

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 29-30, 2000

INDIAN HEAD PARTNERING TEAM MEETING

HARBOR COURT HOTEL

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

The Partnering Team meeting was held on November 29 through November 30, 2000, at the Harbor Court Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland.

The following personnel attended the meeting on November 29, 2000:

Bob Root – CH2M HILL
Tony Tomlin – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Rob Sadorra - EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Armalia Berry-Washington – EFACHES/Tier II link
Janet Eastman – Management Edge
Jim Costello – HydroGeologic
Kelly Gragg - HydroGeologic

The following personnel attended the meeting on November 30, 2000:

Bob Root – CH2M HILL
Tony Tomlin – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Rob Sadorra - EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Armalia Berry-Washington – EFACHES/Tier II link
Janet Eastman – Management Edge

Wednesday, November 29, 2000

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: George Latulippe (scribe), Dennis Orenshaw (member facilitator), Curtis DeTore, Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root, Rob Sadorra (chair), Shawn Jorgensen (time keeper), Janet Eastman, Jim Costello, Kelly Gragg, and Armalia Berry-Washington (Tier 2 Link). Began meeting at 9 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

- **Review previous meeting's minutes and meeting evaluation**

Shawn, Curtis, and Rob previously provided comments. These additional comments were provided during the discussion period:

- Under Fiscal Year 2001 discussion, Site 12 topic is focused on remedial action not remedial design. Change design to remedial action.
- Under Site 57 discussion, delete the word "deeper" and replace "nearby sites" with "the Scrap Yard" in the following bullet item: "TCE was found in deeper wells at nearby sites."

The team went over the meeting evaluation. The delta comment on reaching consensus was discussed. The team needs to go around the table to get member ideas before moving to a new issue. Each of the four delta items from last meeting were posted so the team would be reminded of the issues throughout the meeting.

- **Bob Root – Site 47 update data and additional work**

The purpose of the discussion was to review the latest sampling round (all subsurface soil) and relate new investigative work plans.

The laboratory has not made all the analytical data available; Metals, SVOC, or explosives data has not been provided. For the VOC data, there were contamination hits only in the one part per billion (ppb) range.

Action: Bob will e-mail remaining Site 47 soil data to team by 1/10/01.

The new investigation was discussed. Bob showed overheads with discussion bullets. The purpose of the new investigation was to define direction and distribution of the contaminant plume and define thickness and continuity of the clay layer underlying the upper aquifer.

The proposed approach was discussed. It was proposed to use membrane interface probe/electrical conductivity (MIP/EC) technology to define VOC contamination and clay layer parameters. MIP allows the investigator to define total VOCs, not specific constituents. Approximately 20 samples will be taken using MIP. Eleven would be completed as a first step, then 0-9 additional samples will be taken to further define the plume. Wells would be installed for lithology and more specific sampling. During the same mobilization as MIP, samples would be collected using direct push to determine actual constituents within the plume defined by MIP.

CH2M HILL has experience at Oceana with this technology. The MIP will provide location data on where to direct push sample. This will provide the sampler a better sense on where the contaminants are located in the soil column and consequently on where to sample. CH2M HILL believes it will reduce costs overall.

The approximate costs of the proposed investigation are as follows:

- MIP will cost = \$10K
- Direct push = \$1.25K
- Per diem for two people = \$760
- Sample analysis = \$1.35K
- Mobilization/demobilization = \$2.5K.

The total cost will be approximately \$16K.

If direct push sampling only is conducted, more direct push samples will be required and analytical costs will be increased. The investigation will probably cost more if only direct push sampling is conducted, and a remobilization may be required if the direct push samples do not satisfactorily define the contamination extent.

The MIP work would push to 40-ft maximum from the ground surface. The conductivity difference between sand and clay will provide interface points, however concentrated contaminants would affect the conductivity. The levels at this site would probably not cause a problem.

The team discussed the question of what is a satisfactory clay layer thickness to allow the team to assume that the deep aquifer will not be threatened by contamination. The team tentatively agreed that a continuous layer, approximately 10-ft thick, is good enough.

MIP and CPT were contrasted. MIP is less expensive and provides a quick estimate of total VOC concentration. CPT provides more lithological data and sampling is easier.

The detection limit for MIP detection is 100 ppb. If no hits are recorded by MIP, there may still be contamination of concern in the area. More direct push sampling may be necessary in areas with less than 100 ppb contamination. The existing site data shows contaminant concentrations are above 100 ppb and as high as 250,000 ppb at the site.

Consensus Decision: The team decided that CH2M HILL will develop a work plan for groundwater sampling using MIP technology at Site 47.

Action: Bob will e-mail web link for Columbia Technologies to team by 12/8/00.

The sampling effort in and near the drainage ditch was discussed. The purpose of the sampling is to define the nature and extent of surface water, soil, and sediment contamination in the ditch. Also, the sampling effort will define the extent of soil contamination in the reported chemical dump area near Building 766.

The proposed approach was discussed. Soil and sediment will be sampled from Site 47 to Site 8. Samples at Site 8 will be collected to confirm the site has or has not been recontaminated. The original intent was only to sample above Site 8. The ditch within Site 8

is rip-rapped, but sediment is filling in between the rip-rap. Sediment samples could possibly be collected from this portion of the ditch.

A concern was made that sampling outside of Site 47 and onto Site 8 would encroach on future investigations. The idea of phasing the sampling was suggested, so that sampling of the whole channel length may not be necessary. The chemical dumping area at Building 766 is not part of Site 47 or another RI site. The scope of Site 47 will be expanded to include this area. Sampling will not be done below the road, i.e. no sampling at Site 8.

Action: Bob will check with Jon Weier on where to sample sediments and surface water in the ditch below Site 47 by 1/11/01.

The question was brought up: if the ditch is clean but the dump area is contaminated, what happens? The dump area will be considered a new site and will need to be placed in the IR program.

Consensus Agreement: No sampling will be conducted across the road (e.g., near Site 8). A minimum of three sample locations will be sampled in the ditch. The sampling as proposed by CH2M HILL will be conducted at the dump area. Samples will be analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, explosives, ammonium perchlorate (AP), TOC, and metals in soils. Explosives (not including AP) will not be analyzed for in ditch samples, because no explosives were found in the ditch during previous sampling events.

- **Sites 6, 39, and 45 RI work plan discussion**

A handout was given of the overheads. The purpose of the discussion was to go over the work plan ideas for the sites.

Action: Shawn will check the construction dates for Building 1718 by 12/8/00.

Action: Shawn will check EPIC photos for evidence of stressed vegetation near Building 1718 after spill by 12/8/00.

Action: Shawn will check for evidence of a spent fixer pipe between Buildings 1140 and 1718 by 12/8/00.

Site 6: Sampling will be conducted in the drainage ditch within the site fence line and radially around the site. If fixer was not used in Building 1140, then soil samples around that building may be deleted. Also, the concrete-lined drainage ditch and stormwater piping from Building 1140 may not need to be sampled.

Site 39: The focus of this study is to determine nature and extent of contamination from stack emissions from Buildings 497 and 498. Issues with discharges to Mattawoman Creek will not be investigated; those discharges are being considered as part of the Mattawoman Creek ecological study. Surface and subsurface soil samples will be taken around the perimeter of the buildings and along the fence line. VOCs analysis will not be conducted on surface soil samples because possible contaminants were dispersed via stack emissions. The possible contaminants (HBNQ, UDMH, and acetal/formal) are not common analytes. HGL is looking into laboratories that can analyze for them. Another problem with these contaminants is that they may not have risks numbers associated with them; therefore, even with analytical data there may not be a way to assign risk to the constituents.

Action: HGL, Jim Costello, will consider the need for certain explosives analyses at Site 39 by 12/14/00.

Action: HGL will check with risk personnel to find if explosives data can be used in risk assessments by 12/14/00.

Action: Shawn will check to see if the base laboratory can analyze for exotic constituents and what is the cost at Site 39 by 12/8/00.

The issue of background sampling was discussed. Specific site background levels will be taken. The background study will not be used because it has not been finalized.

Site 45: This site may be related to Site 44. There is existing data for the site: soil gas survey information and surface soil samples. Based on the existing data, Brown and Root put together a work plan for the site. HGL has reviewed the Brown and Root work plan and has modified it slightly. Analyses will include TCL, TAL, AP, Explosives, pH, TOC, and grain size. Some of the additional explosives analyses may be deleted if the Site 44 process did not include those chemical constituents.

Action: HGL will check to see if the propellant process at Site 44 was "double base" by 12/14/00.

The idea of installing temporary monitoring wells was floated. Pre-pack wells could be used but normally the regulators do not allow them.

The work plan will be produced in draft and final copies. A draft final copy will not be produced, but the draft text will be given to Shawn Jorgensen before the draft document is produced. He will check on information about processes.

- **Lunch**
- **George Latulippe and Bob Root – Review Work Load Tool (WLT)**

A handout was provided showing the management tool sorted by site and by comments due.

Action: Tony will compare Rob's goals spreadsheet and modify it appropriately to incorporate Rob's changes by 12/6/00.

We will update the WLT at each partnering meeting. Tony will be responsible for the electronic master file.

To take full advantage of the WLT, the team needs to look at how the changes and revisions to the due dates will affect future portions of the work. The WLT needs to reflect items that have changed. The tool could have a new column for recently changed items or have a new highlighting scheme.

Decision: Add a new column and add an asterisk for each date that has changed. Apply asterisks only to those items that changed during the most recent partnering meeting/month.

During partnering meetings, dates that change will be placed on the goals sheet. These changes will be discussed at the end of the meeting. Tetra Tech and CH2M HILL will look at the long-term changes caused by the date changes after the meeting. Tetra Tech and CH2M HILL will incorporate the changes into the WLT and send out the revised WLT with the meeting minutes.

- **IH and PAX joint session – Discuss base master plans and land use controls**

Meeting minutes for this discussion item were provided by the NAS Patuxent River Partnering Team.

IH team distributed handout with information received from the Army on LUCAP/LUCIP at Aberdeen. EPA's RPM for IH presented information contained in the information obtained from the Army. Yorktown LUCAP is most current language being used by Navy.

LUCAP (land use control assurance plan) is a base-wide document, not site-specific, anticipated to be signed off by regional EPA administrator.

LUCIP (land use control implementation plan) is a document that will apply to specific sites at each base, to be signed by either EPA RPM or base commander.

MDE will concur with LUCAP/LUCIP, but will not be a signatory to these legally binding documents. However, Virginia will sign these documents.

Teams agreed to exchange name and e-mail addresses of members of both teams – Linnea & Tony will follow-up. Teams agreed the joint session was useful and informative.

- **Rob Sadorra/Dennis Orenshaw – LUCAP/LUCIP For Site 12 ROD**

The discussion was focused on what language should be used when incorporating institutional controls into the Site 12 ROD. Three ways to go about it were presented:

- Do not change existing ROD language for institutional controls.
- Prepare LUCAP/LUCIP language before implementing ROD and delete existing institutional control language from the ROD.
- Use existing institutional control information in the ROD, but adding language that the LUCAP/LUCIP, once prepared, will control.

The decision made at the last meeting on this issue was read, then the team reopened the issue for discussion. Team members were worried that the LUCAP/LUCIP may take awhile to be implemented. Presently, there isn't a specific process in place on how to deal with problems/situations on a closed site, such as excavation on-site. Presently, certain activities, such as after-hours excavations, are not regulated. The team needs to figure out a mechanism or mechanisms for implementing processes without a LUCAP/LUCIP.

The following items were discussed as being at the appropriate level of detail for a ROD in the absence of a LUCAP/LUCIP:

1. Items needed to establish protectiveness, for example:

- Prohibit digging
- No residential use
- No potable groundwater use
- Restrict access

2. The ROD will not discuss the institutional control implementation process.
3. Refer to the LUCAP/LUCIP as "under development" or to be developed without timeframes.
4. Mention long term monitoring plan, but do not discuss details such as analytes, frequency, and exit strategies.
5. Do not include NEPA process, MILCON, and other existing procedures in the ROD.

The LUCAP/LUCIP needs to be referenced in the ROD. A due date for getting approval of or providing approving authorities with a LUCAP/LUCIP should not be included in the ROD.

Site-specific implementation plans will be set up in absence of a LUCAP/LUCIP. These implementation plans will not be referenced in the ROD. The team will agree on these informal types of implementation plans.

Action: Dennis will talk to his legal personnel about whether they will accept the level of detail proposed for the ROD by 12/8/00.

George will proceed with revising the ROD based on Dennis's answers.

Action: Rob will get a copy of NAS Patuxent River's latest ROD and disseminate it to the team by 12/8/00.

Scheduling of the Draft Final ROD submission has slipped. The team discussed extending the discussion of the topic at this meeting. The team thought that it would be acceptable to continue discussion of the issue at the next partnering meeting in January.

- **George – Background Report Discussion**

The purpose of the discussion was to discuss the TPH value for background. It was noted that a discussion of the entire background report was not scheduled at this time. It was noted that one TPH value is not sufficient for background.

The one TPH value was left in the report because Tetra Tech did not want to look like they were suppressing data. This value was noted in the ROD as background. This has generated a number of questions. Should the TPH data be eliminated from the background report, or should more TPH samples be taken to work up a statistically significant sampling event to constitute a background value? The point was made that since TPH is man-made, any sample with TPH in it may not be background at all. Since the TPH is man-made can any of the data from the sample be used, because this may be a contaminated area? The questions were not specifically addressed.

Decision: The language in the ROD needs to be changed. Delete the TPH background discussion from the ROD and reference the MDE 100 ppm value for TPH.

- **Janet – Partnering**

Janet has observed more disagreements in the group since her last meeting in August. She warned that we should make sure we make people feel heard otherwise they may harbor resentment.

The team was lead through an activity on solving problems.

A handout, Indian Head Self-Facilitating Checklist, was given. The exercise involved with this handout was recorded and the full text provided with the meeting evaluation.

Action: Tony will finalize the checklist and send it out to the team by 12/15/00.

- **The meeting adjourned at 5:45**

Thursday, November 30, 2000

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: CH2M HILL (host), George Latulippe (scribe), Dennis Orenshaw (member facilitator), Curtis DeTore, Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root, Rob Sadorra, Shawn Jorgensen (time keeper), Janet Eastman, and Armalia Washington-Berry (Tier II Link). Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **Curtis DeTore – Discuss Poster Session**

This session focused on developing ideas for presentations at public meetings, specifically the Site 12 proposed plan meeting. Curtis discussed his experiences at other sites. Posters were produced on foam board about the size of the flipchart paper. Members of the team would stand near particular poster(s) and answer questions and/or give a small description of what their particular poster(s) represented. Questions answered during the poster session were normally not documented, unless the public was not satisfied with the answer. If the public was not satisfied, then the scribe would write the question down for written response. There is a formal question and answer session following the poster session. Those questions and answers are documented. The formal question and answer session will require an open microphone and a court recorder.

The poster session allows the public to ask questions without feeling uncomfortable with getting up in front of the formal Q&A session; the poster session is informal. The team agreed on using the format of having a poster session followed by a formal Q&A session.

Poster Suggestions:

- Site history
- ARAR issues
- Human health
- Ecological health
- CERCLA process
- Remedial action
- Funding/schedule
- Site map
- Contact poster

The posters should be made with a lay audience in mind. The discussion turned to what information needs to go into the production of each poster. It was suggested that a number of the suggested posters could be combined into a "Why action is being taken on the site" poster. The ARAR issues, human health, and ecological health posters would be candidates for this type of combination.

The posters will be placed in stations for public viewing. More than one person may be placed at a station or an individual poster. It was clarified that the site history poster will include a site description and a description of the activities on and the use of the site. The investigative history of the site, such as why the RI report was completed, will be a separate poster. The funding poster will be for future funding of the remedial action. Past funding of the investigative process will not be placed on the posters, but a value will be provided if the topic is broached by the public.

Stations and associated posters:

- Station I: Site map, site pictorial history, site operational history/description
- Station II: CERCLA process, investigative history
- Station III: Why are we taking an action (might be 1-3 posters)
- Station IV: Remedial action, funding, future schedule

To help Tetra Tech, suggestions of what needs to go on the posters were discussed. The team should not expect that all their comments will be incorporated into the posters in order to keep the volume of information to an acceptable minimum.

It was suggested that the posters should include pictures. The investigative report history poster could include pictures of the investigation. The EPIC photos may be used for the site map. More than one picture may be used to describe the site.

The site map poster will show a small picture or drawing of the base with an arrow pointing to the site location. A large-scale drawing showing the specific site will be the main focus of the site map poster. A drawing is a CADD or GIS generated image of an area. A picture is a photographic image of the site.

Action: Rob will send George the fact sheet for Site 12 by 12/8/00.

Action: Rob will find the site pictorial history and send it to George by 12/15/00.

Information to be presented on the site operational history/description poster:

- Information from Fact Sheet
- Dates of operation
- Acreage of site
- Type of waste(s) in landfill
- Depth and/or volume of waste
- Current description/present use and adjacent uses

Action: Dennis will look for a CERCLA process flowchart and send the information to George by 12/15/00.

The CERCLA process poster will include text on the investigative history. The investigative history poster will be a collage of remedial investigation photographs.

Information to be presented on the CERCLA process poster:

- Flowchart
- Descriptions of work and reports
- Dates of work/reports
- This may be more than one poster

Information to be presented on the ARAR poster:

- Landfill capping requirements for rubble/landscaping landfills

Information to be presented on the human health poster:

- No risk for non-residential uses considering all media
- Unacceptable risk to hypothetical future residents from shallow groundwater

Information to be presented on the ecological health poster:

- Surface soil risk
- No negative impacts on ponds from Site 12 activities

Information to be presented on the remedial action poster:

- Cover/capping
 - Cross section as shown in FS
 - 2-ft cover of clean fill
 - Removal of waste in ponds
 - Vegetative barrier
- Institutional controls
 - Restrict future use
 - Prohibit shallow GW use
- Long term monitoring

The scheduling poster should discuss construction schedule start and end dates.

January 23, 2001, the public hearing will be held. The next day there will be a meeting to discuss strategies for other sites' public hearings.

George asked for the team to agree on what remedial action from the FS is considered the preferred alternative. In the proposed plan, Alternative 2 was noted as the preferred alternative. It will be difficult to determine what areas within the landfill already have 2-ft of cover. George would rather not pinpoint areas that have 2-ft of cover.

Decision: Alternative 2 will be used, but the 2-ft of cover will be considered as a minimum cover amount. Additional cover material over 2-ft of cover is acceptable.

- Break
- **George Latulippe – Discussion on deep aquifer investigation at Site 57**

The period began with a discussion on the comments for proposed plans and RODs. George asked if he should delete EPA acceptance as part of the nine criteria. The NCP does not cover EPA acceptance.

Decision: In the document, EPA should not be noted; it should just reference state acceptance.

Action: Curtis will check process for securing a state waiver for Site 12 soil cover by 12/15/00.

The purpose of this discussion item was to go over the work plan concepts for the cone penetrometer (CPT) investigation.

A concern was voiced that Location 3 may be a problem for access. After looking at the drawing and pictures, the location is probably accessible.

CPT contractors have been contacted. Three firms responded to calls. The firms said they would have to make two insertions into the boreholes to grout the hole. This will increase the cost, but the magnitude of increase is not known. Other team members have experience with other contractors that can grout the hole from the bottom up without the reinserting of the tubing. The firms asked that they have a site visit before mobilizing.

It was suggested that a CPT boring be placed next to a known, documented boring/well to calibrate the CPT. It was further suggested that soil boring S57SB032 should be used as the boring on which the CPT should be calibrated.

It was suggested that calibration also be done near Building 292. Since the majority of the CPT borings are on the south side of the site away from the building, it would not be best to calibrate near the building. A greater margin of error for the CPT is acceptable near the building, which is distant from the majority of CPT locations.

It was suggested that two calibrations be done: one near the buildings and one closer to the CPT locations. The cost of the fieldwork should not increase significantly, because the rigs will already be mobilized and additional equipment will not be necessary.

The question was asked as to how easy it is for the operator to see the difference in geologic layers. It is easy to see the variations in the pressure and friction readings as the instrument moves from one layer to the next.

The discussion turned to what is an acceptable thickness of the confining clay layer. What thickness does the team consider acceptable to conclude that the shallow groundwater contamination will not migrate to the deep aquifer and therefore deep wells are not required? It was suggested that if permeability data was available for the clay layer, then that could be compared to Subtitle D landfill liner permeability. The thickness of the clay layer needed to provide an equivalent permeability to a Subtitle D liner could be used to quantify an acceptable thickness. Due to hydraulic head considerations, that approach may not provide a usable number. A 10-ft clay layer will be considered acceptable.

Decision: Two calibrations will be done. Soil boring 28 will be used. Also, Location 4 will be moved so it is in closer proximity to soil boring 32. We will drill into the confining clay layer

10-ft in the soil boring/well location. CPTs do not necessarily have to go 10-ft into the clay, but must penetrate clay.

Action: George will check Site 41 RI for boring logs from the SI by 12/8/00.

- **Armalia - Tier II Update**

There were not specific issues discussed. Armalia congratulated the team on their candidacy for graduation.

- **Lunch**

- **Janet Eastman - Partnering, Next Steps**

Janet will not attend the January meeting. She will attend the February meeting to complete the process of graduation.

Action: Janet will provide the team by 2/21/01 with team building resources for future use.

A survey for self-facilitation handout was provided. The survey should be completed at the next partnering meeting.

Action: Dennis will provide a letter indicating that there will be no further comments on the Site 12 and 41 draft final FSs by 12/8/00.

- **Review Goals, Action Items and Parking Lot**

Parking Lot discussion:

- How to specify the elements of long term monitoring will be a possible agenda at the next meeting.
- How do we handle the not-yet final RFI/VI reports for Stump Neck was left in the parking lot.
- 1-hr graduation for the February meeting was left in the parking lot.

In future meeting minutes, it will be noted if there is nothing left in the parking lot, if that is the case.

Goals discussion:

Two items need to be added to the WLT. First a line item for the background report needs to be made. Second, the Stump Neck Annex RIs need to be added.

Action: Curtis will check with John Fairbank to see if Stump Neck RCRA sites are in the DSMOA by 1/10/01.

- **Close Out**

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

Next Agenda	Lead	Time (hr)
Site 12 ROD Language – Long term monitoring	George	1.0
Background Report issues	George	1.5
Do team assessment, then assess the assessment	Shawn	1.0
Discuss long term monitoring details (analytes, frequency, exit)	George	2.0
How do we handle the not-yet final RFI/VI reports for Stump Neck	George	Parking Lot
Final Site 12 PP meeting posters and presentations	George	2.0
Site 5 work plan discussion	Bob	1.0
Mattawoman Creek Study	George	0.5

Action: George will produce draft posters for Site 12 PP Meeting by 1/10/01.

- **Schedule of Future Meetings**

Date of meeting	10-11 January 2001	21-22 February 2001	21-22 March 2001	24-25 April 2001	23-24 May 2001
Location	Herndon	Indian Head	Philadelphia	Baltimore	Herndon
Host	CH2M HILL	Shawn	Dennis	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL
Chair	Shawn	Shawn	Dennis	Curtis	Rob
Scribe	Dennis	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Tier II Link	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Time Keeper	George	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Conference call will be on January 5th at 10 AM.

- **Meeting Evaluation**

(separate file)

- **Adjourned at 2:59 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
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	Completed on 11/01/00	Completed
12	Mattawoman Creek Risk Study	In progress	174	Develop problem formulation for Mattawoman Creek	Technical Team	08/31/2000	Completed on 11/14/00	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	182	Check piping by Buildings 165 and 496	Heidi Morgan	09/26/2000	Completed on 11/28/00	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	196	Talk to Armalia about the team goal submission	Rob Sadorra	10/25/2000	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	197	Update team goals for 2001-2002	Rob Sadorra	10/25/2000	Completed on 11/20/00	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	198	Update Work Load Tool and provide to Tony	George Latulippe	10/25/2000	Completed on 11/10/00	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	199	Update Work Load Tool and provide to team	Tony Tomlin	10/25/2000	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed

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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47:	In progress	205	Provide information on dumping across from N. G. Plant Lab (Building 766) near Site 47	Heidi Morgan	10/25/2000	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed

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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/10/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/10/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/14/00	Completed
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01:	In progress	212	Talk to legal counsel about reviewing RODs and PPs	Dennis Orenshaw	10/26/2000	Completed on	Completed

	(a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00						11/14/00	
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	Completed on 11/14/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/29/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/03/00	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	217	Send team goal proposal for FY 2001-2002 to team	Rob Sadorra	10/26/2000	Completed on 11/14/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/14/00	Completed
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	Completed on 11/14/00	Completed

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	Completed on 11/14/00	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
13	Graduate	In progress	To be defined	To be defined	Core Team	09/27/2000	In progress	02/22/2001
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	01/10/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	220	E-mail remaining Site 47 soil data to Team	Bob Root	11/29/2000	In progress	01/10/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	221	E-mail web link for Columbia Technologies to Team	Bob Root	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	222	Check with Jon Weier on where to sample sediments and surface water in the ditch below Site 47	Bob Root	11/29/2000	In progress	01/10/2001
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	223	Check the construction dates for Building 1718	Shawn Jorgensen	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000

To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	224	Check EPIC photos for evidence of stressed vegetation near Building 1718 after spill	Shawn Jorgensen	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	225	Check for evidence of location of spent fixer pipe between Buildings 1140 and 1718	Shawn Jorgensen	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	226	Consider explosives analyses at Site 39	Jim Costello, HGL	11/29/2000	In progress	12/14/2000
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	227	Check with risk personnel to find if explosives data can be used in risk assessments	Jim Costello, HGL	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	228	Check to see if the base laboratory can analyze for exotic constituents and what is the cost for Site 39	Shawn Jorgensen	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	229	Check to see if the propellant process at Site 44 was "double base"	Jim Costello, HGL	11/29/2000	In progress	12/14/2000
To be defined	Work Load Tool	In progress	230	Compare Rob's goals spreadsheet and incorporate Rob's changes to the Work Load Tool	Tony Tomlin	11/29/2000	In progress	12/06/2000
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	231	Talk to legal counsel about whether they will accept the level of detail proposed for the ROD	Dennis Orenshaw	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
1	Sign Record of Decision for Sites 12, 41, 42, and 44 by 04/04/01:	In progress	232	Get a copy of NAS Patuxent River's latest ROD and disseminate it to	Rob Sadorra	11/29/2000	In progress	12/08/2000

	(a) Finalize Feasibility Study by 04/19/00 (b) Finalize Proposed Plan by 09/13/00			the Team				
10	Become a Self-Facilitating Partnering Group by 10/01/00	In progress	233	Finalize checklist and send it out to the Team	Tony Tomlin	11/29/2000	In progress	12/15/2000
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	234	Send George the fact sheet of Site 12	Rob Sadorra	11/30/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
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	235	Find the site pictorial history and send it to George	Rob Sadorra	11/30/2000	In progress	12/15/2000
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	236	Look for a CERCLA process flowchart and send the information to George	Dennis Orenshaw	11/30/2000	In progress	12/15/2000
2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	237	Check process for securing state waiver for site 12 soil cover	Curtis DeTore	11/30/2000	In progress	12/15/2000

2	Finalize Treatability Report for Site 57 by 03/13/01:	In progress	238	Check Site 41 RI for boring logs form the SI	George Latulippe	11/30/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
10	Become a Self-Facilitating Partnering Group by 10/01/00	In progress	239	Provide the team with Team building resources for future use.	Janet Eastman	11/30/2000	In progress	02/21/2001
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	240	Provide letter indicating that there will be no further comments on the Site 12 and 41 draft final FSs	Dennis Orenshaw	11/30/2000	In progress	12/08/2000
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	241	Produce draft posters for Site 12 PP Meeting	George Latulippe	11/30/2000	In progress	01/10/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	242	Check with John Fairbank to see if Stump Neck RCRA sites are in the DSMOA	Curtis DeTore	11/30/2000	In progress	01/10/2001