

N00204.AR.002625  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 1 SEPTEMBER AND 2 SPETEMBER  
2009 NAS PENSACOLA FL  
9/1/2009  
NAS PENSACOLA

**NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes**  
**September 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009**  
**Pensacola, Florida**

**ATTENDEES:**

**Team Members:**

Patty Marajh-Whittemore	NAVFAC
Greg Fraley	USEPA
Sam Naik	CH2M Hill
Greg Campbell	NASP PWD
Gerry Walker	TtNUS
Allison Harris	Ensafe
Brian Caldwell	TtNUS
Tracie Bolaños	FDEP

**Support Members:**

Stephanie Carroll	The Management Edge - Facilitator
Yarissa Martínez	TtNUS – Scribe
Ron Kotun	TtNUS
Patrick Owens	NAVFAC (Day 2 pm)
Taylor Sword	AQVIC (Day 2 pm)
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC (Day 1 pm)
Mike Singletary	NAVFAC (Day 2)
Héctor Hernández	CH2M Hill (Day 2)
<i>By phone (for the UST Session on Day 2):</i>	
Casey Hudson	CH2M Hill
Kim Lee	CH2M Hill

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1- Presentation – “OU 18 iROD” – TtNUS
- 2- Presentation – “MRP Corry Station – RAB Presentation” – NAVY
- 3- Presentation – “UST Sites 19, 24 & 25” – CH2M Hill
- 4- Presentation – “OU 2 Work Plan” – AGVIQ
- 5- EPA Memo – “Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions

**MINUTES:**

**1. 1<sup>st</sup> Day Check In/Opening Remarks/Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/Review Ground Rules /Review Consensus Items & Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes 8:30 – 9:27 am**

The Partnering Team completed check-in and then reviewed the Team Charter and Ground Rules.

Resource sharing included a discussion of the USEPA April 22, 1991 - OSWER Memo “Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions.”

The meeting started with the announcement that Earl Bozeman would not be available because of concurrent Tier I/II meetings, therefore the team agreed on inviting him for the next conference call to provide the Tier II update.

For the benefit of new members the Team Pensacola Environmental Restoration Partnering Charter (as amended in June 2004) was read out loud and discussed.

The Team then reviewed consensus items, updated the Action Item List, and reviewed the parking lot items from the June 2009 meeting. The updated Action Item List has been inserted as the last page of these minutes.

**Action Item A-010909:** Greg C. will forward the instructions regarding the CNO award and the previous submittal.

**Action Item A-020909:** Greg F. will distribute the SCAP revision to the team.

*Consensus Item 01 – The June 16th & 17th, 2009 meeting minutes have been approved. A final copy of the approved minutes will be posted to the IR portal and archived.*

**2. Break 9:27 – 9:45 am**

**3. OU 18 Site 43 iROD 9:45 – 10:30 pm**

Gerry W. led a discussion regarding the iROD. A power point (attached) describing the new format for “Improved Record of Decision” was presented. Site 43 will be the first iROD for NAVFAC SE. The iROD would be supported with the information included in the administrative record, incorporate concise text accompanied by tables and figures with conceptual site models and provide a “user-friendly” language to read as a newspaper.

Greg F. was impressed with the figures and maps presented. However, USEPA questioned why there were no surface soil samples taken from the areas that showed geophysical anomalies. Gerry W. explained that usually when a geophysical study is performed anomalies may be detected, then when they are investigated they may not be related to the site use or do not represent a concern, therefore no samples would be collected from those areas.

The  $10^{-5}$  Incremental Lifetime Cancer Risk (ILCR) for residential exposure to subsurface soil was reviewed and discussed. Exposure Point Concentration (EPC) is the concentration in the soil used for calculated the risk; SCTL is the Florida regulatory standard and the ILCR is the direct relationship between the EPC and the SCTL. Simply stated  $EPC/SCTL = ILCR$ .

**Action Item A-030909:** TtNUS will verify the ILCR for Site 43 before the RAB meeting.

**Action Item A-040909:** Ron K. will distribute risk language for USEPA and FDEP to explain the risk associated with Site 43.

Concern related due to a single groundwater sample with detected concentrations above the USEPA action level (15 µg/l) was noted. However, this is a single detection, and part of the remedial action will be monitoring this well.

FDEP would like a living CD with all the support documentation for the iROD.

**Action Item A-050909:** TtNUS will provide a living CD with all the support investigations and documentations for Site 43.

USEPA raised concern related to the high/medium/low designation during the summary of comparative analysis for the nine criteria. Further discussion regarding the description of the designations should take place to ease the understanding of the comparison. Return to use of the phrases “do/does not meet”, “partially meets” or “completely meets” the criteria was discussed.

The Team discussed the down-gradient well proposed locations and TtNUS’s attempt to keep the wells inside the site boundary and to have at least one well directly down-gradient. It was noted that the groundwater flow is to the east.

USEPA would like to see the estimated soil removal volume throughout the presentation in the figures.

**4. Gantt Chart, Document Priority Table, SCAP and Exit Strategy 10:30 – 12:10 pm**

TtNUS reminders from Katie N. are assisting USEPA and FDEP in their review process. Therefore, the reminders will continue to be sent every two weeks.

FDEP concern regarding OU 1 Technical Memorandum (Page 15 Section 7.4 “Recommended Strategy for Iron Surface Water Compliance” second to last paragraph) is related to discontinuing monitoring at the point of compliance. This specific sentence was put in place to be able to have an exit strategy.

*“If iron concentrations greater than the criterion are not detected, the recommendations of the subsequent Five-Year Review would be to discontinue monitoring at the POC and NFA.”*

The team agreed to delete the last sentence in order to address FDEP concerns.

**Action Item A-060909:** TtNUS will prepare an updated page 15 insert to the OU 1 Technical Memorandum.

**UST Sites**

Gerry W. and Samuel N. led a discussion/review of the Gantt chart. The team agreed a year ago that we would keep the completed sites in the chart to be able to show the dates and progress.

UST 014 – Completed.

UST 015/Site 1107 – Moving forward with the schedule.

UST 017 (DFM Pipeline) – Aerostar submitted a quarterly monitoring report last month recommending NFA because of the monitoring results.

**Action Item A-070909:** Patty M. will send a request for a SRCO letter to FDEP.

UST Building 1120 – The SRCO letter is currently under Navy legal internal review. Information needs to be kept in the Master Plan. The Navy needs to be able to document the LUCs. Further discussion within the Navy needs to be completed regarding the LUCs.

UST 18 Crash Crew Training Area – Currently developing a RAP. However a Denitrification Based Bioremediation Treatability Study Work Plan was submitted for review. This document is not a decision document but it will assist us in the development of the RAP.

UST 15/ Site 1159 – Deliverables are on-going with CH2M Hill. Additional monitoring of this site will be presented later during the partnering meeting.

UST 2 – The team needs to schedule a UFP-SAP DQO Meeting to be discussed later in this meeting.

UST 22/Site 21 – Sludge fuel tank – The Supplemental Site Assessment Report under Navy internal review.

UST 24/Site 37 – CH2M Hill is currently working on this site and will be presented later during the partnering meeting.

UST 25/Bldg 1932 – This project will be transitioned to the new CH2M Hill representative in the Team and will be presented later during the partnering meeting.

UST Bldg 782 – Aerostar is working on the Draft RAP to be submitted to FDEP.

UST Bldg 1917 – An additional RAP Addendum is being contracted.

UST Bldg 2270 – Waiting on funding for the assessment report. Hopefully funding will be assigned for FY 2010 (6/2010).

UST Bldg 3644 – SAR has been submitted and approved by FDEP.

Sea Wall – It has not been awarded, probably FY 2010 funding.

The Navy is redistributing workflow and funding, therefore some of these sites will be delayed/affected due to this administrative change. The Sea Wall site may be back to be managed under Patty M.

**5. Lunch 12:10 – 1:25 pm**

**6. MRP Site Update 1:25 – 2:00 pm**

John S. went over the proposed schedule for the SI process.

MRP SI

October 3, 2009 – TNUS submits UFP-SAP to NAVY

November 15, 2009 – The UFP-SAP submitted to the Regulators

December 15, 2009 – All UFP-SAP comments complete

January 10, 2010 – Start of fieldwork

March 15, 2010 – All fieldwork complete

August 2010 – All reports must be completed with regulatory approval

John S. revised the schedule to avoid any log jams for review. The schedule presented has been accelerated to allow field events to commence by January 2010.

Malcolm Pirnie provided the response to comments on the PA to FDEP. However, FDEP has not reviewed the responses. Also, FDEP noted that they will not concur with NFA for sites based on the presence of a building in the area where the small range activities took place. FDEP expects additional information and investigations of the area in question before they will accept a NFA. FDEP mentioned that during the last RAB meeting the community had some concerns that needed to be addressed.

John S. led the team through the presentation to be discussed in the RAB meeting (attached).

Tracie B. commented that at other sites because of the results from the XRF, the lead concentration did not correlate with the range layout proposed. Therefore, we need to be very careful with our site models.

Patty M. was concern about the fact sheet and community outreach process. Greg C. said that the PAO would assist in communication the residents.

**7. Gantt Chart (Continued) 2:00 – 3:50 pm**

Gerry W. led a discussion/review of the Gantt chart and Document Tracking Table.

OU 1– TtNUS will submit the UFP-SAP for the Annual Monitoring which is currently being prepared.

OU 13 – Aerostar is managing the long term groundwater monitoring.

OU 2 – A presentation regarding the radiation preliminary survey findings will be given to the team later during this Partnering Team meeting.

OU 11/Site 38 – Preliminary results will be presented to the team during the partnering meeting. In general, the confirmatory sampling still showed exceedances. However, the samples taken from the replacement fill were non-detects.

OU 16/Site 41 – TtNUS submitted the Feasibility Study to the Navy. The COC list was reduced.

TtNUS will send an email whenever a document is being submitted, to allow people to be aware of the document. SCAP says that a Site 41 ROD will be completed by July 2010. However, according to the progress of the investigations of the site, this would be highly unlikely. The team agreed to update the SCAP date for the ROD for November 2010.

Tracie B. communicated FDEP's concern regarding the workload and the difficulty of trying to have three RODs in the same fiscal year. Gerry W. solicited input from the team in order to improve the process and facilitate the review and comment periods. Gerry W. suggested doing an on-board review for the Proposed Plan for future sites. The team agreed that this process could be used to expedite the review and comment period. Therefore, we would have an on-board review for Site 41 Proposed Plan and further proposed plans. Tracie B. requested that the on-board reviews be added to existing partnering meetings or make the meetings in Tallahassee due to current workload.

OU 18/Site 43 – The ROD is scheduled for this fiscal year. The iROD has been submitted to regulators, approval of the iROD is needed by September 30, 2009.

OU 19/Site 44 – The ROD for this site is scheduled for FY 2010. The Feasibility Study, submitted on March 31, 2009, is currently in regulatory review. USEPA provided comments on 8/5/09, waiting for FDEP comments.

**Action Item A-080909:** Gerry W. will provide FDEP the alternative summary for Site 44.

MNA is one of the options. TtNUS has included the Air Force method for evaluating the potential for MNA in the Site 46 Feasibility Study. This information should address USEPA request for data to support the MNA alternative. However the draft Site 44 Feasibility Study was completed in March 2009 prior to this request USEPA and therefore the method discussion was not included. This method discussion will provide sufficient information to support MNA at future sites.

OU 20/Site 45 – Draft Feasibility Study submitted to the regulators last week.

OU 21/Site 46 – The Feasibility Study is being produced by TtNUS. However, TtNUS is adding information to support MNA and evaluation the alternatives under the carbon footprint.

**8. Closeout 3:50 pm**

Changes to the agenda and revision of the action items will take place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day to allow the group some time for the RAB Meeting, which will take place in NAS Pensacola at 5:30 pm.

**9. 2<sup>nd</sup> Day Check In – 8:00 – 8:15 am**

The Partnering Team completed check in. New attendees joined to group for the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of meetings.

**10. UST Site 18 Treatability Study Wetlands – 8:15 – 9:00 am**

Gerry W. led the group in discussion of the UST Site 18. Information shared with the group started with the background of the site. The Treatability Study Work Plan was submitted in May. The work plan proposes Denitrification-Based Bioremediation to assess and evaluate the biodegradation rate of xylenes. This study will be part of the RAP.

FDEP's Jeff Lockwood has already completed an engineering evaluation of the Treatability Study Work Plan and has provided his comments.

If the treatability study shows that MNA is not viable, then full remediation with nutrient enhancement may be proposed.

FDEP expressed their concern regarding the lack of complete delineation specifically near the wetland areas. However, once the RAP is produced, additional wells will be proposed if needed.

Comments from the Jeff Lockwood's Engineering Review:

\*Technology acceptance letter may be available for nitrate based remediation. This is a new process and might be very easy to obtain. However, this is very important.

- TtNUS will verify if such letter is available for nitrate based remediation.

FDEP will suggest a meeting among the technical people to address all the concerns. Dates suggested September 22, 2009 at 1 pm or September 24, 2009 at 10 am (anytime the week of September 21-25, 2009).

**Action Item A-090909:** Gerry W. will send an invite to Mike S. and FDEP for the discussion of the UST 18 Treatability Study.

**11. Site 41 Wetland Feasibility Study Update**

Currently the Feasibility Study is under internal Navy review and comments should be provided by mid-September. Allison H. provided details regarding the Feasibility Study, specifically the alternatives evaluated.

**12. Facility Update – 8:40 – 8:45 pm**

Greg C. provided a brief facility update.

- The wastewater plant is no longer in operation. A demolition project for the plant will be funded soon.
- The windmill farm, which is a MILCON project, is still in the planning/funding stage.

**13. Continue CNO Award Update 8:45 – 12:05 pm**

Updated write-ups were assigned according to the following topics:

<b>AWARD</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>ASSIGN TO</b>	<b>UPDATE</b>
Team CNO Award – Due by the end of November	OU2 ROD – Streamlined	Gerry W.	Concern regarding the timing of the signing of the ROD. However, it can be specified in the ROD that the technical team has done everything needed.
	Landscaping project on CERCLA Site 38	Greg C.	
	Bronson Field Recovery Systems	Sam N.	
	Site 1 Wetland 3 decision, remedial system shutdown and revised compliance point	Gerry W.	Page insert will be produced and submitted in order to obtain approval for a compliance point.
	Partnering Process (on board review)	Tracie B. & Greg F.	
	Multivariate Analysis of MNA Parameters	Brian C.	
	Closed petroleum sites NFA	Gerry W.	
	UST Site 3	Brian C.	
	Pilot Study for SWMU 1	Mike S.	
	Optimization Study particularly for the UST Sites (reference the CNO Optimization Policy)	Sam N.	
	UFP-SAP	TtNUS	
Facility CNO Award	WWTP shutdown	Greg C.	
	Earth day and beach cleanup	Greg C.	
	FDEP Marina Award	Greg C.	

Greg C. announced that the CNO instructions were released recently and he will send it to the team. The write-ups should be provided to be discussed on the next NAS Pensacola Partnering Conference Call scheduled for October 2, 2009.

Brian C. presented the write-up provided for Site 1. This innovative technology, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is a characterization and analysis of a broad suite of analytes as an indicator of remedial progress. Statistical analysis is used to evaluate the significance of each characteristic and show their interdependencies and overall contribution relative to remedial progress. As a result only 9 out of 33 geochemical parameters should be sampled with vinyl chloride, meaning a cost saving approximately ten to twenty thousand dollars. However, we should bear in mind that this is a site related application; therefore, the statistical evaluation should be calculated for each site independently.

**Action Item A-100909:** Brian C. will send the initial write up regarding Site 1 to the team.

#### 14. UST Sites 19, 24, and 25 – 9:30 – 11:20am

Sam N. and Héctor H. led the group in a discussion regarding these three UST sites. The presentation provided included background information, current conditions, data gaps and proposed path forward according to additional evaluation of the conditions present.

##### Site 25

Information suggests that the plume has elongated to the east - southeast. The pH values are not ideal for MNA. However, further evaluation of the contaminant footprint indicated that natural attenuation is happening on the site. Currently there is no free product at the site.

Tracie B. raised concern regarding naming the xylenes GCTL as a secondary standard. FDEP would prefer further description of the standard as organoleptic or not risk-based rather than secondary standard. The delineation of the site was explained further to FDEP. CH2M Hill is proposing that bioslurping should not be applicable and that this site should be considered for MNA. CH2M Hill will be submitting an amended RAP.

Tracie B. is concerned about proximity of the active gas station to the site. Tracie B. suggested that the facts regarding the active gas station should be explicitly included in the amended RAP. Also, it could be convenient to include a contingency in the amended RAP that if the MNA is not successful, the original remedial alternative (in this site bioslurping) could be implemented.

##### Site 19

Data set supports that natural attenuation is happening at this site. The key activities to consider include the definition of the RAOs, investigation of MIP and an evaluation and recommendation to optimize groundwater remediation. In summary, the remedial action is being revised to include a more passive remedy, according to data gathered from further investigations and statistical analysis.

Further investigation utilizing a Membrane Inter-phase Probe (MIP) should give you additional information when you have well-defined sources. This tool will give you real-time information to make quick decisions at the field.

**Action Item A-110909:** Héctor H. /Sam N. will send the presentation, recommended approach and historical backup of possible names/descriptions of the UST sites to FDEP.

##### Site 24

The Navy questioned the sulfate concentrations, therefore further information was provided. As the previous UST site, a mass budgeting analysis was completed. MNA will be proposed for this site, based on data analysis conducted. FDEP main concern is to provide full delineation, vertically and horizontally, and that no free product is present.

However, additional information and analysis was gathered to show that the degradation is happening at such a rate that MNA would be reasonable.

FDEP recommended that during the 5 year review, an MNA request could be submitted. The MNA action plan would establish goals for the contaminant attenuation. A simple four or five page document can be submitted which would present the goals for attenuation supported by trend analysis. Milestone scheduling should be included to achieve the GCTL.

Since one well showed a minimal sheen of free product, a passive remediation may be an alternative. Looking at the historical trend, the amended RAP is the opportunity to present the alternatives and to provide all the supporting documentation and justification as to how to move forward.

*Consensus Item 02 – CH2M Hill will provide an amended RAP for UST 19, 24, and 25*

**15. OU 11 Site 38 Sampling Results 11:25 – 11:50 am**

Gerry led the discussion regarding the background and the sampling completed recently on Site 38. The purpose of this sampling event was to confirm clean material was used as fill and that the required soil removal specified in the ROD was completed. In summary, the composite soil samples for the fill material indicated no exceedances of industrial standards. However, confirmation samples at the locations specified for removal indicated dieldrin and arsenic present at concentrations exceeding the leachability SCTLs indicating soil removal was not adequate.

TtNUS will evaluate the data and the and provide a draft report to the Navy. Mike S. indicated that the Navy typically does not cleanup individual points and noted that the dieldrin was legally applied; therefore, we need to take a closer look at the data and evaluate the site as a whole and the corresponding risk.

**16. UST Site 2 Update 11:50 – 11:56**

A DQO Meeting was conducted on June 17, 2009. Additional historical documents and draft worksheets 10 and 11 for the UFP-SAP were posted to the TtNUS ftp site, as decided previously by the team. TtNUS will continue to produce the UFP-SAP.

**17. Lunch 12:56 – 1:25pm**

**18. OU 2 Workplan On-Board Review (RAD Update) 1:25 – 1:35 pm**

Taylor Sword, from AQVIC/CH2M Hill provided a brief update on the OU 2 Remedial Design as submitted to the team. Mr. Sword took a minute to provide safety information and then proceeded with a presentation regarding the project overview, scope, and path forward was shown.

Measures and surveys will be done for defining and documenting the removed areas and area to be filled. The facility has been having problems with the fill used for the area;

therefore, information regarding the fill should be carefully evaluated and provided. A separate UFP-SAP will be done for the Long Term Monitoring.

Removal areas will be restored to current conditions. Concrete, rebar, compacted fill or any specific construction areas will be restored.

Greg Campbell requested information and an updated schedule regarding the hotspot removals to have the tenants in the nearby buildings up to date.

Areas of potential concern for this effort include:

- 1- Gopher Tortoise, which is a Threatened Species, could be encountered in the area.
- 2- Traffic Coordination
- 3- Coordination with the base

A preconstruction meeting will be coordinated with the facility, in specific with Greg C. The team discussed the abandonment of wells that are directly in the areas affected with RAD. Taylor requested that the wells be relocated about 15 to 25 feet from their original location to facilitate the fieldwork.

*Consensus Item 03 – A couple of wells in OU 2 are located close to the areas that are being surveyed for radium. The team agreed to allow the wells to be relocated 15-25 feet outside the RAD areas.*

#### **19. Facilitator Exercise 2:25 – 3:20 pm**

##### New member integration

Each member took turns to say something that would help Sam N. to be successful in the team. Specifically, the questions “What you would like him to know about you?” and “What are your expectations of Sam N?” were asked.

Afterwards, Stephanie shared the MBTI types of the team members. Further discussion will be left for the next partnering meeting.

#### **20. 2<sup>nd</sup> Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus-delta/Facilitator Evaluation 3:20 – 3:50 pm**

The Team agreed to move the November 2009 Partnering Meeting to December 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup>

- Reviewed Action Items
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Next Meeting Agenda
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

FDEP is disappointed that the ROD is being provided late and the team expects to have an approved ROD within a month. Among the reasons for the delay we can mention the long review periods for the proposed plan, the new format and several issues that were not in our hands. Everyone will do the best they can.

**Revision of future meetings/activities:**

- RAB Meeting – Fall 2010
- Monthly teleconference on first Friday of each month from 10:00 to 11:00 am (next call is scheduled for October 2, 2009)
- UFP-SAP UST Site 2 DQO Conference Call on October 6, 2009 at 10:00am – noon EST
- OU 11 Site 38 for Groundwater Monitoring UFP-SAP DQO Conference Call October 27, 2009 at 9:00am – noon EST
- UST 18 Teleconference - September of 22, 2009 at 1 pm or September 24, 2009 at 10 am (anytime the week of 21-25)
- Next Partnering Meeting - December 1 & 2, 2009 in Jacksonville, FL

**Plus**

Sam coming on-board  
 Venue/ Arrangements  
 Good progress  
 Everyone engaged  
 CH2M Hill Presentations

**Delta**

Cold in room  
 Ahead of schedule in OU 2

**Facilitator Feedback**

The facilitator Stephanie Carroll reviewed a few items she plans on placing in her report.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 3:50pm

<b>New Consensus Items from September 1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</b>	
1	<i>The June 16<sup>th</sup> &amp; 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting minutes have been approved. A final copy of the approved minutes will be posted to the IR portal and archived.</i>
2	<i>CH2M Hill will provide an amended RAP for UST19, 24, and 25</i>
3	<i>A couple of wells in OU 2 are located close to the areas that are being surveyed for radium. The team agreed to allow the wells to be relocated 15-25 feet outside the RAD surveyed areas. (RASSO)</i>

<b>Action Item No.</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
<b>Ongoing Action Items</b>				
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.

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
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-140309	Greg F.	Completed	3/27/2009	Greg is going to call Tracie at 10:00, Friday, March 20, 2009 regarding the POC sample location for the OU1 wetland 4D monitoring and report back to the team by March 27, 2009.
A-010609	Gerry W.	Completed		UST 15: Gerry to provide Mike Singletary with a copy of the WRS report for Site 1107
A-020609	Patty & Gerry	Ongoing		UST 15: Gerry and Patty will follow up on how to proceed further with UST Site 1107 Site Rehabilitation Closure Request
A-030609				UST 24/ Site 37: Greg W. will follow up on the technical memo status
A-040609	Team members	Ongoing	8/01/2009	Individual writers which had assigned topics should submit their write up to the Team by August 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2009.
A-050609	Greg F.	Completed	9/01/2009	UST 16/ Site 41: SCAP date to be reviewed during the next Partnering Meeting.
A-060609	Brian C.	Completed		UST 19/ Site 44: Brian will review the FS and verify that proper justification for the MNA.
A-070609	Facilitator	Completed		Get MBTI types of the Partnering Team (either by voluntary submission or by inviting the Team to retake the test online)
A-080609	Greg C.	Completed		Greg C. will verify if the Homeland Security Restrictions, as specified in the ROD for OU3 / Site 2, are still in place.
A-090609	Greg F.	Completed	9/1/2009	OU 3/ Site 2 ROD: Greg F. will amend the SCAP to reflect the Five year review requirements as specified in the OU 3/ Site 2 ROD.
A-100609	Greg C.	Completed	6/26/2009	Greg C. will verify with the PAO for aerial figures of the base for Site 43 Proposed Plan.
A-110609	Greg C.	Completed	6/26/2009	Greg C. will verify the scope of work for the soil removal Site 38 north of Radford (verify if it was 2 ft or 5ft)
A-120609	TtNUS	Completed	6/26/2009	TtNUS will amend the Technical Memo for OU1 Wetlands to reflect the updated background calculations and will be submitted for FDEP/EPA approval.

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
<b>New Action Items from September 1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 Meeting</b>				
A-010909	Greg C.	Completed	9/4/09	Forward the instructions regarding the CNO award and previous submittal to the team.
A-020909	Greg F.	Completed	9/4/09	Distribute the SCAP revision to the team.
A-030909	TtNUS	Completed	9/1/09	Verify the ILCR for Site 43 in the presentation for the RAB.
A-040909	Ron K.	Completed	9/4/09	Distribute risk language for USEPA and FDEP to explain the risk associated with Site 43.
A-050909	Gerry W.		9/4/09	Distribute a living CD with all the support investigations and documentations for Site 43.
A-060909	Gerry W.		9/4/09	Prepare an updated page 15 insert to the OU 1 Technical Memo and send it to FDEP.
A-070909	Patty M.		9/30/09	Send a request for a SRCO letter to FDEP by for UST Site 017
A-080909	Gerry W.		9/4/09	Provide FDEP the Alternative Summary for Site 44.
A-090909	Gerry W.		9/4/09	Send an invitation to Mike Singletary and FDEP for the discussion of the UST 18 Treatability Study –on board review (keeping in mind that Jeff will be out until September 9, 2009)
A-100909	Brian C.	Completed	9/4/09	Send the initial write up regarding Site 1 to the team.
A-110909	Héctor H. / Sam N.		9/4/09	Send the presentation, recommended approach and historical backup of possible names/descriptions of the UST sites to FDEP.