

5090
Ser 1811RP/00786

9 AUG 1991

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) MEETING

Encl: (1) Summary of 24 July 91 Subject Meeting

1. In accordance with the Remedial Action Order (Docket No. HSA87/88-134RA) for Naval Station, Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex, enclosure (1) is forwarded for your review and comment.
2. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, the point of contact is Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (Attn: Louise T. Lew, Code 1811, (415) 244-2551).

original signed by:

MICHAEL A. MIGUEL
By direction

Distribution:

Department of Health Services (Attn: Bill Brown)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Roberta Blank)
Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Steve Ritchie)

Copy to:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Attn: Scott Lutz)
California Dept. of Fish & Game (Attn: Mike Rugg)
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Attn: Steve Schwarzback)
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (Attn: Chip Demarest)
Hunters Point Technical Review Committee Public Member (Attn: Rev. Arelious Walker)
City and County of San Francisco (Attn: David Wells)
San Francisco District Attorney (Attn: Steve Castleman)
Bay Conservation and Development Commission (Attn: Bob Merrill)
U.S. Dept. of the Interior (Attn: Bill Allen)
Blind copy to: (w/o encl) 09B, 09CPB, 09A2A.43, 24, 1811RC
PWC SF Bay (Code 420) (w/ encl) 1811, 1811RP, (Admin. Record 4 copies)
COMNAVFACENGCOM (181), HLA (Attn: Ashok Verma)
OIC Treasure Island, HPA COMNAVSEASYSYCOM (Attn: Robert Milner)
COMNAVBASE S.F., CNO (OP-45) Writer: Richard Powell, Code 1811RP, x2555
NAVSTA Treasure Island Typist: B. Palmer, 5 Aug 91, TRC ltr
PRC (Attn: Gary Welshans) File: HP/DOHS

Attendees: See attached
Agenda: See attached

General Announcements:

Chuck Flippo is leaving EPA. Roberta Blank will replace Chuck.

Bill Brown announced that DHS has become a part of the California EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Chip Demerest has left NOAA. Michael Buchman of NOAA/Hazmat Division will temporarily fill in for Chip.

Mary Lucas-McDonald will be on maternity leave beginning in August. David Leland will take her place as Assistant Program Manager of the non-RI tasks for HPA. Grant Ohland will be the Assistant Program Manager of RI related tasks.

Julie Carver is leaving the Navy. This meeting will be her last Technical Review Committee meeting.

I. Approval of minutes of last meeting:

The minutes of the last TRC meeting were approved by all parties present.

II. Federal Facility Agreement/Technical Assistance Grant:

The Navy's responses to EPA comments are being finalized. DHS will participate as the Department of Toxic Substances Control. OU I, III, and IV schedules will be incorporated in the revised FFA. OU II schedule is being considered by the regulatory agencies. EPA to publish schedules for public review.

III. Removal Action Status Report:

1. Pickling and Plate Yard - The Navy is working on Plans and Specifications for construction award. Navy will do a quality-based-procurement rather than strictly by low bid. The construction contract is expected to be awarded in two to three months.
2. Tank S-505 - Contractor selection is being finalized. Contract award is expected by mid-August. Contractor is required to submit Health and Safety Plan and Work Plan within 60 days after award.
3. Tank Farm - Design work is complete. Contract award is expected by late September or early October.
4. Sandblast Grit Fixation - Sandblast grit report was distributed on July 15, 1991. Comments on this report are due August 29, 1991. Jeff Heath of NCEL discussed asphalt treatment of sandblast grit. Previous laboratory testing on fixation was successful, but field-scale pilot testing failed. The Navy is pursuing using this material as raw ingredient for asphaltic concrete processing.. Bench-

scale testing was conducted. Results indicate that the product is not hazardous. A field demonstration is planned. Caltrans criteria will be used to assess the suitability of this material for use as pavement. The Navy will keep track of where the material will go when it is transported off site. The Navy will check the grit pile for radioactivity. The Navy will simulate asphalt cutting of test strips and will perform health monitoring.

IV. Preliminary Assessment - Other Areas:

All agency comments have been received. Since it is a secondary document, comments will be addressed in the SI Work Plan being prepared to investigate the sites identified in the PA/Other Areas Report.

V. SI/RI Activities:

1. Environmental Sampling and Analysis Plan/Wetlands - Revised Draft Final ESAP will be issued on July 31, 1991. The Navy has performed a preliminary survey of the wetlands at HPA per the Corps of Engineers' Wetlands Delineation Manual. Copies of the Wetlands map and a letter report on this investigation will be distributed by the Navy. Doug Pomeroy of the Navy gave a short presentation on distribution of wetlands at HPA. All wetlands at the shore are stable in size. The Navy will offer site tours to the regulatory agencies on request.

Two COE criteria (vegetation and hydrology) were used for wetland delineation. Soil type was generally not used as a criterion due to the large amount of artificial fill material.

NOAA would like to see the broadest interpretation of the wetlands.

A comprehensive delineation of wetlands will be included in the ecological risk assessment plan to be authorized in early August.

2. Status of Sites PA-16 and PA-18 - Draft SI is due to agencies on September 9, 1991.
3. Status of Operable Unit II - A schedule extension request was submitted to the agencies based on necessity to perform contingency phase work. Contract for the contingency phase work will be awarded late July.

SOFM response to comments has been submitted by incorporation into the minutes of an agency meeting at DHS on June 4.

Description of CLP validation procedure was presented by Carl Michelsen and a summary of key CLP review items was distributed. A decision was made to follow the EPA functional guidelines for assigning validation qualifiers.

The agencies requested that a discussion of laboratory contaminants should be included in future SOFMs.

NOAA pointed out that detection limits for the CPL methods are high. NOAA may want lower detection limit for antimony. AA method will be used to get a lower detection limit for antimony in the ESAP.

4. Status of Operable Units I, III, and IV - Julie Carver distributed the schedule for OUs I, III, IV and V and PA16/18.

Data submittals for OU I and OU III sites are planned for October 16 and August 29, 1991, respectively.

Low levels of radiation were encountered at IR-2 in areas of anomalous readings. These findings confirm the findings of scintillation survey performed during Reconnaissance Phase activities that radioactive material is present at IR-2. Radium has been identified as one of the isotopes. Quantification is in progress. High volume air sampling is scheduled to begin in late July. Preliminary report to the Navy is scheduled for early September.

Real time monitoring and air sampling for radiation will be performed during all intrusive activities at the entire HPA facility. A confirmation radiation survey of a portion of the facility will be performed.

Phase 2B field work on OU IV will start early August.

5. Status of Operable Unit V - OU V field work will be completed by mid-August.
6. TIMP - TIMP will be implemented in early August.
7. Aquifer Testing - Slug tests on all 4" wells have been completed. Slug tests for 2" wells are in preparation. Aquifer testing plan will be submitted by late August to the regulatory agencies.
8. RI Work Plan - RI Work Plan for IR-19, 20, 21 and 22 is in preparation. It is due to the agencies in mid-September.

IR-19 is recommended for SI rather than RI based on further review of data. IR-21 will be incorporated into IR-1. IR-22 will be expanded to include a part of PA35. Navy requested the results of routine laboratory testing on bottled water from Mountain Spring Water Company from DHS.

VI. **OU II PHEE**

Intake assumption and a preliminary list of chemicals of concern are scheduled for submittal to the agencies on August 30. The Navy would like to meet with the agencies on September 30, 1991; Discussion to include COCs, intake assumption, ARARs and groundwater modeling approach. ARARs are due from the DHS by August 30.

VII. **Air Sampling**

Sampling was performed week of July 8. Lab analysis being performed. A report on this activity will be submitted.

VIII. **Underground Tanks**

Julie Carver handed out a list of tanks and schedule. Six tanks will be closed in place. The rest (13) will be removed. Twenty-two additional UST's were found this year. Final work plan was submitted to the agencies in July and comments are due on August 16. Work will start in early November.

IX. Storm Water Sampling

Report on storm water sampling was distributed on July 17, 1991. Comments are due in 45 days. Naval Ocean System Center will perform bathymetric survey and limited water quality testing on or about July 31, 1991.

X. Next Meeting:

The next TRC meeting was scheduled for 0930 hours on September 25, 1991. Navy will find another conference room.

AV/dvl18950

ATTENDANCE SIGN UP
HUNTERS POINT ANNEX
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

July 24, 1991

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Grant Ohland</u>	<u>HLA</u>	<u>899-7387</u>
<u>MARY LUCA'S McDONNARD</u>	<u>HLA</u>	<u>899-7350</u>
<u>Lynn Nakashima</u>	<u>Dept. of Toxic Sub. Control</u>	<u>540-3818</u>
<u>RICHARD POWELL</u>	<u>WES DIV</u>	<u>244-2555</u>
<u>EDDIE SARMIENTO</u>	<u>NETI</u>	<u>395-5452</u>
<u>Emir Ltuoh</u>	<u>PRC</u>	<u>543-4880</u>
<u>Gary Welshans</u>	<u>PRC</u>	<u>543-4880</u>
<u>Michael Buckman</u>	<u>NOAA/HAZMAT</u>	<u>(206) 526-6340</u>
<u>Roberta Blank</u>	<u>EPA</u>	<u>(415) 744-2385</u>
<u>Jessie Schnell</u>	<u>DTSC / ATB</u>	<u>916-322-1003</u>
<u>Randal Friedman</u>	<u>COMNAURBASE SF</u>	<u>415 395-3916</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

ATTENDANCE SIGN UP
HUNTERS POINT ANNEX
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

July 24, 1991

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>ASHOK VERMA</u>	<u>HLA</u>	<u>899-7386</u>
<u>David Leland</u>	<u>HLA</u>	<u>855-7352</u>
<u>Carl Michelson</u>	<u>HLA</u>	<u>899-7358</u>
<u>Tom Gundersen</u>	<u>RWQCB</u>	<u>464-0841</u>
<u>Louise T. Lew</u>	<u>WESTDIV</u>	<u>244-2551</u>
<u>Barbara Nelson</u>	<u>NCEL</u>	<u>982-1668</u>
<u>Jeff Heath</u>	<u>NCEL</u>	<u>805 982-1657</u>
<u>RAY CHIANG</u>	<u>WESTDIV</u>	<u>244-2554</u>
<u>Bill Brown</u>	<u>DTSC</u>	<u>540-3816</u>
<u>Cathi Gardiner</u>	<u>BEGHTEL FOLEPA</u>	<u>708-2766</u>
<u>Chuck Flippo</u>	<u>EPA</u>	<u>744-2388</u>
<u>JULIE CARVER</u>	<u>WESTDIV</u>	<u>244-2557</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>



AGENDA
Technical Review Committee Meeting*

Hunters Point Annex
July 24, 1991
Treasure Island, California

- I. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
- II. Federal Facility Agreement/Technical Assistance Grant
- III. Removal Action Status Report
 - 1. Pickling and Plate Yard
 - 2. Tank S-505
 - 3. Tank Farm
 - 4. Sandblast Grit Fixation
- IV. Preliminary Assessment Other Areas
- V. SI/RI activities
 - 1. Environmental Sampling and Analysis Plan/Wetlands
 - 2. Status of Sites PA-16 and PA-18
 - 3. Status of Operable Unit II
 - 4. Status of Operable Units, I, III, and IV
 - 5. Status of Operable Unit V
 - 6. TIMP
 - 7. Aquifer Testing
 - 8. RI Work Plan - IR 19, 20, 21 and 22
- VI. OU II PHEE
- VII. Air Sampling
- VIII. Underground Tanks
- IX. Storm Water Sampling
- X. Next Meeting
- XI. Summary of Notes

*Meeting will be held in Building 1, Naval Station Treasure Island Conference Room, which is at the South end of Building 1.

AV/dvl18552-PRC

HUNTERS POINT ANNEX VALIDATION OF CHEMICAL DATA

PURPOSE:

- o Determine the validity of chemical results.
 - precision
 - accuracy
 - completeness
 - comparability
 - representativeness

- o Review laboratory and field Quality Control Samples and analytical data.
 - blanks
 - duplicates
 - spikes

- o Assignment of Data Qualifiers.
 - "flags" to tell the data user about QA/QC problems concerning chemical identity and concentration.

TWO PART VALIDATION PROCESS

I. Cursory Validation -- 100% of the samples

Review of: Holding Times
 Matrix Spike Recoveries (Accuracy)
 Matrix Spike Duplicate RPD (Precision)
 Blanks (Field & Laboratory)
 Blank Spikes/Blank Spike Duplicates
 Matrix Duplicates (Field & Laboratory)
 Surrogate Spike Recovery

II. Full-CLP Validation -- 10% of the samples

Review of: GC/MS Tuning
 Calibration
 Internal Standards Performance
 Compound Identification
 (e.g. review of GC/MS mass spectra)
 Compound Quantitation
 Reporting Limits
 Tentatively Identified Compounds
 Overall System Performance

- o Data Validation following EPA's *Laboratory Data Validation, Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Inorganics Analyses (July, 1988)* and for *Evaluating Organic Analyses (February, 1988)*.

VALIDATION QUALIFIERS:

PURPOSE: To tell the data user the quality of the data.

1. Qualifiers assigned by the Laboratory (defined by CLP protocols):

J,B,E,M*,+, etc

- o see attachment for CLP definitions of laboratory assigned qualifiers

2. Qualifiers assigned during the Cursory Validation Process:

A,J2,U1,U2,R2,R1, etc

A = accepted data
J = estimated value
U = non-detected
R = rejected value

- o every value for each compound assigned a qualifier
- o couple of hundred compounds/sample

3. Qualifiers assigned during the Full-CLP Validation Process:

V,J6,R3, etc

EXAMPLE:

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Qualifier</u>	<u>Units</u>
Copper	20	VJ2/*	ug/L

V = Full-CLP validation completed

J2 = Result is qualified as estimated due to laboratory duplicate quality control criteria exceedances.

(assigned during the cursory review process)

* = Duplicate Analysis not within control limits

(assigned by the laboratory at the time data reported; required by the CLP protocol)

CURSORY VALIDATION, KEY REVIEWS

I. HOLDING TIMES REVIEW

- o If holding times exceeded, positive results flagged with a J qualifier (estimated).
- o If holding times grossly exceeded, reviewer must use professional judgement to determine the reliability of data. The reviewer may flag non-detect data as unusable (R qualifier).

II. BLANK REVIEW

- o Qualifies sample data according to the level of contamination in associated blanks
- o For common lab contaminants (methylene chloride, acetone, toluene, 2-butanone, common phthalate esters), no positive results reported unless concentrations in the sample exceed 10X the amount in associated blanks.
- o For other contaminants, the rule is 5X.

EXAMPLES:

1. Laboratory Blank = 7 ug/L acetone (10X = 70 ug/L)

Sample Result = 20 B ug/L acetone

Qualified Sample Results = 20 U1/B ug/L acetone

- o compound is now non-detected

2. Laboratory Blank = 10 ug/L bis 2-ethylhexyl phthalate

(10X = 100 ug/L)

Sample Result = 4 JB ug/L bis 2-ethylhexyl phthalate

Contract Required Quantitation Limit = 5 ug/L
(CRQL)

Qualified Sample Result = 5 U1/B

- o result is qualified as non-detect at the CRQL

3. Laboratory Blank = 12 ug/L TCE (5X = 60 ug/L)

Sample Result = 113 B ug/L TCE

Qualified Sample Result = 113 A/B ug/L

- o A = acceptable (assuming no other QC problems)

- o Blank contamination does not effect the result

ATTACHMENT

CLP Statement of Work lists of required qualifiers to be assigned by the laboratory.

July.

Under the columns labeled "C", "Q", and "M", enter result qualifiers as identified below. If additional qualifiers are used, their explicit definitions must be included on the Cover Page in the Comments section.

FORM I-IN includes fields for three types of result qualifiers. These qualifiers must be completed as follows:

- o . C (Concentration) qualifier -- Enter "B" if the reported value was obtained from a reading that was less than the Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL) but greater than or equal to the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL). If the analyte was analyzed for but not detected, a "U" must be entered.
- o Q qualifier -- Specified entries and their meanings are as follows:
 - E - The reported value is estimated because of the presence of interference. An explanatory note must be included under Comments on the Cover Page (if the problem applies to all samples) or on the specific FORM I-IN (if it is an isolated problem).
 - M - Duplicate injection precision not met.
 - N - Spiked sample recovery not within control limits.
 - S - The reported value was determined by the Method of Standard Additions (MSA).
 - W - Post-digestion spike for Furnace AA analysis is out of control limits (85-115%), while sample absorbance is less than 50% of spike absorbance. (See Exhibit E.)
 - * - Duplicate analysis not within control limits.
 - + - Correlation coefficient for the MSA is less than 0.995.

Entering "S", "W", or "+" is mutually exclusive. No combination of these qualifiers can appear in the same field for an analyte.

- o M (Method) qualifier -- Enter:
 - "P" for ICP
 - "A" for Flame AA
 - "F" for Furnace AA
 - "CV" for Manual Cold Vapor AA
 - "AV" for Automated Cold Vapor AA
 - "AS" for Semi-Automated Spectrophotometric
 - "C" for Manual Spectrophotometric
 - "T" for Titrimetric
 - "NR" if the analyte is not required to be analyzed.

A brief physical description of the sample, both before and after digestion, must be reported in the fields for color (before and after), clarity (before and after), texture and artifacts. For water samples, report color and clarity. For soil samples, report color, texture and artifacts.

For reporting results to the USEPA, the following contract specific qualifiers are to be used. The seven qualifiers defined below are not subject to modification by the laboratory. Up to five qualifiers may be reported on Form I for each compound.

The seven EPA-defined qualifiers to be used are as follows:

- U - Indicates compound was analyzed for but not detected. The sample quantitation limit must be corrected for dilution and for percent moisture. For example, 10 U for phenol in water if the sample final volume is the protocol-specified final volume. If a 1 to 10 dilution of extract is necessary, the reported limit is 100 U. For a soil sample, the value must also be adjusted for percent moisture. For example, if the sample had 24% moisture and a 1 to 10 dilution factor, the sample quantitation limit for phenol (330 U) would be corrected to:

$$\frac{(330 \text{ U}) \times \text{df}}{D} \quad \text{where } D = \frac{100 - \% \text{ moisture}}{100}$$

and df = dilution factor

$$\text{at } 24\% \text{ moisture, } D = \frac{100 - 24}{100} = 0.76$$

$$\frac{(330 \text{ U}) \times 10}{.76} = 4300 \text{ U} \quad \text{rounded to the appropriate number of significant figures}$$

For soil samples subjected to GPC clean-up procedures, the CRQL is also multiplied by 2, to account for the fact that only half of the extract is recovered.

- J - Indicates an estimated value. This flag is used either when estimating a concentration for tentatively identified compounds where a 1:1 response is assumed, or when the mass spectral data indicate the presence of a compound that meets the identification criteria but the result is less than the sample quantitation limit but greater than zero. For example, if the sample quantitation limit is 10 ug/L, but a concentration of 3 ug/L is calculated, report it as 3J. The sample quantitation limit must be adjusted for both dilution and percent moisture as discussed for the U flag, so that if a sample with 24% moisture and a 1 to 10 dilution factor has a calculated concentration of 300 ug/L and a sample quantitation limit of 430 ug/kg, report the concentration as 300J on Form I.
- C - This flag applies to pesticide results where the identification has been confirmed by GC/MS. Single component pesticides ≥ 10 ng/ul in the final extract shall be confirmed by GC/MS.

- B - This flag is used when the analyte is found in the associated blank as well as in the sample. It indicates possible/probable blank contamination and warns the data user to take appropriate action. This flag must be used for a TIC as well as for a positively identified TCL compound.

- E - This flag identifies compounds whose concentrations exceed the calibration range of the GC/MS instrument for that specific analysis. This flag will not apply to pesticides/PCBs analyzed by GC/EC methods. If one or more compounds have a response greater than full scale, the sample or extract must be diluted and re-analyzed according to the specifications in Exhibit D. All such compounds with a response greater than full scale should have the concentration flagged with an "E" on the Form I for the original analysis. If the dilution of the extract causes any compounds identified in the first analysis to be below the calibration range in the second analysis, then the results of both analyses shall be reported on separate Forms I. The Form I for the diluted sample shall have the "DL" suffix appended to the sample number. NOTE: For total xylenes, where three isomers are quantified as two peaks, the calibration range of each peak should be considered separately, e.g., a diluted analysis is not required for total xylenes unless the concentration of either peak separately exceeds 200 ug/L.

- D - This flag identifies all compounds identified in an analysis at a secondary dilution factor. If a sample or extract is re-analyzed at a higher dilution factor, as in the "E" flag above, the "DL" suffix is appended to the sample number on the Form I for the diluted sample, and all concentration values reported on that Form I are flagged with the "D" flag.

- A - This flag indicates that a TIC is a suspected aldol-condensation product.

- X - Other specific flags may be required to properly define the results. If used, they must be fully described and such description attached to the Sample Data Summary Package and the Case Narrative. Begin by using "X". If more than one flag is required, use "Y" and "Z", as needed. If more than five qualifiers are required for a sample result, use the "X" flag to combine several flags, as needed. For instance, the "X" flag might combine the "A", "B", and "D" flags for some sample.

The combination of flags "BU" or "UB" is expressly prohibited. Blank contaminants are flagged "E" only when they are also detected in the sample.

If analyses at two different dilution factors are required (see Exhibit D), follow the data reporting instructions given in Exhibit D and with the "D" and "E" flags above.

Navy CLEAN - Hunters Point Annex
Group 5 Project Schedule

ID	Task	1991												1992												1993								
		Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
1	Group 5	5/29 → 7/31																																
2	Field Work Planning/Prep	5/29 [] 6/17																																
3	Drilling/Well Installation	6/17 [] 7/31																																
4	Surface Sampling	7/8 7/9																																
5	Well Development / Round 1 GW Sampling	7/22 [] 8/16																																
6	Database Entry	7/22 [] 8/23																																
7	Laboratory Analysis	6/24 [] 9/30																																
8	Round 1 Chemical Database Management	8/26 [] 10/14																																
9	Round 2 GW Sampling	11/19 [] 11/25																																
10	Round 2 GW Lab Analysis	11/25 [] 1/9																																
11	Round 2 GW Chemical Database Management	1/10 [] 1/29																																
12	Data Validation (Full)	1/30 [] 3/26																																
13	Data Evaluation	3/20 [] 5/29																																
14	Prepare Summary of Findings Memorandum	4/11 [] 6/26																																
15	Navy Review	6/29 [] 7/13																																
16	Respond to Navy Comments	7/14 [] 7/31																																
17	Summary of Findings, Draft to Agencies	⊕ 7/31																																

Navy CLEAN - Hunters Point Annex
PA 16 & PA 18 Project Schedule

ID	Task	1991												1992																										
		Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr								
1	PA 16 & PA 18 Site Investigation			1/28	→												9/9																							
2	Field Work			1/28	2/13																																			
3	Database Entry			2/4	2/21																																			
4	Receive Chemical Data							5/17	6/5																															
5	Chemical Database Management							5/17	6/12																															
6	Data Evaluation							6/13	7/11																															
7	Prepare SI Report							6/20	8/1																															
8	Navy Review								8/2	8/15																														
9	Respond to Navy Comments								8/16	9/9																														
10	SI Report, Draft to Agencies									9/9																														