

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 10-11, 2001

INDIAN HEAD PARTNERING TEAM MEETING

CH2M HILL OFFICE

HERNDON, VIRGINIA

The Partnering Team meeting was held on January 10 through January 11, 2001, at the CH2M HILL Office in Herndon, Virginia.

The following personnel attended the meeting on January 10, 2001:

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

The following personnel attended the meeting on January 11, 2001:

Bob Root – CH2M HILL
Tony Tomlin – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Heidi Morgan – NSWC Indian Head
Rob Sadorra – EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Neil Parker – EFACHES
Kent Cabbage – Tetra Tech NUS (via conference call)

Wednesday, January 10, 2001

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: CH2M HILL (host), George Latulippe (timekeeper), Dennis Orenshaw (scribe), Curtis DeTore (member facilitator), Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root, Rob Sadorra, Shawn Jorgensen (chair), and Heidi Morgan. Began meeting at 10 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

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

Shawn and Heidi provided comments prior to the meeting. There were no other comments.

- **Bob Root – Site 47 additional work plan discussion**

The purpose of the discussion was to discuss the sampling described in the work plan and consider adding more sampling to the work plan. Bob presented information on overheads.

MIP/EC profiling will occur at up to 15 locations, primarily south of Building 856 (highest levels of VOC contamination found in this location). Direct-push sampling will be used in up to 10 locations. As many as 6 monitoring wells are planned for installation. Based on a comment from the team, the wells will be located so bulldozing of trees is not required for installation. In the drainage ditch, soil, sediment and surface water samples will be collected and analyzed for TCL, LC PAHs (solids), TAL, AP, and TOC (no explosives). Surface soil and subsurface soil samples will be collected at the reported dump area, and they will be analyzed for TCL, LC PAHs (surface-soil only), TAL, explosives, AP (subsurface-soil only), and TOC.

The question of whether the lower level (deep) aquifer should be evaluated was briefly discussed. If an evaluation is conducted, then it should be presented as screening level data only, because only a few samples will be taken. The team went over the question of what is considered an adequate thickness of the confining clay layer; a 10-ft thickness was reaffirmed as being adequate.

Based on comments received pertaining to the RI report additional sampling will be added to the work plan. 6 shelby tube samples, to determine vertical hydraulic conductivity in the confining clay layer, will be collected. Slug tests will be done on wells in the upper aquifer. Also, at shelby tube locations, 6 subsurface soil samples will be collected from the unsaturated zone and analyzed for total organic carbon. Two water level measurement rounds, 3 months apart, will be conducted. Navy comments also suggested the need to sample for hydrazinium nitroformate (HNF). No one has checked whether laboratories can analyze for that chemical. The question was asked whether this would have been something that could have been spilled or applied to ground. HNF is an unstable propellant (explosive potential).

Action: Shawn and Heidi to check with activity personnel on the process that used HNF, possible disposal methods, chemical composition, and degradation products by 02/02/01.

The question was asked whether risks can be determined for this chemical. If not, then the concentration numbers will not be worthwhile for the RI report. The numbers may be helpful in determining whether HNF is an explosive hazard in the environment. MSDS sheets on the chemical may help in determining risks and hazards involved with the chemical. Clean-up goals could be based on the MSDS or explosives hazards concentrations from the safety department. The base laboratory should be able to determine concentrations and explosive hazard for HNF.

It was noted that more chemicals than HNF were produced in the building. If HNF were sampled for, then would the other chemicals have to be sampled for also? The idea was brought up that maybe we should not sample and instead just use a research approach to ruling out this chemical as a problem.

Also, a potential for dioxin contamination is present in conjunction with PAHs. The dioxins may have been a product of the building burning due to explosion. It is considered unlikely that the dioxins would be present after the long period of time since the building explosion and fire. If they are present, then they are probable in the top 6-inches of surface soil.

Action: Heidi will check with the activity chemist to see if dioxins were used in Building 856 by 2/2/01.

Decision: If there is no historical use of dioxins in the building, then there is no need to sample for dioxin.

Heidi led a discussion on historical photographs of the Site 47 vicinity. The drainage ditch near Building 856 may have been rerouted per the photographs. It was noted that during the construction of replacement bunkers south of the building there were problems with concrete not setting up due to the pH of the soil. These replacement bunkers were constructed to replace a large bunker that blew up southwest of the building. The ditch may have been situated in the area where the replacement bunkers were constructed. The existing ditch may have been constructed in the time period between the replacement bunker construction and the building repair after the explosion there. It was suggested that soil samples be taken near the replacement bunkers to see if the area was contaminated with chemicals deposited in the original ditch line. After the team looked at the historical photographs, a number of members were unsure of whether the existing ditch was not in the same course/CHANnel as the original ditch.

It was pointed out that a number of MIP profiles were to be done in the location of the magazines, but no soil samples were scheduled.

Decision: Bob will move forward with the work plan. No more sampling for the replacement bunker area will be scheduled at this time.

Action: Heidi and Shawn to check local topography and ditch locations, past and present, and ascertain how it may affect the Site 47 work plan by 1/26/01.

- Lunch

- **George Latulippe - Final Site 12 Proposed Plan Meeting Posters and Presentations**

A HANdout was given on the proposed posters and the draft; full-size posters were taped to the wall. The purpose of the discussion was to go over the posters and provide George with comments and guidance on the posters and presentation.

The role of the regulators was discussed. The regulators' experience has been that they are not normally confronted with involved questions and their involvement is limited.

The layout of the meeting stations in the meeting room was discussed. The dimensions and layout of the room itself should dictate how to layout the meeting stations. Normally, team members have seen the posters in the back of the room with the speakers in the front or on a stage.

The team addressed the poster issue. Comments were written directly on the full-size posters or the flip chart. The dimensions of the full-size poster were deemed adequate.

On the Site Map poster, George plans to make the site map larger and move the site location box. The following comments were made on the poster:

- Make the site map bigger.
- Delete the building shown in the site map.
- Add the logos of MDE and EPA (applicable to all posters).

The following comments were made on the Site Description/Operation History poster:

- CHANge period of landfill operation to "1960's to June 1980."
- Categorize bullets into sections of history and description.
- Add to end of current use statement, "...inhabited by wildlife."
- Some bullet items do not have periods at the end. Add period to the end of each bullet whether it is a sentence or sentence fragment.
- Delete words like "unauthorized," "trash," and "dumping."

On the General Process poster, quotes were given from the documents. These quotes were meant to represent the documents' overall conclusions. The following comments were made on the General Process poster:

- Add equivalency statements that the PA/SI are the same as the initial assessment study and confirmation study.
- For the ROD process block, cHANGe the blue type to state, "Record of Decision (ROD): Specifies the cleanup method and responds to public comments."
- Add these bullet items in the ROD process block: "Will consider public comments" and "Will select remedy."
- Delete these bullet items in the ROD process block: "Incorporate responsiveness summary," "Legal document," and "Prepare final document."
- In the ROD process block, cHANGe bullet item on signing the ROD to "EPA and Navy will accept and sign ROD."
- Remove the quoted passages from the process blocks.
- The process blocks for PA/SI, RI, and FS need to flow better to show reasons for doing each of the reports. Provide the scope/action and recommendation/conclusion of each report.

- PA/SI bullets for the 1983 study should be: "Old records reviewed and minimal samples collected" and "Arsenic detected."
- PA/SI bullets for the 1985 study should be: "Additional samples collected" and "No immediate threat to human health identified."
- RI bullets should be: "Collected environmental samples," "Performed human health risk assessment," "Performed ecological risk assessment," and "Identified regulatory requirements (i.e., landfill closure)."
- In addition to the existing FS bullets, add the following: "Evaluated five alternatives" and "Identified remedial action objectives."
- On the Proposed Plan process block, cHAnge blue text to say, "Proposed Plan: Outlines feasible alternatives and recommends a preferred course of action."
- In the Proposed Plan process block delete the "Currently under review."
- In the PP block add a bullet saying, "Present to public."

On the Pictorial History poster, the following comments were made:

- Provide another poster with photographs of the existing site that will be complementary to the Site Description poster.
- Provide another poster showing the current aerial of the site with the cap area outlined/highlighted.

Action: Shawn to send Site 12 photos to George for new poster(s) by 01/12/01.

Action: Tony will send electronic logos of MDE and EPA to George by 1/12/01.

Action: Rob will send the EFACHES logo to George by 1/16/01.

Action: George will put logos on the posters by 1/17/01.

On the ARAR poster, the text focuses on the need for a soil cover in order to meet landfill closure requirements. It was noted that the proposed plan's soil cover system does not strictly adhere to the ARAR's requirements. A variance to the ARAR is being requested in order for the soil cover system to be used. This variance request should be acknowledged as questions pertaining to the issue are presented. No text cHAnGes were made to the poster.

On the Human Health Risk poster, the poster highlights what risks are above the acceptable range. The ranges are given in scientific format (e.g., 1.0E-01). It was decided to use exponents (e.g., 1.0x10-01).

An ecological risk poster was not presented at the meeting, but will be created for the public meeting.

On the Proposed Plan poster, the following comments were made:

- Put the cross-section on a separate poster and add complimentary text for the soil cover and shoreline preservation.
- Under the land use controls bullet items move the first bullet to the third bullet and add at the end, "...and geographic information system."
- Delete "annually" from the fourth bullet under land use controls.
- Add box that notes costs of the preferred alternative.

The topic turned to how these posters will be grouped and who will be tending which poster grouping. Heidi and Shawn will tend Group 1. Curtis and Dennis will tend Group 2. George will tend Group 3. Rob will tend Group 4. Kent will attend the public meeting and will help tend Group 3 with George. The poster groupings are as follows:

Group 1: Site Map, Site Description, Existing Site Photography (landscape), Existing Site Photography (aerial), and Historical Photographs.

Group 2: Process Posters (2) and ARARs.

Group 3: Human Health Risk and Ecological Risk.

Group 4: Proposed Remedial Action (2).

The team turned to considering what broad issues need to be discussed in the presentation. The topics should include:

- Nine criteria
- Rationale (MDE regulations versus alternatives).
- All FS alternatives (5) with costs.
- Ways for public to comment.
- Responsiveness summary.
- Next steps.
- Proposed vs. selected remedy.
- Residential health scenarios as hypothetical scenarios.
- Facility IR history (NPL listing, public input through the RAB, and IHIRT).

Shawn and Rob will be presenting for the meeting. They will organize the topics for the presentation. It was noted that the presentation show be clear and to the point, so that the public feels there has been no attempt to obfuscate.

- **George Latulippe – Site 12 ROD Language – Long-Term Monitoring (LTM)**

The purpose of this topic was to determine the extent of discussion on LTM to put in the ROD.

Page 2-40 from the ROD was HANDED out. The draft language for LTM is presented on this page. It was noted that at the last partnering meeting it was agreed that the language should not include specifics, such as how often to sample and what constituents to analyze.

The issue of MDE concurrence was discussed. The sentence, "A long-term monitoring plan will need to be developed with EPA and MDE concurrence to detail the frequency, media type, analysis, and locations of the long-term monitoring samples," was noted. MDE does not sign the ROD, however decisions made in order to sign a ROD will include MDE acceptance. It was noted that the sentence specifies that MDE acceptance is needed on the monitoring plan, not on the ROD itself.

Decision: Leave in sentence that notes that MDE concurrence is needed on the long-term monitoring plan.

The sentence, "Details on the land use controls will need to be developed as part of the remedial design and approved by EPA and MDE," was discussed. The word "approved" should be CHANGED to "concurred with."

The third paragraph discusses long-term monitoring. It is under the land use controls section. The long-term monitoring should not be under the land use controls section; it should be its own section, Section 2.12.2.4. The fourth paragraph about the 5-year review should also be its own section, Section 2.12.2.5. Otherwise, the language for long-term monitoring was considered sufficient for the ROD.

The team decided to focus the conversation on what language to have in the land use control section. Delete the sentence, "Monitoring will be performed to confirm that migration of contaminants from the site to the environment is not occurring."

The restrictions to put in the land use controls section were listed as follows:

- No residential use.
- No use of groundwater as a potable water source.
- Other groundwater uses require Navy approval.
- After the construction of the landfill cover, prior approval of any activities that may disturb the cover must be authorized by the Navy prior to said disturbance.

The question was asked as to whether there needs to be a statement on how the above noted restrictions will be implemented. Presently, there is not a land use control plan in place at Indian Head. The mechanism for implementing and enforcing the controls may not be developed before the remedial action is complete. The language in the ROD needs to be broad to allow for a situation where a formal LUCAP has not been completed.

Decision: The following language will be added to the ROD: Navy, EPA, and MDE will develop and maintain a plan to ensure these restrictions will be implemented.

The Navy does not want to reference a LUCAP/LUCIP in the ROD. It is preferred that the restrictions and implementation of the restrictions be discussed in the ROD as it has been in the past, before the advent of the LUCAP.

- **Tony Tomlin – Site 13 Sampling Results**

The purpose of the conversation to reevaluate the consensus agreement made during the August partnering meeting on not installing monitoring wells at Site 13. It was explained that since that decision subsurface soil data has been received that shows there are arsenic concentration above soil screening levels near Site 13. The concentration and locations of the hits were presented on a map of the site. The concentrations were deemed to be within background levels for arsenic at the site. It was also noted that the location where the highest concentration were found are now under a newly developed parking lot and building. Team members stated that the magnitude of the concentrations were not significant enough to justify the expense of installing the wells.

Consensus Agreement: The consensus agreement from the August 2000 partnering meeting was reaffirmed; no wells will be installed at Site 13.

- **End meeting at 5:50 PM**

Thursday, January 11, 2001

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up: CH2M HILL (host), George Latulippe (time keeper), Dennis Orenshaw (scribe), Curtis DeTore (member facilitator), Tony Tomlin (minutes), Bob Root, Rob Sadorra, Shawn Jorgensen (chair), Heidi Morgan, Neil Parker, and Kent Cabbage (via conference call). Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **George Latulippe – Discussion on Long-Term Monitoring (LTM) Details (Analytes, Frequency, Exiting Criteria)**

The purpose of the discussion was to provide George with guidance on the specifics for a long-term monitoring plan of groundwater. It was requested that the group focus on three topics. The first topic was the standard by which any collected data would be compared. Direct comparison of data to a specific standard, such as an MCL, was Tetra Tech's preferred standard. The second topic was what to sample for during the monitoring events. One idea was to go through the RI report and pick the chemicals that were noted as problem sources. The third topic was the frequency of the sampling. One idea was to collect data on an annual basis.

The topics were captured on the board. On the topic of what to monitor for the following ideas were noted:

- COCs maybe used as a starting point.
- The analytes that are risk drivers for the action.
- Chemicals that stand out when a comparison is done to standards such as MCLs or risk numbers that are more stringent than what is of concern in the RI report.
- There should be step-down criteria based on reviews of data.
- Surrogates/indicators of other chemicals may be sampled.

On the topic of frequency of sampling, the following ideas on what will influence frequency were noted:

- Extent of historical data will influence the data, such as site operations.
- Stakeholder concerns.
- COCs: mobility and degradation products.
- Magnitude of effect of contaminant level increases.
- Step-down criteria based on reviews of data (5-year or sooner).
- Funding available for sampling.

On the topic of data comparison, ideas on exiting criteria was noted as follows:

- Published list of standards (e.g., MCLs).
- Risk based concentrations.
- Budget/funding (who's paying for what).
- Stakeholder input.
- Criteria for reducing analytes sampled and/or frequency.
- Concentration levels stabilize or become asymptotic.
- Guidance documents (EPA, Navy, etc.).

It was pointed out that the issues captured are similar to the issues discussed in the Navy guidance document on this subject.

There is a requirement to have at least three sampling rounds to show a downward trend in analytes. This is out of the EPA guidance document on natural attenuation.

The discussion turned from looking at how to end long-term monitoring to what happens if the concentrations increase. The question, what types of triggers need to be in the plan to deal with greater contamination problems, was asked. Specifics were not discussed. It was decided that the exiting criteria should also consider what happens if levels increase.

The discussion turned to how George should move forward. George will develop an outline of the Site 12 long-term monitoring plan. At some point in the future, the team will discuss the outline and fill in the blanks and expand the outline, as necessary. If the outline is general enough, it may be used as a template for other sites.

The conversation turned to long-term maintenance of the landfill. The wording for signs was brought up as a topic. That issue will be examined during the design phase.

Action: Heidi to check with Indian Head's public works about sign standards and provide information to George by 2/7/01.

Action: George will work up an outline of the Site 12 long-term monitoring plan by 2/7/01.

- **Break**
- **George Latulippe and Shawn Jorgensen – Background Report**

The purpose of the discussion is to identify issues needing resolution prior to finalizing the Background Report. The report should be considered as a report of data to be used for background samples. Upper confidence limits noted in the report are not going to be used by the Navy for background purposes. The statistical analysis, such as a hypothesis test, to determine a specific background number will be done to compare the report data and specific site data; background values will be based on this type of approach. The issues to be resolved before finalization are:

- Navy policy on developing background data.
- Use of background report data (compare data sets and others obtaining comparison numbers).
- Chemicals to include in background report.

- Use of literature background values.
- Anthropogenic chemicals (how to HANdle).
- Railroad tracks and arsenic.
- Tying in new background samples into existing background data.

It was noted that the current report focuses on metals, pesticides, and PCBs. The report was not set up to provide data for SVOCs, VOCs, TPH.

The distribution of the samples in the report was discussed. Most samples were taken in the upland areas. There were none taken near Mattawoman Creek. The areas where samples were collected were not likely to have been affected by run-off from contamination areas. However, the locations were not near any human activity. Pesticides probably would not have been applied in these areas, but the background data should take into account normal human activity (anthropogenic effects), not considered contamination, that was conducted at the base. There may be a need to add more sample points to increase the data set. The point was made that the purpose of the background report is to reduce the cost of doing background sampling at each site. Taking more samples to expand the data set may be counter to that aim. Another point was made that an upgradient well will be installed at sites and that that data can be used as background. The data from the upgradient well can also be used to show that the contamination extent is not in the upgradient area. If there is contamination in the upgradient sample, then it can not be considered part of the background data set.

Action: Dennis to distribute ROD forum information to the team by 1/16/01.

Action: Rob to distribute EPA background guidance to the team by 1/16/01.

Neil Parker, ecological representative from Navy, was introduced. He came for the Mattawoman Creek study discussion.

- **Break**
- **George Latulippe and Kent Cabbage – Mattawoman Creek Study**

The purpose was to update the group on progress with the study. Tetra Tech submitted the problem formulation to BTAG on November 21, 2000. Comments on the document have been received. Chemicals of concern, bioassays, fate and transport, conceptual model, risk questions, and assessment endpoints were all discussed in the report. BTAG made the major comment that language needs to be added to help transition from one section to another section. There were no "show-stopper" comments. BTAG felt that the formulation was in-line with their approach. Some of the analysis may be phased to keep cost down. For example, tests that may show another test is unnecessary will be conducted first, then a determination will be made on the need for the other test. BTAG asked that alternative screening levels be suggested for use in some of the testing.

Kent went over comments that were made on starting the next phase, the work plan and sampling and analysis phase. BTAG believes that Tetra Tech is ready to start putting together a work plan.

The final version of the problem formulation will be sent out on February 15, 2001. The work plan will probably be submitted in draft form by early May, but perhaps as late as June. Tetra Tech wishes to have the team and BTAG provide comments on it.

Curtis noted that the Maryland State Secretary of the Environment requested and has received information on Indian Head with a large portion of the information focusing on the Mattawoman Creek Study. No comments or questions have been received from the Secretary.

- **Shawn Jorgensen - Team Assessment**

A three page survey, Self-Facilitating Team Follow-up Survey, was handed out. Team members individually filled out the survey, then discussed their answers with the group.

- **Lunch**

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

Reviewed revised meeting checklist that the team was given at the December partnering meeting.

Decision: Use the meeting checklist individually as an informal document to assess the group. The checklist will be added to the Deliverable Package.

The following items were left in the parking lot:

- Background report finalization.
- How do we HANdle the not-yet final RFI/VI reports for Stump Neck was left in the parking lot?

WLT was reviewed.

- **Close Out**

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

Next Agenda	Lead	Time (hr)
Graduation	Shawn	1.0
Background report issues (issues listed in January minutes)	Rob	2.0
Analysis for non-standard compounds at sites	Dennis	1.5
How to move forward on sites where we used the background report	Rob	1.5
Partnering	Janet	1.0
Lab Area WP comment discussion	Tony	0.5
Site 6, 39, and 45 comment discussion	Tony	0.5

- **Schedule of Future Meetings**

Date of meeting	7-8 February 2001	21-22 March 2001	24-25 April 2001	23-24 May 2001	27-28 June 2001
Location	Indian Head	Philadelphia	Baltimore	Herndon	Virginia Beach
Host	Shawn	Dennis	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL	CH2M HILL
Chair	Shawn	Dennis	Curtis	Rob's replacement	Shawn
Scribe	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Tier II Link	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Time Keeper	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Action: Bob to check costs on Virginia Beach conference information by 2/7/01.

Conference call will be on January 30th at 10 AM.

- **Meeting Evaluation**

(Separate file)

- **Adjourned at 2:50 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
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	Completed on 01/10/01	Completed
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	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed
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	Completed on 01/10/01	Completed
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	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/14/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed

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	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/14/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/06/00	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	231	Talk to legal counsel about whether they will accept the level of detail proposed for the ROD	Dennis Orenshaw	11/29/2000	Completed on 12/08/00	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	232	Get a copy of NAS Patuxent River's latest ROD and disseminate it to the Team	Rob Sadorra	11/29/2000	Completed on 12/08/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/15/00	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	235	Find the site pictorial history and send it to George	Rob Sadorra	11/30/2000	Completed on 12/15/00	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	236	Look for a CERCLA process flowchart and send the information to George	Dennis Orenshaw	11/30/2000	Completed on 12/15/00	Completed
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	Completed on 12/08/00	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	240	Pursue letter indicating that there will be no further comments on the Site 12 and 41 draft final FSS	Dennis Orenshaw	11/30/2000	Completed on 12/08/00	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	241	Produce draft posters for Site 12 PP Meeting	George Latulippe	11/30/2000	Completed on 01/10/01	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	02/07/2001
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	01/25/2001
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	01/19/2001
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	02/07/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	243	Check with activity personnel on the process that used HNF, possible disposal methods, chemical composition, and degradation products	Heidi Morgan	01/10/2001	In progress	02/02/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	244	Check with activity personnel on the process that used HNF, possible	Shawn Jorgensen	01/10/2001	In progress	02/02/2001

				disposal methods, chemical composition, and degradation products				
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	245	Check with the activity chemist to see if dioxins were used in Building 856	Heidi Morgan	01/10/2001	In progress	02/02/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	246	Check local topography and ditch locations, past and present, and ascertain how it may affect the Site 47 work plan	Heidi Morgan	01/10/2001	In progress	01/26/2001
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	247	Check local topography and ditch locations, past and present, and ascertain how it may affect the Site 47 work plan	Shawn Jorgensen	01/10/2001	In progress	01/26/2001
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	248	Send Site 12 photos to George for new poster(s)	Shawn Jorgensen	01/10/2001	In progress	01/12/2001
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	249	Send electronic logos of MDE and EPA to George	Tony Tomlin	01/10/2001	In progress	01/12/2001
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	250	Send the EFACHES logo to George	Rob Sadorra	01/10/2001	In progress	01/16/2001

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	251	Put logos on the posters	George Latulippe	01/10/2001	In progress	01/17/2001
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	252	Check with Indian Head's public works about sign standards and provide information to George	Heidi Morgan	01/11/2001	In progress	02/07/2001
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	253	Work up outline of the Site 12 long-term monitoring plan	George Latulippe	01/11/2001	In progress	02/07/2001
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	254	Distribute ROD forum information to the team	Dennis Orenshaw	01/11/2001	In progress	01/16/2001
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	255	Distribute EPA background guidance to the team	Rob Sadorra	01/11/2001	In progress	01/16/2001
To be defined	To be defined	To be defined	256	Check costs on Virginia Beach conference information	Bob Root	01/11/2001	In progress	02/07/2001