

N00204.AR.002633
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 22 SEPTEMBER AND 23 SEPTEMBER
2010 NAS PENSACOLA FL
9/22/2010
NAS PENSACOLA

**NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes
September 22 and 23, 2010
St. Augustine, Florida**

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

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

Support Members:

Mike Singletary	NAVFAC
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC (Day 1 pm)
Frank Lesesne	TtNUS
Ron Kotun	TtNUS
Melissa Brock	TtNUS – Scribe
Stephanie Carroll	The Management Edge – Facilitator
Aaron Bernhardt	TtNUS (day 2 am, teleconference)
Dawn Marshal	Solutions IES (Day 2 am, teleconference)
Brian Rebar	Solutions IES (Day 2 am, teleconference)

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1- CH2M Hill Meeting Minutes with consensus items
- 2- Site Management Plan (SMP) Gantt Charts (updated IR and Petroleum Sites)
- 3- Action Item List

MINUTES:

1. 1st Day Check In/Opening Remarks/Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/Review Ground Rules /Review Consensus Items & Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes (8:00 - 8:57 am)

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

The Team Pensacola Environmental Restoration Partnering Charter (as amended in December 2009) was read aloud and discussed. The Team then reviewed consensus items, updated the Action Item List, and reviewed the parking lot items from the June 2010 meeting. The updated Action Item List is attached to these minutes. All Action Items from the June 2010 meeting were discussed. Completed and ongoing Action Items were noted. Site 1107 was discussed in detail including the site rehabilitation closure order (SRCO). The Team then reminded each other about their e-mail search words “roses are red”. Action items from the conference call meeting from Aug. 16, 2010 were also reviewed.

Action Item A-010910 – Gerry W. will check to see if there is an updated Team Charter tonight.

Action Item A-020910 – Gerry W. will send and David G. will review the example of the request for SRCO Tetra Tech was provided by Tracie.

Action Item A-030910 – David G. will investigate if more recent/current data is needed before the SRCO can be approved.

Action Item A-040910 – Greg C. will call Ed Parker to determine if the flight simulator can be utilized by the Team for team building.

Action Item A-050910 – Greg C. will provide documentation a letter on absence fishing pressure in marina and Wetlands 64.

Action Item A-060910 – Greg F. will send formal letter to Team on the Community Relation Plan and OU2 Remedial Design.

Consensus Item 01 - The 4th quarter meeting will be held November 30 and December 1, 2010 in Pensacola, Florida.

Consensus Item 02 – The June 29 & 30, 2010 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes. A final copy of the approved minutes will be sent to the team and archived.

Comments on the NASP Partnering Team Draft Meeting Minutes - June 29 and 30, 2010 meeting minutes included:

- Brian Rebar and Dawn Marshal will be added to the minutes as support members.
- Page 5 Site 1159, Solutions gave the presentation not Sam.

2. Break (8:57-9:04 am)

3. Partnering Training (9:04-10:08 am)

Stephanie C. provided a presentation on “High Performing Team Communication.” Each of the Team members were presented with the main factors of affective communication: Action, Process, People, and Ideas. Ten elements of good communication are: clarity, authenticity, accuracy, efficiency, completeness, timeliness, focus, openness, action oriented, and depersonalization. The Teams strengths and weaknesses were discussed. The goal of this exercise was to help Team members understand the types of people they partner with and how to better communicate, which can be beneficial during Team meetings in resolving issues, making proposals, etc.

4. Break (10:08-10:30 am)

5. SMP, SCAP, and Exit Strategy (10:30-12:00 pm)

Greg F. discussed the SCAP database and how he has changed the SCAP dates to match the new Site Management Plan (SMP).

Action Item A-070910 – Greg F. will send out the new SCAP dates by Monday September 28, 2010.

Gerry W. presented the SMP IR program Gantt schedule. The color coding for both documents was discussed.

Patty indicated that the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) specified review periods had been incorporated into the Gantt Chart schedule. Helen read the section guidance on the dates for the NPL facilities. She suggested that each Team member read the FFA and be familiar with it to help set realistic dates. The annual SMP must be submitted on time. She said to not just focus on the end result, but all aspects of the SMP items. She said it was important to document all extensions and requests for information. Meeting minutes do not substitute for not abiding by the FFA. The climate at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) seems to have an emphasis on enforcement, so the Navy needs to be cautious and proactive. Whiting Field was the case study used as an example.

The things to take away from this situation were to continue effective partnering, proper documentation, get consensus, set and keep realistic goals and document schedules. Helen also indicated that Tier II wants Teams to include an SMP column of date deadlines (shaded in red) on the Exit Strategy (Teams could remove CTC column and replace with SMP column). Gerry presented the overall rules and stipulations specified in the FFA. David said the Assistant Secretary position for dispute resolutions may have been delegated to the Division Director.

David G. said the on-board reviews may not substitute for meeting the requirements of the FFA as the only means of documentation. Formal documentation must also be completed. He also said formal regulatory approval letters need to be produced. Helen indicated to be sure from “here on out” that all documentation is made and stored for future reference and to be consistent.

Action Item A-080910 – Helen will send the guidance discussed during a recent Tier II Meeting to the Team for their reference.

6. Break (11:27-11:37 am)

7. SMP Review Continued (11:37-12:06 pm)

OU 1

The draft annual monitoring report will go out in January 2011 and the final in October 2011.

OU 13

This site is currently in a monitoring only program being completed by Aerostar.

OU4/Site 15

This site is currently in a monitoring only program being completed by Aerostar. The Sampling Report should be coming out soon.

OU 2

RASO is continuing work at OU2. They will request an NFA for radium at Site 25 A: The Record of Decision (ROD) called for contaminated surface soil excavation to be

removed to 2 feet bls. Site 27 C: Plans at the site are to cap it with a concrete pad (4-5” pad). The construction completion report is being generated and should be sent out for review September 28, 2010. Site 30G: The DRMO trailer was moved to complete the soil excavation. Now there are no funds to return the trailer to the location and so it will be put on the amended funds list to request funds.

Action Item A-090910 – Sam will send Gerry SMP schedule update for OU2 (including LTM for GSI) and OU18.

Action Item A-100910 – Gerry/ Melissa will add the updates from Sam (CH2M Hill) to the Gantt Chart and update the Petroleum Gantt Chart for Site 1107 and the Berthing Pier (UFP-SAP).

8. Lunch (12:06-1:25 pm)

9. Continue Gantt Chart-Petroleum Sites (1:25-2:15 pm)

OU 11/Site 38

The Draft Remedial Design (RD) is scheduled to be submitted October 2010. Soil confirmation sampling has been completed. The Draft Uniform Federal Policy Sampling and Analysis Plan (UFP-SAP) for the groundwater is currently in regulatory review. The Confirmation Soil Sampling event and Letter Report have been completed. The RD will cover the Groundwater Long Term Monitoring (LTM), where a well will be installed and sampled.

OU 16/Site 41

(Wetlands) –In November 2010 the Draft Feasibility Study (FS) will be published. This site is a high priority. The likely path forward will be LTM of the wetlands.

OU 18/Site 43

The ROD was signed April 2010. The Draft RD was sent out September 2010. Additional items (construction completion reports) will need to be added to the SMP and Gantt Chart (included in action item **A-090910**). Sam indicated that is it not likely they will have to step out with sampling; however it will have to be taken cautiously because of the historic presence of munitions. The issue of the trees will also need to be considered during excavation.

OU 19/Site 44

The FS was approved. The Draft Proposed Plan (PP) has been submitted (June 2010). The opportunity to include additional dates and time can be put into the SMP as a contingency. The final ROD has been extended until March 2012. The process of the SMP review times and dates was discussed, especially where documentation of extensions was concerned.

OU 20/Site 45

The Draft PP was submitted in August 2010.

OU 21/ Site 46

The Final FS is being submitted this week. The Final ROD is proposed for August 2012 at this site.

MMRP Update

The Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Site Investigations (SIs) for all sites are due before the end of the fiscal year. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) comments have been received for the SI's. David is not sure how many of the sites will go to a full Remedial Investigation (RI). Some sites may be completed with an Interim Remedial Action and an EECA. The EPA does not have to review the documents if the sites are not NPL. RODs will still be required; EPA will not be signing them.

10. Continue Gantt Chart-Petroleum Sites (2:15-3:10 pm)

Historical sites (closed sites) were covered and kept in the Gantt Chart for general purposes.

UST Site 1159

UST Sites 19, 24 and 25 will be covered in detail tomorrow. CH2M Hill is waiting for the permit from the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) for UST Site 19, but the FDEP permit is in. The gopher tortoise survey will be conducted along with a land survey and utility survey. Then the Remedial Action Plan (RAP) addendum will be written.

UST 22/Site 21

The SAR Addendum III was completed and the Navy is awaiting comments from FDEP. The dates will need to be extended.

Building 782

This site is scheduled for on-board review tomorrow.

Building 2279

Nothing to update. This site was being funded by the utilities department.

Building 3644

This site is scheduled for on-board review tomorrow. Greg C. had questions about who is funding his sites and the ERN checklist.

UST Site 02/Building 2662

A presentation is scheduled to be given tomorrow. The Draft Site Assessment Report Addendum (SARA) will be submitted in October 2010.

UST 15/Site 1120

For this site implementing RMO 2 was suggested by David. The Navy is moving forward with the SRCO. Patty asked if any other Sites have ever been successful with RMO 3? David could not think of one and that is why he suggested that an RMO 2 be considered.

UST 15/ Site 1107

Gerry indicated that Tetra Tech is working on a Request for SRCO. The Gantt Chart needs to be updated to reflect changes.

UST 24/ Site 37

Sam N. will give an update on this site tomorrow.

UST 25/ Building 1932

The Draft RAP Addendum was submitted.

Action Item A-110910- Gerry will send Sam the Petroleum Gantt Chart as separate Microsoft Project and PDF files.

UST 15/1159

There is nothing to update for this site.

UST Site 18

Biotrap results for this site will be discussed tomorrow in a presentation. A conference call is also scheduled next week.

Site 1116

Biotraps and baseline sampling for this site has already occurred and data will be incorporated into the RAP.

UST 21 /Site 20 Berthing Pier

On board review of this UFP-SAP is scheduled for tomorrow. One year of monitoring and then MNA and a re-writing of the RAP may possibly occur. The plan is to use FDEP's RMO 3 (closure with controls) rules which designate specific criteria to meet these goals (one year monitoring etc.). The UFP-SAP will be added to the Gantt Chart.

UST 25

The Draft Remedial Action (RA) has been completed. Active remediation is closed. One compliance well will be installed in July 2011 and groundwater analytical data from the well will be provided in a Report scheduled to be submitted August 2011.

Corry Station-

This UFP-SAP is in FDEPs review.

Building 782

Re-sampling of one well is going to be conducted to see if the site can be closed.

Building 782, Building 1917, 2270 ,3644, and Seawall

Gantt Chart needs to be updated.

Action Item A-120910 – Greg C. will send Gerry updated information regarding UST site report dates and site status.

The funding for these last six sites was discussed.

Comments on the SMP from Regulators need to be submitted by October 1, 2010. The sites and status of both Gantt Charts will be updated according to the comments received during the meeting.

11. Break (2:36-2:55 pm)

12. Tier II Update (2:55-4:05 pm)

Helen gave the Team an update from the last Tier II meeting. She reiterated the SMP information. Feed-back required: Would the Team like to have a joint Tire II and Tier I meeting? David reminded the Team about the travel restrictions for FDEP. Gerry suggested an agenda topic for the joint meeting be the EPA and FDEP differences regarding Secondary Standards. The Team believes that this type of training/meeting *would be beneficial* to network with other teams.

- The term I-ROD will not be used anymore. The new ROD toolkit (made in conjunction with DOD and EPA) is being rolled out for the use of Teams. The tool kit is available on the T2 website portal. Look for it!
- Communication needs to be improved in order to facilitate better tracking and understanding. Sub-groups have been created to look at key points with tracking and training. Arthur Collins gave a presentation on the Dispute process and he would like to be added as an adjunct member to Tier II meetings on occasion.
- Saufley Field is going to have a separate Partnering Team. The level of effort will be determined by the new Team (ex. 3 conference calls and one meeting a year).
- It is mandatory/policy now that *Sitewise* be used for all Feasibility Studies. ERN funding will be used for DSMOA sites in 2011.
- The other base Partnering Teams' statuses were discussed. NAS Pensacola needs to provide additional clarification on the comments for Site 16, 19 and 20. A new commanding officer has taken over. The new Governor will be elected in November 2010.
- Rapid Gate base passes were discussed and mainly affect contractors and vendors; a letter is being drafted by the Navy for all vendors for clarification. The rationale is to increase security but provide efficiency in the long run. The contractor can opt out; however they may have a longer wait period. Contracts are being reviewed for the language of funding. Regulators are exempt from Rapid Gate but require a sponsor to accompany them (along with other requirements detailed in the meeting minutes Helen will send out). The Tier II Team thought that Partnering meetings could be held off base until the Rapid Gate passes are worked out. Gerry indicated that he thought that the long term passes could be kept. NAS Pensacola will have Rapid Gate implemented by October 1st. Helen will send out further guidance, should any be sent.

Helen then went over the Tier II 2010 and 2011 goals. Teams need a way to periodically evaluate how well the performances of meetings are going. The data will be shared with the team and probably reported back to Tier II.

- The Team has been tasked to review and input updates and comment on the SMP in order to update the Exit Strategy (due November 1, 2010).

13. MRP Site Update (4:05-4:45 pm)

John S. discussed the MRP efforts at NAS Pensacola. The SI results were discussed. Four of the MRP sites are NFA. Ten MRP sites need further action or study.

John then presented an overview map for the Team's reference. As each individual site map was presented, the exceedances (if any) and the priority of the sites were discussed. David said Bronson Field Skeet and Pistol Range will need the ecological risk assessor to be involved during the RI/FS phase.

The bombing target sites were also discussed. The bombing target site at Magazine Point will need additional samples collected. The new site closure criteria will be reviewed.

Brian has completed background data report for arsenic from a previous study that will be reviewed to determine if the Fort Redoubt site arsenic concentrations are results of background. This site may need to be given its own designation under a different program than the MRP label to address the rubble piles.

The National Cemetery sites had PAH exceedances and will probably be combined into a single site. The site will require further study. After they rank the sites (weighted system ranking), John thinks this may be the second highest priority site.

Corry Station residential area has a high priority. Soil samples were initially collected and evaluated at 0-6 and 6-24 inch intervals. The data may be re-evaluated over the combined 0-24 inch depth. This residential area was previously a wetland and was filled with backfill during development. David thinks that some lead contamination may exist on the subsurface level and may need to be explored further.

The sampling event at Bronson Field had delineated areas of contamination, but additional delineation will be required.

Saufley Field will also need additional soil sampling to further delineate the extent of contamination. The investigation at Saufley Field bombing range identified anomalies that will need to be investigated further.

In order to accelerate the schedule, a rolling review is planned for the report.

David G. had previously discussed within the department whether or not XRF screening data could be used as more than screening data and used for decision making purposes. David said they are initially open to the use of the XRF data for decision making purposes. A correlation curve may need to be established per site. David did not foresee a delay in review time of documents.

14. 1st Day Meeting Closeout- Review Action Items/ Consensus Items (5:00-5:05 pm)

Action Item A-0130910: SMP: Greg F. and David G. will have comments on the SMP in by October 1, 2010.

15. 2nd Day Check In (8:00-8:22 am)

16. UST Site 18 Treatability Study (8:22-8:30 am)

Gerry W. indicated that this site was not able to be discussed before the meeting with the Navy. Therefore, he suggested the presentation be discussed at the next meeting.
Agenda Item: UST Site 18

17. Site 44 and 45 Proposed Plan (8:30-9:00 am)

Tetra Tech presented and discussed Sites 44 and 45 Proposed Plans. Site 44 comments have been received from the regulators.

Site 45 Proposed Plan was discussed and handouts were distributed. The document should be in the Team's review. The RODs have been initiated, however It is awaiting comments to incorporate and update the document. Greg C. has one editorial comment that his contact information, the fax number, should also be updated.

Pictures of the site were presented and areas of contamination were covered. The pictures illustrate site conditions and areas where excavation might take place. A discussion about removing about 6" of soil in some areas in order to have level caps was completed. RCRA designed caps are not the level of engineering control being used. The Team discussed the fact that the asphalt caps will not be completely impervious and will allow some leaching to groundwater. David is not comfortable with the term "impermeable" being used as asphalt is not impermeable. Asphalt is semi-permeable. Mike S. indicated the site just has direct exposure exceedances; therefore "impermeable" caps may not be necessary. He indicated if there is not a leachability problem, based on the data, only a cap may be necessary. If it is not necessary to have an impermeable cap then the language needs to be removed, as inspections and other aspects will be affected based on this language.

The condition of the existing asphalt is older, but in relatively good condition (not huge cracks). Under the Selected Remedy, the preferred alternative (Proposed Plan, pg. 13) does not match the language in other sections. Land Use Controls (LUCs) on the groundwater will be in place and a cap will be placed on the soil to prevent direct exposure. David just wanted to emphasis that if you use the language "impermeable" it leads the department to think of RCRA Cap standards.

The word "impermeable" will be removed and replaced with "relatively impermeable" or "a cover system over the contaminated soil to prevent direct exposure of receptors". The ROD language specifies the word "cap," but the Team decides "cover system" is acceptable. The RAO bullet three will need the language of "resident" be changed to

“receptor”. David G. indicated the “cover system” meets the RAO. The regulators will have their comments in to the Team by December 2010.

The RAB meeting and presentation will need to be scheduled in the future. Greg C. asks if we can do a public release vs. newspaper. Ron will send Greg C. the RI/FS guidance he has on regulatory requirements for public notice.

Action Item A-140910- Gerry W. will research the requirements for “public notification” of proposed plans and public comment.

18. UST Site 02 Update (9:00-9:22 am)

Melissa gave a presentation on UST Site 02. David will need to review the old reports that show the site meets the SRCO. Gerry wanted to know if we call the report a SARA or a Technical Memorandum. David would like the document to be a SARA with summary tables and figures of the recent and historic reports. He suggested the historic data be appended to the SARA so it can be used to complete the SRCO.

19. Break (9:22-9:38 am)

20. Site 41 Wetlands Feasibility Study Update (9:38-10:00 am)

Aaron Burnhart, Tetra Tech, was conferenced in to the meeting via telephone. The meeting minutes from the Risk Assessor Conference call will be distributed. The Tech Memo will be revised based on the comments and appended to the Site 41 FS. Several analytes were added to Contaminants of Concern (COCs) at some of the wetlands (metals). Moving forward the post meeting notes will go out with the meeting minutes. Patty would like Dave Barcliff to review the minutes too before they get distributed. Mike would not like to be painted in a corner by labeling something as toxic. Patty’s preference would be to look at the samples in more detail. The COC list will not be changed whether or not the samples were listed as toxic or non-toxic. Aaron said we can retain them as presented in the RI and incorporate a statement into the uncertainty analysis of the FS. Wetland 64 needs re-evaluation for the fish consumption rate (12 vs. 52 vs. 5 meals consumed per year). Greg C. does not know if fishing is prohibited in this area, so he calls a base contact to clarify. Greg C. says signs at the wetlands say “No fishing, no casting, and no cleaning”; this is not based on toxicity but a part of the clean marina purposes. David will take this into consideration.

Action Item A-150910- Greg C. will take pictures of the marina signs and send them to David G.

Aaron explained the rationale behind the Preliminary Remedial Goals (PRGs) with a risk of 10^{-4} for fish advisories (per the Div. of Environmental Health, Department of Health email [Environmental Public Health]). Aaron will forward this email to David G. so he can discuss within FDEP. These values and rationale will be presented in the FS. The Draft FS will proceed forward and be submitted by November 18, 2010.

Saltwater and freshwater values were agreed upon Aaron says. Aaron felt MNA would be the best action instead of active remediation (which might cause more harm than good). Greg F. indicated the argument would need to be strong.

21. Bronson Site 1159 Remedial Update (9:45-10:45 am)

Brian and Dawn with Solutions IES were conferenced into the meeting via telephone. Sampling activities took place in June 2010. No free product was observed. The groundwater flow direction was to the west. Ethyl-benzene was detected. Benzene was not detected, toluene was detected but did not exceed Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels (GCTL). Total xylene was detected and one well exceeded the GCTL. MTBE was not detected in any sample. TRPH was detected in 8 wells, none exceeded GCTL. Lead exceeded GCTL in one well and NADC criteria in 5 wells throughout the site.

The catalytic converter valve of the system was found faulty and sent back to the manufacturer. The Air Sparge (AS) system ran 276 hours. Average flow rate: 390 cubic feet per minute. Influent and effluent air samples were collected. Daily air pollutant was reported at 12 lbs per day.

From June to September 2010 the AS system ran 668 hours and the SVE system ran 776 hours. The system was shut off September 20 to let the aquifer stabilize.

During the next event, no polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) will be sampled. The current lab cannot run the method for carbon dioxide (CO₂) as previously outlined. The lab can run a different method that can reach the detection limit for the CO₂. The Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) well head vapor gas will be measured with flame ionized detector (FID) once the system is started back up. The goal would be to eventually run the system without the oxidizer. David G asked, "What treatment efficiency is being received with the oxidizer." Brian said about 83%. Mike said that mass removal from the ground is one of the main goals. Iron oxide is not currently believed to be an issue.

22. Break (10:45-11:00 am)

23. OU 2 Removal Update and UST Site 29, 24, 25 (11:00-11:45 am)

Sam N. gave presentation on OU 2 Removal. Site 25A and 27C were discussed during a conference call. Tomorrow or the day after they may begin backfilling at these sites. He talked about the 6" lifts, compaction, straw, and sod. While that is going on the completion reports are being completed. The reports will be in a technical memorandum format. The regulators will receive the reports sometime next week.

Sam will send the teleconference meeting minutes discussed as an attachment to these meeting minutes. The intent was to get consensus on the decisions/consensus items made during the previous meeting and have them documented in this meeting. The Team agrees to these items.

Consensus Item 03- The Team agrees and approves of the decisions/consensus items made during the conference call recorded in the meeting minutes of CH2M Hill and they

will be incorporated into these, the September Quarterly 2010 meeting minutes, in an attachment.

David had an issue with Site 11G argument completeness. This site had “excavation of soil” removed from the scope of work based on the preservation of a live oak tree. David G. did agreed to the rationale and asked that supporting information be included in the Construction Completion Report.

Soil sampling at the sites was discussed. The last of the excavations finishes today.

- Each site has a typical soil “hotspot” of 40x40 feet. Hot spots under paved areas were removed from the scope of work. COCs for soils were mainly metals, pesticides, PAHs, and PCBs.
- Pre-excavation confirmatory sampling included side wall samples (4) and a floor sample (1). The larger ones (greater than 40x40 feet) may have 6 and 2 sidewall and floor samples taken respectively. This approach is based on the FS and ROD; best professional judgment.

Groundwater sampling for LTM will also be conducted (total of 30 wells).

- Groundwater COCs included in the ROD were called out in WS #14 (additional analytes were included in “analytes of interest”).

Action Item A-160910- Patty will send David G. the internal RASO tech memo by Monday.

Site 19: Wetland site. MIP/DPT confirmatory investigation technology was discussed. This work will help give a better vertical and horizontal profile of contamination. The ECD data will help in the decision making process. LIF was not chosen since no NAPL was seen. The RAP addenda will most likely have AS system recommended.

Site 24: Synoptic groundwater monitoring with hot spot delineation is proposed to move forward at this site. It is possible MIP work will be utilized for the hot spot delineation. Eventually, Sam thinks, AS system will be used to remediate. The work order is in process to test the power pole in order to utilize the power source.

Site 25: (Touch and Go gas station). Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) is the path forward. The Draft RAP addendum is in production.

24. Facility Update (11:45 am -12:00 pm)

Greg C. gave an update on base activities. OU4 Site 15 wells may be destroyed during the construction of the new warehouse at the golf course. If any wells are destroyed or damaged they will be replaced.

Consensus Item 04- The Team agrees that should any wells at OU4 Site 15 become damaged or destroyed, they will be abandoned properly and replaced.

The new criteria for arsenic (10 ug/L versus the old value of 50 ug/L) were discussed. The Team agreed the new clean up criteria will be used for comparison during the monitoring at the site.

Action Item A-170910- OU4 Site 15: Patty will notify Aerostar to update their monitoring reports to reflect the arsenic criteria

Greg then updated the Team on the cleanup efforts of the BP oil spill. The new flight simulator was also discussed.

25. Lunch (12:00-1:30 pm)

26. Corry Station/ Saufley Field Update (1:30-2:00 pm)

Frank/ David/ and Gerry presented the Team with status updates for Corry Station and Saufley Field.

Corry Station: The goal was to be sure the regulators know that two different investigation methods of the pipes lines are being utilized. (Saufley had detailed drawings from the original installation and a removal report; but Corry Station has limited historic maps). During a Saufley Field site walk many fuel pits (bowers) were discovered to still be open.

At Corry the plan is to first locate pipeline, field screening samples with FID (send confirmation samples to lab), have discussions with the Team and then install monitoring wells as needed. Corry Station work will commence next week.

At Saufley Field the plan is to screen with the FID, have soil samples screened via DPT using UVF 3100 and groundwater samples via DPT with a mobile lab, send samples to fix based lab, discussion of preliminary results, then install micro wells as needed.

The Team is now aware of the differences between the pipeline studies and will not be a surprise when the reports come in.

27. Onboard Review (UST Site 21 Berthing Pier UFP-SAP; UFP-SAP for OU 2 GSI) (2:00 – 3:30 pm)

UST Site 21 Berthing Pier UFP-SAP:

Last meeting David had comments on his desk back at the office and just needed to send them out to the Team. The points taken away from the comments were that deeper wells were needed along the seawall. David would also like the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) figure changed to extend 'A' beyond the seawall to incorporate the bay on the western side. The wells need to be shown on the CSM extending below the sheet-pile hydraulic barrier (right now the figure does not show this). David commented that the proposed deep wells are good.

Gerry was concerned that the recent BP oil spill might make the contamination tracking in Pensacola Bay difficult. He wondered how the site would be addressed. Patty wanted to know what would happen if deep contamination is found? David suggests a remediation system might be installed to keep the contamination from entering the bay, if

we don't want to sample the bay again (because of the BP contamination). The vertical gradient will need to be determined in order to see if the contamination could be traveling under the sea wall.

The Team also discussed the previous location of the pipe lines. Greg thought the old fuel lines extended from the north part of Radford toward the tank and cut back from the pier. However, Greg was not sure exactly where the lines went.

David also suggested that additional monitoring wells have their water levels measured instead of just the wells to be sampled to get a representative picture of the groundwater. Then the Team could think about RMO 3 or Technical Impracticality (TI) for the exit strategy.

David G. will send his comments to the Team as soon as possible.

OU 2 GSI UFP-SAP: This report was submitted to the regulators August 3, 2010. The Data Quality Objective (DQO) presentation was used for review. Site 30 is of particular concern; monitoring wells are proposed to be installed near Site 30 and Wetland 5A and 5B. Trident probe studies have already been done at Wetland 64. The contaminants of concern for groundwater to surface water are metals, VOCs, and SVOCs. The purpose of the proposed sampling is to see if the surface water is being affected by the groundwater. The proposed sampling locations for (direct push technology (DPT), monitoring wells, and pore water sampling locations were discussed. David was interested in the existing monitoring well COC's from previous investigations to see if they meet surface water standards. The surface water criteria (marine vs. fresh) were discussed.

David wanted to be sure there is not a big discrepancy between the fresh and marine surface water CTLs. Right now the lab just needs to be sure they can achieve the method detection limit (MDL) and PQL. Part I of the project action limits or decision criteria/rules were discussed. The problem lies in the "if" "then" statement David said. David thinks the decision rule needs to be modified to eliminate the verbiage 'PAL' from worksheet 15 (pg. 40).

David also brought up the issue of lead in groundwater and how it disappeared from the COC list. Lead is a part of the analytes in LTM of groundwater. However, lead is not a COC in the groundwater to surface water interface (GSI) investigation. David felt it was erroneous that lead was not included in the COCs. He thought the ROD could be amended to include lead. Frank said, "At the five year review, this issue could be addressed."

David will submit his comments to the Team on the GSI Sampling Plan soon.

28. Break (3:30-3:40 pm)

29. Continued On-board Reviews (3:40-4:00 pm)

UST 22/ Site 21: SARA III- TRPH and lead were the contaminants of concerns. More work between the plumes in the groundwater and surface water need to be conducted. David indicated he also thought that each of the individual ASTs did not receive the same amount of investigation. The discrepancy needs to be explained. This site was in the IR program and was later switched to the petroleum program. Previous discussions indicated that another addendum or additions to addendum III will be needed to further define the boundaries of the plume.

30. 2nd Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus-delta/Facilitator Evaluation (4:00 – 4:15 pm)

- Reviewed Action Items
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Agenda is critiqued
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

Plus +

Partnering Training
Productive
SMP schedule
Tier II Update
Location
Breakfast
Time Keep
Focus
Humor
Resolution of problems

Delta Δ

Teleconference phone

Facilitator Feedback

Stephanie C. reviewed items she will include in her report to Tier II. The Tier II Team has requested that facilitators complete a more detailed report of Team interactions.

The next teleconference is scheduled for 10/4/10 from 10:00 - 11:00 am (at which time the next meetings for 2011 will be scheduled).

MEETING ADJOURNED at 4:15 pm