TtNUS will generate posters from the Team Improvement Program for use at the next partnering meeting. The four top areas and one with the 20 Team Assessment Survey questions.

Pensacola Partnering Meeting Agenda
Pensacola, FL
October 21 and 22, 2003

Leader: Greg Wilfley
Scribe: Jamie
Timekeeper: Brian Caldwell

Item	Description	Presenter	Time	Category
1	1 st Day Check In/Opening Remarks/ Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/ Review Ground Rules/Action Item & Parking Lot Review	Greg W.	8:00 – 8:30	Info
2	Training - MBTI	Gus	8:30 – 9:30	Required
3	Break	All	9:30 - 9:45	Refresh
4	SCAPS update and review the Interim Report Tracking Document	All	9:45 - 10:15	Info
5	Close-out Site 43 – information and decision	Allison	10:15 - 11:15	Info
6	Lunch	All	11:15 – 12:30	Refresh
7	Review exit strategy table	All	12:30 – 2:30	Info
8	Tier II Presentation for Greg	Paul	2:30 – 3:00	Info
9	Break	All	3:00 – 3:15	Refresh
10	Arsenic background discussion	Brian	3:15 – 4:15	Info
11	1 st Day Meeting Closeout - Review Action Items/ Consensus Items/+/-/Review Agenda for Day 2	All	4:15 - 4:30	Info

Pensacola Partnering Meeting
Second Day

Item	Description	Presenter	Time	Category
12	2 nd Day Check-In/Opening Remarks	Greg W.	8:00 – 8:30	Info
13	Close Out Report Site 15	Allison	8:30 - 9:15	Info
14	OU13 PAH Discussion	Tracie	9:15 – 9:45	Info
15	Tier II Update	Paul	9:45 – 10:15	Info
16	Break	All	10:15 - 10:30	Break
17	Facility/UST Update	Greg C.	10:30 – 11:00	Info
18	RAC Update	Greg W.	11:00 - 11:15	Info
19	Lunch	All	11:15 – 12:30	Refresh
20	Site 38 – finalize remedial values	Allison	12:30 – 1:00	Info
21	Site 40 Proposed Plan Review	Allison	1:00 – 2:00	Info
22	Site 2 Update	Allison	2:00 – 2:15	Info
23	Site 41 – concurrence on screening and refinement tables	Allison	2:15 – 3:15	Refresh
24	RAB Meeting Preparation	Greg C.	3:15 – 3:45	Info
25	TIP Review	Gus	3:45 – 4:15	Info
26	2 nd Day Meeting Closeout – review action items/next agenda/+/-/consensus/facilitator eval.	All	4:15 – 4:45	Info