



**TETRA TECH**

C-NAVY-06-07-2400W

June 6, 2007

Project Number G00632

Mr. James Colter  
Remedial Project Manager  
NAVFAC Mid-Lant  
9742 Maryland Avenue  
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-3095

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-03-D-0057  
Contract Task Order No. 65

Subject: RPM Meeting Notes and Summary May 16, 2007  
NAVSTA Newport, Newport, Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Colter:

Attached for your records are the final notes and summary of the RPM meeting held for the NAVSTA Newport IR Program on May 16, 2007. These notes were revised based on comments received from USEPA on March 29, 2007. No comments were received from RIDEM.

This material is being provided to the recipients on the copy list below for their records. If you have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Stephen S. Parker, LSP  
Project Manager

SSP/rp

Enclosure

c: K. Keckler, USEPA (2, w/encl.)  
P. Kulpa, RIDEM (2, w/encl.)  
C. Mueller, NAVSTA (2, w/encl.)  
J. Stump, Gannett Fleming (1, w/encl.)  
J. Trepanowski, TtNUS (1, w/encl.)  
G. Glenn, TtNUS (1, w/encl.)  
File G00632-3.2 (w/o encl.) File G00632-8.0 (1, w/encl.)

**Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.**

55 Jonspin Road, Wilmington, MA 01887-1020  
Tel 978 658 7899 Fax 978 658 7870 www.ttnus.com

**Meeting Notes**  
**RPMs Meeting, May 16, 2007**  
**NAVSTA Newport, Newport Rhode Island**

The meeting convened at 3:00 PM

Refer to attachments provided by S. Parker at the meeting:

- Agenda
- RPM Document Tracking Sheets dated 5/18/07
- Draft Field Schedule for NUSC
- Summary of Comments from Derecktor Revised FS.

Present:       Kymberlee Keckler, USEPA  
                  Paul Kulpa, RIDEM  
                  Jim Colter, NAVFAC  
                  Cornelia Mueller, NAVSTA  
                  Steve Parker, TtNUS  
                  Diane Baxter, TtNUS

**1.       Site 1, McAllister Point Landfill**

S. Parker noted that ECC had provided several monitoring reports for McAllister Long Term monitoring. These include:

- Final 2005 Annual Monitoring Report (Landfill Gas and Groundwater) (April 2007)
- Draft Round 2 (2005) Sediment Monitoring Report (April 2006)
- Draft Round 3 (2006) Sediment Monitoring Report (April 2007)
- Draft 2006 Annual Monitoring Report (Landfill Gas and Groundwater) (April 2007)

The deliverables list will be updated to reflect these document submittals. The Navy will anticipate comments on the three draft documents 45 days from the submittal date of April 18, 2007.

K. Keckler noted her concern with late deliverables from ECC. She asked J. Colter to stress to ECC the importance of meeting the LTM Report schedules so that they can be reviewed and any required actions be taken in a timely manner. J. Colter noted that ECC's contract will be ending soon, and depending on when it can be resolicited, there may be a gap in the reporting process.

The discussion was tabled until the correspondence could be reviewed, and further interpretations of the regulations made if necessary. A meeting on this specific topic may be required.

K. Keckler again noted the need for an explanation of significant difference for the McAllister ROD to add institutional controls to the cap that would prevent future intrusion.

J. Colter noted his action item to develop a schedule for the ESD. It was noted that this is an item to be dealt with using a base instruction. C. Mueller stated that the draft Master Plan is due in August 2007. The instruction will be issued base-wide but will not be included in the base master plan. She noted that she will have the instruction completed and signed by the CO by the July RPM meeting.

## **2. Site 8, NUSC Disposal Area**

J. Colter noted that a record of conversation had been provided and then updated to describe the resolution of the method to collect benthic diversity samples (resolution reached in 4/24/07 conference call). P. Kulpa noted that he had received both but offered no further comment on the subject.

S. Parker stated that the field investigation will start soon (5/21/07), and that a tentative field schedule will be forwarded (post script – the field schedule had to be delayed, and will be forwarded as soon as possible).

## **3. Site 09, Old Fire Fighting Training Area**

S. Parker noted that the response to comments to the Draft Removal Action Work Plan and the draft final Work plan were in final preparation and would be issued as soon as the end of the week (5/18/07).

S. Parker attempted to recap the discussion held on the conference call 5/1/07 to discuss the revetment. He stated that the revetment was purposely extended seaward to accommodate a request by EPA and RIDEM to address ecological PRG exceedances in sediment near the shoreline. He also stated that while the Revetment may not need to extend that far, if sediment is to be excavated there, it should be covered with a material that will prevent further erosion.

S. Parker also noted that there is a misconception on the material that is currently present at the shoreline of the site. S. Parker explained that there are two portions of the shoreline, west and east, which are completely different environments due to the open water distance (fetch) that opposes each. It was recognized that the revetment material will need to be different for each of these. P. Kulpa stated that the revetment should replace the existing material with in-kind (size) material.

It was agreed that a site walk should be done (including RI CRMC and other stake holders) and this could be scheduled when the comments to the 30% revetment design are received. Both EPA and RIDEM agreed they would be providing comments on the design.

## **4. Sites 12 and 13, Tank Farms 4 and 5**

J. Colter stated that the Closeout Report for Sludge Disposal Trenches and Review Areas at Tank Farms 4 and 5 submitted on February 28, 2007 will not be revised and is considered a final. TtNUS will be preparing a data gaps assessment and plan for risk assessment to proceed on this site, which is anticipated for early June 2007.

## **5. Site 17, Gould Island**

J. Colter stated that the work plan for the Phase 2 RI and Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment is being scoped and may be funded in 2007, though the field work would not be commence until 2008. He wants to be sure that the contracting actions are in place for continued work through 2008. All appeared to be in agreement with this approach.

## **6. UXO Site 1, Carr Point**

J. Colter noted that the name for the site will need to be revised from IR Site 22 to UXO Site 1, as it is actually in the Munitions Response Program, different from the IR Program. He noted that under the MRP, all SI studies need to be completed by 2010 and Carr Point is on track for that goal. The SI work plan and field work is being scoped now, and the Navy anticipates an award to TtNUS shortly. S. Parker will update the action items list when the scope is approved.

## **7. Site 21, Melville Water Tower**

J. Colter noted that the construction effort will be awarded soon to keep the project on schedule requested by the School (construction over the summer break). He noted that document review cannot hold back the construction action, which is to remove the soil containing lead from the tower. The goal may not be to close the site out after the summer construction action (though that would be great) but to be sure that this construction effort is not delayed beyond late August.

P. Kulpa asked if confirmation samples would include analysis for arsenic. S. Parker stated that the excavation is being done to clean up to a lead standard. Since lead is the primary hazardous ingredient of the paint, if the lead standard is met, then all the contaminants from the paint will have been addressed. P. Kulpa stated that one of the soil samples contained over 1300 mg/kg arsenic, so why wouldn't the Navy consider this a paint component. S. Parker agreed that paint contains other metals as well, but reiterated that if the paint is cleaned up as indicated by lead, then the arsenic from the paint will also be resolved. (RIDEM report shows this result was co-located with a lead concentration of 28,000 mg/kg of lead).

RIDEM stated that they would also like arsenic sampled in the confirmation samples. S. Parker stated that he expects to see arsenic above 7 mg/kg in these soils due to background. Previous soil data shows elevated concentrations under the tower and nearby. J. Colter stated the Navy will not clean up a background condition. P. Kulpa stated this would be a comment on the submittals for the project. P. Kulpa also stated that RIDEM would request that confirmatory samples also include analysis for chromium, copper, and cadmium.

K. Keckler suggested that to satisfy P. Kulpa's request for analysis of additional metals, RIDEM and EPA could collect "split" samples and analyze them for the additional metals. P. Kulpa stated that he thought that RIDEM could only collect "split" samples if Navy was analyzing for the same constituents. Others did not think that was a requirement. Resolution was not reached on this issue.

P. Kulpa also stated that the elevated lead level identified from the soil sample by the road near the school entrance should be addressed (excavated) as well. S. Parker stated that the lead in this area is likely present due to road contamination and does not appear to be a result of the tower. J. Colter expressed the concern that if this spot was excavated it would lead to excavating farther along the roadway (as sidewalk samples continue to show roadway-related contamination).

J. Colter stated that these issues cannot hold up the project, it must go forward per the schools schedule. K. Keckler stated that the Navy can conduct the action voluntarily, and Jim reiterated that the goal is not to close out the site, but to get the highly contaminated soil away from the school yard through the removal action proposed.

## **8. Site 19, Former Derecktor Shipyard**

D. Baxter noted the receipt of comments from EPA and RIDEM on the Revised Draft FS for the site. A summary table was prepared and distributed to highlight the major points in the comments letters (Attached).

D. Baxter requested that RIDEM's comments on ARARs in the FS need to specifically state the specific section(s) of the regulations that are requested to be included as ARARs. The regulations should not be cited as a whole, but individual sections identified and how they apply to the Action, Location, or Chemical-specific categories as appropriate. D. Baxter stated and K. Keckler confirmed that individual ARARs apply to one category (action, location or chemical-specific), not all types as stated in RIDEM's comments.

K. Keckler noted that RIDEM is supposed to give EPA their recommendations for ARARs and meet with them on that topic. P. Kulpa noted this could be done.

Discussion items relate to the attachment provided

1. EPA and RIDEM agreed that the on shore human health risk needs to be completed, and EPA stated that it should be incorporated into the existing FS, leaving one FS for the entire site. P. Kulpa stated that he would have to check to see if his management would allow this approach. There was discussion about whether a residential exposure scenario (for human health risk) will be needed and that the site must meet residential risk criteria or a land use control will have to be established to keep the site commercial and industrial. D. Baxter indicated that this may not be consistent with other sites, and J. Colter stated that Navy policy is to clean up to existing and reasonable future property use. D. Baxter noted that including the onshore risk assessment and onshore remedial alternatives in the revised FS will delay the submittal of the draft final document. K. Keckler stated that she understood that next version of the FS would be delayed, but believed that the addressing the site as a whole (onshore and offshore) in the FS and decision documents would be the most efficient and timely way to close out the site.

The Navy agreed to prepare a plan for the human health risk assessment in the onshore area, including proposed exposure scenarios and assumptions, and submit it for review before continuing work on the FS.

2. Which data to use for the FS was discussed at length. It was recognized that if the sediments are dynamic and can be moved via currents and prop wash, the sediment data only represents a snapshot in time, and from year to year concentrations at each location may change. Because of this it was recommended that the PDI include a preliminary step of revisiting all the previous sampling stations to determine the stations exceeding PRGs and then conducting additional sampling in a grid around the stations where exceedances of the PRGs are found to further define the areas requiring remedial action.

As a result of the agreement on the PDI approach, it was agreed that in the FS, the 2004 data would be used to estimate the area and volume requiring remediation, except for stations that were not resampled in 2004 – the most recent previous data would be used for the other stations. D. Baxter pressed the point that the reviewers should not get hung up on the estimated volumes and areas to be remediated presented in the FS because the final volumes and areas will be based on the PDI results. If there is agreement on the PRGs and on the actions to be evaluated, then the alternatives are evaluated equally based on a baseline volume and unit cost (+50% and -30%).

3. PRGs were never agreed to by RIDEM, do we all move forward anyway? K. Keckler stated it is up to Jim to determine if the Navy wants to invoke a formal dispute at this time to address RIDEM's disagreement with the PRGs.

EPA's comments indicated that the PRGs had to be evaluated to demonstrate that they are protective of early life exposure in accordance with USEPA's new policy guidance for assessing susceptibility from early-life exposure to carcinogens. K. Keckler stated that the new guidance applies to this project because it has not reached the ROD yet. D. Baxter asked for clarification on how the evaluation of PRGs should be conducted, i.e. recalculate the PRG for benzo(a)pyrene only or calculate new PRGs for all carcinogens to see whether new COCs are identified. K. Keckler agreed to talk to the EPA Risk Assessor and provide Navy further guidance (completed 5/18/07).

#### Secondary Issues:

1. P. Kulpa stated he would check to determine if state has jurisdiction that would apply to closing the affected area to lobster collections
2. K. Keckler and P. Kulpa explained that shellfish (bivalves) are sometimes relocated from closure to non-closure areas if the closures are related to bacterial issues (red tide), because the bacteria are naturally flushed from the shellfish once placed in clean water. Because the site contaminants would not be flushed from the shellfish, it was agreed that language similar to that proposed by EPA (in 5/8/07 comments) will be included in the FS descriptions of the proposed ban on shellfishing.

3. D. Baxter will provide backup from the CRMC about whether contaminated sediment from a CERCLA site can be placed in the CAD cell and any criteria or testing requirements that the sediment must meet.
4. See Major Issue No. 1 above. The on shore soil risk assessment will be presented in an appendix to the FS.
5. Navy to evaluate whether to drop claims/predictions of natural attenuation or to incorporate them into a formal Monitored Natural Recovery (MNR) alternative conducted in accordance w/ EPA's MNA/MNR guidance. K. Keckler recommends not proposing a MNR alternative and removing discussion of natural attenuation from monitoring alternative (Alt. 2). K. Keckler also stated that if MNR is to be retained as an alternative, it needs to comply with EPA's remediation guidance, chapter 4. Source control, modeling to determine time to reach cleanup goals, and an evaluation of the natural processes affecting fate and transport need to be part of the analysis. Since the sediment is not stable as indicated by changes in concentrations, it is unlikely that this alternative will meet the 7 criteria in the FS.
6. Due to migration and life cycle patterns PRGs for and alternatives to prevent ingestion of lobster should be considered as uncertain at best.
7. See discussion above regarding ARARs - EPA will usually develop all of the ARARs tables. NCP states that the States need to provide their ARARs to EPA (40 CFR 300.400(g)). EPA and RIDEM may meet separately on this topic if RIDEM disagrees with EPA's FS comments on the State and Federal ARARs.
8. D. Baxter stated that several of RIDEM's comments on the FS pertained to the dewatering and water treatment methods proposed in the FS: the comments indicate that the less expensive methods used for the McAllister Point Landfill marine sediment remediation should be used here. D. Baxter explained that the technologies used for MPLF are not appropriate here because MPLF included land disposal of sediment and off shore disposal is the recommended disposal option for Derecktor. K. Keckler and P. Kulpa both state that the proposed methods are more complex and expensive than necessary for this project. D. Baxter agreed to review the proposed technologies and revise the FS if it is concluded that simpler technologies could be used.
9. D. Baxter stressed that the cost estimates provided in the FS are supposed to fall within an accuracy of +50 percent to -30 percent because the cost estimates are based on limited data and a conceptual understanding of each alternative. RIDEM's comments on numerous small details of the costs are not helpful to the FS and only delay the process. Small changes in the unit costs of these items will not have a large impact on the costs and will not alter the remedy selection because the cost differences between alternatives are very large (\$1.1M vs \$6.5M, vs \$13.8M). P. Kulpa explained that he requested backup data for the costs so that he can check the costs compared to cost estimates RIDEM (or their consultant) obtains from various vendors. S. Parker stated that the Navy provided the requested type of costing backup for a previous version of this report and the backup data was ignored; RIDEM still disagreed with the costs.

J. Colter pointed out that RIDEM did not need the Navy's costing backup in order to develop their own independent cost estimate. J. Colter stated that the Navy will not provide the requested backup data.

C. Mueller again stated that the cleaning of the Forrestal is going to be completed for the sink (or reef) exercise at the end of 2007, but funding is not in place to conduct the exercise. She also reported that the Saratoga has \$8M in funding of the \$10 M necessary to move it to Quonset for refit as a museum display, and hopes are that the remaining \$2M will be acquired. Ships may be moved in 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.

**AGENDA**  
**RPMs MEETING 5/16/07**  
**NAVSTA Newport IR Program**

**3PM-6PM Building 1, NAVSTA**

- 1. Site 1, McAllister:**
  - a. 2005 and 2006 monitoring reports are out.
  
- 2. Site 08, NUSC:**
  - a. Tentative schedule for RI field work
  
- 3. Site 09, OFFTA:**
  - a. Draft Final RA Work Plan
  - b. Revetment Conceptual Design
  - c. Revised FS
  
- 4. Sites 12/13 Tank Farms 4 and 5:**
  - a. Data gaps for risk assessment
  
- 5. Site 17 Gould Island:**
  - a. BERA Work plan anticipated to be funded FY 07.
  
- 6. Site 19, Derecktor:**
  - a. Comments on Revised Draft FS report – need discussion.
  
- 7. Site 21, Melville Water Tower:**
  - a. Document review cycles

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

Revised: 5/10/2007

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
<b>Site 1 McAllister Point</b>	<b>Long Term Monitoring 2003 (ECC)</b>					
	Final 2003 Report	1/10/2004	NA	10/1/2004		
	<b>Long Term Monitoring 2004 (ECC)</b>					
	Final 2004 Report (Air and Groundwater)	1/10/2005	NA	1/10/2005		
	<b>LONG TERM MONITORING 2004 (Marine Sed) (TINUS)</b>					
	Final 2004 Report (Marine Sediment)	9/5/2005	NA	3/9/2006		
	<b>LONG TERM MONITORING WORK PLAN (incorporates LF Gas, GW, and Marine Sed) (TINUS)</b>					
	EPA corresp on draft LTM work plan	NA	NA	8/31/2005		
	RIDEM Corresp On draft LTM work plan	NA	NA	9/6/2005		
	Final LTM Work Plan	10/18/2005	10/18/2005	10/18/2005		
	RIDEM Notice to enter dispute on LTM Work Plan	NA	NA	11/14/2005		
	Navy response to RIDEM letter	NA	NA	1/6/2006		States that addendum paragraphs will be provided, but that RIDEM does not have jurisdiction on LTM completion
	Draft Addendum to the Final LTM work plan	---	---	1/8/2007		RIDEM Letter 3/19/07 - Need discussion
	Final Addendum to the Final LTM work plan	---	---			
	<b>Long Term Monitoring for 2005: Air and Groundwater (ECC)</b>					
	Final LTM Report for 2005	5/3/2006		4/18/2007	90 days after receipt of comments	
	<b>Long Term Monitoring for 2006: Air and Groundwater (ECC)</b>					
	Draft LTM Report for 2006	2/28/2007		4/18/2007		
	Comments from Regulators				45 days after receipt of draft document	
	Comment Resolution				45 days after receipt of comments	
	Final LTM Report for 2006	5/31/2007			90 days after receipt of comments	
	<b>Long Term Monitoring Marine Sediment 2005 (ECC)</b>					
	Draft LTM Marine Sed report for 2005	2/28/2007		4/18/2007		
	Comments from Regulators				45 days after receipt of draft document	
Comment Resolution				45 days after receipt of comments		
Final LTM Marine Sed Report for 2006	5/31/2007			90 days after receipt of comments		

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
<b>Site 1 McAllister Point (Continued)</b>	<b>Long Term Monitoring Marine Sediment 2006 (ECC)</b>					
	Draft LTM Marine Sed report for 2006	2/28/2007		4/18/2007		
	Comments from Regulators					45 days after receipt of draft document
	Comment Resolution					45 days after receipt of comments
	Final LTM Marine Sed Report for 2006	5/31/2007				90 days after receipt of comments
	<b>AIR MODELING (TINUS)</b>					
	Navy Assessment of Air monitoring data	11/11/2005	11/11/2005	11/11/2005		Resubmitted
	RIDEM Evaluation of data	12/11/2005	12/11/2005	---		RIDEM action, clarified in email from C Frye 5/22/06 Evaluation never received as of 1/10/07
	Screening Air Model	---	---	---		Funding moved to Melville Water tower
	ITEM COMPLETE	---	---	---		Navy opted to not pursue air model, data collection continuing under LTM until next 5 year review
	<b>EELGRASS RESTORATION (Battelle)</b>					
	Draft Technical Memorandum, Eelgrass Restoration	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/22/2006		
Final Completion Report	12/12/2006	12/12/2006	11/27/2006	60 Days after receipt of comments		
<b>Site 2 Melville North Landfill</b>	<b>GROUNDWATER MONITORING (TINUS)</b>					
	Submit Draft Round 3 Monitoring report	10/15/2004	10/15/2004	10/15/2004	NA	
	RIDEM Letter, Comments on monitoring report	NA	NA	7/1/2005	NA	Letter states that sheens constitute free product Please see Navy letter to RIDEM defining position on sheens 11/6/06, see Site 9
	Navy Response to RIDEM comment letter	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	RIDEM Response Letter	NA	NA	1/21/2007		RIDEM Response on Sheens, See Site 09
<b>Site 4 Coddington Cove Rubble Fill Area</b>	<b>PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT (TINUS)</b>					
	Preliminary Assessment Report, Coddington Cove	4/14/2005	4/14/2005	4/14/2005		
	Comments on Preliminary Assessment Report	5/14/2005	5/14/2005	5/16/2005	30 days after receipt of report	EPA comments 5/16/05, RIDEM comments 5/27/05
	Draft SASE Work Plan	TBD	TBD	---		Low Priority - Planned FY10

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
Site 8 NUSC Disposal Area	<b>RI WORK PLAN (TINUS)</b>					
	Submit Draft RI Work Plan	2/3/2006		2/3/2006		
	Submit Draft Final RI work Plan	6/15/2006		6/29/2006	90 days after receipt of comments	
	Submit final RI work plan	9/26/2006		---	60 days after receipt of comments	
	Submit final RI work plan REV 1	NA		10/6/2006	Not Anticipated	Minor revisions to HHRA section of work plan
	Submit final RI work plan REV 2	1/15/2007	NA	1/5/2007	Not Anticipated	Based on conference call 11/3/06 and resolution 11/15/06
	<b>ITEM COMPLETE</b>					
	<b>Drum Removal Report (TIN&amp;Assoc)</b>					
	Draft Drum Removal Report	6/26/2006		6/26/2006		
	Submit Final Drum Removal Report	10/30/2006		1/12/2007	Secondary Document	EPA approved 1/19/07
	<b>ITEM COMPLETE</b>					
	<b>NUSC Background Report (TINUS)</b>					
	Submit Draft Background Report	4/17/2006		4/17/2006		
	Submit Revised Report	8/31/2006		9/5/2006	90 days after receipt of comments	
	Concurrence on Final	10/5/2006		10/2/2006	30 days after submittal of final document	EPA concurs - 10/2/06, RIDEM - requests southern fill area delineated
	RIDEM Letter Clarification on Southern Fill Area	NA	NA	3/21/2007	NA	Map Showing southern fill area as to be determined Map to be appended to meeting notes 3/21/07
	<b>ITEM COMPLETE</b>					
	<b>REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION</b>					
	Fieldwork Scoping Mig & Site Walk	NA	12/19/2006	12/19/2006	As agreed 11/15/06	Complete - RIDEM requested Fill and pipes be investigated in RI
	Initiate Field Work NUSC RI	NA	NA	TBD		Anticipated field start 5/21/07

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
Site 9 Old Fire Fighting Training Area	<b>Action Memorandum For Soil Removal (TINUS)</b>					
	Draft Action Memo for Soil Removal Actions	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	9/21/2006		
	Comments to Draft Action memo	10/21/2006	10/21/2006	11/7/2006	30 days after draft doc	EPA Comments 10/31/06, RIDEM Comments 11/7/06
	Resolution of Comments	12/7/2006	12/1/2006	12/1/2006	30 days after comments received	EPA 12/24/06, RIDEM 1/9/07
	Final Action Memo	12/21/2006	12/21/2006	2/9/2007	60 days after comments received	Signed 1/15/07, sent out 2/9/07, TINUS Cover Letter
	<b>Sheens Letter (TINUS)</b>					
	Navy Position on NAPL and Sheens	NA	NA	11/6/2006		Defines position on Melville and OFFTA, Tank Farms
	RIDEM Response to Navy Letter	NA	NA	1/21/2007		RIDEM position on NAPL
	Revised FS for Site 09 will close this loop					
	<b>Recreational Land Use Clarification (TINUS)</b>					
	Navy Letter clarifying recreational land use	NA	NA	11/6/2006		Defines state criteria applicable to the site
	RIDEM Response to Navy Letter	NA	NA	1/19/2006		RIDEM position on Recreational use and Land Use Controls
	Navy Letter 3/16/07	NA	NA	3/16/2007	Letter indicates concurrence on this matter, Revised FS will close this loop	Item Closed
	<b>Removal Action Work Plan (TINUS)</b>					
	Draft Removal Action Work Plan	1/2/2007	1/2/2007	1/10/2007		
	Comments to Draft Removal Action Work Plan	2/16/2007	2/16/2007	2/26/2007	45 days after receipt of draft document Actual is date email recv'd by RIDEM	EPA letter dated 1/29/07, RIDEM letter dated 2/23/07
	Response to comments, Draft RA Work Plan	3/29/2007	3/29/2007	5/11/2007	45 days after receipt of comments	Draft response will be issued prior to 3/21/07 Will discuss at RPMs Meeting 3/21
	Draft Final RA Work Plan	6/12/2007	6/12/2007	5/11/2007	90 days after receipt of comments	
	Concurrence on Draft Final RA Work Plan	7/11/2007	7/11/2007	---	30 days after draft final doc	
	Final RA Work Plan	8/9/2007	8/9/2007	---	60 days after draft final doc	
	<b>Public Outreach OFFTA Removal Action</b>					
	RAB presentation by Tiger Team Rep	--	---	1/17/2007		
	Draft Fact Sheet Update	1/17/2007	---	1/15/2007		Handed out at RPMs meeting, Official version sent out 1/29/07
	Comments to Draft Fact Sheet Update	1/30/2007	---	3/12/2007	15 days	EPA Comments 2/26/07, RIDEM comments 3/12/07
	Final Fact Sheet Update	2/15/2007	---	5/1/2007	15 days	

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
Site 9 Old Fire Fighting Training Area (Continued)	<del>Revetment Design (TINUS)</del>					
	30% Design	TBD	---	5/1/2007		
	Comments to the 30% design	6/15/2007	---	---	45 days after receipt of document	
	Response to comment 30% Design	7/30/2007	--	---	45 days after receipt of comments	
	90% Design	9/15/2007	---	---	90 days after receipt of comments	
	Comments to the 90% design	10/15/2007	---	---	30 days after 90% doc	
	Response to comment, 90% Design	11/15/2007	---	---	60 days after 90% doc	
	Resolution of comments	11/15/2007	---	---		
	100% Design	12/15/2007	---	---		
	<del>Revised FS (TINUS)</del>					
	Draft FS Revision 1 Report	5/25/2007	---	---		Anticipate 6/25/07
	Comments to the Draft FS Revision 1 Report	TBD	---	---	45 days after receipt of document	
	Response to Comments, Draft FS Revision 1 Report	TBD	-	---	45 days after receipt of comments	
	Resolution of Comments, Draft FS revision 1 Report	TBD	---	---	30 days after response to comments	
	Final FS Revision 1 Report	TBD	---	---	30 days after resolution of comments	
Site 12 Tank Farm 4	<del>Site Closure Report (ITEC)</del>					
	Draft Report	10/20/2006	10/20/2006	10/20/2006		
	Draft Final report	1/18/2007	1/18/2007	3/14/2007	60 days after receipt of comments	Discuss 3/21/07
	Final Report	5/15/2007	NA	2/28/2007		Date of Navy Letter
	<del>Data Gaps Analysis (TINUS)</del>					
	Draft Technical Memorandum on Data Gaps For RA	6/3/2007	---	---		Anticipated 6/3/07
	Comments to Draft Tech Memo on Data Gaps	7/18/2007	---	---	45 days after receipt of document	
	Response to Comments to Draft Tech Memo	8/18/2007	---	---	30 days after receipt of comments	
	Final Tech Memo on Data Gaps	9/18/2007	---	---	60 days after receipt of comments	
	Additional Field Work, Data Gaps	TBD	---	---		

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
Site 13 Tank Farm 5	<b>Site Closure Report (TTEC)</b>					
	Draft Report	10/20/2006	10/20/2006	10/20/2006		
	Draft Final report	1/18/2007	1/18/2007	3/14/2007	60 days after receipt of comments	Discuss 3/21/07
	Final Report	5/15/2007	NA	2/28/2007		Date of Navy Letter
	<b>Data Gaps Analysis (TINUS)</b>					
	Draft Technical Memorandum on Data Gaps For RA	6/3/2007	---	---		Anticipated 6/3/07
	Comments to Draft Tech Memo on Data Gaps	7/18/2007	-	---	45 days after receipt of document	
	Response to Comments to Draft Tech Memo	8/18/2007	---	---	30 days after receipt of comments	
	Final Tech Memo on Data Gaps	9/18/2007	---	---	60 days after receipt of comments	
	Additional Field Work, Data Gaps	TBD	--	---		
	<b>Tanks 53 and 56 (TINUS)</b>					
	Draft Round 5 Groundwater report	10/30/2004	---	10/30/2004		
	Final Round 5 Report	3/25/2005	---	3/30/2005	60 days after receipt of comments	
	EPA Letter on NFA recommendation	NA	---	4/22/2005		EPA concurs w/ NFA
	Discussion on how to proceed to ROD	9/21/2006	9/21/2006	9/21/2006	Meeting at NAVSTA	Agreed to hold on ROD until whole site is addressed
	<b>OU COMPLETE - PICK UP ACTION WITH SITE CLOSURE REPORT FROM TTEC ABOVE</b>					
	Site 17 Gould Island Building 32	<b>Remedial Investigation Report (TINUS)</b>				
Draft RI report		3/30/2006	3/30/2006	5/12/2006		
Draft Final RI report		9/30/2006	9/30/2006	10/25/2006	90 days after receipt of comments	
Final RI Report		12/25/2006	12/25/2006	12/29/2006	60 days after draft final doc	
<b>ITEM COMPLETE</b>						
<b>Phase 2 RI and Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment</b>						
Maps Deliverable for RIDEM		NA	NA	12/29/2006	Anticipate 12/15/06	In accordance with RIDEM comment to draft RI report
Technical Meeting to Discuss Phase 2 RI and BERA		1/18/2007	1/18/2007	---		Agreement at November 15 RPMs meeting
Draft Phase 2 RI and BERA work Plan		TBD	TBD	---		Budgeted for FY 07
Phase 2 RI and Baseline ERA Field Work		TBD	TBD	---		Anticipated FY 08

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
Site 19  Former Derecktor Shipyard	Feasibility Study For Marine Sediment (TINUS)					
	Disputed FS from April 1999	---	---	7/29/1999		Refer to meeting minutes 4/27/1999 and response to comments on Draft Final FS 4/16/1999
	Meeting to discuss PRGs and Marine Sediment FS	---	---	11/15/2006		Addressed issues at November 15 RPM meeting
	Draft Marine Sediment FS REV 1	2/20/2007	---	3/15/2007		Anticipate 4/3/07 to EPA and RIDEM
	Comments to the Draft Marine Sed FS Revision 1	5/6/2007	---	5/8/2007		45 days after receipt of draft document
	Response to comments, FS Comment Resolution	6/21/2007	---	---		45 days after receipt of comments
	Draft Final Marine Sediment FS Revision 1	TBD	---	---		90 days after receipt of comments EPA request to conduct on-shore HHRA will delay submittal
	Sandblast Grit Removal (TTEC)					
	Draft EECA for Sandblast Grit Removal			7/11/2006		
	Public Comment Period starts			7/19/2006	30 day comment period	No comments
	Comments to Draft EECA			8/25/2006	45 days after draft submittal	EPA - 7/31/06, RIDEM 11/9/06 (comments to be incorporated into RA work plan)
	Final EECA for Sandblast Grit Removal	10/10/2006		10/10/2006		EPA concurs 10/18/06, RIDEM comments 11/9/06 (ARAR Comment to be incorporated into RA work plan)
	Action Memo For Removal	11/10/2006	11/10/2006	11/10/2006		EPA concurs 12/4/06, RIDEM no comments received
	Action memo signed by NAVSTA CO			11/16/2006		
	Draft Removal Action Work Plan	---	---	1/12/2007	secondary document	
	Comments to Draft RA Work Plan	2/26/2007	---	---	45 days from delivery of draft	EPA letter of 1/19/07. RIDEM - No comments to date???
	Response to comments, Draft RA work plan	4/12/2007	--	---	45 days after receipt of comments	
	Comment Resolution to Draft RA Work Plan	5/28/2007	---	---	90 days after receipt of comments	
	Final RA Work Plan	6/28/2007	---	---		
	Building 62					
	Letter on Building 62 and IR Site Boundary			1/8/2007		
	DEREKTOR/DECISION/DOCS					
	Draft Proposed Plan	TBD	---	---		Per the RPM Meeting 1/17/07, decision documents will follow completion of the revised FS, and will address both the onshore portions of the site as well as the marine sediments. Planned dates for these deliverables will be determined after review of the revised FS (May 07)
	Comments to Draft Proposed Plan	TBD	---	---		
	Resolution on Comments to PRAP	TBD	---	---		
	Final Proposed Plan	TBD	---	--		
	Public Comment Period	TBD	---	---		
	Draft ROD	TBD	-	---		
Comments to Draft ROD	TBD	---	---			
Resolution on comments to Draft ROD	TBD	---	---			
Final ROD	TBD	---	---			

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
<b>Study Area 20 SWOS</b>	<b>Focused SI Report (TINUS)</b>					
	Final SWOS Focused SI report	6/1/2006		6/1/2006		Report concludes that SWOS will be addressed under Site 09 FS
	Concurrence on Report	7/1/2006		---	30 days after receipt of report	EPA 4/5/06 (concurrence on DF version) RIDEM comments 3/24 do not concur
	<b>SITE IS COMPLETE, ACTIONS TO BE CONDUCTED WITH OFFTA Administrative closeout is unnecessary</b>					
<b>Basewide Background</b>	<b>Basewide Background Soil Investigation (TINUS)</b>					
	Draft Work Plan	1/18/2006	1/18/2006	1/18/2006		
	Comments to Draft Work Plan	3/3/2006	3/3/2006	2/24/2006	45 days after receipt of draft document	EPA - 2/9/06, RIDEM - 2/29/06
	Response/ Resolution of Comments	4/10/2006	4/10/2006	NA	45 days after receipt of comments	
	Final Work Plan	5/25/2006	5/25/2006	5/12/2006	90 days after draft final doc	
	Response to Additional Comments	NA	NA	9/14/2006	not anticipated	Additional RIDEM comments 6/14/06, Response 9/15/06
	Field Investigation complete	2/28/2007	2/28/2007	3/30/2007		
	Internal Draft Report	4/30/2007	4/30/2007	---		Anticipated 6/15/07
<b>SA 21 Melville Water Tower</b>	<b>LEAD IN SOIL INVESTIGATION (TINUS)</b>					
	Site Notification Letter	TBD	TBD	1/11/2007		
	SI Field Sampling Plan	NA	NA	6/2/2006		
	Comments to Field Sampling Plan	NA	NA	6/19/2006		EPA 6/19/06, RIDEM 6/14/06
	Response to Comments	7/19/2006	7/19/2006	7/27/2006		
	Revised Field Sampling Plan	8/19/2006	8/19/2006	8/1/2006		
	Data summary report (to be identified as SASE)	11/17/2006	11/17/2006	11/21/2006		
	Comments on Data Summary report	12/21/2006	12/21/2006	1/18/2007	30 days after receipt of report	EPA 12/11/06, RIDEM 1/18/07
	Response to Comments	12/27/2006	12/27/2006	2/14/2007	30 days after receipt of comments	30 days from 1/18 is 2/19/07
	Final Data Summary Report	12/27/2006	12/27/2006	2/14/2007	30 days after receipt of comments	30 days from 1/18 is 2/19/07
	Fence	10/30/2006	10/30/2006	---	6 month lease	Temp Fence is renewed through Nov 1, 2007
	Open House to Present Report and Fact Sheet	5/1/2007	5/1/2007	5/1/2007		
	Draft Action Memo and RA Work Plan	5/14/2007				Anticipate 5/31
	Regulatory Review Complete	6/1/2007				
	Final Action memo and RA work plan	6/21/2007				
	Draft Removal Action Plans and Specs	5/31/2007				
	Regulatory Review Complete	6/14/2007				
	Final Removal Action Plans and Specs	6/19/2007				
	Begin Removal	7/5/2007				
	Complete Removal	8/17/2007				
T&D Complete	TBD	---	---			

**NAVSTA NEWPORT  
RPM DOCUMENT TRACKING AND 3-MONTH SCHEDULE PROJECTION**

SITE	ACTIVITY	PLANNED DUE DATE	AGREED- ON DATE	ACTUAL DATE	FFA DURATIONS	COMMENTS
<b>UXO Site 1 Carr Point</b>	<b>SITE INVESTIGATION</b>					
	Site Notification Letter	---	---	1/11/2007		
	Draft Site Investigation Work Plan	8/29/2007	---	---		Scoping in progress
	Comments to Draft SI Work Plan	10/12/2007	---	---		Scoping in progress
	Response to Comments	12/3/2007	--	---		Scoping in progress
	Draft Final SI Work Plan	1/11/2008	---	---		Scoping in progress
	Concurrence on Draft Final SI Work Plan	2/11/2008	---	---		Scoping in progress
	Final SI Work Plan	3/11/2008	---	---		Scoping in progress
	Instate Field Work	TBD	---	---		Scoping in progress
<b>RPM Meeting Notes</b>	Draft Notes to the Meeting 9/21/06	10/16/2006		---	2 weeks after meeting	Draft Sent to RIDEM and USEPA
	Final Notes to the Meeting 9/21/06	11/16/2006		11/16/2006		
	Draft Notes to the Meeting 11/15/06	11/30/2006		12/1/2006	2 weeks after meeting	No comments as of 1/5/07
	Final Notes to the Meeting 11/15/06	12/15/2006		1/8/2007		
	Draft Notes to the Meeting 1/17/07	1/30/2007		2/2/2007	2 weeks after meeting	No comments as of 3/2/07
	Final Notes to the Meeting 1/17/07	12/15/2006				

**TBD - To Be Determined**

**NA - Not Anticipated**

**Planned DUE DATES are based on SMP Durations unless noted.**

**Red text indicates not completed - dates show minimum 3-month projection**

**Yellow shading denotes item needs attention**