

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 25-26, 2000

INDIAN HEAD PARTNERING TEAM MEETING

RAMADA PLAZA

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

The Partnering Team meeting was held on October 25 through October 26, 2000, at the Ramada Plaza in downtown Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The following personnel attended the meeting on October 25, 2000:

Bob Root – CH2M HILL
Tony Tomlin – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Heidi Morgan – NSWC Indian Head
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Rob Sadorra - EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
John Fairbank – Maryland Department of the Environment/Tier II link

The following personnel attended the meeting on October 26, 2000:

Bob Root – CH2M HILL
Tony Tomlin – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Heidi Morgan – NSWC Indian Head
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Rob Sadorra - EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
John Fairbank – Maryland Department of the Environment/Tier II link

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: George Latulippe (host), Dennis Orenshaw, Curtis DeTore (chair), Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root (time keeper), Rob Sadorra, Shawn Jorgensen (member facilitator), Heidi Morgan (scribe), and John Fairbank (Tier 2 Link). Began meeting at 9 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

- **Review previous meeting's minutes**

The following revision was needed: correct spelling of John Trepanowski's name.

Two issues were discussed during the review time:

- The previous meeting's Meeting Evaluation needs to be reviewed at future partnering meetings.
- Progress reports need to be discussed at partnering meetings and included in the minutes. This will allow for the elimination of quarterly reports. The two-year plan report is still required. The two-year plan report for 2002-2003 will be due in September, instead of January. The 2001-2002 goals need to be discussed in the near future.

ACTION: Rob will talk to Armalia about the team goal submission date by 11/03.

ACTION: Rob will update team goals for 2001-2002 by 11/29.

- **Rob Sadorra – Fiscal Year 2001 Plan**

Handout was provided on Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 Planned Execution.

In FY 2000, approximately \$2.8 million was awarded. In FY 2001, approximately 2.9 million is planned for award, but this number may increase.

This may be the team's most critical year, because studies of high priority sites will be completed by end of 2001. The most critical project is the Towngut Landfill, Site 12. This project is moving into remedial action (RA). The RA is scheduled to be awarded in June/July, but may be vulnerable to late year budget cuts if it is delayed. Due to that possibility, the project needs to be moved along quickly so it can be awarded as soon as possible.

The team will start turning their attention to the Stump Neck Annex sites. Documents for the RCRA sites at the annex will need to be reviewed to restart the investigation process. The question came up as to whether some of the annex sites may come under the "range rule". Since the sites are considered inactive, they may not be covered by the rule.

In the coming years, more focus should be placed on clean-up efforts. Presently, approximately 50 percent of the budget is spent on clean-up efforts. In the future, the team should focus on clean-ups instead of studies. This should be easy to implement, because most of the priority site studies are complete or being completed.

- **LUNCH**
- **George Latulippe and Bob Root - Work Load Tool Discussion**

Handout was provided for the Work Load Tool (WLT). Pages 1 and 2 presented tasks sorted by comments-due-date and secondarily sorted by submission-due-date. Pages 3 and 4 showed tasks sorted by site.

Instead of having a separate goal schedule and WLT, the suggestion was made to combine the two schedules. This would allow the WLT to be used as part of the Tier II submissions. Tier II does not have a standard for the goal schedule, so this may be allowable. Tier II would like to see the 35 percent design tasks shown in the goals.

The publishing of the WLT was discussed. In future presentations, it will be published on 8.5x11 paper in a landscape style. This will make line items easier to read. As printed in portrait view, the lettering is too small.

There was a concern that a task or tasks may be missed in the sorting process. The solution is to maintain the tool and crosscheck the sort by comments-due-date and sort by submission-due-date pages.

The question was raised if the pages showing the sort by comments-due-date should show tasks that have no comments-due-date. A number of the tasks that do not have a comments-due-date have been completed or are not coming up in the near future. It was noted that the completed tasks (shaded items on the list) may need to be shown for Tier II reporting.

The original planned comments-due-date column needs to be completed in order for the WLT to be used in the Tier II reporting submission. The marker, NA, will be placed in the comments-due-date column for final document versions. Dates will need to be added only for new work; no need to add dates to completed tasks. Those line items that do not show specific tasks may be deleted. The WLT will be attached to the meeting minutes.

There will be one more iteration of the WLT. It will be discussed at the next meeting and probably finalized. Overheads of the WLT will be used as visual aides at the next meeting.

- **Shawn Jorgensen – Inclusion of Deliverables in Action Item List**

Currently, the CH2M HILL deliverables show up in the Action Items List, while Tetra Tech's deliverables do not. The suggestion was made that the WLT be used as a type of action items list for the deliverables. Action items in the minutes are generally quick turn-around tasks for team member(s). Deliverables do not fit that definition. Using the WLT as a type of action items list may create a disadvantage, because the team would need to review and maintain two lists. The WLT will be used for deliverables and the Action Items List used for quick, turn-around tasks.

As deliverable dates change during a meeting, the changes will be writing down in the same fashion as action items. During meeting closeout, the goals and deliverable dates will be discussed. The deliverable due-dates for submission and comments will be adjusted in the WLT as appropriate.

It was noted that the Action Items List needs to be standardized to say "core team" in the responsibility column. Currently, core team, core team members, core members, etc. are used.

ACTION: George to update WLT and provide to Tony by 11/10.

ACTION: Tony will update the WLT and provide to team by 11/29.

- **Bob Root – Update on Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 Remedial Investigation**

A handout was provided on the overheads shown during the discussion. The goal of the discussion was to relate results of groundwater sampling at Sites 11 and 21, review the recent field work, and discuss the RI report schedule.

Site 11: Explosive constituents without screening values were detected. The constituent concentrations are too low to be considered an explosive problem. Iron and Manganese were found at levels above the RBCs in many of the wells. A risk assessment will be completed on the site, but based on the data the site may not be a problem for human health.

TPH was found in the downgradient wells at levels below 100 ppm. Since the site was a waste disposal facility, the TPH exemption under CERCLA may not apply. Since the TPH was found at levels in the part per billion range it is probably not an issue, but the groundwater risks to humans may not be the driver; the effects on the stream are probably the driver. The stream effects are being looked at as part of the overall Mattawoman Creek Study. The TPH numbers can not be used in a risk assessment, so it may be hard to quantify TPH risks at all. Ecological toxicity tests will show if there is a toxicity to TPH; the testing will not show if there has been past degradation of the creek. Also, the testing will not show if there is a potential for future risks.

ACTION: Bob will check to see if diesel range organics (DRO) constituents were compared to sampling data for Site 11 (elements) by 11/29.

The team discussed the remedy for the Caffee Road Landfill. A presumptive remedy may be appropriate for the site. This would probably mean the capping of the landfill. Any ecological risk will trigger the State ARARs to cap the landfill. It was noted, however, that the remedy must alleviate the site risks. If groundwater is a risk for human health or ecology, then a cap may not be the total remedy. The thermal treatment process is going to be changed. There is a plan to construct a burn pad at the site. Whatever the remedy, it must allow for use of the site as a burn area.

ACTION: Heidi and Shawn will check on the proposal for placing a burn pad for large item treatment at Site 11 by 11/29.

Site 21: Contaminant constituents exceeded screening levels in only one well (MW-02). Iron and Manganese were above RBCs.

Recent Sampling: Three wells were placed downgradient (groundwater) of Site 17, and surface and subsurface soil samples were taken just upslope (topographical) of the drum area. At Site 25, subsurface and surface soil samples were taken and two monitoring wells were installed. Data is expected back from the sampling in mid- to late November.

RI report: Schedule was briefly discussed through the draft RI submission. The schedule has been incorporated into the WLT.

- **Bob Root – Lab Area Update**

A handout was provided on the overheads shown during the discussion. The goal was to discuss the changes between the draft and draft final work plan and the inclusion of another site, Site 14, to the Lab Area project.

Changes in work plan: The main changes discussed were the elimination of the smoke testing and deletion of the surface and sediment sampling downstream of the storm drain.

Addition of Site 14: The scope of the sampling needed to be determined. Also, input from Jim Dolph on the history of the site was needed.

ACTION: Heidi will check with Jim Dolph on whether an acid pit existed at Site 14 (in the lab area) by 11/03.

The Initial Assessment Study (IAS) discussed Site 14, however the IAS has been shown to contain false or incorrect data. The site may not have existed.

If the site can be found, the site will be tied into the Lab Area schedule and a scope created for sampling the site. It may be added to the work plan, if information on the location can be discovered before the Final Work Plan is submitted in approximately 2 months.

ACTION: Heidi to check with Bob Farncomb on whether the acid pit existed 11/03.

The team was warned that there are many utilities in the Lab Area. The area's utilities are old and a number of the lines may not be shown on the new utility maps. Even active lines may not be shown or shown incorrectly on the utility maps. The field workers will have to be careful in performing subsurface sampling.

ACTION: Heidi to get Jim Dolph to research old utility maps around the lab area and identify all possible utilities in the area by 11/03.

- **Bob Root – Site 47 Final RI Report**

A handout was provided on the overheads shown during the discussion. The discussion goal was to update the team on sampling recently performed and the proposed additional sampling.

The reason for the recent sampling was to define the location of the pit and extent of the contamination plume. No evidence of the limestone pit, in terms of finding limestone chips, was discovered in the borings. The schedule for the Site 47 RI Report will be contingent on the incorporation of the new data from this recent sampling. At present, the report is in draft final form. The results of the sampling analysis will be discussed at the next partnering meeting in November. The final report is scheduled for submission on January 2, 2001.

Additional sampling was proposed. The sampling would help to define the groundwater flow pattern and further define the nature and extent of contamination. It was suggested that the additional sampling would be completed as part of a pre-feasibility study (pre-FS). An FS will be needed, because the present data shows there is a definite human health risk. The ecological risk assessment has not been completed.

The discussion was opened up to find out whether the team would want to incorporate the additional sampling into the RI Report or provide it in a the proposed pre-FS. If the data will change the risk assessment, then it should be in the RI Report. If the data is being collected

solely to define extent, then it may be done separately from the RI Report. The results of the additional study probably may not change the risk assessments for human health or ecology. However new analytes, such as carbon tetrachloride, will be part of the study. Since these new analytes may cause potentially different or greater risks, the additional sampling may need to be incorporated into the RI Report.

The team discussed that the completed removal action area at Site 8 is downstream of Site 47. The ditch from Site 47 leads into the ditch at Site 8 where the soil was removed. Additional sampling may be needed to see if the removal area has received contamination from this upstream site.

ACTION: Heidi will provide information on dumping across from N. G. Plant Lab (Building 766) near Site 47 by 11/03.

DECISION: The additional sampling will be completed and incorporated into the RI Report for Site 47.

The affect of the building foundations on the groundwater table was discussed. Since the buildings with basements are small and water pumping is minimal, the foundations are probably not a factor in dictating the direction of groundwater flow.

ACTION: Bob and Shawn will develop a work plan for sampling at Site 47 in the area across from Bldg. 766 by 11/29.

- **George Latulippe – Site 57 Update**

The goal of the conversation was to obtain comments from the team on the proposed field activities at Site 57. A handout was provided on the Navy Ecological Risk Assessment Tiered Approach.

It was noted that the proposed temporary wells need to be changed to permanent wells.

The work plan presented at this meeting has comments from the September partnering meeting incorporated into it.

The well downgradient from the probable location for a barrier wall is proposed as a deep well to check on TCE migration to the deeper aquifer. A question was asked on which direction does groundwater flow in the deeper aquifer. The direction of groundwater flow in the deep aquifer is not known. It was noted that TCE was found in a potable water well in the southwestern portion of the site. There is a discrepancy on whether this well was found to be clean in subsequent sampling or whether a back-up well in the near vicinity was found to be clean. The potable water well may be screened in multiple aquifers and/or may be acting as a pathway for contamination. This may mean that the deeper aquifer has already been contaminated. Since the deep aquifer has not been studied, it may be considered a data gap.

ACTION: Heidi will check the sampling records of the potable water well and its back-up near Site 57 and report her findings by 11/10.

The following reasons for initiating a study of the deep aquifer groundwater were written on the board:

- Contamination was found in the potable water well in the deeper aquifer.

- TCE was found in wells at the Scrap Yard.
- The study would provide definition on the thickness of the confining layer.
- The study would provide definition on the unknown groundwater flow direction in the deeper aquifer.
- Slope of confining unit surface is undefined.

The question was raised on whether a study of the deeper aquifer could be performed in a phased approach. First, the thickness of the confining layer would be determined. The Cone Penetrometer method (CPT) was suggested as a means to establish the lithology of the confining layer. The slope and thickness of the layer could be confidently defined. If the confining layer is thin and/or has gaps, then the deeper aquifer groundwater may need to be sampled. If the confining layer is continuous and thick, then groundwater sampling may not be required.

It was noted that CPT is not the only applicable technology. A drill rig could be used in lieu of or in conjunction with that technology.

ACTION: Shawn will look for locations to use in identifying the confining layer at Site 57 and provide information to George by 11/10.

ACTION: Per Shawn's information, George will prepare a drawing by 11/29 showing the proposed locations to drill in order to get to the confining layer.

Scheduling of the fieldwork was discussed. Establishing the confining layer lithology will be part of a large field effort. The data probably will not be available for the next partnering meeting. Tetra Tech will be in the procurement process and/or the initial field exercises by the next partnering meeting. The CPT drilling locations will be discussed at the next meeting.

The question was asked: In order to forego analytical testing of the deeper aquifer, how thick does the confining layer need to be? It will be helpful to the field crew to have a minimum thickness defined, so they can make the determination of whether the deep wells are necessary. It was noted that the data will need to be assembled and plotted in order to figure out the best location for wells. A determination on a sufficient thickness will be made at a later date.

Mobilization of subcontractors was discussed. A remobilization of the auger driller may be necessary if the CPT driller and auger driller are mobilized at the same time. That is because the auger driller will probably be finished with his initial work effort before the locations of deep aquifer wells are determined. The CPT drilling may be done before the auger driller is mobilized. Calibration of the CPT drilling could initially be done using existing well boring logs. The CPT drilling points will probably need to be surveyed before the points are drilled. This will mean that the surveying crew will need to be mobilized twice. First, they will need to set-up for the CPT drilling, and second for establishing well coordinates for the deep aquifer and other wells being done as part of the field work.

DECISION: At Site 57, the Team will pursue the potential of deep aquifer contamination by assessing confining layer continuity as part of the field work.

ACTION: Curtis will send George names of CPT drillers by 11/03.

ACTION: Heidi will send George names of CPT drillers by 11/03.

- The meeting adjourned at 5:10

Thursday, October 26, 2000

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: George Latulippe (host), Dennis Orenshaw, Curtis DeTore (chair), Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root (time keeper), Rob Sadorra, Shawn Jorgensen (member facilitator), Heidi Morgan (scribe), and John Fairbank (Tier 2 Link). Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **George Latulippe – Site 12 Draft ROD & Sites 12, 41, 44 Draft Proposed Plans**

The goal of the discussion was to get comments from team on the documents.

The general scheduling notes were made:

- Though the EPA may have additional comments, George will move ahead with finalizing the Feasibility Study for Sites 12 and 41.
- Comments on the Draft Final Proposed Plans are not due until November 22.
- Comments were received on the Draft ROD for Site 12.

The proposed plans may be reviewed by the EPA legal staff. The concern was voiced that their review may change information in the ROD.

It was noted that the decision had been made to do a draft, draft final, and final ROD. To maintain the original schedule, which only included draft and final documents, the review time on the draft was decreased. Therefore it is critical that the draft ROD for Site 12 be reviewed and comments returned by the due date.

ACTION: Dennis will confirm that there are no additional comments on the Feasibility Study for Sites 12 and 41 by 11/14.

The differences between a proposed plan and the ROD were discussed. The proposed plan is a document for public review. The ROD, though accessible by the public, has the main purpose of being the legally binding document for the project. Much of the proposed plan language is incorporated into the ROD.

The question came up on whether the Navy and EPA will review the RODs in parallel or in series.

ACTION: Dennis will talk to his legal counsel about reviewing RODs and PPs by 11/14.

ACTION: Rob will talk to his legal counsel about reviewing RODs and PPs by 11/14.

The need to reference a land use control action plan and a land use control implementation plan (LUCAP/LUCIP) was discussed. This is a relatively new way of carrying out institutional controls on bases. References will be added to the ROD. This will require that NSWC Indian Head have a LUCAP/LUCIP document(s). The ROD will be moved forward by sending it to the Navy's and EPA's legal counsels. By the next partnering meeting, information and direction on the LUCAP should be ready for discussion. George will revise the ROD based on the comments received during this partnering meeting.

The suggestion was made that ROD is worded to say that a procedure outlined in the ROD will be followed until a LUCAP/LUCIP is approved. Once a LUCAP/LUCIP is approved, then those procedures will be used. The suggestion was made that the approval process for the LUCAP/LUCIP be added to the language of the ROD. The process should include the Navy and EPA.

ACTION: Rob will try to find information about LUCAP/LUCIP by 11/29.

ACTION: George will send a copy of Cherry Point's LUCAP/LUCIP documents to core members by 11/03.

ACTION: Dennis will talk to Steve Hirsh about having Aberdeen personnel responsible for Master Plan and deed modifications come to the November Partnering Meeting by 11/14.

DECISION: Draft Final ROD will be prepared utilizing the land use control details described in the draft document but with the addition of language referencing the approval of the LUCAP and LUCIP documents.

It was noted that the LUCAP/LUCIP question might cause problems with the schedule. Answers need to be found on what the LUCAP entails and how it should interact with the ROD or this may affect the award of the project before the end of FY 2001.

- **George Latulippe and Rob Sadorra – Scheduling for Public Meetings**

The goal of the discussion was to set dates for meetings and agree on the types of presentations.

It was suggested that all three sites (Sites 12, 41, and 44) be discussed at one meeting. A disadvantage of doing this is that it would be a long meeting. An advantage of doing one instead of individual meetings for each is that it is easier to get the public to come to one meeting than multiple meetings. It is cheaper and convenient to do one public meeting. A concern was raised that the public would not have enough time in the normal 30-day comment period to review three documents, especially if given at one time. The public may feel overwhelmed. To counteract that problem, the comment period could be extended. Regardless of the length of the public comment period, the public meeting needs to be within the period. The documents could be released in a staggered fashion to allow people to digest information before the next document is handed out.

The public comment period needs to be tied to the submission of the final proposed plan documents. It may be necessary, based on the proposed plan submission dates, to separate Site 12 from the other sites.

The following schedule was set-up for the public comment periods and meetings:

Site	Start Public Comment Period	End Public Comment Period	Public Meeting Date
12	12/11/00	1/26/01	1/23/01
41	1/22/01	3/02/01	2/20/01
44	1/22/01	3/02/01	2/20/01

The clarification was made that this type of public meeting is technically a public hearing. A certified stenographer will be needed. The minutes from the meeting will become part of the legal process and could affect the ROD.

To keep the meeting time in check, an agenda and specific times for the meeting should be set up. If the public has additional comments, then arrangements should be made so the comments can be written down and sent to the Navy. If the public has questions off topic, those persons should be referred to the public affairs office, but the specific issues of the questions should not be addressed.

Whether to have and what to do with a poster session was discussed. The poster session idea was proposed as an agenda item for a future partnering meeting. In the January partnering meeting, the overall presentation for Site 12 would be discussed. The day after the January public meeting (January 24th), the other site presentations could be discussed in a meeting at NSWC Indian Head.

- **Break**
- **Shawn/Heidi – Hazwoper Requirements**

The goal of this discussion was to determine the OSHA requirements for workers on IR sites that are not involved with the remedial action process. The base has construction workers working on utilities and other projects requiring excavation. These workers are not required to provide a health and safety plan (HASP), wear personal protection equipment (PPE), or be 40-hr OSHA trained.

The suggestion was made that a general (master) HASP be prepared for excavation projects. Site-specific HASPs would be provided as necessary.

The safety personnel at the site are oriented on explosives safety. They have been unresponsive in implementing any guidance or regulations. The environmental department has let them know where problems exist or may exist. The safety of the workers is the safety department's responsibility. The environmental department does not want the liability of acting in the safety department's role.

Aberdeen has had the same problem in the past. Ken Statute (410-446-3320) was given as a contact for what Aberdeen did to resolve the problem.

The present plan is to provide the safety department with fact sheets on each site. If excavation is required on a site, then the environmental department should be contacted. The environmental department will work with construction workers to assess whether they are going to be excavating in contaminated areas.

Other suggestions were provided as follows:

- TLVs could be used for setting up allowable exposure levels.
- Construction Contractors should receive a safety briefing before going on-site.
- The safety department needs to take responsibility for the issue.

- **John Fairbank – Tier II Report**

The following changes or suggestions were noted by the Tier II link:

- Draft and final Minutes need to be e-mailed to the Tier II Link. CH2M HILL will e-mail the Tier II links directly.
- Add Tier II goals as standard agenda item at partnering meetings.
- There seems to be too many recurring agenda items. It may be more efficient to solve problems off-line.
- The partnering meetings do not have to be monthly. The scheduling of meetings should be evaluated.
- 35 percent designs should be added to the scheduling tools.

The suggestion on not having as many recurring agenda items was discussed. A number of the sites have been on the agenda because there are a number of issues that require discussion. Sites have not been left on the agenda because of a lingering issue. However, some of the issues are related and could have been dealt with as one "big-picture" issue. As issues come up, the information needs to be evaluated against the DQO process. This evaluation could be done off-line. Once a solution is found for the problem it could be presented at a future partnering meeting.

The suggestion of evaluating the meeting schedule was discussed. Meetings could be scheduled for every month in advance, but as the team gets closer to the date the need for the meeting could be reevaluated. The meetings could be cancelled or the time decreased to less than two days. One problem with setting up meetings then canceling them is that hotels may charge for cancellations of meeting rooms. The suggestion was made that offices could be used for all meetings. It was pointed out that lengthening the time between meetings is not a requirement, but Tier II thinks that it may be more efficient to do that. The team believes that there are enough projects going on to justify monthly meetings. The need to get together each month will be reevaluated at future meetings.

Steve Hirsh will be at the next partnering meeting. Armalia will be at the January meeting.

- Lunch
- Review of Action Items

ACTION: Heidi to tell Lou S. about Aberdeen personnel coming to next partnering meeting by 11/29.

ACTION: Rob to send out team goal proposal for FY 2001-2002 by 11/14.

ACTION: The team needs to review and have comments on the goals by the next conference call.

ACTION: Core Team to review and have comments on the Background Study in preparation for discussion at the November partnering meeting by 11/29.

- Review of Parking Lot

It was decided to discuss the piping issues at Site 25 off-line.

ACTION: Rob, Shawn, Heidi and Bob will discuss piping at Site 25 by 11/14.

- **Build Next Meeting's Agenda**

The following items were suggested for inclusion in the next meeting agenda:

Next Agenda	Lead	Time
Mattawoman Study	George	1.5 hrs
Review Meeting Evaluation from Previous Meeting	Std	+15 min to close out
Review Goals at close-out	Std	
Review Work load tool	George	.5
Discuss Jim Dolph's Arsenic information	Rob	1.0
Site 47 Update data and additional work	Bob	1.5
Discussion of poster sessions	Curtis	2.0
Discuss background report	Shawn	1.5
Discuss Master Plan and Land Controls	Aberdeen personnel	(2.0) tentative
Partnering Information with Janet	Janet	1.0
LUCAP/LUCIP Information Discussion	Rob and Dennis	1.0
Site 57 Decision on deep aquifer investigation	George	1.5

Due to time constraints in order to transport people to the airport, a final set of agenda items was not completed. A conference call was set up for discussing the matter. See below for conference call scheduling.

- **Schedule Next Conference Call**

The intermediate conference call to discuss the agenda items will be held on October 30th at 2 PM. Rob will set it up.

The monthly conference call will be held on November 20, 2000 at 2PM. Rob will set it up.

- **Schedule of Future Meetings.**

Date of meeting	29-30 November 2000	10-11 January 2001	21-22 February 2001	21-22 March 2001	24-25 April 2001
Location	Baltimore	CH2M HILL, Herndon, VA	Indian Head	Philadelphia	Baltimore
Host	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL	Shawn	Dennis	CH2M HILL
Chair	Rob	Shawn	Shawn	Dennis	Curtis
Scribe	George	Dennis	TBD	TBD	TBD
Tier II Link	Steve	Armalia	TBD	TBD	TBD
Time Keeper	Shawn	George	TBD	TBD	TBD

- **Meeting Evaluation**

(separate file)

- **Adjourned at 2:15 PM.**

Action Items Completed Since Last Meeting

Goal Number	Goal	Status of Goal	Action Number	Action	Person Responsible for Action	Date Action Created	Status of Action	Date Action Must Be Completed
4	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 15, 16, 49, and 53 by 04/06/01: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	109	Make necessary changes to Sites 15, 16, 49, 53 WP and send additional copies and .pdf file to Rob and Shawn for distribution to the RAB	Anne Estabrook	04/19/00	Completed on 10/20/00	Completed
5	Revise Fieldwork for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25	In progress	179	Check piping under drainage ditch at Site 25	Shawn Jorgensen	09/26/2000	Completed on 10/06/00	Completed
TBD	TBD	In progress	180	Quarterly report due to Tier 2	Rob Sadorra	09/26/2000	Completed on 10/06/00	Completed
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01: (a) Finalize Remedial Investigation by 03/07/00 (b) Finalize Treatability Study Work Plan by 07/04/00	In progress	184	Change work plan to reflect adding two wells and site walk	George Latulippe	09/26/2000	Completed on 10/06/00	Completed
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01: (a) Finalize Remedial Investigation by 03/07/00 (b) Finalize Treatability Study Work Plan by 07/04/00	In progress	185	Review Site 57 Workplan tables and Figures and reply to George by 10/16/00 with comments.	Core Team	09/26/2000	Completed on 10/06/00	Completed
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	187	Arrange conference call with BTAG on October 13, 2000, to discuss Mattawoman Creek problem formulation	Kent Cabbage	09/27/2000	Completed on 10/13/00	Completed
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	188	Review draft Mattawoman Creek Problem Formulation and provide comments to Kent	Core Team	09/27/2000	Completed on 10/13/00	Completed

3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	189	Send email of proposed subsurface soil sample locations at Site 47 to team	Anne Estabrook	09/27/2000	Completed on 10/04/00	Completed
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	190	Concur with soil sample locations at Site 47 by responding to Anne's email	Core Team	09/27/2000	Completed on 10/06/00	Completed

Open Action Items

Goal Number	Goal	Status of Goal	Action Number	Action	Person Responsible for Action	Date Action Created	Status of Action	Date Action Must Be Completed
5	Revise Fieldwork for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25	In progress	167	Check history of chemical incinerator at Site 17	Heidi Morgan	08/30/2000	In progress	11/01/2000
12	Mattawoman Creek Risk Study	In progress	174	Develop problem formulation for Mattawoman Creek	Technical Team	08/31/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
13	Graduate	In progress	To be defined	To be defined	Core Team	09/27/2000	In progress	01/11/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	181	Bring Nerf balls to next meeting.	Heidi Morgan	09/26/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01: (a) Finalize Remedial Investigation by 03/07/00 (b) Finalize Treatability Study Work Plan by 07/04/00	In progress	182	Check piping by Buildings 165 and 496	Heidi Morgan	09/26/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	196	Talk to Armalia about the team goal submission	Rob Sadorra	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000

To be defined	To be defined	In progress	197	Update team goals for 2001-2002	Rob Sadorra	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	198	Update Work Load Tool and provide to Tony	George Latulippe	10/25/2000	In progress	11/10/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	199	Update Work Load Tool and provide to team	Tony Tomlin	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	200	Check to see if DRO constituents were compared to sampling data for Site 11 (elements)	Bob Root	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	201	Check on proposal for placing a burn pad for large item treatment at Site 11	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	201	Check on proposal for placing a burn pad for large item treatment at Site 11	Shawn Jorgensen	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
4	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Lab Area by 04/06/01: (a) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	202	Check with Jim Dolph on whether an acid pit existed at Site 14 (in the lab area)	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
4	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Lab Area by 04/06/01: (a) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	203	Check with Bob Farncomb on whether the acid pit existed	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
4	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Lab Area by 04/06/01: (a) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	204	Get Jim Dolph to research old utility maps around the lab area and identify all possible utilities in the area	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47:	In progress	205	Provide information on dumping across from N. G. Plant Lab (Building 766) near	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000

				Site 47				
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47:	In progress	206	Develop a work plan for sampling at Site 47 in the area across from Bldg 766	Bob Root	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47:	In progress	206	Develop a work plan for sampling at Site 47 in the area across from Bldg 766	Shawn Jorgensen	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	207	Check the sampling records of the potable water well and its back-up near Site 57 and report the findings	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/10/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	208	Look for locations to use in identifying the confining layer at Site 57 and provide information to George	Shawn Jorgensen	10/25/2000	In progress	11/10/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	209	Per Shawn's information, prepare a drawing showing the proposed locations to drill in order to get to the confining layer	George Latulippe	10/25/2000	In progress	11/29/2000

2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	210	Send George names of CPT drillers	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	210	Send George names of CPT drillers	Curtis DeTore	10/25/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	211	Confirm that there are no additional comments on the Feasibility Study for Sites 12 and 41	Dennis Orenshaw	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	212	Talk to legal counsel about reviewing RODs and PPs	Dennis Orenshaw	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	212	Talk to legal counsel about reviewing RODs and PPs	Rob Sadorra	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	213	Find information about LUCAP/LUCIP	Rob Sadorra	10/26/2000	In progress	11/29/2000

1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	214	Send a copy of Cherry Point's LUCAP/LUCIP to core team	George Latulippe	10/26/2000	In progress	11/03/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	215	Talk to Steve Hirsh about having Aberdeen personnel responsible for Master Plan and deed modifications come to the November Partnering Meeting	Dennis Orenshaw	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01: (a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00	In progress	216	Tell Lou S. about Aberdeen personnel coming to next partnering meeting	Heidi Morgan	10/26/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	217	Send team goal proposal for FY 2001-2002 to team	Rob Sadorra	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	218	Review and have comments on the goals by the next conference call	Core Team	10/26/2000	In progress	11/29/2000
5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	219	Discuss piping at Site 25	Heidi Morgan	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	219	Discuss piping at Site 25	Shawn Jorgensen	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000

5	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25 by 04/17/02: (a) Finalize Work Plan by 04/28/00 (b) Complete Draft Final Remedial Investigation report by 02/09/01	In progress	219	Discuss piping at Site 25	Bob Root	10/26/2000	In progress	11/14/2000
---	---	-------------	-----	---------------------------	----------	------------	-------------	------------