

**NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes
May 28 & 29, 2008
Jacksonville Beach, Florida**

ATTENDEES:**Team Members:**

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Patty Marajh Whittemore | NAVFAC |
| Tracie Bolaños | FDEP |
| Brian Caldwell | Tetra Tech |
| Greg Campbell | NASP PWD |
| Greg Wilfley | CH2M Hill |
| Gerry Walker | TtNUS |
| Greg Fraley | USEPA |

Support Members:

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Stephanie Carroll | Mgmt Edge - Facilitator |
| Earl Boseman | USEPA Tier II Link |
| Jacqueline Strobl | TtNUS - Scribe |

1. 1st Day Check In/Opening Remarks/Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/Review Ground Rules & Charter/Review Consensus Items & Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes

The Partnering Team completed check in and then reviewed the Team Charter and Ground Rules. The Team then reviewed consensus items, updated the Action Item List, and reviewed the parking lot items from February's meeting. The updated Action Item List is attached.

Consensus Item 01 – Charter does not need to be updated or revised (last updated in 2004).

Consensus Item 02 – February meeting minutes have been approved.

Brian requested the Team review the April 9 & 10 UFP-SAP meeting minutes. Gerry provided a brief overview of the meeting, explained that the meeting minutes were limited, and indicated that three action items resulted from the meeting.

Greg W. asked how it is determined when to complete a UFP SAP and if there is a case by case determination. Patty indicated that it will be individually tasked by NAVFAC.

Consensus Item 03 – the NAS Pensacola OU 1 UFP SAP April 2008 meeting minutes have been approved.

Review of Action Items

Gerry led the team through the February 2008 action items table and updated the table accordingly (see the attached updated Action Item List).

Gerry led the team through the April meeting minutes action items. All three action items from the April meeting have been addressed/completed (A-010408, A-020408, and A-030408).

The team discussed the wording and details of Action Item A-030408.

2. 15 minute break.

3. Partnering Training - Stephanie

Stephanie led the team through a review of last meeting's exercise on "Systematic Problem – Solving". The steps for the Systematic Problem - Solving include:

1. Identify the problem
2. Identify the goal of the problem-solving exercise
3. Analyze the problem
4. Brainstorm potential solutions
5. Evaluate solutions
6. Create an action plan
7. Troubleshoot the plan
8. Monitor & evaluate

The topic of discussion was that the "Team schedules are not being met". Stephanie posed the question, "If we are not meeting team schedules, what is the 'ideal scenario'?"

What percentage of the time are we meeting our schedules? Team Feedback – at the moment the team meets approximately 30% of the scheduling deadlines. Ideally, the team should meet 100% of the scheduled deadlines – realistically, the team should be able to meet between 85 – 90% of the deadlines. Now that the problem has been identified and the idealistic/realistic goal has been established, how do we get there?

Stephanie led the team in a review of the "Pitfalls of Problem Solving":

Pitfalls of Problem Solving

- Rapid fire solutions.
- Solve the wrong problem.
- Symptom versus root cause.
- What ever happened with that?
- Why? Why? Why?
- Just the facts.
- Are we there yet? (not setting the desired state)

Stephanie led the team in review of the problems noted on the Fishbone - Problem - Solving - Diagram from the last facilitator training session.

Fishbone – Problem - Solving - Diagram

Problem Identified = team scheduling not being met

- Resources/Funding: Budget
- Workload: realistic deadlines, review time, individual team member work load varies, over commitment.
- Review process – upper management approval, outcome out of PM control, organization review varies
- People
- Complexity Document

Stephanie requested a vote on the issues/areas that have the most impact on the problem; team members were selected and instructed to vote by placing dot stickers on the area(s) they felt was most important. According to the vote the workload has the greatest impact followed by the Complexity Document.

Stephanie led the team in brainstorming activities concerning the problem area selected during the vote.

Workload: over commitment of individuals,

Brainstorming – can anything be done concerning the workload?

- Learning to prioritize – create priority list (hopefully Gantt chart will assist in lining out a priority)
- Work on efficiency

Stephanie instructed the team to proceed with Brainstorming activities – take 5-6 minutes and come up with ideas to help impact workload. How do we work around the workload problem?

Ideas:

- Supervisor
- Work Harder
- Individual Priority tables chart
- Increase meeting frequency
- Review/assistant with documents
- Increase contractor support and resources
- Establish priorities – Navy, FDEP, TtNUS; Earl commented that each section has different priorities. As a team we should have the same priority, but we need to consider the individual drivers.
- No control/time – outside factors
- Feedback to managers – if you are overworked, you should make it known to your supervisors.
- Develop efficiency – at an individual level learn to be more efficient.
- Conference calls – are we using them to their full potential? Conference calls are a good idea, but are they being used effectively?
- Increase trust – if trust is involved, then we will have less time consuming reviews – can we trust and move forward?
- Increase funding for review agencies.
- Hire student interns to help agency review.
- Try to reduce the number of documents to be reviewed – several versions, draft, final draft, final, etc. Would help reduce the number of reports to review?
- UFP SOP.
- Standardize report essentials – most reports have about 80% that is standard, concentrate on the other 20%.
- Keep dialogue going concerning deliverables.
- Prioritize the sites
- Keep a realistic and positive point of view.

Stephanie led the team through a review and sorted the ideas according to themes.

Categories identified included: Supervisor Controls, Prioritizing, On-board Reviews, Reduce Workload, Communication, and Funding. The team then placed the categories within the chart to display the “level of effort involved” vs. “impact in addressing the problem”. The chart included: Easy/Major – Prioritizing Jobs; Difficult/major – Supervisor Controls, Reduce Workload, Funding, On Boarding Reviews; Easy/Minor – Communication.

Prioritizing Goals:

- Priority/goal.
- Individual priority.
- Tables/charts.
- More thought given to deadlines.
- Prioritize sites.
- Establish priorities: Navy, EPA/FDEP, TtNUS/CH2M Hill.
- Timelines? Can they be trusted? How do they impact workload?
- Better organization of workload to improve efficiency.

On-Board Reviews:

- Table-top review, i.e. assistance, with document (technical assistance).
- More on board reviews.
- Increase meeting frequency.
- Keep a dialogue about deliverables due for all the contracts.
- On-board executive summary reviews – standardize report essentials, and then reviews can concentrate on the new issues.
- Increase trust.
- UFP SAP use to increase initial regulatory buy-in.

Supervisor Controls:

- Supervisor – priority of project
- Feedback to managers
- Supervisor’s equalizing/balancing personnel workload

Reduce Workload

- Try to reduce the number of documents to be reviewed (draft, draft final, final).
- Keep a realistic and empathetic point of view.
- No control/time

Funding

- Increase funding for review agencies.
- Increase contractor support and resources.
- Utilization of support staff; hire assistant.
- Hire student interns to help agency review.

Communication

- Re-think the monthly telecom – is it working?
- Develop efficiencies.

Misc.

- Funding to be used, i.e. completion of project within fiscal year.

Action Plan Chart:

1. What will be done and how?
2. By whom?
3. By when?
4. Measure of success.

Prioritizing the Jobs :

Gantt Chart production – There is a need to prioritize the sites and put more thought into deadlines. This should help organization and efficiency. ID items for onboard review. Gerry is currently working on a Gantt chart to organize and prioritize jobs. Quarterly updates will be made to the Gantt chart at scheduled Partnering Team meetings.

Communication:

Teleconferences – Four key entities (NAVFAC, FDEP, EPA, contractors) need to be there in order for the telecom to work. The meeting discusses documents for review. Are the telecoms effective and useful? Team discusses that if one of the four entities isn't there, is it even worth having the telecom but decides that "yes it is"... The team decides that the telecom should continue to be held and discusses whether or not the frequency should be adjusted. The team decides that the telecoms should maintain a monthly frequency and continues to hold meetings on the second Monday of each month at 2pm eastern time. The team discusses people missing meetings, how can we alert/remind people that there is an upcoming meeting? Team decides that instead of sending out a meeting place notification, a telecom notification will be sent through outlook appointments. The team decides that the telecom should be cancelled if there is less than 50% acceptance of the appointment invitation.

On Boarding Review:

What we have been trying to do is to review non decision documents during on boarding reviews. Tomorrow we will be discussing the Response to Comments for several documents. The problem is that we haven't been able to submit the final because we are waiting on approval of the Response to Comments.

We can increase the on boarding review, but we need to discuss which documents can be done this way. Not all documents easily lend themselves to this type of review.

The question was asked “Does everyone need to actually be present or can on board reviews be accomplished in part by teleconference?” The team decided that the reviews would best be accomplished in person.

What types of documents could we address by an on boarding review? The team decided that all kinds of documents includes: Remedial Investigation Reports, Feasibility Studies, Proposed Plans, RODs, and all UST documents.

What will be our action plans for each of these documents? The team decided to complete the review on a case by case basis to decide whether or not an on board review will be feasible. We may be able to identify documents for On Boarding Review issuing the Gantt chart. The team noted that this is all affected by timing, The team shouldn't necessarily wait for a meeting to complete the on board review if a document can be reviewed within the due date well in advance of the next meeting.

The following questions were asked: “What is going to be done during the on board review? Will a presentation be involved? Would it be better to just bring the actual document?” It was determined that normally the document itself will suffice; however, if it is felt that something needs further explanation, you could create a power point presentation.

“As a measure of success” – we will be meeting more deadlines.

The team asked, “How do we evaluate whether or not this will be effective?” The team determined that they would review deadline completions and evaluate them at the first meeting of calendar year 2009.

4. Break

5. Tier II Update -

Earl presented a Tier II update: At the last meeting Tier II discussed exit strategies, reorganization and funding update.

- EPA's superfund site attorneys and private site attorneys combined to one group. The internal reorganization will hopefully not greatly impact the team.
- UFP SAP training was completed in Jacksonville, and it won the CNO Environmental Team award.
- Earl discussed the audit/investigation – federal facility cleanups and DOD. He has been asked for a list of team awards received; since no list of these awards has been kept to date, he is in the process of forming one.
- Exit strategies – OU 2 ROD was scheduled for completion in March 2008, where is it now? Team indicated it is currently scheduled for June 2008 (changed to September 2008 during this meeting) The public comment period is currently underway. The five-year-review has been submitted. The dollar/funding amounts (estimated costs to complete) should be reviewed to see if they still make sense.
- Camille Desfaney replaced Don Dangerfield.
- A Tier 3 meeting was held at Jeckle Island back in February. Streamline RODs were discussed – 50% of the RODs in 2009 need to be streamlined RODs. We still don't really understand what a streamlined ROD is yet. Earl has asked Robbie to explain what the Navy's idea of a streamlined ROD is and will review it. All future RODs should be in this streamlined format. The goal is to achieve consistency between federal assistance superfund sites and private superfund

sites. This impacts us within the federal facilities branch. Closer scrutiny will be placed upon the RODs; the regional decision team will be composed of section chiefs, technical experts, etc.

- The next Tier II meeting is scheduled for June 11 and 12, 2008.

5. Lunch Break

6. Document Priority Table, SCAP, Exit Strategy

Gerry provided a Gantt Chart presentation:

OU1/site 1: Right now we have ongoing work at OU 1 - a reconnaissance and flow study work plan and field event. Before we block the culvert, we have to collect some data (flow control pilot study). We will be sampling monitoring wells and putting in replacement wells.

OU3 /site 2: The site is completed – NFA site

OU13/site 8 & 24: Remedial design stage – are we on schedule? The final remedial design has not yet been submitted. The draft final remedial design was submitted 6/26/07. We did an on board review of this but have not received regulator’s confirmation of NFA yet. After Greg F. approves, we can complete and publish the final document. No letter is needed on draft final; however, an email approving the draft final remedial design is necessary to proceed with the final. Greg F. will email it today.

OU2: The final proposed plan was approved 4/28/08. The Public Comment period will take place from 5/12/08 – 6/25/08. We can say the start date for the ROD has been met due to the on board review. Gerry adjusted the Gantt chart accordingly and adjusted Draft ROD to say “Draft Final ROD” and highlighted the priority in red. Patty – will 15 days be long enough to review? Probably not; realistically, let’s give it 45 days. OU2 final ROD is scheduled for 9/23/08.

OU11/site 38: Excavation - Soil removal down by the water front area. We need to confirm the removal of the contaminated soil. The Draft Final Remedial Design needs confirmation sampling funding in order to proceed with the design. The current remedial design assumes that the soil removal was successful. The design is supposed to be implemented within 18 months of the ROD. The team reviewed the figure sent by contractor depicting removal areas. The remedial design cannot be completed until confirmation sampling takes place. Several sections of soil that should have been removed were not removed. It is likely that an additional removal will have to take place.

It is not known yet whether the areas that still need removal are paved or not. A work plan for confirmation sampling will have to be created. If funding becomes available, the final design could be submitted by December.

OU15/Site 40: Final ROD in '04 – NFA (Patty wanted to know if we could move this site to the NFA sheet for the exit strategy).

Action Item 010508: OU15 -Move NFA sites from the Gantt chart to the NFA table (exit strategy).

Gerry asked the team, “What do you all want the Gantt chart to display?” Tracy said, “Show only the sites that are actually an active priority.” We need to come up with a certain number of sites that are top priorities. Gerry asked for clarification: “Are we talking about sites or documents?” Document prioritization may be more effective. The big picture is what is important.

Gerry will provide the team with a Gantt chart for all CERCLA sites (and will leave off NFA sites) and UST sites with a 6 month priority document review Gantt chart is showing documents to be reviewed for both petroleum and CERCLA sites. We will also need to incorporate CH2M Hill and Aerostar sites – we will need a list from Patty and update the Gantt chart during the next meeting. Per the team’s request, we will continue to maintain the document tracking priority table and attempt to link the two tracking tables together.

OU16/site 41: We are still waiting on the Feasibility Study – we don’t have FDEP or EPA approval of the Draft Final RI Addendum (addressed wetlands 10 and 48). We do have approval of the Final RI. We will do an on board review of the Draft Final RI Addendum followed by an email requesting regulatory approval of the document. Draft Final FS is due 8/22/08 (60 days for review). The priority is to get the Draft Final RI Addendum approved.

OU18/site 43: The Draft Final RTC was submitted in February 2008. The Final FS will be submitted next month. The projected ROD date is scheduled for 12/09. If this becomes a priority, we will adjust/tighten the schedule.

OU19/site 44: The Final RI stage – we have an RTC which will be discussed during the on board review later in the meeting. The RTC was sent out in March 2008. The Draft Feasibility Study was adjusted down to 30 days (from 45). The Final FS is scheduled for 5/25/09. The ROD will be scheduled for 9/8/10.

Currently, the team does not have any RODs scheduled for 2009.

OU20/site45: Tracy has draft comments on the Final RI.

OU21/site 46: This site is waiting on RTC from Gerry – approval of Draft Final RI received. RTC should be submitted within the next couple of weeks. The Final FS approval is scheduled for 6/10/09. The Final ROD approval is scheduled for 9/16/10.

Action Item 020508: Gerry will update the Gantt chart to include remedial design and final construction dates for all OU’s.

The team reviewed upcoming UST site priorities. Because there is not a current Gantt chart developed for the UST sites, the team reviewed the document tracking and priority table.

UST 014 Tank 681/682– Please submit the request (coversheet) for SRCO for UST014 – per Tracy.

Action Item 030508: Gerry will submit a coversheet requesting SRCO 014.

UST 015/ site 1107 – The team is unclear on the stage and status of this site. Greg has the Completion Report (dated 10/03 from WRS). Three quarters of groundwater monitoring have been completed, but we are unsure if this was the most recent document work completed. Patty and Greg C. will investigate and provide information to the team.

Action Item 040508: Patty & Greg Campbell to determine UST 015/site 1107 status.

UST 015/ site 1116: Initially, there was Bunker C contamination but no groundwater contamination at the site. The team is unclear as to the stage and status of this site. Patty and Greg C. will investigate and provide information to the team.

Action Item 050508: Patty & Greg Campbell to determine UST 015/site 1116 status.

UST 017/DFM Pipeline: The team is unclear as to the stage and status of this site. Patty and Greg C. will investigate and provide information to the team.

Action Item 060508: Greg Campbell to check the status of UST017/DFM Pipeline.

UST015/Site 1120: The Navy wanted to push the SRCR with conditions as per FDEP Risk Management Option level II. TtNUS will submit a letter to Tracy to request an SRCR with conditions as per FDEP Risk Management Option Level II site rehabilitation completion order.

UST 015 site 1140: NFA approved.

UST Building 3241: NFA approved.

Action Item 070508: Greg Campbell to determine status of last document submitted (UST Building 3241).

UST 015/site 1159: Remedial system installation to be completed in June 2008.

UST 020/site 19: Internal review of Work Plan to finalize the boundary on where the treatment system will be placed.

UST 021/site 20: Work Plan was written to take water quality analysis on well samples and out into the bay. During the optimization phone call, the decision was made to do long-term monitoring and water level measurements outside the sheet piling walls and to put in a cluster of wells to get vertical gradient information instead of performing the

originally planned water quality analysis. The plan is currently undergoing revisions. The plan should be ready by the middle of July 2008.

UST 022/site 21: Supplemental SAR to be submitted within a month or so.

UST 024/site 32: Upcoming sample engaging event to check status of free product to provide more current data. Product gauging and GW sampling event is scheduled for next month.

UST 025/NASP Building 1932: Additional assessment Work Plan.

NASP 782: Areostar is preparing a Draft SAR. The document should be published by July 2008.

NASP Building 1917: Soil removal action has been completed; however, contamination remains under the building. A RAP Addendum is recommended.

UST Building 2270 Naval Hospital: Currently writing the statement of work; waiting on funding.

NASP UST Site 3644: Aerostar has completed the sampling and is preparing the report.

Seawall: Sampling has been completed; preparing Draft SAR.

UST 02/Building 2662: Gerry indicated that we still need to locate site.

7. Faculty Update (Greg Campbell):

The facility is constructing a new flight simulator but it will not significantly affect any sites.

8. Day 1 Meeting Closeout

Reviewed schedule for tomorrow and prioritized and planned on trimming down certain sections, and removing others. NIRIS update to be moved to next meeting. Removed the 5-year-review from the schedule. Site 44, 45, & 46 have already been discussed.

9. 2nd Day Check-In

10. On Board Review

ROD OU2

Gerry led the on board review discussion. The team decided that in Section 1 and throughout the report to remove the term “dilution” and replace it with “hydraulic dispersion”. In Section 2, all the text was straight out of the Proposed Plan and remains unchanged.

Based on Earl’s information yesterday, the team discussed if the Information Repository should be listed as the John C. Pace University of West Florida even though they don’t

actually have hard copies? The library has CD copies only, no paper copies. It was decided that Greg F. would research this issue and report to the team.

Action Item 080508: Greg F. will check into the rule concerning the document hard copy availability issue.

Brief review of remedial action objective section. Discussion of the wording “reduced” and “eliminating.” Moved to selected remedy section per Tracy’s suggestion.

Section 2.11.2.1 concerning natural attenuation – replaced dilution with “hydraulic dispersion.” Section 2.11.2.2 – removed “construction” from first sentence. Move back to RAO section and removed “reduced”. Greg F. requested clarification of “local regulatory agencies” – added “including but not limited to local state agencies and water management districts”.

Discussion interrupted to allow a telecom to discuss OU 4.

11. OU4 site 15 NFA Decision:

Aerostar telecom: called Emily - semi annual report for OU4 – Patty requested brief overview:

Emily – Monitoring has taken place for the past 4 years. Another well installation should take place in order to sample in that area again. NFA requirements have not yet been met. Emily asked, “Do we need all wells sampled again for 2 quarters?” The team discussed whether or not all wells would need to be re-sampled or if the only new well would need to be sampled. Patty requested that Emily provide a scope of work for installation of a new well and sample all the wells for two more complete consecutive rounds of groundwater sampling (2 quarterly or 2 semiannual – TBD later per funding availability). Greg C. asked Emily how much a round of sampling costs – Emily estimated \$2,800 for a full round of sampling. The team decided on quarterly sampling.

12. Resumed On-Board Review

ROD OU2

Gerry presented some of the internal concerns that TtNUS had with the document including:

- Conceptual site model was not in the RI or FS so it has not initially been included in the ROD. The team decided that it is needed, and TtNUS will add it.
- Comparative analysis section has tables only, no associated text. Greg F. indicated that text is needed to accompany and support the table. TtNUS will develop text based on the comparative analysis tables.

Gerry indicated that he would attempt to publish the Draft ROD within a week.

13. OU1 Field Update

Currently, TtNUS is implementing the Pilot Study reconnaissance Work Plan including a topographic survey of the wetland area and collection of surface water elevation data

with three staff gauges, a shallow groundwater elevation survey from six peizometers to observe GW to surface water interaction and installation and monitoring of an on-site weather station to monitor rainfall. TtNUS will collect soil permeability data from the site.

Gerry indicated that yesterday he received a phone call from TtNUS technical support who are working on this project along with Mike Singletary, NAVFAC. The initial data indicates blocking the culvert may not work, it will likely flood onto the road. TtNUS wants to gather additional data prior to installation of the mechanism to block the culvert. TtNUS will present the data in a technical memo and lead a detailed discussion of the project at the next Partnering Team meeting. By then we will have more data and be able to make recommendations. Initially, TtNUS wanted to install the culvert and then see the effect of the hurricane season on the wetland, but now we plan to hold off on that and only collect data.

The team reviewed OU 1 ROD ESD, specifically RAO #3 is an issue. The Optimization Study recommendation proposed a modification to this RAO. The team needs to rethink the wording, but we cannot permanently shut down the treatment system until it is determined whether or not the culvert can be blocked. Brian provided a brief review of the history of the iron contamination issues. One of the suggestions was the use of a filter at the culvert instead of total blocking. ROA #3 will not be met if a filter is used, wetland 3 will not be protected.

The proposed technical memo for the next meeting will cover the data collected to determine whether or not the culvert can be blocked and will address the possibility of another remedial solution (i.e. a filter). We will need to do an ESD at some point.

Site 41 Wetlands RI Report Addendum for Wetlands 10 & 48:

Gerry summarized the recommendations. Tracy and Greg F. will send a letter to the team concerning the on board review completion and approval of the Site 41 Wetlands RI Report Addendum.

Action Item 090508: Gerry will send Tracy and Greg F. an e-mail including a copy of the Site 41 Wetlands RI Report Addendum.

Site 43:

Site 43 EPA approved the Draft Final FS without comments. Tracy asked, "What is the preferred remedy?" Gerry indicated that it has not yet been decided; the recommendation comes in the Proposed Plan after the evaluation in the Feasibility Study. Pump and treat was suggested, but the Navy is resistant to any future Pump and treat systems. There is lead contamination in the groundwater at this site which will complicate any remedial design.

Action Item 100508– Gerry will send the regulators a list of on board documents reviewed for e-mail confirmation

Site 44:

Site 44: Response to FDEP Comments Site 44 RI Report.

Comment 1 -Tracy, lead should stay on the COC list. Lead was still found in the GW; so, it is potentially leaching. This analyte needs to be carried through the soil evaluation process.

Comment 2 – is addressed.

Comment 3 – it will be defined in more detailed.

Comment 4 – is addressed.

Comment 5 – is addressed.

Comment 6 – not an issue, is addressed.

Comment 7 – The Navy is not likely to allow trespassers 270 days a year. The University of Florida Risk Assessors are not fond of the 45 day per year issue. Tracy accepted the RTC decision of 45 days and suggested that it would have helped to put this explanation in the text in the final version of the document.

Comment 8 – the reported value of 0.07 was taken from EPA guidance. And the difference in the numbers is insignificant. Tracie said to include an explanation in the document.

Comment 9 – is addressed.

14. Meeting Closeout:

Reviewed Action Items

Reviewed Consensus

Next Meeting Agenda

Parking lot – Construction completion dates are changing due to RODs being pushed out farther. The Navy will not be pleased with the delay. The team will need an explanation. Greg F. and Patty said that they would discuss it in the next couple of weeks and determine an explanation for Tier II.

Team completed a meeting evaluation:

Plus

Brian as leader

Facilities on beach

Productive meeting

Gantt chart

Food

Good brainstorming for meeting schedule deadlines.

Scribe present

Delta

Maps and flip charts were trashed.

Rushed at the end of meeting.

New Consensus Items from May 28 & 29 2008

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Charter does not need to be updated or revised (last updated in 2004). |
| 2 | February 12 & 13, 2008 NASP Partnering Team meeting minutes are approved. |
| 3 | April 9 & 10, 2008 NASP Partnering Team meeting minutes are approved. |

| Action Item No. | Responsible Party | Status | Due Date | Action Item |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--|
| Ongoing Action Items | | | | |
| A-050305 | Team | Ongoing | | Team needs to review the Document Tracking and Priority Table to hit document due dates. |
| A-070305 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will update the Document Tracking and Priority Table. |
| A-011207 | Greg F. | Working | 5/30/08 | Greg F. will e-mail the team, approval of the Draft Final Remedial Design for OU 13 within 2 weeks. |
| A-010208 | Greg F. | Working | 2/22/08 | Greg F. will check with agencies to determine if ROD needs to be forwarded to Headquarters for approval by 2/22/08 (all need to be forwarded if LUCs). |
| A-020208 | Gerry | Completed | 2/22/08 | Gerry Walker will resend OU 1 Optimization Study Response to Comments by 2/22/08. |
| A-030208 | Greg F | Complete | 2/22/08 | Greg F. will update the SCAP by 2/22/08. |
| A-040208 | Gerry | Complete | Next meeting | Gerry Walker will create a sorting function for the document priority table so that the team can identify the priority in the 3 month, six month, and 1 year time frame. – Created a Gantt Chart instead – to be presented today. |
| A-050208 | Gerry & Team | Ongoing | | When documents are submitted to the team, the author will e-mail recipients and indicate the agreed comment or approval dates with the statement: “Roses are red, violets are blue – just wanted to remind you when your comments are due _____” |
| A-060208 | Tracie & Greg F | Complete | 2/22/08 | Tracie and Greg F. will send an e-mail detailing comments/approval for the on-board review of the Draft Final Wetland 3 Flow Control Reconnaissance Phase Work Plan. |
| A-070208 | Tracie & Greg F | Completed | 2/22/08 | Tracie will send an e-mail detailing comments/approval for the OU 1 Annual Monitoring Report. |

| New Action Items from May 28 & 29 2008, Meeting | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|
| Action Item No. | Responsible Party | Status | Due Date | Action Item |
| A- 010508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will move NFA sites from the Gantt Chart to the NFA table (exit strategy). |
| A- 020508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will update the Gantt Chart to include remedial design and final construction date for all OU's. |
| A- 030508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will submit a coversheet requesting SRC0 for UST Site 14. |
| A- 040508 | Patty & Greg C. | Ongoing | | Patty & Greg Campbell to determine UST Site 015/site 1107 status. |
| A- 050508 | Patty & Greg C. | Ongoing | | Patty & Greg Campbell to determine UST Site 015/site 1116 status. |
| A- 060508 | Greg C. | Ongoing | | Greg Campbell to check the status of UST Site 017/DFM Pipeline. |
| A- 070508 | Greg C. | Ongoing | | Greg Campbell to determine status of last document submitted (UST Building 3241). |
| A- 080508 | Greg F. | Ongoing | | Greg F. will check into regulations concerning the administrative record – are hard copy documents required or are CDs OK? |
| A- 090508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will send Tracy and Greg F. an emailed copy of the Site 41 Wetlands RI Report Addendum. |
| A- 100508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will send the regulators a list of on board documents reviewed for email confirmation. |
| A- 110508 | Gerry | Ongoing | | Gerry will add the petroleum sites to the Gantt Chart. |

Parking Lot:

- Construction Completion Date.

Pensacola Partnering Meeting Agenda
September 16 & 17, 2008
Sarasota, Florida

Leader: Greg Campbell
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
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 & Charter/Review Consensus Items, Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes | Greg | 8:30 – 9:30 | Info |
| 2 | Break | Team | 9:30 – 9:45 | Needed |
| 3 | Gantt Chart, Document Priority Table, SCAP, and Exit Strategy | Gerry | 9:45 – 12:00 | Info |
| 4 | Lunch | Team | 12:00 – 1:30 | Needed |
| 5 | Continue Gantt Chart, Document Priority Table, SCAP, and Exit Strategy | Gerry | 1:30 – 2:30 | Info |
| 6 | Break | Team | 2:30 – 2:45 | Needed |
| 7 | OU 2 ROD | Gerry | 2:45 – 3:15 | Info |
| 8 | Facility Update | Greg C. | 3:15 – 3:30 | Info |
| 9 | Tier II Update | Earl | 3:30 – 3:45 | Info |
| 10 | 1 st Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items | Greg | 3:45 – 4:00 | Training |
| 11 | Partnering Training | Stephanie | 4:00 – 5:00 | Info |
| | | | | |
| 12 | 2 nd Day Check In | Greg | 8:00 – 8:15 | Info |
| 13 | Background Sample update | Brian | 8:15 – 8:45 | Info |
| 14 | OU 10 WWTP update | Mike Singletary | 8:45 – 9:15 | Info |
| 15 | Break | Team | 9:15 – 9:30 | Needed |
| 15 | OU 1 Fieldwork update | Gerry | 9:30 – 10:30 | Info |
| 16 | Risk Assessment Presentation | Ron Koton | 10:30 – 11:15 | Info |
| 16 | NIRIS Update | Mike S. Mike Kuhn (call-in) | 11:15 – 12:00 | Info |
| 17 | 2 nd Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus - delta/Facilitator Evaluation | Team | 12:00 – 12:30 | Info |
| 18 | Lunch | All | 12:30 – 1:30 | Needed |
| 19 | On board Reviews | Gerry / Greg W | 1:30 – 4:00 | Decisions |

Meeting Schedule:

- Monthly telecom on second Monday from 2:00 to 3:00 in the afternoon
- September 16 & 17, 2008, in Sarasota FL
- December 2 & 3, 2008, in Pensacola, FL (RAB Meeting)