

N65928.AR.001223
NTC ORLANDO
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM MEETING ON 5 DECEMBER 2001 NTC
ORLANDO FL
12/5/2001
NAVFAC SOUTHERN

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM - MEETING MINUTES

Date: 5-6 December, 2001
 Location: Orlando
 Team Leader: Steve Tsangaris
 Gatekeeper/Timekeeper: Greg Fraley
 Facilitator: Stephanie Fraser-Beekman
 Recorder: Mark Salvetti

OPT MEMBERS:

David Grabka
 Barbara Nwokike
 Steve McCoy

SUPPORT MEMBERS:

Flip Altman, Tier II
 Nick Ugolini, SDIV

GUESTS:

Nina Mentuccia, ICLD
 Mike Albert, Tetra Tech
 Jennifer Ottoson, CH2M Hill
 Robert Rivers, SDIV
 Dave Twedell, Nodarse &
 Assoc.
 John Classe, Baldwin Park
 Development Corp.

HANDOUTS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

1. Meeting Minutes 10/30 – 10/31, 2001
2. UST/IR Update and Status - December 2001 (Tetra Tech)
3. Action items
4. SA18 Potentiometric Surface Maps and Chlorinated Tag Maps (Tetra Tech)
5. OU4 Additional Source Delineation & Treatment System Process Flow Diagrams (Tetra Tech)
6. SA 17 Fenton's Injection and Plume Maps (CH2M HILL)

05 December 2001**CHECK-IN**

Greg Fraley introduced himself. Been with EPA since 1978. Worked in various programs including Superfund and UIC. Dave G. survived his one Tindel meeting. Dave passed the PG exam! Congratulations! Nick U.'s airplane engine blew up for the second time. Spent 5 months in overhaul, but now flying again. Nina Mentuccia (ICLD) facilitating and visiting to see how we're doing. Mike Albert (Tt) got his 5 tons of dog food, and is in business! Flip Altman (Tier II) didn't bag an elk in Colorado, but saw one shot. Great experience. Robert Rivers (SDIV) here to observe and present how the facilitation contract works. Steve M. still remodeling; moldings and drywall. Aspiring to not having a life like Dave G. Steve T. had 50 people for Thanksgiving and 130 people the next weekend for his daughter's Baptism. Stephanie still trying to get her pool screened. Her husband Carl bought a Chevy dualie; may

now need to get horses to go along with it. Will be teaching at a Navaho reservation at the end of January. Mark S. updated on trip to Camden Yards and new F150. Barbara is just busy this month with no life.

ACTION ITEMS

Went through action items (see revised list at end of minutes).

PERSONNEL CHANGES

New EPA RPM is Greg Fraley. Mark Salvetti took over for Rick Allen. OPT agreed to accept both new members. This was the first meeting as full OPT members for each.

TRAINING

Stephanie performed transition training to introduce Greg and Mark S. to the OPT. Each of them were presented with the expectations of each team member. Then Greg and Mark responded with their expectations. Reviewed the meaning of "consensus decision making". Process leads to acceptance, can live with it, or can't accept.

Greg and Mark also need to complete the Myers-Briggs test, er, indicator. (Done later).

Dave G. reviewed the responsibilities of the Team Leader, Time Keeper, etc. Greg selected as Team Leader for next meeting in Atlanta.

ICLD Facilitation Services Contract (Robert Rivers) (Dollar figures are examples and do not reflect actual costs). ICLD has a half-day person rate, and a full day rate. If we start meetings at noon, would be the half day rate. Half day rate approx. \$600, whereas full day is about \$1,000. So two half days cost more than one full day. There is also a flat rate per day to cover per diem, expenses, etc. (\$300). Flat travel (\$1,200) covers air fare and travel time. Then there's the conference calls that cost a flat rate of \$400 regardless of length. There is also a new flat rate (\$10,000) for calls made to check in with members to make sure everything is prepped prior to starting a new meeting. Because of the various rates, it's important that the meeting schedules are specific so it's clear whether the half-day or full-day rates apply. Saves later modifications. We should also consider the rates when planning meetings, i.e., two half days can cost more than a full day.

Robert also noted that we are required to fill out a facilitator evaluation at the end of each meeting. Dan Morris of SDIV reports that the last few have not been turned in. However, the hard copy evaluations were completed by the OPT and submitted by Barbara. It could be that Dan Morris wants them electronically, and may not be accepting hard copies.

UST/IR Update (see Handout)

Bldg. 200

Draft fifth quarter monitoring report approved by Navy. Final fifth quarter monitoring report in preparation for submittal to FDEP. Nick will work with Tetra Tech on monitoring report formats for future reports.

Bldg. 2036

A draft SAR Addendum approved by the Navy. Final SAR Addendum is in preparation for submittal to FDEP.

Action Item: Barbara requested a large figure (suitable for RAB and OPT meetings) showing location of all UST locations. Nick U. agreed.

Bldgs 2080, 2115

Well going in at 2080, and Nick will also resample existing wells that had previously indicated groundwater contamination. If concentrations have decreased substantially, ORC may not be needed and might be able to go just with monitoring.

Wells scheduled to go in next month.

Bldg 2273

Resurvey of wells scheduled for week of Dec 10. Contamination assessment will be reevaluated when the new groundwater elevation data are available (mid-December).

McCoy Annex

City called Navy about digging up the ballfield (near 7174, 7175) to install some drainage improvements. They found some petroleum-contaminated soil. Nick U. meeting with the City tomorrow. City willing to dig up and transport; Nick working to come up with funding to pay for the disposal. May end up stockpiling soils at McCoy pending funding for disposal. Nick will get more info on locations and volumes tomorrow. Dave G. wondering if the City notified central district of FDEP. Nick will send out an update via email to the team members later this week. Will end up sampling soil and groundwater. Dave G. mentioned that this won't be a UST site, it's covered by pure petroleum rule, as there is no regulated UST associated with the petroleum.

Dave worried about the City preparing a report on their excavation. Right now, Tetra Tech will do the sampling and oversight of the City's work. Tetra Tech will prepare the report and install a well. Need to work out manifesting and soil disposal receipts. Probably Tetra Tech working with the City.

Robert R. mentioned that if the OPT decides to do something that may be out of scope, then the OPT needs to email Robert. There are a lot of things that SDIV can do to help out with scope changes. Just need to make sure that new scope or scope swaps are run through SDIV Contracts so it all gets covered to avoid cost growth and/or scope change claims in the future.

Bldg 7151

Draft first quarter MOP report approved by the Navy. Final first quarter MOP report in preparation for submittal to FDEP.

Bldg. 7175

Draft SAR Addendum approved by Navy. Final SAR Addendum in preparation for submittal to FDEP.

SA16

Tetra Tech sampled further down the ditch, and samples were clean. Only need to dig out areas that were already boxed out for disposal. Probably talking less than 50 cy. Only at outfalls. Delineation already done, don't need confirmatory sampling. CH2M HILL will perform necessary soil removal.

OU 1

Next semi-annual sampling event scheduled for December 2001.

OU3

Have an unexplained eastern component of GW flow that may be a survey problem. Will be resurveying.

Groundwater modeling indicates that the funnel and gate configuration for the proposed PRB will work with a downgradient pumping well to enhance gradient through the system.

Action Item: Barbara N. requested a one-page fact sheet outlining the reactive wall technology to show to her management. They are concerned the activated alumina may not work. Steve M. to provide.

SA36

An additional 50 gallons of veggy oil were injected into site wells in November 2001. Monitoring wells resurveyed to resolve groundwater flow discrepancies. See discussion below.

SA39

An additional 960 gallons of veggy oil were injected into site wells in November 2001.

SA40

Issued draft final ESSR. See discussion below related to antimony detection in groundwater.

OU4

Tetra Tech is preparing the draft ROD, which is expected to be issued for review in December 2001. Draft Final Remedial Design Report (60% Design) was issued on Dec 3. See further discussion below related to further source delineation and remedial design.

OU-2

A Monitoring Program outline was presented at the October 2001 OPT meeting. Draft monitoring plan expected out in December 2001.

SA17

Additional injection of Fenton's reagent will be required. See detailed discussion below.

SA18

Tetra Tech issued draft final Site Screening Report on Nov 30, 2001. Contaminated soil exceeding SCTLs will be excavated by CH2M HILL in January 2002.

SA54

CH2M Hill will excavate soil in late January. Steve M. hoping to get some feedback on this report. Steve T. proposes to not clear the trees, but just dig as close to them as possible. Should be adequate. Barbara noted that they also have to meet with the Army to discuss future reuse. It's also possible the Army isn't comfortable with the proposed remediation. Steve M. asked about the small area around Sample 16. Steve T. said they would have to make a decision when they get to it. Army has requested that the trees be left.

Decision: Dave G. and Greg F. agreed we can leave trees, but it may mean there would have to be confirmatory sampling. Later in the meeting this was discussed further, and it was decided that it will be good enough to get as close as possible to the trees and confirmatory sampling would not be necessary.

Action Item: Steve T. to consult with Orlando tree expert (Wiley) to determine how close to the trees we can remove soil.

Tier II (Flip Altman)

Talked about post-ROD land use controls enforcement. Non-NPL bases need to follow the requirements of their permit. Still should consider LUCs as a viable alternative. Can't be accepted until this debate is over. Tier II will provide some language to include in LUCs.

Dispute between EPA and DoD on LUCs is way beyond Tier II. Basically, Tier I to proceed within partnering. Dispute will be resolved in Washington, and we'll have to deal with the consequences at that time.

Tier II reached unanimous consensus that turnover on the Orlando OPT is coming at a bad time. But Tier II is commending the Orlando OPT for sticking together and continuing to move forward.

SA 36

Alan Jenkins (via speakerphone) and Steve McCoy gave presentation. A-interval wells about 15-20 feet bls, B-interval down to about 25 feet. C-interval to 30-35 feet. D-interval wells are 50-60 ft bls. Chlorinated solvents (primarily TCE) in GW highest in wells in the middle of the site. Never detected in D wells yet. Looked at graph of water levels in A, B, C, and D wells. In October 2001, A, B, and D wells stopped following their trends. Don't know why. Could represent variation in equilibration times between wells. Or veggy oil injection could be having some effects on water levels measured.

Well elevations were also re-surveyed to correct some elevation discrepancies.

Data shows a downward component between A and B wells. C and D wells have about the same potentiometric levels, so there is very little vertical GW flow in this zone.

Data shows A and B wells show GW flow to the NW. However, the C zone is to the SE. This is apparently because SA36 is in a central area surrounded by wells. You might expect a GW divide somewhere in this area. Alan next described a conceptual model that could explain the GW flows observed at SA36. The lower unit is probably flowing towards a major surface water body, such as Lake Susannah.

Potentiometric Cross-Section. Shallow cemented sand layer seems to have no effect on GW flow, i.e., its permeability is probably the same as the sand around it. But there is a deeper cemented sand layer that does affect GW flow. It has a strong vertical gradient.

Alan is satisfied that we understand what is going on out there, i.e., we understand better why GW flows in different directions at different depths.

Based on this data, we can cut back on the number of wells that we will replace after the developer destroys the existing, and these new wells can probably even do a better job of defining the plume extent.

RAB Presentation

Steve M. will describe the purpose of the treatability study at OU3. Arsenic plume at SA9, results of benchscale study, and show some of the modeling results for the treatability system. Steve T. will talk about OU4, OU2, SA18, and SA54. Also will talk about the tank that showed up at Area C in late August. Navy Special Agent wants us to hold off on disposal of the tank. Contents failed TCLP for lead. Costing over \$10K to dispose. Navy is investigating, and would like more time before disposal of tank.

06 December 2001

SA36 Survey Errors (Steve M.) – About 1/3 of the wells were surveyed by HLA, 1/3 by Tt, and about 1/3 by CH2M Hill. There were three wells that were way off on elevation, from between 0.86 to 2 feet. Northing and easting were also off on some wells by about 8 feet and 19 feet, respectively. This happened because different surveyors used different datums. There can also be differences in state plane (flat world) and geophysical coordinates (round world).

Vertical data was NVD 1929, but is now NAVD 1988. Horizontal datum was NAD 1927, now NAD 1983/1990. Can't translate from one horizontal datum to the other if the area is large. Accuracy in horizontal direction should be +/-0.2 feet, and vertical +/-0.015.

Developer Update (Dave Twedell), John Classe (Baldwin Park Development Co.)

SA39 is becoming a critical path situation. How quickly can they get the FOST on the site? One more oil injection, but it likely will take months before any positive results are evident. Can they get title before that, with GW restrictions? Barbara explained that there needs to be one more monitoring report. Need the wells to be reinstalled, and right now that looks like it will be in about 3 months. So sampling won't occur before March. Need Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) determination before FDEP and EPA will sign off from the FOST.

Dave T. – If the data shows no change, then what? Can they take title while monitoring is occurring? Dave G. – Before FOST can be signed for SA36 or SA39, EPA needs to determine that the technology is working. Not sure what that criteria will be. Early "dirty" transfer might be an option, but not sure if that would apply to these sites. Greg F. can have EPA's attorneys look at that, but it needs to be a concurrent decision between EPA and FDEP.

John C. - Developer anxious to get these two sites because they are in their Phase I plans. Original schedule from the City had cleanup complete in June 2000, and the redevelopment schedule was based on that. This situation will begin to impact project financing.

Steve T. – Doesn't think a FOST is going to happen any time soon. Seeing some decreases at SA36, but not yet at SA39. This isn't something that's going to happen quickly. Let's just look at how to transfer early.

Action Item – Dave G., Barbara, and Greg F. will look into the early transfer process for these two sites. Final decision will be up to the State, working with EPA. This means transferring without an OPS. John C. will call their environmental attorney (Tim Ramsey) to discuss the issue, and issue a letter to the Navy explaining why an early transfer is necessary.

Barbara then asked John C. about maintaining Lake Susannah, following up on the residents' concerns expressed at the RAB last night. John C. stated that as they develop around the lake, they will plant trees, cut back cattails, and restore the shoreline. But this will only be done in phases as the development progresses.

Dewatering – Don't need a SJWMD permit if your flow is below a certain threshold, which they are. But they still have to deal with the City, and they have a permit from the City for the dewatering that is occurring in this area.

Action Item: John C. will come to the next RAB meeting to discuss the restoration plans and schedule for the lakes.

Action Item: Steve M. to look at historic GW data at SA36 & SA39 for the next OPT meeting. We need to decide if there is a chance that the veggy oil won't work, and the developer may need to realize that these sites may face other more intrusive remediation in the future.

Myers-Briggs – Concluded that Mark S. is an IS, T/F, P. Greg F. is I/E, NT, J/P.

OU 4 (Mike Albert) – Beginning to look at various jar tests to settle out the solids that we expect to create during KMnO₄ addition. Collected GW from IW-4 and the sample was pink. Still some KMnO₄ in it. DPT data within the building shows the source area plume is a bit further south than it was before. Alan Jenkins working on a model of the proposed extraction/injection well locations.

May not need deep wells throughout, as there are almost no VOCs below the hard layer at the east end of the building.

Discussed system procurement. Apparently Carus is not willing to provide the treatment system beyond the KMnO₄ feeder. May end up putting the system out to bid.

Sixty percent design includes a long-term monitoring plan – please make sure that gets reviewed.

100 Percent design document will have the polymer addition issues, electrical issues, and finalizing some of the specs. Also coming up with a cost. Proposed well locations will come out after that.

Steve T. would like to get started on the well installations in January. Can we get this reviewed by everyone separate from the full design document?

Action Items – Tetra Tech to send out color concentration maps for OU4. Mark S. to get Mike A. info on polymers that might be used to remove MnO₂ solids. Tetra Tech to issue proposed well locations memo.

SA17 – Steve T

Presented results of Fenton's remediation performed at the site. Used Waterloo profiler to sample GW every 2 feet. Initially installed 69 injectors at three different depths (10-13, 16-19, 22-25). Then added 10 more injectors at 22-25 depth using DPT. Two mobilizations for a total of 21 days of treatment, added 6,307 gallons of H₂O₂.

First injection got about 95% reduction in the deep zone (started at about 300 ppm). Goal was to get down to about 500 ppb total VOCs. Shallow zones got down to below treatment goal. Deep zone got down to 25 ppm but then rebounded to 75 ppm. Second injection didn't help that much.

Then injected 10 deeper injectors from 31-34 feet bls. Showed delineation was not complete.

Jennifer O. talked about the additional delineation. Added 22 DPT locations from 31–52 feet bls. Deep zone GW flows to the east. Shallow GW has a very flat gradient.

TCE well delineated from 31-34 ft bls (hottest zone). To the east, we have DCE and VC, but not delineated yet. DPT shows no contamination below 38 ft. Primary zone is between 32-36 ft. Will be doing more DPT in the downgradient plume to delineate. Installing 26 more very deep injectors in mid-January (2 wks). Planning another round of water levels too. Will be injecting at the very deep zone, and possibly polishing the shallow (depending on GW sampling results). In Feb adding more H₂O₂ (5 wks). By May hope to be back out doing a final polishing (more H₂O₂ addition for rebound) if needed.

All the above work being performed under an IRA. Still need to complete a site screening report (never went final), and there will also be an IRA completion report. Plus, we still need to finish delineating the dissolved phase plume for inclusion in the final site screening report.

Work plan will be out during the next couple of weeks, focusing on the additional injection.

SA40

Steve discussed the SA40 site screening report. Had 13 ppb antimony versus GCTL of 6 ppb in the old 1996 ABB-ES data. At the time, this was dismissed due to high turbidity in the sample. Can we close the site?

Action Item: Steve M. to look for turbidity data for other GW samples to see if the above exceedance was an anomaly. Mark S. offered to review field logbooks for information if Steve M. is unable to find additional data.

CRITIQUE/CHECKOUT/AGENDA

+’s	Δ’s
New members	Too many observers on first day
Dave G. passing the Florida PG exam	Missed traditional OPT dinner
Good RAB presentations	Forgot to double-side RAB handout/errors
Jennifer O. SA 17 Animation	Late Minutes/Late agenda from last meeting
SA 36 Hydrogeo Evaluation	

The need to bring Mark S. and Greg F. up to speed on all the sites still to be closed was discussed. This will be done at the next OPT meeting in Atlanta in January. The following topics will be discussed (lead presenter(s) in parentheses):

OU1 (Steve T), OU2 (Steve M), OU3 (Steve M), OU4 (Steve T), SA2 (Steve M), SA36 & 39 (Both Steve’s), SA52 (Steve M), SA18 (Barbara N.)

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

January 22-23, 2002 – Atlanta (CH2M HILL’s offices)
 March 5,6 - tentative

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

December 2001

ACTION ITEMS (PREVIOUS)

1. **Dave** talk with Greg Brown and discuss FS alternatives with FDEP management so we can get closer to a decision point on OU 2. **Done. Greg has reviewed draft FS and concurs with range of alternatives. Draft FS approval letter schedule to be issued, indicating FS should go final. Dave has tentatively agreed to monitoring in the northern part of OU2, and possibly the southern part. But needs to review with management.**
2. **Barbara** to check with EPA to see who will be reviewing the FS for OU 2. **Greg Fraley has not had a chance to review and send to EPA attorneys. Greg will be reviewing the document for EPA.**
3. **Dave** to get written interpretation from the DEP's UIC people concerning whether we have to meet MCL's for PCE and TCE before we can reinject into a closed-loop system (OU 4). **Dave** to provide written letter to team. **Done. Letter drafted. Tim Barr has no problem. There is a question whether the rule interpretation letter has to go through attorney. Tim will be talking to Jim Crane to say it's OK. Letter says it's OK.**
4. **Steve T.** to get tree specifications and specifications for the drip irrigation system to Tetra Tech. **Done. Will provide it today.**
5. **Steve T.** to send out overall schedule for updating. **Done**

ACTION ITEMS (STATUS AND NEW)

1. **Barbara** requested a large figure (suitable for RAB and OPT meetings) showing location of all UST locations. **Nick U.** agreed.
2. **Barbara N.** requested a one-page fact sheet outlining the reactive wall technology to show to her management. They are concerned the activated alumina may not work. **Steve M.** to provide.
3. **Steve T.** to consult with Orlando tree expert (Wiley) to determine how close to the trees we can remove soil.
4. **Dave G., Barbara, and Greg F.** will look into the early transfer process for SA36 and SA39. Final decision will be up to the State, working with EPA. This means transferring without an OPS. **John C.** will call the developer's environmental attorney (Tim Ramsey) to discuss the issue, and issue a letter to the Navy explaining why an early transfer is necessary.
5. **Steve M.** to look at historic GW data at SA36 & SA39 for the next OPT meeting. We need to decide if there is a chance that the veggy oil won't work, and the developer may need to realize that these sites may face other more intrusive remediation in the future.

6. **John C.** will come to the next RAB meeting to discuss the restoration plans and schedule for the lakes.
7. **Steve M.** to send out color concentration maps for OU4. **Mark S.** to get Mike A. info on polymers that might be used to remove MnO₂ solids. **Steve M.** to issue proposed well locations memo.
8. **Steve M.** to look for turbidity data for other GW samples to see if the above exceedance was an anomaly. **Mark S.** offered to review field logbooks for information if Steve M. is unable to find additional data.
9. Need response from FDEP for treatability study (sparge system) at Bldg 2080. **Nick** will check with Paul and reissue treatability study as necessary. SAR had been put together, reviewed and comments provided, SAR addendum for Bldg 2080 will be necessary. Action Item: Tetra Tech to submit SAR Addendum. ***SAR Addendum submitted, but haven't heard back from FDEP. Still open awaiting resolution related to new monitoring well.***

ORLANDO PARTNERING TEAM**AGENDA****22-23 January 2002 – Atlanta, GA**

Team Assignments		Support	Expected guests
Team Leader:	Greg Fraley		Jennifer Ottoson (CH2M HILL)
Gate/Timekeeper:			Mike Albert (Tetra Tech NUS)
Recorder:	Mark Salvetti		
Facilitator:	Gus Campana		
Tier II Link:	Flip Altman		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Tuesday – 22 January 2002			
11:00AM	Check-In, Action Item Review	Administration	GF
11:45	Training	Get Smart!	GC
12:30	LUNCH		
1:00	Petroleum/Tier II/UST	Information/Discussion	NU
1:30	Active Site Review (Operable Units)	Information transfer	SM/ST/BN
3:30	BREAK	Leg Stretch	Team
3:45	Active Site Review (SA2, SA36/39, SA52, SA18)	Information transfer	SM/ST/BN
5:30	End of day		

Time	Subject	Objective	Lead
Wednesday – 23 January 2002			
8:00	UST/IR/Transition Update	Information transfer	GF
9:00	SA17 Update	Information transfer	ST/JO
9:30	SA36/39 Update	Information transfer	SM/ST
10:15	BREAK	Recharge batteries	
10:30	OU2, OU 3, OU 4 update	Information transfer	SM/ST
11:30	OPS Determinations	Information transfer	ALL
12:00	Checkout/Next Agenda (+/-)		ALL
12:30	End of Day		

In accordance with discussions during Training in September, here are the ground rules (Code of Conduct and Process) to review prior to the next meeting. Are changes needed to bring the Team up to date??

GROUND RULES

Code of Conduct

- Allow speakers to complete their thought.
- Be forthright (no hidden agendas)
- Be on time (10 cents per minute to be given to person who purchased refreshments).
- Invoke the 100 mile rule (avoid distractions; i.e., conducting non-OPT business).
- Be open and honest.
- Be professional.
- Bring Teammates up to speed.
- Use I statements.
- Be courteous to the speaker; no side conversations.
- Leave your ego and "business coats" at the door.
- Stay for the hard parts.
- Fix the problem, not the blame.

Process

- Team leader, Timekeeper and recorder rotate alphabetically progressing in this order: timekeeper, recorder, team leader, participant.
- Check-in: personal up-dates; read ground rules; review agenda, ground rules, action items and +/-.
- Proxy: Absent members have the discretion of designating a proxy to represent his/her views at the meeting. The OPT will not deliberately make a decision contrary to an absent member's known views or interests.
- Guests: All guests must be invited by the OPT. The sponsor is responsible to brief guest(s) on the OPT meeting process.
- The Team Leader to confirm that the sponsor has briefed guest(s) on the ground rules. If not, then provide guest(s) with overview of ground_rules.
- The OPT and guest(s) shall recite the Ground Rules immediately after the Team Leader calls the meeting to order.
- Close-out: Draft agenda for next meeting; critique meeting; review action items.
- Distribute draft of minutes and Agenda within 7 working days of concluding the meeting. A master copy of the minutes will be maintained and rotated with the recorder.
- Comments or acknowledgment of receipt due back to scribe 7 days after receipt of draft.
- Final minutes and agenda distributed 7 working days before next meeting.
- An action item list with due dates will be maintained and updated monthly.