

N00204.AR.004263
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES 13 MARCH 2012 NAS PENSACOLA FL
3/13/2012
PARTNERING TEAM MEMBERS

EPA discussed their top priorities for Region 4 and they are as follows: 1) branch realignment and reorganization, 2) continuation of partnerships with all the service branches 3) resolving DOD and DOE disputes.

Tier III Top Priorities

- Performance Based Contracting for Air Force facilities
- Tyndall Air Force Base - Tyndall is not accepting EPA's version of FFA and the issue will be submitted to the enforcement department.
 - FDEP has approached Air Force to see if they would like to enter into a two party agreement as there is already a two party agreement for the petroleum sites.
 - FDEP's desires are to have a credible enforceable agreement to be protective of human health and the environment that meets the requirements of CERCLA, 62-780 and the RCRA 70003 order.
 - If a two party agreement is entered into FDEP may not be interested in entering into a three party agreement in the future if EPA and Tyndall AFB reach an agreement.

Federal Facilities Agreement Meeting January 2012

The attorneys from each agency were present and provided training on the FFA, the training was one of the requirements to close the informal dispute at NAS Whiting Field. The training has generated a greater use of extension requests and letters to properly follow the FFA.

Topics to bring to Tier II

The topic of Tier II reevaluation exit strategies was brought to the table; Tier II finds them useful, but has been receiving mixed feelings from the Tier I level. The NAS Pensacola Team's opinion is that they were a good idea originally, but now they are tracking so many things they have become cumbersome. The Exit Strategy has become more of a tool for determining NFAs, RIPs etc. it's not really an Exit Strategy. Eric N. said the document presents the requirements for all the agencies sitting at the table; which, is one of the main things it was meant to do.

The question was asked does the SMP (which was approved in December 2011) need to be updated further with extension requests? Eric N. stated that at the beginning of year the SMP is negotiated and as you go through the year there will be extension requests which will change the schedule not the SMP. Tier II will look at the extensions in conjunction with the SMP to see if the extensions will put things behind schedule. Currently, NAS Pensacola is tracking approximately 18 active sites, any future updates to the Exit Strategy will continue to be highlighted in bold. The NAS Pensacola Partnering Team is experiencing growth on how to meet schedules and has made a lot of progress on the extension letter request process.

3. Partnering Team Training

Stephanie C. provided the training. This is Eric N.'s last meeting; he is retiring May 2012. The Team took the opportunity to express their appreciation to Eric N. for his contribution to the Team.

4. Break

5. SMP Gantt Chart and Exit Strategy and EPA Target Dates

OU 1

This Site is currently in annual monitoring. The Response to Comments (RTCs) were submitted January 27, 2012; additional comments were received from EPA. The response to the RTCs was submitted February 22, 2012. The Draft Final Annual Monitoring Report is due March 16, 2012.

The Annual Monitoring Report is a secondary document; therefore no extension requests as stated by EPA's attorney. Based on the FFA, only draft final Primary Documents are subject to dispute.

The FFA states (page 21) "secondary documents are issued by the Navy in draft subject to review and comment by US EPA and FDEP. Although the Navy will respond to comments received, the draft secondary documents may be finalized in the context of the corresponding primary documents. A secondary document may be disputed at the time the corresponding draft final primary document is issued."

A01-031312 Tim W. will determine whether or not extension requests are required for secondary documents

The Draft ESD for OU 1 is in Navy review (Steve Beverly) and is slated to be submitted by the end of March 2012.

Tim W. asked what was the rationale for moving the surface water compliance point? Mike S. said when the wetlands were chosen as a treatment system, the compliance point was moved down gradient of the wetlands to assess the effectiveness. There was too much iron for the interceptor trench to treat; therefore, the wetlands were added as part of the treatment system based on the presence of iron flocculating bacteria. The ESD explains the addition of the wetlands and the change in the point of compliance location. Tim W. asked in the original ROD, did it talk about having the wetland system treat the iron? Frank L. said yes there was a natural attenuation component evaluated in the ROD and the use of the wetland as part of the treatment system was one of the natural attenuation components. Tim W. wanted to make sure that the point of compliance wasn't moved because it wasn't telling us what we wanted, but that it is a designed treatment system with a systematic sampling process that has been documented. Mike S. stated two optimization studies have been completed and we have a good idea of what happens from a process standpoint.

OU 2

Sam N. was absent from the first day of the meeting due to family emergency and the Gantt Chart for OU 2 was not reviewed during the meeting.

OU 4 Site 15

The Site is currently in a semi-annual monitoring only program being completed by Aerostar. Tim W. asked to receive the six month data only as a data transfer without a report and then combine all the data (six month and one year) into one report. David G. concurred with seeing only the annual report, but would still like to see data from the six month sampling event along with a presentation to show what is occurring at the Site (e.g. he doesn't want to see there is a well damaged in the six month report and then see it is still damaged in the annual report).

Consensus Item 01 The Team reached consensus that for OU 4 the semi-annual reports and data will be generated and submitted to the regulatory agencies as a final secondary report and the Gantt chart will not include draft review dates

Monitoring wells GR01 and MW-76 were not able to be located using GPS or the schonstedt metal detector. Tim W. is concerned that the groundwater flow direction is not clear throughout the site particularly in the fairway area if we don't have these monitoring wells. Gerry W. suggested replacing the monitoring wells as part of the ongoing monitoring well inventory.

A02-031312 Gerry W. /Patty W. will send Tim W. a proposal for the possibility of replacing the two missing monitoring wells at OU 4.

Tim W. will review the proposal along with personnel from the groundwater section.

OU 11 Site 38

EPA has approved the Draft Remedial Design (RD) Extension request. The Navy submitted a Draft Land Use Control (LUC) Remedial Design (RD) in November 2011 along with the Draft groundwater monitoring plan. FDEP issued comments on both of the documents; no comments were received from EPA on the groundwater monitoring plan. There are currently three documents in review: (1) the Draft Groundwater Monitoring Plan, (2) the Draft LUC RD and (3) the UFP-SAP which combines Site 38 and a one-time sampling event for Sites 45 and 46. Kay W. has reviewed the UFP-SAP and her comment of including Sites 45 and 46 into the UFP-SAP for Site 38 was incorporated into the sampling design. Sites 45 and 46 are being combined with Site 38 for one sampling event for the sole purpose of collecting additional data for the Proposed Plan and ROD for Sites 45 and 46. Greg Fraley (EPA) issued an approval letter for the Site 38 UFP-SAP November 1, 2010; EPA provided comments December 7, 2011 following the change in EPA RPMs. There is no RTCs because the response was to rewrite the Site 38 UFP-SAP and include Sites 45 and 46. Dave G. commented on the LUC RD May 2010; RTCs were submitted December 27, 2011; but have not been approved.

A03-031312 Tim W. will issue a letter with his comments for the OU 1, Site 38 groundwater monitoring plan

OU 13, Sites 8 and 24

Consensus Item 02 The Team reached consensus that for OU 13 the semi-annual data will be delivered as a presentation to the Team and a PDF summary of the data will be submitted electronically as a Final document; the Gantt chart will not reflect document review periods.

OU 16, Site 41

An extension request was approved; a meeting is scheduled for March 27 and 28, 2012. The meeting is being held to discuss the risk assessment to determine the path forward on the Site. FDEP has tasked their risk assessors to determine where additional data collection is necessary and to think about how one would determine if the wetlands have naturally recovered. The discussion will focus mainly on the risk assessment and not remedial options.

OU 18, Site 43

The Final RD was submitted November 22, 2012; EPA and FDEP have approved the documents.

OU 19, Site 44

The Draft UFP-SAP was submitted March 12, 2012.

A04-031312 Gerry W. will send Claire M. and Kay W. the RMFT link for the Site 44 UFP-SAP.

OU 20, Site 45

The Navy requested an extension and the extension request has been approved. The sampling for Site 45 will be included into OU 11, Site 38 UFP-SAP.

OU 21, Site 46

The Navy requested an extension and the extension request has been approved. The sampling for Site 46 will be included into OU 11 Site 38 UFP-SAP.

EPA Target Dates

Gerry W. distributed a Tech Memo with EPA's target dates for final signed documents. OU 19 was not listed due to the informal dispute; the Final ROD is projected February 2015.

Consensus Item 03: The Team reached consensus that the Team will not do SMP schedule extensions for Secondary documents unless there is a request that those documents be specifically tracked

6. **Lunch**
7. **OU 19, Site 44 Discussion**
PowerPoint Presentation by Mike M.

The revised Draft UFP-SAP (Tier I instead of Tier II) incorporating Regulatory comments was submitted March 12, 2012. The proposed sampling plan is as follows;

- The first sample event will consist of sampling all the existing shallow and deep monitoring wells. The groundwater samples from approximately half of the monitoring wells will be analyzed for TAL/TCL list to confirm the results from RI. The groundwater samples collected from the remaining wells will be analyzed for PCE and daughter products only.
- The locations of the monitoring well clusters will be proposed following review of analytical results from the first sampling event.
- The second sampling event will consist of monitoring well installation and sampling. The newly installed monitoring wells will be sampled and analyzed for the TAL/TCL list. The need for sampling existing wells will be determined following the review of the analytical data from the first sampling event. Six soil samples will be collected from three locations around the flammable storage area at two different depth intervals.
- Worksheet 18 will be reviewed and updated following each sampling event.
- Three groundwater samples and the surficial soil samples will be analyzed for hexavalent chromium.

Discussion:

Tim W. asked if the three soil samples will be grab sample or composites? Mike M. said the soil samples will be collected from the 0 to 2 foot interval and one will be collected from either the 2 to 4 foot interval or the 4 to 6 foot interval based on screening data. If the readings are zero in all the intervals, the subsurface soil sample will be collected from the interval above the water table. Tim W. stated he will probably ask the surficial soils be composites instead of grab samples. David G. said composite samples will be an issue for FDEP as they are not normally accepted by the Department. Tim W. said we can let the composite soil sampling go for this one.

Hangar 3221 has been separated from Site 44 and will become a new site. The first stage is an extensive PA/SI and its separation from Site 44 is outlined in the work plan.

8. **UFP-SAP for OU 11, 20 and 21 (Sites 38, 45 & 46 Discussion)**
PowerPoint Presentation by Frank L.

The UFP-SAP for Site 38 has been updated to include a sampling event for Sites 45 and 46 and the installation of monitoring wells to be used for data collection for all three sites is being proposed. The vanadium, mercury and lead groundwater concentrations at Site 45 have decreased over the course of two sampling events and four feet of soils have been removed at Site 46. The shallow and deep groundwater flow is to the southeast; Mike M. and Frank L. have been compiling the list of monitoring wells to

be sampled in the next event. One round of sampling will be performed and the path forward will be determined after the Team reviews the analytical data. A teleconference using Site 44 as a model will be held in lieu of a DQO meeting.

A teleconference was scheduled for April 9, 2012 at 2 pm; there will be no Team call on Monday April 2, 2012

9. OU11, Site 38 LUC Remedial Design Discussion

The update was provided during the morning Gantt Chart Review

10. OU 6, Site 34 History and Team Discussion

Gerry W. requested to work with Allison H. on the Site History research for this topic. Site 34 was a screening site that never became part of the OU, it was listed in OU 6 due to proximity to the other sites. A ROD is in place for OU 6 Sites 9 and 29. The results are discussed in the RI, but it is not clear where in the process Site 34 was dropped.

A05-031312 Alison H. will search the administrative record for the regulatory letters issued for Site 34

11. Facility Update

Presented by Greg C. A security exercise to be conducted the week of March 19, 2012 at all bases except OLF Bronson Field. A storm water inspection was conducted during the week of March 5 2012. The construction of a new BOQ is ongoing.

12. Break

13. Discussion of Tier II Presentation for Next Meeting

Gerry W. presented the PowerPoint Presentation that was used in a previous Tier II meeting and the Team developed the following list of topics for the June 2012 meeting:

- Site History
- Informal Dispute Resolution
 - Current status
- Tier I vs. Tier II UFP-SAPs
- ROD changes or amendments due to changes in ARARs or Risk Based Closure levels
 - ESD (OU 1)
 - Amendment (OU 2)
 - Arsenic changing from 50 ug/L to 10 ug/L
- SPLP
 - EPA's non-acceptance of FDEP's method
- Hexavalent Chromium
 - Changes in the RSLs
- MNA
 - Navy following FDEP's criteria
- OU 2
 - Radium ROD amendment

- Asbestos
- SMP Milestone schedules
 - Extension requests
 - Process
- List successes
 - Current data collection for Site 45 and Site 46 in the Site 38 UFP-SAP
 - OU 2 asbestos path forward
 - Extension request form
 - OU 18 Site 43
 - NFA'd MRP sites

The Team will structure the presentation to represent the issues the Team has faced and how the Team is working on the issues. The presentation for NAS Pensacola will include Bronson Field, the MRP Sites and the UST Sites and will be 45 minutes with 15 minutes allotted for Q&A. Corry Station and Saufley Field will be also be presented to Tier II as a separate PowerPoint presentation. Corry Station and Saufley Field will also include MRP Sites and will be 45 minutes with 15 minutes allotted for Q&A.

14. Break

15. OU 2 Soil Removal Updated RAD

PowerPoint Presentation presented by Patrick O.

Navy Radiological Program

- Tech Support for Environmental Radiological Programs
- Multi-Agency Rad survey and Site investigation guidance for all sites
- Regulatory interface with federal and state agency
- Documents
 - Historical Radiological Assessments
 - Work Plans/Final Reports

MARSSIM-NUREG 1575

- Mirrors CERCLA process and is a multi-phase process

NASP OU2 Radium

- Radiological screening surveys April 2009
- Final Work Plan & Final Status Survey March 2010
- Soil Sampling and Survey April 2011
- Final Work Plan 7 Final Status Survey Plan for Sites 12 & 27 August 2011

Ra-226 OU 2 Cleanup

- Soils were removed and disposed offsite at U.S. Ecology in Grandview Idaho
- DCGL release criteria 1.61 pCi/g for RA-226 for soil and background is 0.27 pCi/g
- At Site 12 gamma counts ranged from 3,000 to 275,000 cpm

- MARSSIM surveys and sampling was conducted (95 roll off bins were removed)
- At Site 27 area excavated and confirmation samples were collected (max 0.8 pCi/g); the radium has not impacted the groundwater (5 pCi/L was used at the screening level)
- At Site 12 the Final Status Soil Survey averaged 0.3 pCi/g below 1.61 pCi/g
- Site 12 meets release criteria; however there is a 5x15 area south of area that needs additional investigation
- Site 27 meets release criteria

Project Management Team

- Patty W. and Greg C.
- Patrick O. and Laurie Lowman, RASO
- Joe Hart, HQ Joint Munitions Command Rock Island Arsenal
- Dan Spicussa and Bill Haney, AWS

Schedule

- Final Report Spring 2012

16. 1st Day Meeting Closeout (Review Action Items/Consensus Items)

17. 2nd Day Check In

Day 2 Check In complete

18. Administrative Record Management (Public Website)

Update Provided by Gerry W. and Mike Kuhn (Tetra Tech)

Last Partnering Team meeting we discussed where to maintain the Administrative Record; one of the options is to use the NIRIS portal so the public can view the information online. Mike Kuhn gave examples of how other installations have used the public portal to store their information; one main component is a link to NIRIS which will show documents that have been made publically available.

Questions:

Q: When the public tries to log in do they need to log into NIRIS?

A: No, it's a public network and the administrative record is pulling the documents from NIRIS and make them publically available. This is how the Navy is implementing Administrative Records across the board.

Q: Can NAS Pensacola website have a link to the public portal?

A: Yes, that can be arranged.

Q: Can there be a set of instructions on how to search the webpage for the public and could there be an index of documents?

A: There's a search capability within the Administrative Record so any document can be searched. You can also query by date. If you have an index then it will need to be updated every time a new documents is added.

Q: Could there be a link for a list of current documents?

A: It is an option that could be looked into, the only concern is maintaining consistency on all the NAVFAC webpages.

Q: Can correspondence be screened out?

A: When websites are set up there are three options. 1) The webpage doesn't have to be used at all and hardcopies can be made available 2) flags can be set to only let the metadata be available but not the document and 3) the metadata and the documents can be available. Any classified information can be screened out. If information isn't classified and it is screened out the downside is some people may feel they are being denied information if they can find them in the administrative record. The Team can decide which documents are most important and have a link to those documents.

Discussion:

Tim W. thinks the website is very close to what he is looking for, the only problem he has with it is that it may not be fully publically accessible because there are parts of the public that are unable to perform simple searches. If the public were to go to the library, the documents would be listed newest to oldest. Mike C. said all the headers have the capability to sort ascending to descending and a more detailed set of instructions could be listed on the webpage. Tim W. said he likes the idea, but wants to take it one step forward and make it dummy proof; we can start with the webpage and see if we can improve it. Mike C. said any suggestions or feature enhancements can be made through the NIRIS webpage. A button for an Excel spreadsheet with an index of all the sites could be added to make the search capabilities more dynamic.

Mike K. is working with Bob Fisher to set up the website for Pensacola. The Team can view examples of other webpages and provide input.

A06-031312 Mike Kuhn will email Gerry W. examples of NAVFAC public portal webpages so the Team can determine what content needs to be on the NAS Pensacola web page

If the content is available the webpage can be created in a few days and if the content is provided in a timely manner a webpage can be available for the June 2012 Partnering Team meeting. Since the inception of the webpages most of the installations have stopped maintaining CDs, but that decision is up to the installation RPM. When Proposed Plans are issued there will continue to be a mail out and one copy will be maintained at the library and one on base.

Consensus Item 04: The Team reached consensus to move forward on the concept of maintaining the administrative record on the NAVFAC public portal webpage and

provide a link to the NAVFAC public portal on the NAS Pensacola ERP webpage. A process to further streamline the administrative record is ongoing.

19. December 2011 Meeting Minutes Approval

The Team reviewed the December 2011, provided comments and approved the minutes.

Consensus Item 05: The December 13 and 14, 2011 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes.

20. Break

21. MRP Update

PowerPoint Presentation Presented By John S.

List of Sites From PA and SI Studies

- Two sites have received NFA's
- Five sites need additional assessment

Ranges/Sites

- Sherman Field
 - No further action
- Fort Barrancas Rifle Range
 - A zinc exceedance was detected in a groundwater sample from a temporary monitoring well; a permanent monitoring well will be installed to obtain a low turbidity groundwater sample.
- Fort Redoubt Skeet Range
 - Arsenic and PAHs exceedances were detected in soil samples. Arsenic may be result of natural background concentrations. NAS Pensacola background is 2.8 mg/Kg. Soil samples were collected and the background was calculated as twice the average. The PAHs are most likely from creosote and shingle piles not from the Skeet Range.
- Magazine Point Rifle Range and Bombing Range
 - Lead exceedance in groundwater (not in soil), a well with a screen pack is proposed to be installed and sampled.
 - Soil samples need to be collected from the bombing target area; multi incremental sampling is being proposed. The UFP-SAP for multi-increment sampling has been submitted to FDEP and EPA. FDEP is currently working on guidance for multi-incremental sampling.
- National Cemetery Skeet and Trap Range
 - Lead (residential and industrial) and PAHs exceedances were detected in soil samples.
 - Additional soil samples will be collected.
- National Cemetery Gunnery Area South
 - Additional soil samples will be collected to fully delineate vertical and horizontal extent of lead.

Propellants will be analyzed in soil samples collected from firing points at the rifle ranges.

Incremental Sampling Discussion

When using incremental sampling a 95% UCL can be calculated for the Site if a minimum of 60 points along with duplicates and triplicates are collected. Tim W. asked if the calculation is above criteria what are you going to do? John S. said we would then subdivide the grids and isolate that area.

Based on the guidance the original samples would be collected first in a certain direction, then the duplicates would be collected starting from a different direction and then the triplicate samples would be collected starting from yet a different direction to introduce randomness and provide a representative sample. Tim W. said he does not think three samples would be enough for a 95% UCL because it would be more of a yes or no determination. If you spread the aliquots out and collect samples in the exposure area that is most likely to be contaminated and then collect samples outside that area you would have representation from both areas, the shape doesn't have to be rectangular. David G. said it makes sense to use a rectangular as the shape for the decision unit with the beach due east and the former waste water treatment plant due west. Tim W. asked what happened in pond area? Greg C. said it was the stabilization pond for the now closed waste water treatment plant.

Brian C. asked "does incremental sampling supersede the visual sampling plan?" David G. said the incremental sampling plan does not supersede the visual sampling plan because the incremental sampling approach works well for some sites but not well for others. John S. said the developers were looking at explosives and propellants so they determined it was best to grind the samples for reproducible results. Tim W. said multiple studies across multiple sites have been conducted and you can see the correlations in the standard deviations. David G. said this process makes sense for looking at risk exposure. Tim W. said if there are contaminants in the soil the groundwater will be a composite as well because you are recovering water from entire area. The concentration in the well is representative of everything leaching around it, but the groundwater from each individual well will still need to meet criteria. David G. said the geophysical testing performed during the SI stage indicated that the area is not impacted, but the site needs confirmation laboratory data. He is okay with using incremental sampling.

22. Site 43 UFP-SAP

Update provided by Sam N.

Update provided by Sam N. Site 43 has a RIP date of FY 2012 and the RAP is due April 12, 2012. The two main questions are: what is the sampling approach for lead; and is SPLP analytical method applicable.

Step 1:

At the three hot spots collect four sidewall samples (12 locations total) using XRF. At each sample location there will be five aliquots collected from the 0 to 1 foot bls interval to make one homogenous sample from each side wall location and a split sample will be sent to the fixed based laboratory from each location.

Step 2:

Adopt a field "Action level" for the XRF; 1,190 mg/kg on the XRF represents 85% of the industrial SCTL for lead. The key is not to have rocks or a lot of moisture in the XRF sample.

XRF Discussion

Tim W. said the FDEP's Industrial number for lead is 1,400 mg/kg, but EPA's RSL is 800 mg/kg and leachability screening value is 14 mg/kg. The leachability criteria used in the ROD was 1,400 mg/kg.

Sam N. said if we go to 800 mg/kg it would be a 57% correlation with the XRF. When the XRF was used on the MMRP sites there was approximately 90% correlation and it tended to overestimate the levels when compared to the laboratory results. David G. recalled that there is a good distribution of values with higher concentrations, but when there are only low lead concentrations the XRF doesn't correlate well. Brian C. said he has seen that the XRF tends to overestimate at low concentrations and under estimate at high concentrations. Sam N. said the safety factor is that we are not solely relying on XRF we will have laboratory results for total lead.

Tim W. said the XRF should be used to delineate to below 800 mg/kg; Mike S. said that the ROD is already in place with the value of 1,400 mg/kg and that the 800 mg/kg value is a screening value. Ron K. said that you can default to the 800 mg/kg number or generate your own. Tim W. suggested using XRF to screen the area below the 800 mg/kg value and take laboratory confirmation samples only at the 85% levels to give you an idea of what is a reasonable excavation volume. If we choose the MNA remedy for groundwater we will have the screening data to determine what concentrations are being left behind. Sam N. asked Tim W. are you suggesting we collect lab splits from the areas with 1,190 mg/kg and 800 mg/kg on the XRF? Tim W. said we don't need to collect splits from the 800 mg/kg areas just delineate to those areas with the XRF; Tim W. wants to make sure the lead concentrations that are left in the soil will allow you to achieve cleanup in the groundwater and would like to get an idea how far out lead at a concentration at 800 mg/kg (on the XRF) extends. The XRF screening data is going to give us the area around the excavation area that would be needed to meet EPA's bare minimum criteria. If we use the default numbers for the risk assessment we are allowed to use something higher if need be, but Tim W. wants to see how much is being left behind. David G. said something he has done repeatedly is to delineate to Residential SCTLs to determine how big of a LUC area would need to be applied, but you don't normally dig to Residential levels. Mike S. said we have already delineated to FDEP's Residential SCTL and FDEP's Industrial number of 1,400 mg/kg is a promulgated criteria therefore the Navy will clean up to that criteria. The XRF readings of 1,190

mg/kg will be used to evaluate leachability and if those fail then at that point we will go beyond that criteria. Tim W. said he is not advocating that we dig to 800 mg/kg, but we need to delineate to 800 mg/kg. Mike S. asked is the additional data valuable enough to justify the cost? Tim W. said EPA's leachability RSL for lead is 14 mg/kg. David G. said FDEP doesn't have a default based criteria for lead and you would use SPLP to determine the number. You would take a minimum of 10 samples for total lead and SPLP and plot the numbers. If the R value is 0.8 to 1, there is a good correlation. If your R value doesn't fall in the 0.8 to 1 range, you take the highest concentration that has correlation in the 0.8 to 1 R value range and use that number as your site specific number. Sam N. asked should we collect soil samples from the 800 mg/kg area and hold them for lab analysis? Tim W. said no, just screen to the 800 mg/kg area.

SPLP Discussion

Sam N. asked is the SPLP methodology accepted by EPA? David G. said if the SPLP meets 15 ug/kg that would meet their leachability to groundwater. If we don't have a good correlation, we would use the highest lead concentration that had an SPLP correlation for our Site specific number (See FDEP guidance). Tim W. said if we can establish a good correlation he thinks it will work, but he hasn't talked with Kay W. to see what correlation would be acceptable. Sam N. said for the subsurface soil samples we are not using XRF, we are currently planning on collecting total lead and SPLP lead samples. Tim W. said we could use XRF in the subsurface soil samples.

A07-031312 Sam N. will summarize the Site 43 XRF and SPLP discussion and email the summary to David G. and Tim W.

David G. is concerned that during the 5 year review the 1,400 mg/kg number will be determined unacceptable. Mike S. said we will cross that bridge when we come to it and he doesn't think the 800 mg/kg number is needed right now. David G. said he wished he knew which kind of lead was out there because there's a lot of SPLP data from John S. gun ranges, but that is lead shot in environment that has corroded and might not have anything to do with the lead at this Site. Brian C. thinks the approach is sound and we will know more when we get hard data, but in concept it sounds like good approach. Mike S. reiterated that using the 800 mg/kg number isn't useful since the ROD is using 1,400 mg/kg. Tim W. said he will look at the ROD data and if it's not acceptable to EPA he will make recommendation. Mike S. said that if it was going to come to that we will do the additional XRF screenings. Sam N. said the way he envisions it is to start horizontally then screen vertically with the XRF on the first set of samples. Laboratory splits will be also be collected at pre-determined locations to establish correlations. Once the correlations have been determined they will delineate further using the XRF.

David G. said he read Kay W's email as SPLP was not an acceptable method for EPA. Tim W. responded the email said that blind faith is not acceptable, you have to have good correlation. Tim W. wants to see Sam N.'s summary of the discussion to see where we're going and he doesn't have a problem with the protocol he is trying to balance out what is already in the ROD and what EPA's requirements are. He would like to see where we are going with the groundwater model and hoping that the data for the 800 mg/kg areas

will help and he will keep the conversation going at EPA. Patty W. reiterated the RIP date is June 30, 2012 and the conversations on this Site need to move forward. Sam N. will send the summary email on Thursday and speak with Tim W. on Monday and based on the discussion will update the UFP-SAP. The Remedial Design is a final document with place holders for the UFP-SAP.

David G. asked what about the monitoring well that is in the excavation area. Sam N. said that if the monitoring well becomes physically compromised (e.g. the riser damaged or the screen is exposed) it will be re-installed.

23. OU 2 Removal Update Asbestos

Update provided by Sam N.

Sam N. would like to set up a call with Tim W. and Claire M. to discuss site summaries for Sites 11, 12F and 30.

Tim W. asked do you think you have the areas delineated and are you looking to excavate based on delineation? Sam N. said yes, each of the three hot spots have been delineated; one side wall sampled failed TCLP for lead. Tim W. asked do you have any total lead data? Sam N. said he thinks so, but if not it can collect or we can use XRF. Lead was not an original COC for the Site, but it became one when it failed TCLP in the disposal sample.

At Site 11 the Navy is working to modify the contract to lay out the grids to verify the soil thickness at each node and determine how much soil may need to be added.

At 12F, CH2MHill is waiting on the confirmation from RASO for AWS's work plan. If needed CH2MHill now has a health physicist on staff that can provide assistance.

A08-031312 Sam N. will schedule a teleconference (week of March 19, 2012) with Tim W. and Claire M. to discuss the removal actions for OU 2 (Site 11, 12F and 30).

24. NASP IR Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/plus - delta/Facilitator Evaluation

- Reviewed Action Items
- December 2011 meeting minutes approved
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Parking Lot Items discussed
- Agenda is critiqued
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

Consensus Items:

Consensus Item 01: The Team reached consensus that for OU 4 the semi-annual reports and data will be generated and submitted to the regulatory agencies as a Final secondary report and the Gantt Chart will not include Draft review dates.

Consensus Item 02: The Team reached consensus that for OU 13 the semi-annual data will be delivered as a presentation to the Team and a PDF summary of the data will be submitted electronically as a Final document; the Gantt Chart will not reflect document review periods.

Consensus Item 03: The Team reached consensus that the Team will not do SMP schedule extensions for Secondary documents unless there is a request that those documents be specifically tracked.

Consensus Item 04: The Team reached consensus to move forward on the concept of maintaining the administrative record on the NAVFAC public portal webpage and provide a link to the NAVFAC public portal on the NAS Pensacola ERP webpage. A process to further streamline the administrative record is ongoing

Consensus Item 05: The December 13 and 14, 2011 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes.

Parking Lot Items:

- OU 2 Gantt Chart Review
- Sam N.'s Action Item

Plus +

- Nice location
- Nice send off for Eric N.
- Good discussion and brainstorming
- Very flexible in re-arranging topics to cover them in the amount of time scheduled

Delta Δ

- Eric N. retiring
- Didn't get through agenda with time allotted

Facilitator Feedback

Stephanie C. reviewed items she will include in her report to Tier II.

Next meeting June 12 and 13, 2012 in Orlando, Florida.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 11:30 am.

On Going Action Items				
NAS Pensacola September 27 & 28, 2011 Partnering Team Meeting Action Items				
Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A18-0911	Sam N.	Ongoing	10/7/11	Will email Tim W. and Claire M. the analytical data site summaries for OU 2. Would like to set up Team call
A19-0911	Sam N.	Ongoing	10/7/11	Will send Tim W. and Claire M. the previous discussions for Site 30 at OU 2
NAS Pensacola December 13 & 14 2011 Partnering Team Meeting Action Items				
Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A01-121311	Sam N.	Ongoing		Will make the arrangements for the June 12 & 13, 2012 Partnering Team Meeting. Per diem rate goes up June 1 st embassy suites talking to courtyard Marriott. Have to present to Tier II in June
A04-121311	Mike M./Frank L.	Ongoing	1/9/12	Will make the appropriate unit changes to the Site 45 and Site 46 Soil Cleanup Tables
A05-121311	Greg C.	Ongoing		Will write a soil removal completion report for the soil removal activities that were conducted at Site 46
A08-121311	Gerry W.	Ongoing	Next Partnering Team Meeting	Will write a memo for OU 6 that includes the timeline and documentation for why Site 34 was removed from the OU 6 ROD. The memo will be discussed at the next Partnering Team Meeting.
A09-121311	Sam N.	Ongoing	12/14/11	Will call Patrick O. to discuss the plan of action for sampling the sidewall at 12 F
A10-121311	Sam N.	Ongoing	12/23/11	Will send the OU 2 Site 26 Tech Memo to the Team Sent to Patty W. and Mike S.
A26-121311	Team	Ongoing		Will provide an agenda during an upcoming the Monday morning meeting to provide timeframes for their topics.
NAS Pensacola March 13 & 14 2012 Partnering Team Meeting Action Items				
Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A01-031312	Tim W.	Completed	3/13/12	Will determine whether or not extension requests are required for secondary documents
A02-031312	Gerry W./Patty W.		3/31/12	Will send Tim W. and David G. a proposal for the possibility of replacing the two missing monitoring wells (15GR01 and MW-76) at OU 4 Site 15
A03-031312	Tim W.	Completed	3/13/12	Will issue a letter with his comments for the OU 11 Site 38 groundwater monitoring plan

A04-031312	Gerry W.	Completed		Will send Claire M. and Kay W. the RMFT link for the Site 44 UFP-SAP
A05-031312	Allison H.		3/23/12	Will search the administrative record for the regulatory letters issued for Site 34
A06-031312	Mike Coon			Will email Gerry W. examples of NAVFAC public portal webpages so the Team can determine what content needs to be on the NAS Pensacola web page
A07-031312	Sam N.			Will summarize the Site 43 XRF and SPLP discussion and email the summary to David G. and Tim W.
A08-031312	Sam N.			Will schedule a teleconference (week of March 19, 2012) to discuss the removal actions for OU 2 (Site 11, 12F and 30)