

N00204.AR.002629  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 16 MARCH AND 17 MARCH 2010 NAS  
PENSACOLA FL  
3/16/2010  
NAS PENSACOLA

**NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes**  
**March 16 & 17, 2010**  
**Jacksonville, Florida**

**ATTENDEES:**

**Team Members:**

Patty Marajh-Whittemore	NAVFAC
Greg Fraley	USEPA
David Grabka	FDEP
Helen Lockard	Tier II
Sam Naik	CH2M Hill
Greg Campbell	NASP PWD
Gerry Walker	TtNUS
Brian Caldwell	TtNUS
Allison Harris	Ensafe

**Support Members:**

John Schoolfield	NAVFAC (Day 2 pm)
Patrick Owens	NAVSEA RASO (Day 1)
Hector Hernandez	CH2M Hill
Frank Lesesne	TtNUS
Ron Kotun	TtNUS
Aaron Bernhardt	TtNUS (Day 2 am)
Melissa Brock	TtNUS – Scribe
Mike Kuhn	TtNUS (Telecon, Day 1)
Stephanie Carroll	The Management Edge - Facilitator

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1- Facilitator Partnering Training Presentation
- 2- Gantt Charts (updated IR and Petroleum Sites)
- 3- NIRIS Presentation
- 4- Action Item List

**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 - 9:13 am)**

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

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 first bullet in the charter was discussed as well as the fact that the CERCLA program was the only program mentioned.

The Team then reviewed consensus items, updated the Action Item List, and reviewed the parking lot items from the December 2009 meeting. The updated Action Item List is attached to these minutes. All Action Items from the December 2009 meeting were completed, ongoing Action Items were noted, and the Team then reminded each other about their e-mail search words “roses are red”.

*Consensus Item 01 – The December 1st & 2nd, 2009 meeting minutes have been approved. A final copy of the approved minutes will be sent to the team and archived.*

2. **Break (9:13-9:23 am)**

3. **Partnering Training (9:23-10:06 am)**

Stephanie C. provided a presentation on “Presenting Type in Organizations.” Each of the Team members determined their type with regard to preferential characteristics. The goal of this exercise is to help Team members understand the types of people they partner with, which can be beneficial during Team meetings in resolving issues.

4. **Break (10:06-10:25 am)**

5. **Gantt Chart, Document Priority Table, SCAP, and Exit Strategy (10:25-11:30 am)**

Gerry W. presented the Gantt Chart and reviewed the Document Tracking and Priority Table (which was used to update the Gantt Chart). The Gantt Chart should be updated at every meeting. The color coding for both documents was discussed.

OU 1

The UFP-SAP was reviewed and was submitted to the regulators on February 4, 2010. Onboard review is scheduled for tomorrow for approval.

OU 13

Aerostar is in the field this week.

OU 2

The RD has been approved by the EPA; the RD (with the response to comments) has approved by the FDEP (lead disappearance from COPC list still an issue with David G., would like more data).

**Action Item A-010310:** Gerry W. - OU2: The CH2M Hill excavation schedule will be added to the Gantt Chart. (Due 03/19/10)

The RD can be finalized as is now. Lead in groundwater will be evaluated post excavation. If exceedances are detected then continued monitoring will occur, if not it will be dropped. The LTM may need to be revised at a later date, but moving forward for now is fine with David G.

The Administrative Record status was discussed and the Team was updated on the progress of the NIRIS ready documents and uploads.

The UFP-SAP is currently under review; the Team expects to receive comments soon.

OU 11/Site 38

Final RDs are holding. Soil confirmation sampling has been completed. The Draft UFP-SAP for the groundwater is currently under Navy. The UFP-SAP for soil was completed, the corresponding sampling event has been completed along with the Confirmation Soil Sampling Letter Report. The Team is still awaiting regulator comments.

Regulator comments on the Confirmation Soil Sampling Letter Report will be tabled for onboard review tomorrow so the RD can be approved and finalized.

OU 16/Site 41

(Wetlands) – A Presentation will be provided tomorrow on the Tech Memo. The UFP-SAP has been reviewed and comments have been made. Response to comments will be discussed tomorrow during the presentation. COCs and PRGs will be discussed for a buy in. (Sites 43, 44, and 45 are proposed for RODs this Fiscal Year).

OU 18/Site 43

The ROD is currently under review by FDEP. Secondary standard issues were causing delays for the ROD. Patty and Gerry have the white paper with them.

**Action Item A-020310:** Greg C - OU 18/Site 43: Email the Team with the new name of the Acting Commanding Officer at NAS Pensacola for the White Paper. (Due 03/22/10)

OU 19/Site 44

All comments on the FS have received. The PP is 70 percent complete. This site is an agenda item for tomorrow's discussion.

OU 20/Site 45

EPA and FDEP have provided comments on the FS. The Team wants a ROD to be completed for this site.

**Action Item A-030310:** Gerry W. - Update the Gantt chart schedule to reflect dates and resend to the Team for sites 44, 45, and 46. (Due 03/26/10)

OU 21/ Site 46

The Navy is currently reviewing the Draft FS.

**Action Item A-040310:** Gerry W. - Site 46: SCAP date for this site in the exit strategy may not be met if the ROD date is kept, update it to reflect an accurate date of December 30 and the Remedy in Place date will need to be pushed back to 9/30/12. (Due 03/26/10)

6. **Lunch (11:30 am- 1:03 pm)**
7. **June Meeting Schedule (1:03-1:10 pm)**

Patty has schedule conflict with the Quarterly Partnering Meeting in June.

**Action Item A-:** Gerry W. - Arrange the hotel accommodations for the next partnering meeting. (Due 06/01/2010)

*Consensus Item 02 – The Team agrees to move the June meeting in Sarasota to the dates of June 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>.*

**8. UST Site 1120 SRCO (1:10-1:30 pm)**

Gerry W. provided a presentation on the site history. The well and groundwater contamination in well 14-R is still present. David G. has concerns with the recommendations. He had reservations about putting a permanent groundwater restriction at a site that might clean up. The soil recommendations are also a concern. He believes no soil restriction may be required at all, however the data is so limited he cannot make a clear decision.

David would like to go back and see if his management will accept each individual carc. PAHs is below residential levels instead of combined. Thus his argument that all the samples were clean would suffice. Dig restrictions would be in place if designated contaminated, not non-residential. David thinks an RMO Level 2 would be a better option to reach complete NFA.

**9. NIRIS Update (1:30 - 2:26 pm)**

The initial interests that the Team has with NIRIS were addressed (i.e. Do the regulators have to have access to NIRIS?). Mike Kuhn provided a web based presentation on the NIRIS system (Tom Deck will travel to Jacksonville to assist with NIRIS). An overview was covered, roles and responsibilities, components, status, policy, RPM's requirements, tools, uses, tracking, support, project management, documents, etc.

**Action A-060310:** Gerry W. - NIRIS: Send Mike's presentation to the Team with the meeting minutes. (Due 03/26/10)

**10. Break (2:26- 2:38 pm)**

**11. UST Site 1120 SRCO Continued – 2:38-3:16 pm**

David stated that if a closure assessment report was completed, it may be possible to find the tank ID to look up on oculus to investigate the history of the tanks and nature of the contamination.

**Action Item A-070310:** Greg C. - UST Site 1120: Talk to an associate at the base for tank information at UST 1120. (Due 03/26/10)

**Action Item A-080310:** Gerry W. - UST Site 1120: Obtain historical data relating to soil for the site and send to David G. for his review. OVA data from the CAR will be provided to David. (Due 04/01/10)

The LUCs memorandum was discussed along with the deeds. The soil issue needs to be resolved in order to proceed with establishing the LUCs for groundwater.

The goal is to get an NFA for the soils based on past data, and have two more sampling events of the monitoring well with exceedances and a down gradient well using the over-pumping method for the well with exceedances. If the events don't resolve the issue then a no further action or an RMO Level 2 determination can be explored.

*Consensus Item 03 – The Team agrees to proceed by having two more quarterly sampling events of the monitoring well with exceedances (14-R) and a down gradient well (38) using the over-pumping method for the well with exceedances. If the groundwater concentrations are less than GCTL levels the site will be no further action. If the GCTLs are exceeded the Navy will request an RMO level 2 closure.*

**12. OU 2 Radium Sites (3:16-4:04 pm)**

Pat Owens gave a presentation on OU 2 Radium Sites which included Sites 12, 25, and 27. RASO, MARSSIM approach, approach at NAS Pensacola, project management team, and time frames were covered. NAVSEADDET is the branch under which RASO operates. MARSSIM approach: 1) Planning phase of the Data Cycle (scenarios A or B), 2) Implementation phase, 3) Assessment phase, 4) Decision Making phase. A Work Plan for NAS Pensacola was presented detailing the approach and concerns.

**Action Item A-090310:** Greg C. - OU 2 Radium Sites: Send Pat the report done on the pipe line near the parking lot. (Due 03/24/10)

The work schedule was reviewed. Surveys were performed in April of '09 and will commence again in August 2010. Field work is expected for Spring/Summer 2010 with the Final Report projected for Fall 2010.

**Action Item A-100310-** Greg F. and David G. - OU 2 Radium Work Plan: Provide all comments and questions on the Work Plan back to Pat by April 5, 2010. (Due 04/05/10)

David will review the document if it is investigative, but would need to bring in others if it is a decision document.

**13. Break (4:04 – 4:16 pm)**

**14. Site 19 – 4:16 – 4:45 pm**

Hector H. gave a presentation on the Site 19 Fuel Farm Pipeline Leak Area at OU 2. The site location was referenced along with the site plan with pipeline. Wet seasons were discussed as well as site history. The current site status and CSM was presented. The groundwater at the site has exceedances in the shallow, intermediate, and deep wells. The concentrations of contaminants were presented along with potentiometric groundwater flow. A budget analysis for the site was run. The soil had few exceedances of SCTLs. The following data gaps were noted: surface water (run-off from runways), and groundwater- no clean boundaries (to less than GCTLs).

Path forward- Gopher tortoise screening, wetlands permitting, tortoise pre-construction confirmatory survey, third party utility locate, NASP dig permitting, hot spot delineation and treatment, Final RD with CSM, then remedy implementation. Confirmatory DPT will be performed in zones below the deep wells.

The Team then discussed the options of whether or not excavating was still not really an option. Air sparging is what Hector and the consultants view is the better options. David G. indicated that issues arose and concerns were felt due to the absence of sediment samples with a “plunging plume”.

David asks if the consultants have considered the results of pH and an increase of sulfate due to remedial activities at the wetlands. Hector indicates that a “box” could be put around the area with wells. David asked if a pilot test could be performed on a small scale before the entire site is done. The answer is yes, but the RIP and money are concerns of the consultants and the Navy. Hector indicated that pH and DO on select wells could be monitored during pulsing activities to prevent acidic changes and track the conditions at the site boundaries. Sam indicated an issue of length of sparging vs. pH declining. Sam stated that MIP work should commence first, then study of the pH effects. The Study Area 2 in Orlando should be reviewed for comparison/reference. Source area sparging wells would be in the shallow zone above the peat layer. David wants to see data that the sparging will clean up the soil too. Additional soil data will be provided during the MIP and DPT work.

**Action Item A-110310:** Sam N. - Site 19: Research history at the site and similar cases to report back to Hector and David (pH). (Due 03/23/10)

The wetlands permitting may not be an issue under the Army Corp vs. FDEP due to some exemptions. It is under review and a meeting is planned to discuss this.

*Consensus Item 04- The Team approved the outlined path forward presented including MIP and DPT investigation for Site 19.*

**15. UST Site 24 (5:15 - 5:20 pm)**

Hector provided a presentation on Site 24. The proposed work is synoptic and he would like to get a consensus on the path forward. The presentation will be continued tomorrow.

**16. Site 43 iROD (5:20 - 5:30 pm)**

Gerry presented the Site 43 iROD changes. The plan is to have Greg F. and David G. will review the updated document. The page with the Commanding Officer will need to be changed. David indicated he himself could write a letter stating he concurs, but he is concerned that they don't sign documents if the document is not truly finalized.

**Action Item A-120310:** David G. - Site 43 iROD: Complete a personal Site 43 concurrence letter (not a formal agency letter) and send to the Team. (Due 03/31/10)

**17. 1<sup>st</sup> Day Meeting Closeout- Review Action Items/ Consensus Items (5:30 - 5:51 pm)**

**18. Second Day Check In (7:30 - 7:35 am)**

**19. UST 24 (7:35 - 7:48 am)**

The team resumed discussion on UST 24 from where the Team left off yesterday. The plumes and contaminants were discussed. NADC exceedances were found in some of the 12 wells selected for monitoring. MNA is occurring. The path forward will include: gopher tortoise screening, a synoptic round of depth to water and a site-wide groundwater monitoring event to determine extent of dissolved plume, preparation of a RAP (air-sparge, MNA, LUCs). David noticed that the mounding cut and cover, and end up with radial flow and vertical gradient contamination. Site contamination may be migrating toward Site 19 Hector says. They need to investigate and collect more data. MIPs and DPT are proposed as well. David says more vertical delineation is warranted.

*Consensus Item 05- The Team approved the outlined path forward presented including MIP and DPT investigation for UST 24.*

**20. Facility Update (7:48 – 7:55 am)**

Greg C. provided an update on the base. There had been difficulty in obtaining UST 17 soil boring data, but Gerry found it in an old report. The data from that report was added to the SRCR and the regulators at FDEP are awaiting a decision. The site rehabilitation completion letter report should recommend site closure.

**Action Item A-130310:** Patty - UST 17: Have Aerostar write the Site Completion Letter Report for UST 17. (Due 03/31/10)

**21. OU 2 Remedial Design/ Work Plan (7:55 - 8:15 am)**

The UFP-SAP will need an amendment to add the confirmatory sampling. Could someone annotate the table Sam sent Gerry so they could be included in the plan. The original RD had lead as an analyte, then it was removed and all the ROD analytes were proposed. Sam's work plan was tailored to the FS and RD instead of the ROD. The table Sam sent has results for data that was included in some reports but not others. Sam needs to know which tables and figures need to be used with the respective data captured in each. The work plan must match the RD; this should be discussed during the next conference call meeting. CH2M Hill will sample the 0-2 feet to help them delineate horizontal extent of impacted soils. If it is hot, they will go deeper. Three sites had a RAD issue but were cut out.

**Action Item A-140310:** Gerry W. - OU 2: Organize a conference call for Friday to recap and further discuss OU 2 CH2M Hill work plan. (Due Date Pending)

**Action Item A-150310:** David G. - OU 2: Review the Tech Memo for the excavation sampling approach and let Sam know if he has any questions.

**22. Tier II Update – 8:15 - 8:30 am**

Helen covered the minutes and the items discussed at the last Tier II meeting held in Orlando in December 2009. The next meeting is scheduled for March 30, 2010. Issues concerning travel were discussed. A BRAC update was given on the new determination and how this may cause issues later on down the line. A GAO audit will be coming. The

date restrictions for dirt funding have been lifted, so the funding stream will be changing. Greg C stated that he was unclear on how he puts in his funding. Some of his sites have RAPs and will be needing implementation. The overall budget hasn't changed so some sites will be re-prioritized. RODs were discussed. Contract costs for risk assessors have increased.

Exit strategies at various sites were covered and discussed, highlighting the major items Tier II covered. For Pensacola the White Paper was discussed and the Team will get a "gold star" for its efforts. FEPA team is working on a revamped facilitator form. The contract is about to change. The forms will help all parties to evaluate team effectiveness. The Team presented at the last Tier II meeting. On the agenda for the Tier II level at the next meeting will be Site 43. MRP sites will be discussed along with the new facilitator form. Continue following the current ROD format for the sites the Team is currently working on.

**23. Break (8:30 - 8:50 am)**

**24. Site 41 Wetlands FS Update 98:50 - 10:05 am)**

Aaron Bernhardt called in to discuss the Site 41 Wetlands. A hard copy of the EPA Response to Comments was distributed to the Team. The COCs and Remedial goals for sediment were discussed at the last meeting. The EPA and the FDEP have provided comments, TtNUS is working on the response to comments. No FDEP RTCs have been formulated yet.

There are a couple duplications between the EPA and FDEP comments. The refinement values were both commented on by the regulators. All the risk assessors may need to get together.

Comment by comment, the points were reviewed:

**Comment A: Further Refinement**

The risk assessment was not preliminary, and the COPC and COC benchmarks were used in the memo. The FS did not show less conservative benchmarks.

**Comment B: Alternative Screening Values**

The FS outlined several refinement values.

**Comment C: Preliminary Remedial Goals**

*Agree* - The more conservative approach was used. Emphasis was placed on the toxicity test data.

*Disagree* - The minutes reflect that the reference locations are obviously contaminated. This is carried through the whole RI. Allison asked, "Which wetlands are being referred to Aaron answered that this corresponded to the reference locations. The regression analysis was used. Allison explained that this should be substantial information to justify this comment. (Refer to comment F) Aaron stated that this may need further clarification. The regulator would like to think about this response further.

**Comment D: Wetlands Characterization**

Navy recognizes that additional sampling would remedy this, but may not be necessary-  
*Greg F. finds this response acceptable.*

**Comment E: Toxicity Evaluation**

NOECs and LOECs were developed for these specific areas. Greg F. asked why different test organisms with different sensitivity were used. Aaron indicated that standard ASTM species and methods were used. Greg F. thinks that a judgment call was made here. David G. interpreted the comment a problem with the NOEC curve for the specific contaminants where one would want to use the typical food chain models for the PRGs. Aaron indicated the sites were assessed by OU sites individually (site specific). Allison indicated the max and average were developed for the various animals and all the wetlands were in good shape (no major affects were observed at the wetlands). **Wetlands 48 model may need PRG looked into more and Wetland 64 (for mercury).** Allison resolves the issue after reviewing the charts and tables: the average level was good across OU 2. The issues don't seem to be site related due to bioaccumulation. Greg F. will need to review this RTC more.

**Comment F:** Covered

**Comment G: Site-related Issues**

The terms used are commonly used to refine the list of ecological COPCs. The low concentration is not indicative of a disposal activity. No comments or questions were brought up.

**Comment H: Uncertainly/Data Gaps Section**

In the memo this focused on more of the NOECs and LOECs (slightly different than what is in the Risk Assessment. It would be more appropriate to discuss these comments with the risk assessors Greg F. suggests so that these issues can be fleshed out. The eco risks are not as cut and dry as human risks thus the questions and answers may not be as easy to understand.

**Comment I: Surface Water**

The media is not typically a part of the rationale in clean up. This statement should be revised to reflect. Consensus that this is not a risk driver should be added to the response.

**Comment M: Eco. Risk Assessment**

Gerry does not want to go back to write the RI to make it fit in the FS. David G. feels this exercise was provided to help identify the primary risk drivers without the process of trying to remove the contaminants of concern. Aaron replies that the tables were refined further (16-1, see footnote) in the tech memo and why some chemicals were not referred to. The purpose of the Tech Memo was to “eliminate” or refine the number of contaminants to be done in the FS so risk drivers can be determined (further refinement of the RI) and to include as an attachment to the FS as to the rational as why the contaminants were not considered risk drivers. Once the risk drivers have been identified, everything else will go along as “indicator chemicals”. Monitoring or excavation are the two remedial actions that are optional. The Tech Memo was able to show that Wetlands 16 and 18B are the only two wetlands not in the FS and therefore COCs from those two wetlands are not significant risk drivers and can be dropped from the list. FDEP and EPA have different goals in what we are trying to get (monitoring).

Aaron will revise the responses to include the new language discussed in today's meeting.

**Action Item A-160310:** David G. - Site 41: Provide comments to Aaron (and in a Word document format if possible). (Due 03/20/10)

**Action Item A-170310:** Greg F. - Site 41: Discuss the comments with EPA risk assessors to discuss the information needed in order to move forward. (Due 03/24/10)

**Action Item A-180310:** Aaron - Site 41: Provide responses to FDEP within a week. (Due 03/24/10)

**Agenda Item- this topic may need to be brought up during the next conference call.**

**25. SMP and Gantt Chart (10:05 - 10:11 am)**

Discussion was generated about the SMP and Gantt chart for the format David would like to receive (as discussed last quarterly meeting). Mike Davenport may need to address this issue.

**26. Gantt Chart, Petroleum Sites (10:11 - 10:20 am)**

Sam N. led a continued discussion/review of the Gantt Chart. The Team agreed a year ago that they would keep the completed sites in the chart to be able to show the dates and progress.

**Action Item A-190310:** Gerry W. - Petroleum Gantt Chart: Send the Team the Gantt Chart with meeting minutes. (Due with Minutes)

**UST 015/Site 1107**

Moving forward with the schedule. The Bunker C petroleum clean up rules and regulations were discussed again.

**27. UST 015/Site 1107 (10:20 - 10:40 am)**

Frank L. gave a presentation on the site history and activities. Soil samples exceeded SCTLs. Groundwater monitoring results showed exceedances of GCTLs in the smear zone. WRS recommended NFA on the basis of no free product and sampling events, and location of the site (future land use etc.), leachability.

NFA could not be dismissed based on the argument. David thinks a dig restriction might be necessary. Because it is Bunker C, David has a hard argument without having a well directly in the area. David thinks an RMO Level 2 for soils and dewatering.

**Action Item A-200310:** David G. - Site 1107: Review Site 1107 reports again to see where the Team can go from here. (Due Mid April)

**Agenda Item for next meeting to discuss options of where to go in the future to get closure.**

**28. Break (10:40 - 10:55 am)**

**29. MRP Update (10:55 am - 12:02 pm)**

John S. gave a presentation on the MRP work that was performed at NAS Pensacola (base wide). The Saufley field pilot was done in 2009 prior to the work at NAS Pensacola. The results of the Saufley Field sampling event showed a very close correlation between field screening results and lab results. The XRF screenings trended to be conservative.

During the Pensacola base wide sampling the UVF methodology for PAHs was field tested. John wanted to have an “XRF-like tool” for PAHs. The current study only has field screening data back. Then John gave a case study of a site in Texas at Kingsville Petroleum Fuel Site 1763. QROS is working with different extraction solvents to match the labs results.

Clay pigeons and clay targets for skeet ranges are non-toxic but if exposed long term will result in carcinogenetic (adverse) affects. Other states have approached the sites by a combination of elements to see if the PAHs will pose a problem. David gave the example of the study where clay pigeons were sieved and not sieved to see the breakdown. The clay pigeons were treated as waste and hauled away, versus having a “regulated clean-up” rendering it a hazardous waste. Therefore the best-management practices are developed. Soil collected should be just below the surface to avoid getting pieces in the sample. PAHs are not likely to mobilize into the groundwater analyzing with SPLP.

David would be interested to see the separate report on the PAHs.

XRF screening results are mapped, but no lab data is back yet for the base wide XRF screening. The schedule was reviewed and deliverable dates were projected. The final approval for the SI Report may be able to be signed and approved by David; it just depends on the recommendations.

The UFP-SAP needs to be signed off on.

The separate firing ranges’ (rifle, skeet, pistol) field screening XRF results were reviewed. The results reflect most of what the Team expected to see at the sites.

The residential XRF sampling field screening results had two hits, but the lab analytical results showed no exceedances.

Based on the results, David suggested that the Bronson Field Skeet Range might need to go to the RI phase.

Saufley Field Skeet Range XRF field sample results showed additional investigations are needed.

The UFP-SAP did not have a decision approach made for the various sites separate or holistically. Helen suggested decisions could be approached based on the size of a site, as done in Texas. David indicated ¼ acre is listed.

**30. Lunch (12:02- 1:14 pm)**

**31. Scheduling (1:14 – 1:24 pm)**

The Team discussed the location of the June 29 – 30, 2010 meeting. It was suggested that it be moved to Pensacola. The three RODs need to be presented for the RAB. The Team decided that the next meeting should be held in Pensacola, with the following Partnering Meeting (August 17 – 18, 2010) in Sarasota. In November the Team will meet in Pensacola.

**Agenda Item- David will be given a tour of the base/ walk through of the sites.**

**32. Site 44, 45, OU 11 Site 38 (1:24 – 2:34 pm)**

Site 44

FS EPA RTC: Stating monitoring natural attenuation versus long term monitoring was discussed. Greg finds the RTC for the selected action of monitoring natural attenuation acceptable.

FS FDEP RTC: The remedy is in question. David G. finds the RTC are found acceptable.

*Consensus Item 06 - The Team agrees that the Response to Comments for both the EPA and FDEP comments are acceptable for Feasibility Study Site 44.*

It is called into question whether or not a letter of approval is still needed for the RI

**Action Item A-210310:** Gerry W. - Site 44: Check to see if an approval letter needs to be created or was ever done for the RI at Site 44. (Due 03/26/10)

Site 45

FS EPA RTC: *If the contractor has data that demonstrates natural attenuation* then Greg F. finds the recommendations okay.

FS FDEP RTC: David still has questions with his comment number 7. Frank discussed the volume of contaminated groundwater calculated. David would like to see this data graphically to clarify the confusion in the text.

**Action Item A-220310:** Frank - Site 45 FS: Revise the text and create a figure depicting the data. (Due 03/26/10)

David also asked why the active treatment for groundwater was limited to in-situ treatment (comment 11)? He wants to have more options, like the pump and treat. However Gerry discussed how this is not the “low action” remediation. He says to gather data over a 5 year period in order to see how the remedy is doing, and if it is not being remediated then the active remediation treatment would be in-situ treatment. David is worried we would be monitoring forever with no changes to the media. Phyto was suggested by Brian as a possible option. Gerry stated that the contractors did look at the low, medium and high actions were all considered for the alternative analysis. Patty asked how the process would be accomplished

if changes to the alternative remediation were made. It was indicated that work would need to be re-done.

Gerry suggested that in the early chapters of the FS those alternative options are included so that the regulators can see where the rationales for the remedial treatments were devised. David was satisfied with the remedies presented.

The MCLs were reviewed, lead is above the MCL.

*Consensus Item 07: The Team agrees that the FDEP Response to Comments are acceptable for Site 45, with Comment 7 being addressed with an additional figure and revised text.*

**Action Item A-230310:** Brian, Sam, and Frank - Site 45: Address EPA Comments by including the hydrogeologic data and make the MNA argument defensible and send Greg F. an email making their case. (Due 03/25/10)

**Action Item A-240310:** Greg F. - Site 45: Respond to the response provided by Sam, Brian, and Frank. (Due 03/25/10)

**33. Break (2:34 - 2:44 pm)**

**34. Onboard Review (UFP-SAP for OU 1; Corry Station; UST Site 2 & UST Site 21; and the Seawall) (2:44 – 3:30 pm)**

David G. received the onboard review items (but didn't see the UST Site 2).

OU 1:

David had questions on the purpose of the UFP-SAP. Gerry said LTM was the purpose. The statements and items in the document were extracted from the ROD. Twice a year the site would be monitored. Groundwater compliance well will be replaced with a newly installed well. David said the review should be fairly easy.

Chapter 11 is discussed along with the decision rules: David stated that he understood the rationale behind the decision criteria.

The sampling frequency is called into question.

**Action Item A-250310:** Gerry W. - OU 1: Verify the sampling frequency proposed in the SAP vs. the ROD for OU 1. (Due 04/01/10)

The inputs for the decision rules are an issue for David. He sees a disconnect between the bullets. Gerry explained the differences of the bullets. David asked about the background behind figures 10-1 and 10-3. The monitoring well points' groundwater flow direction is generally to the north and radial in some areas. David asked which wells are which and where they fit into the decision rules. Gerry explained where the up-gradient, replacement, background, and new wells will be placed. David stated that he found decision rule 2 confusing.

David had questions on the decision rule 3. He would like the marine/freshwater numbers identified for the background threshold values. Gerry would like to have quotations put around the threshold value (the 5862 ug/L). This value (5862) must be met at the surface-water compliance point.

Page 57; David needs clarification on the the table. Empirical is the lab. He ideally wants the QL for vinyl chloride down. He is okay with the way the table reads.

David also wants TtNUS personnel be sure that the QLs meet the states criteria. The concern is noted. The compliance point was an issue with David's predecessor. David will prioritize this document's review.

The sampling event is scheduled to occur around April 2010.

Corry Station: David has not read through the document yet.

**35. Break (3:30 – 3:46 pm)**

**36. Onboard Review (UFP-SAP for OU 1; Corry Station; UST Site 2 & UST Site 21; and the Seawall) continued (3:46 – 4:32 pm)**

Seawall: David and Greg C. discuss the seawall. Greg C. gave David his copy of the Seawall Report.

OU 11, Site 38: Confirmation Soil Sampling Report (submitted in February) was discussed. The conclusions and recommendations were discussed in detail. The soil and groundwater results were covered.

Two things stand out to David: The problem statement questions (top 5 feet of contaminated soil were to be removed). Only the top two feet were actually removed. Although it was specified to be removed to 5 feet, it was not done. Two feet of clean fill are over the area where 5 feet were proposed.

A figure in the ROD needs to show the areas proposed to be excavated along with performing a re-calculation of the 95 % UCLs.

**Action Item A-260310:** Gerry W. - OU 11, Site 38: Provide the FS and ROD to David so he can compare the two documents, determine how the UCL data set was used to make decisions, and make changes to the errors in text described during today's discussion. Gerry will also provide the historical Dieldrin data to David. (Due 03/26/10)

Some errors with text were discovered and need to be addressed (example, micrograms: milligrams). Criteria values should be verified to ensure accuracy. David also wants to see that no dieldrin or arsenic is in the groundwater based on the SPLP.

The areas with difficulty (in the utility corridor) and the missed hot spot are an issue. The closest well to the area needs to be looked at to be sure dieldrin is not in the groundwater. Gerry indicates no wells are close to the area.

**Action Item A-270310:** Greg C. - OU 11, Site 38: Verify if the 38SB11 and 38SB12 are covered with concrete. (Due 03/22/10)

**Action Item A-280310-** Greg F. - Update the SCAP and send it to the Team before the next meeting. (Due 06/01/10)

**37. 2<sup>nd</sup> Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus-delta/Facilitator Evaluation 4:32 – 5:07 pm**

- Reviewed Action Items
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

**Plus +**  
Productive Meeting

Meeting Minutes  
Tenacity of Team to work through schedules  
Hard Working  
David G.  
Facilitator Training

**Delta Δ**

Hotel (cold cookies, poor services, etc.)

**Facilitator Feedback**

The facilitator (Stephanie Carroll) reviewed items she plans on placing in her report.

The next teleconference is scheduled for April 9, 2010.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:07 pm

<b>New Consensus Items from March 16<sup>th</sup> &amp; 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	
1	<i>The December 1st &amp; 2nd, 2009 meeting minutes have been approved. A final copy of the approved minutes will be sent to the team and archived.</i>
2	<i>The Team agrees to move the June meeting in Pensacola to the dates of the 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>.</i>
3	<i>The Team agrees at Site 1120 to proceed by having two more quarterly sampling events of the monitoring well with exceedances (14-R) and a down gradient well (38) using the over-pumping method for the well with exceedances. If the groundwater concentrations are less than GCTL levels the site will be no further action. If the GCTLs are exceeded the Navy will request an RMO level 2 closure.</i>
4	<i>The Team approved the outlined path forward presented including MIP and DPT investigation for Site 19.</i>
5	<i>The Team approved the outlined path forward presented including MIP and DPT investigation for UST 24.</i>
6	<i>The Team agrees that the Response to Comments for both the EPA and FDEP comments are acceptable for Feasibility Study Site 44.</i>
7	<i>The Team agrees that the FDEP Response to Comments are acceptable for Site 45, with Comment 7 being addressed with an additional figure and revised text.</i>

<b>New Action Items from March 16 &amp; 17, 2010 Meeting</b>				
<b>Action Item No.</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
<b>A-010310</b>	Gerry W.		03/19/10	OU 2: The excavation schedule will be added to the Gantt Chart.
<b>A-020310</b>	Greg C.		03/22/10	OU 18/Site 43: Email the Team with the new name of the Acting Commanding Officer at NAS Pensacola for the White Paper.
<b>A-030310</b>	Gerry W.		03/26/10	Update the Gantt chart schedule to reflect dates and resend to the Team for sites 44, 45, and 46.
<b>A-040310</b>	Gerry W.	<b>Completed</b>	3/26/10	Site 46: SCAP date for this site in the exit strategy may not be met if the ROD date is kept, update it to reflect an accurate date of December 30 and the Remedy in Place date will need to be pushed back to 9/30/12.
<b>A-050310</b>	Gerry W.		June	Arrange the hotel accommodations for the next partnering meeting.
<b>A-060310</b>	Gerry W.		03/26/10	NIRIS: Send Mike Kuhn's NIRIS presentation to the Team with meeting minutes.
<b>A-070310</b>	Greg C.		03/26/10	UST Site 1120: Talk to an associate to try and obtain information on the UST tank closure report.
<b>A-080310</b>	Gerry W.		04/01/10	UST Site 1120: Obtain historical data relating to soil for the site and send to David G. for his review. OVA data from the CAR will be provided to David.

<b>A-090310</b>	Greg C.		03/24/10	OU 2 Radium Sites: Send Pat Owens the report completed for the pipe line at the parking lot
<b>A-100310</b>	David G/ Greg F.		04/05/10	OU 2 Radium Work Plan: The Team needs to have all comments and questions on the Work Plan back to Pat Owens by April 5, 2010.
<b>A-110310</b>	Sam N.		03/23/10	Site 19: Sam N. Research the history at the site and similar cases to report back to Hector and David (pH)
<b>A-120310</b>	David G.		03/31/10	Site 43 iROD: Complete a personal Site 43 concurrence letter (not a formal agency letter) and send to the Team.
<b>A-130310</b>	Patty W.		03/31/10	UST 17: Have Aerostar write the Site Completion Letter Report for UST 17.
<b>A-140310</b>	Gerry W.	Completed	pending	OU 2: Organize a conference call for this Friday 3/19/10 further discuss OU 2 Remedial Design and RTC and CH2M Hill work plan
<b>A-150310</b>	David G.		03/26/10	OU 2: Review the Tech Memo for the excavation sampling approach and let Sam know if he has any questions
<b>A-160310</b>	David G.	Completed	03/20/10	Site 41: Provide comments to Aaron (and in a Word document format if possible).
<b>A-170310</b>	Greg F.		03/24/10	Site 41: Discuss the comments with EPA risk assessors to discuss the information needed in order to move forward.
<b>A-180310</b>	Aaron B.		03/24/10	Site 41: Provide responses to FDEP within a week.
<b>A-190310</b>	Gerry W.		With minutes	Petroleum Gant Chart: Gerry will send the Team the Gant Chart so everyone can review.
<b>A-200310</b>	David G.		Mid April	Site 1107: Review reports again to investigate where to go from here.
<b>A-210310</b>	Gerry W.	Completed	3/26/10	Site 44: Check to see if an approval letter is needs to be created or was ever done for the RI at Site 44.
<b>A-220310</b>	Frank L.		03/26/10	Site 45 FS: Revise the text and create a figure depicting the data David discussed in the meeting.
<b>A-230310</b>	Sam/Brian/ Frank		03/25/10	Site 45: Address EPA Comments by including the hydrogeologic data and make the MNA argument defensible and send Greg F. an email making their case.
<b>A-240310</b>	Greg F.		03/25/10	Site 45: Respond to the response provided by Sam, Brian, and Frank.
<b>A-250310</b>	Gerry W.		04/01/10	OU 1: Verify the sampling frequency proposed in the SAP vs. the ROD for OU 1.

A-260310	Gerry W.		03/26/10	OU 11, Site 38: Provide the FS and ROD to David so he can compare the two documents, determine how the UCL data set was used to make decisions, and make changes to the errors in text described during today's discussion. Gerry will also provide the historical Dieldrin data to David.
A-270310	Greg C.		03/22/10	OU 11, Site 38: Verify if the 38SB11 and 38SB12 are covered with concrete.
A-280310	Greg F.		06/08/10	Update the SCAP and send it to the Team before the next meeting.