



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
SOUTHWEST DIVISION
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92132-5190

N68311.000474
NAVSTA LONG BEACH
SSIC #5090.3

5090
Ser 1823.AM/ 2244
6 November 1992

From: Commanding Officer, Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX TEAM BUILDING FOLLOW-UP AND FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

Encl: (1) Summary of Participant Evaluations
(2) Meeting Minutes of Schedule Negotiations
(3) Negotiated Schedule
(4) Future Meeting Schedule

1. The purpose of this letter is to follow-up on the Long Beach Team Building Conference and Schedule Negotiation Meeting held 20-22 October 92. Enclosure (1) contains a summary of the evaluations provided by all attendees. Based on the evaluations, the meeting was viewed as a tremendous success. Thank you for your participation and for making this meeting such a success.

2. Enclosures (2) and (3) contain the meeting minutes from the third day of the conference and the negotiated schedule. The future meeting schedule which was agreed upon during these discussions is included in enclosure (4).

3. The next meeting scheduled for Long Beach Naval Complex will take place:

WHEN: 20 November 1992
10:00 AM
WHERE: Naval Station Long Beach
Officer's Club
The Ward Room

4. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the approach to be used in preparation of the preliminary risk assessment and the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) work plans. Your attendance at this important scoping meeting is requested.

5. If you have any questions please contact the undersigned at (619) 532-1250 (DSN 522-1250).

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Andrea Muckerman".

ANDREA MUCKERMAN

By direction

5090
Ser 1823.AM/2244
6 November 1992

Distribution:

NAVSTA Long Beach (N46, LCDR John Snyder, YI Hwa Kim)

NAVSHIPYD Long Beach (Codes 106.31, 106.31KM)

SOUTHWESTNAVFACENCOM

09B

09A2C.41

0232.PH

182

1823

1823.FA

Copy to:

NAVSTA Long Beach

NAVSHIPYD Long Beach

SCHERER ASSOCIATES INC. _____

28092 San Lucas - Mission Viejo, CA, 92692
(714) 768-1940 FAX (714) 768-9097

LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX PARTNERING MEETING October 20-22, 1992 SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT' EVALUATIONS

NOTE: Numbers identify comments made by the **same** person(s) under each category in the verbatim summary of participant' evaluations of the partnering meeting.

A. OVERALL, DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE LB NAVAL COMPLEX PARTNERING MEETING HAS BEEN WORTHWHILE?

(14) YES (0) NO

1. Yes - It was great to meet and get to know the players. The time spent was worthwhile and should lead to significant time savings in the end.
2. Yes - Many issues were clarified. It was good to understand where everyone fit in the big picture with organization charts. Also, good to hear everyone's concerns even if we didn't solve all of them.
3. Yes - Nice blend of both general team effort issues and specific project goals.
4. Yes - Broke down barriers and opened communication! Helped mend a few bridges and build others (ie., mutual trust - open communication).
5. Yes - Finally brought everyone together to get the schedule resolved and clearly established a 'team' that I am very optimistic will succeed.
6. Yes - Brought the team together to understand requirements and help communication for commitment.
7. Yes - Before the meeting there was misunderstanding about what each person's role in the team is. Now, I think it's very clear for each one what his/her role in the team is.
8. Yes - The most obvious indication was the change in team members from the first day to the last. And, also, my personal desire to work on this project has increased, mostly due to my enjoyment of the team members.
9. Yes - Everyone has a clearer understanding of each others' goals, and I think we reached closure on several issues. It was also very important that we get to know each other on a one-to-one basis. It will make the project more fun.
10. Yes - Helped everyone learn how better to communicate and showed the value of doing this.

Encl (1)

11. Yes - Many issues were identified, discussed and many resolved. Key members were identified, brought together, and commitments made for future work.

THIS MEETING WAS DEFINITELY A SUCCESS!

12. Yes - It appears to me that everyone was willing to come together but as the time has progressed, everyone has become willing to join together!
13. Yes - We were able to bring together the diverse groups that are parties to a fast-track, difficult project and come to an understanding of what is involved - and, established a sense of team.
14. Yes - Pinpointed why there is a problem with NAVSTA, Naval Shipyard, SW Div and Regulators. Problems are communication, hierarchy, funding, etc.. Some problems can be resolved - communication and hierarchy.

B. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE FACILITATOR(S):

Bill Scherer

Andrea Muckerman

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Great job, very well polished. The team building exercises kept the days enjoyable | I thought you did an excellent job. You were able to cut through the B.S. at times and clarify the points.

However, we do need to revisit the RI vs Extended RI issue soon.

Thanks for all of your hard work in putting this show together. |
| 2. Very good exercises. Pace was excellent - activities were varied - very talented, easy to approach, listen to and understand. | Left blank. |
| 3. I thought Bill was great! Warm, friendly! | Excellent job of keeping focus on relevant issues and directing discussion to some real objectives/solutions. |
| 4. EXCELLENT. Open, straight forward and down-to-earth manner and technique helped open group up and was easy to relate to. Made me feel comfortable right off! | Yes. Improved on teamwork. Identified schedule - ie. set common goals and schedule. Identified roles and responsibilities which will lead to improved working relationships.

Outstanding effort - You do a great job. This is not easy (I know, I try to do it all the time with my staff) as a |

Facilitator in learning also - I urge you to take charge of the group and be confident. You've got what it takes.

Practice, Practice, Practice as I do every day.

5. Outstanding, personable, wise 'people-person' from whom I've learned many lessons.

Obviously very well prepared as always. Very good at ensuring good flow of ideas and solutions. Good with people of varying personalities. Very patient. Very effective schedule and time use.
6. Good - helpful to understand overall communication

Andrea had to 'step up' unexpectedly and did a super job. She was able to understand everything by everyone - she would have been able to be a little more flexible in a few areas if she had been prepared for the 'role' (a few times, frustration was caused).
7. I think you did an excellent job, especially by the games we did which reflect our behaviors.

Did a super job in the presentation. She knows the project and did an excellent job in answering all of the questions.

She knows and understands the personalities, thinking, attitudes and backgrounds of each person. She was able to handle each person and make sure that her message/point got through.

She worked a lot to get this meeting going and be **one of the most successful NAVY PARTNERING MEETINGS ever held**. She deserves to be acknowledged as a smart, talented person.
8. Great job. Kept the meetings moving. Interjected, not only appropriate, but meaningful bits of information at just the right points in our communication efforts. Provided team with a lot to think about.

Andrea, for someone who was hesitant about facilitating a discussion at first, you sure overcame your doubts and did a wonderful job. (Maybe Bill has an opening?)
9. Excellent! He is obviously very knowledgeable and has a way of making us confront uncomfortable issues without feeling too uncomfortable. I enjoyed

Andrea did a great job in steering the meeting in the right direction and in getting everyone's issues addressed.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | the exercises and I feel that I have learned a lot that I will use in other parts of my work - and my personal life. | I know it took a lot of energy and I appreciate her effort to get the project started off on the right track. |
| 10. | Excellent. Comfortable to be with! | Sometimes, too polite. Need to take charge a little more. |
| 11. | Enjoyed Bill's input, examples and presentations. Games were helpful and fun. | Left Blank. |
| 12. | Who? Bill, you really did a great job! | Andrea - fantastic, you should ask Bill for a job. |
| 13. | The Facilitator did a good job of conveying the importance of teamwork and gauged the 'chemistry' of the group accurately. He kept the progress going and knew when to intervene and when to let us go on our own. | Andrea did a great job of keeping us focused on our agenda and objectives within the time constraints we have. |
| 14. | Very good. Intervened when necessary but, let the groups work alone. | N/A |

C. WHAT SUGGESTION(S) DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVING THIS AND/OR SIMILAR MEETINGS THAT MIGHT BE HELD IN THE FUTURE?

1. None.
2. After we identified some problems, I wanted to try to find solutions to all of them, although I know we had too little time.

Some of our discussions dragged on with too much 'voting' on what to do instead of just doing it. Maybe that cannot be avoided with lots of people.
3. None.
4. Try to provide new Facilitators with some training up-front and perhaps more coaching during - or, on the sidelines - Facilitating. I think we could have moved quicker and more effective in some areas.
5. Can't see how - seems very effective and efficient as is.
6. If the Facilitator is planning on having someone else help, he should give some warning - and explain what and why he needs help.
7. I think the meeting was very well organized.
8. One area might be to have one team member (maybe a different one each day) tell you (Bill) when discussions are degenerating so those moments can be minimized.

9. None.
10. Overnight in exotic places.
11. Have lunch at the meeting to reduce time lost at lunch. Give more time during exercises.
12. These meetings should be held where telephones are not available so as to concentrate on the task at hand.

NEXT TIME LET'S DO IT IN HAWAII!

13. I see the benefit of keeping the meeting location as inconveniently far from our work offices to eliminate the temptation to go back to the office.
14. A meeting with Naval Station, Shipyard and SWDiv would be very beneficial since the problem seems to be mostly internal.

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0226-05 CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0003	PROJECT NO. 01-F226-NS
--	---------------------------

CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE X TELECOM OTHER	DATE HELD	22 October 1992
		DATE ISSUED	5 November 1992
		RECORDED BY	Peter Torrey/CH2M HILL
SUBJECT	Team-Building Meeting Long Beach Naval Complex Site Management Plan	PLACE	Marriott Hotel, Torrance, CA

PARTICIPANTS: (* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)

A. Muckerman/Code 1823.AM	K. Masden/LBNSY
Y. Kim/NAVSTALB	B. Wong/CH2M HILL
P. Torrey/CH2M HILL	R. Udabe/JEG
LCDR J.L. Snyder/NAVSTALB	C. O'Rourke/DTSC
J. Zarnoch/DTSC	W. Scherer/Scherer Associates, Inc.
D. Ballie/LBNSY	J. Hendrix/CH2M HILL
F. Aljabi/Code 1822.FA	P. Husted/Code 0232.PH
K. Brewer/CH2M HILL	

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
------------------	------

	<p>A team-building meeting for the Installation Restoration (IR) program at the Naval Complex (NC) Long Beach was held from 20 through 22 October 1992. The first two days consisted primarily of general team-building exercises. In addition, specific strengths and shortcomings of the team were identified and addressed. On the third day, the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Work Plans schedule was discussed, and this project note summarizes the discussion.</p> <p><u>RI/FS Goals</u></p> <p>The following goals were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Complete the Draft RI/FS Work Plan as soon as possible but no later than 30 April 1993, based on a 9 November 1992 start date. o Complete the Work Plans for the Naval Shipyard Long Beach (LBNSY) and the Naval Station (NAVSTA) Long Beach in parallel. o Avoid resubmissions and minimize review comments on the draft. o Accelerate schedule. o Produce a high-quality technical product (i.e., satisfy regulatory requirements and properly identify data needs). o Be innovative. o Be efficient and cost-effective. o Continue teamwork. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Encl (2)</i></p>
--	--



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0226-05
CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0003

PROJECT NO.
01-F226-05

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

- o Continue the quality improvement process.
- o Address overlap of requirements of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).
- o Make defensible decisions.
- o Inform public through the Community Relations Plan.
- o Minimize repetition from previous work or documents.
- o Commit to sufficient review time.

J. Zarnoch stated that he would like to see work proceed at both the LBNSY and NAVSTA Long Beach. However, if Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERA) funds are not available for LBNSY, then NAVSTA Long Beach could proceed with available Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) funds. J. Snyder stated that the work at NAVSTA Long Beach should proceed as quickly as possible, and that he is not concerned if the investigations at the LBNSY and NAVSTA Long Beach proceed at different rates.

Assumptions and Actions

The following assumptions and actions were established for the development of the RI/FS Work Plans:

- o LBNSY and NAVSTA Long Beach Work Plans will be completed in parallel, except when so doing would delay the NAVSTA Long Beach schedule.
- o State regulatory agencies will jointly provide one set of comments on the Draft Work Plans.
- o The Response to Comments will show where changes have been incorporated in the Final Work Plans.
- o Interagency project manager meetings will be held to make timely decisions, review the technical approach, and minimize revisions to the Work Plans.
- o SOUTHWESTDIV will send identical letters addressed to both the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to propose that the IR at NC Long Beach follow either RCRA or CERCLA. These letters should state why a decision is needed as soon as possible.
- o A RCRA cross-reference is not required for the Work Plans. The RCRA permit modification will reflect that this cross-reference is not required.
- o The Work Plans will include Feasibility Study (or Corrective Measure Study) activities, as required by CERCLA guidance.

PROJECT NOTE NO.
 PN-0226-05
 CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0003

PROJECT NO.
 01-F226-05

ACTION
 REQ'D. BY

ITEM

- o Meeting minutes will be sent out after each interagency Project Managers' (PM) meeting to document agreed-upon decisions.
- o A meeting will be held to ensure continual quality improvements. An assessment of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) may be done.
- o Schedule progress will be monitored and, when possible, the schedule will be accelerated.
- o Extended LBNSY passes will be obtained for the Jacobs Engineering Group (Jacobs) Team and SOUTHWESTDIV.
- o Discussion was postponed on whether to conduct an extended Site Inspection at Sites 4 and 8 and a Preliminary Assessment at Site 6B.

RI/FS Schedule

K. Brewer presented the components of an RI/FS and a strategy for the Work Plans, including a handout. A. Muckerman then summarized the contractual issues. The Work Plans will be funded by the DERA and BRAC funds, but the funds have not yet been received. The negotiation of CTO 249 and 250 will be scheduled for the week of 26 October 1992. The target date for the award of the contract is 9 November 1992.

The amount of time needed for each team member to review the Draft RI/FS Work Plans was established. SOUTHWESTDIV and the Jacobs Team will obtain all Navy comments and brief DTSC on those comments. SOUTHWESTDIV will meet with DTSC to discuss resolution of the comments before the Final Work Plans are produced.

The RI/FS Work Plan schedule was presented and discussed. The schedule shows the Draft RI/FS Work Plans being submitted to the Navy on 28 April 1993 and to the DTSC on 30 April 1993 if the Notice-To-Proceed is received by the Jacobs Team by 9 November 1992. The Technical Review Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9 June 1993. The Final RI/FS Work Plans are scheduled to be submitted to the Navy on 9 October 1993.

To minimize the number of reports to be reviewed, C. O'Rourke stated that DTSC's preference is that the additional investigations proposed for Sites 4, 6A, and 8 be included in the RI/FS Work Plan. In addition, DTSC prefers that the potential disposal areas adjacent to sites 3, 4, and 6(6B) be included in the RI/FS Work Plans. DTSC would be willing to write a letter stating that an observed release has not been established yet at those adjacent sites, but that they were included in the RI/FS Work Plans for efficiency. A. Muckerman requested that a full discussion of this topic be conducted later.

RI/FS Project Managers' Meetings

The following tentative schedule was established for the Project Managers' meetings:

PROJECT NOTE NO.
 PN-0226-05
 CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0003

PROJECT NO.
 01-F226-05

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
------------------	------

RI/FS Project Managers' Meetings			
Meeting	Date	Location	Participants
Initial Scoping	11/20/92	NAVSTA, Long Beach	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, NAVSTA Long Beach, LBNSY, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Conceptual Model Review	12/17/92	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Initial Evaluation Review	1/26/93 1/27/93	DTSC	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Data Needs/Task Review	3/2/93 3/3/93	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Comment Resolution	7/13/93	To be determined	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, and DTSC

Nonattendee Distribution

R. Green/Code 0232.RG	File - CTO Notebook/PMO
M. Nuzum/Code 1813.MN	File - PMO
K. Tomeo/CH2M HILL	File - CH2M HILL

**Long Beach Naval Complex
RI/FS Work Plan**

ID	Name	Duration	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish	Predecessors	Resource No.	Oct '92	Nov '92	Dec '92	Jan '93	Feb '93	Mar '93	Apr '93	May '93	Jun '93	Jul '93	Aug '93	Sep '93	Oct '93
1	Receive CTO	0d	Mon 11/9/92	Mon 11/9/92		N,C,R		◆											
2																			
3	Draft Work Plan	165d	Mon 11/9/92	Tue 7/6/93				◆											
4	Conceptual Model Development	4w	Mon 11/9/92	Tue 12/8/92	1	C		▨											
5	Initial Assessment	30d	Wed 12/9/92	Fri 1/22/93					▨										
6	Preliminary Risk Assessment	4w	Wed 12/9/92	Fri 1/8/93	4	C			▨										
7	Preliminary ARARs Evaluation	4w	Wed 12/9/92	Fri 1/8/93	4	C			▨										
8	Preliminary RA Evaluation	4w	Wed 12/23/92	Fri 1/22/93	6FF+2w,7FF+2w	C				▨									
9	Conclusions and Data Needs	2w	Mon 1/25/93	Fri 2/5/93	8	C					▨								
10	RI/FS Tasks	3w	Mon 2/8/93	Fri 2/26/93	9,42	C					▨								
11	FSP Preparation	4w	Thu 3/4/93	Wed 3/31/93	10,43	C						▨							
12	QAPP Preparation	4w	Thu 3/4/93	Wed 3/31/93	10,43	C						▨							
13	HSP Preparation	4w	Thu 3/4/93	Wed 3/31/93	10,43	C						▨							
14	Internal Review	2w	Thu 4/1/93	Wed 4/14/93	11,12,13	C							▨						
15	Draft Revision and Production	9d	Thu 4/15/93	Tue 4/27/93	14	C								▨					
16	Document Distribution	2d	Wed 4/28/93	Thu 4/29/93	15										▨				
17	Navy Review	30d	Fri 4/30/93	Fri 6/11/93		N										◆			
18	NS Review	2w	Fri 4/30/93	Thu 5/13/93	16	N											▨		
19	NYS Review	4w	Fri 4/30/93	Thu 5/27/93	16	N												▨	
20	SWDIV Review	6w	Fri 4/30/93	Fri 6/11/93	16	N													▨
21	Regulatory Review	60ed	Fri 4/30/93	Tue 6/29/93	16	R													▨
22	Navy/Regulatory Comment Submittal	1w	Tue 6/29/93	Tue 7/6/93	17,21	N,R													▨
23	TRC Mailing	1w	Fri 4/30/93	Thu 5/6/93	16	N													▨
24	TRC Review	4w	Fri 5/7/93	Thu 6/3/93	23	T													▨
25	TRC Comment Submittal	1d	Fri 6/4/93	Fri 6/4/93	24	T													▨
26	TRC Meeting	1d	Mon 6/7/93	Mon 6/7/93	25	N,R,T													▨
27																			

Project: Long Beach
Date: 10/23/92

Critical
 Noncritical
 Progress
 Milestone
 Summary
 Rolled Up

Draft Schedule

7/26(3)

**Long Beach Naval Complex
RI/FS Work Plan**

ID	Name	Duration	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish	Predecessors	Resource N:	Oct '92	Nov '92	Dec '92	Jan '93	Feb '93	Mar '93	Apr '93	May '93	Jun '93	Jul '93	Aug '93	Sep '93	Oct '93
46	CRP and Fact Sheet	115d	Mon 11/9/92	Fri 4/23/93															
47	Draft CRP	85d	Mon 11/9/92	Fri 3/12/93															
48	Preparation	8w	Mon 11/9/92	Fri 1/8/93	1														
49	Internal Review	2w	Mon 1/11/93	Fri 1/22/93	48														
50	Document Revision and Production	2w	Mon 1/25/93	Fri 2/5/93	49														
51	Navy/Agency Review	5w	Mon 2/8/93	Fri 3/12/93	50														
52	Final CRP	10d	Mon 3/15/93	Fri 3/26/93															
53	Preparation	2w	Mon 3/15/93	Fri 3/26/93	51														
54	Submittal	0d	Fri 3/26/93	Fri 3/26/93	53														
55	Draft Fact Sheet	20d	Mon 3/15/93	Fri 4/9/93															
56	Preparation	2w	Mon 3/15/93	Fri 3/26/93	51														
57	Internal Review	1w	Mon 3/29/93	Fri 4/2/93	56														
58	Document Revision and Production	1w	Mon 4/5/93	Fri 4/9/93	57														
59	Navy/Agency Review	0d	Fri 4/9/93	Fri 4/9/93	58														
60	Final Fact Sheet	10d	Mon 4/12/93	Fri 4/23/93															
61	Preparation	2w	Mon 4/12/93	Fri 4/23/93	59														
62	Submittal	0d	Fri 4/23/93	Fri 4/23/93	61														
63																			
64	Public Meeting (Prepare and Conduct)	4w	Mon 4/26/93	Fri 5/21/93	62														
65																			
66	Administrative Record	75d	Mon 11/9/92	Fri 2/26/93															
67	Records Search/Draft Files	4w	Mon 11/9/92	Tue 12/8/92	1														
68	Navy Review	1w	Wed 12/9/92	Tue 12/15/92	67														
69	Prepare Draft AR File Index	3w	Wed 12/16/92	Fri 1/8/93	68														
70	Navy/Agency Review	5w	Mon 1/11/93	Fri 2/12/93	69														
71	Prepare Final AR File Index	2w	Mon 2/15/93	Fri 2/26/93	70														
72	Submit Final AR File Index	0d	Fri 2/26/93	Fri 2/26/93	71														

Project: Long Beach
Date: 10/23/92

Critical

Noncritical

Progress

Milestone

Summary


Rollled Up

Draft Schedule

**Long Beach Naval Complex
RI/FS Work Plan**

ID	Name	Duration	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish	Predecessors	Resource N:	Oct '92	Nov '92	Dec '92	Jan '93	Feb '93	Mar '93	Apr '93	May '93	Jun '93	Jul '93	Aug '93	Sep '93	Oct '93
28	Final Work Plan	56d	Wed 7/14/93	Fri 10/1/93															
29	Preparation	4w	Wed 7/14/93	Tue 8/10/93	44,25	C													
30	Internal Review	1w	Wed 8/11/93	Tue 8/17/93	29	C													
31	Final Revision, Production, Distribution	2w	Wed 8/18/93	Tue 8/31/93	30	C													
32	Navy Review	10d	Wed 9/1/93	Wed 9/15/93		N													
33	NS Review	2w	Wed 9/1/93	Wed 9/15/93	31	N													
34	NSY Review	2w	Wed 9/1/93	Wed 9/15/93	31	N													
35	SWDIV	2w	Wed 9/1/93	Wed 9/15/93	31	N													
36	Regulatory Review	30ed	Wed 9/1/93	Fri 10/1/93	31	R													
37	Navy/Regulatory Approval	0d	Fri 10/1/93	Fri 10/1/93	36	N,R													
38																			
39	Project Managers Meetings	161d	Fri 11/20/92	Tue 7/13/93															
40	Initial Scoping	1d	Fri 11/20/92	Fri 11/20/92	1	N,R,C													
41	Conceptual Model Review	1d	Thu 12/17/92	Thu 12/17/92	4	N,R,C													
42	Initial Evaluation Review	2d	Tue 1/28/93	Wed 1/27/93	5	N,R,C													
43	Data Needs/Tasks Review	2d	Tue 3/2/93	Wed 3/3/93	10	N,R,C													
44	Comment Resolution	1d	Tue 7/13/93	Tue 7/13/93	22FF+1w	N,R,C													
45																			

Project: Long Beach
Date: 10/23/92

Critical 
 Noncritical 
 Progress 
 Milestone 
 Summary 
 Rolled Up 

Draft Schedule

RI/FS Project Managers' Meetings RI/FS Work Plans Naval Complex Long Beach			
5 November 1992			
Meeting	Date	Location	Participants
Initial Scoping	11/20/92	NAVSTA, Long Beach	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, NAVSTA Long Beach, LBNSY, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Conceptual Model Review	12/17/92	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Initial Evaluation Review	1/26/93 1/27/93	DTSC	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Data Needs/Task Review	3/2/93 3/3/93	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, DTSC, and DTSC Technical Staff
Comment Resolution	7/13/93	To be determined	CH2M HILL, SOUTHWESTDIV, and DTSC