MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 27-28, 2001

INDIAN HEAD INSTALLATION RESTORATION TEAM MEETING

INDIAN HEAD NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

INDIAN HEAD, MARYLAND

The meeting was held on June 27, 2001 and June 28, 2001, at the Founder's Inn in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

The following personnel attended the meeting on June 27, 2001:

Anne Estabrook – CH2M HILL
David Steckler – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Jeff Morris – EFACHES
Lee Ann Sinagoga – Tetra Tech NUS
Kent Cubbage– Tetra Tech NUS
Tim Smith – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Brad Rock - Tier II link

The following personnel attended the meeting on June 28, 2001:

Anne Estabrook – CH2M HILL
David Steckler – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Jeff Morris – EFACHES
Lee Ann Sinagoga – Tetra Tech NUS
Tim Smith – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Brad Rock - Tier II link

Wednesday, June 27, 2001

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up:, Dennis Orenshaw, Tim Smith, Kent Cubbage, Curtis DeTore (time keeper), David Steckler (minutes), Anne Estabrook (scribe and host), Lee Ann Sinagoga, Jeff Morris, Brad Rock (Tier II Link), and Shawn Jorgensen (chair). Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

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

Specific comments noted at the meeting are as follows:

No comments other than those that had been previously received.

- **Kent: Mattawoman Creek Study Update, Including Potential Screening and Scheduling**

Goal: Provide team with current status of study, including pros and cons of the field screening technology.

The leader opened with a summary of the discussion to follow. Specifically noted were comments recently received from the USEPA. The leader next provided a recap of what has been done to date. A major item of the work to date has been the problem formulation. The leader then turned to the field schedule. The leader felt that the schedule as is may be ambitious and may need to be modified in the near future. The leader then moved to a discussion of the comments from the USEPA:

Comment 2 (incorporating the TIE Study). A team member asked what the value of incorporating the study was. The leader mentioned such items as COPCs and confounding factors.

Comment 4 (the inclusion of a QAPP). The leader told the team that the document is currently being generated.

Comment 5 (detection limits). The leader explained that this would be included in the QAPP.

Comment 3 (data evaluation). The leader explained how the data evaluation will be performed and what factors are considered during data evaluation. The leader explained that two options are being considered: 1) put all of the data evaluation in the workplan; or 2) create a second document for the data evaluation. The leader felt that the latter was preferable because the workplan would not be held up waiting for the completion of the data evaluation write-up. A team member asked what would have been done if the USEPA had not provided the comment. The leader responded that the section would have been produced in any event; however, it was not clear whether it would have been a separate document or not.

The discussion turned to the application of field methods. To that end, the leader discussed sampling areas. The leader explained that using the field methods, the field team would be able to sample much larger areas with quick turn-around-time. This would allow the field team to focus fixed-base lab sampling. The leader noted that the methods may not be applicable because

the methods are not useful for the major risk drivers at Mattawoman Creek. A team member suggested that, if the methods are to be used, SOPs should be obtained from SPAWAR for the field methods to be included in the workplan.

The discussion turned to the use of TIE studies. The leader felt that it is better to conduct smaller efforts rather than go right to a TIE study. The discussion returned to whether or not the data evaluation section should be presented in a separate document from the workplan. The leader explained that the plan at this point is to move forward with the data evaluation as if it will be presented in the workplan. The leader noted that he is due to speak with BTAG about this issue to determine whether or not they have a preference . A team member noted that it may be prudent to generate a second document for data evaluation because of the 'open' time generated by data analysis and validation.

The discussion turned back to screening methods and the potential need for a consensus decision. The pros and cons were discussed. The issues were posed as three questions and responses:

- What is the cost? It appears to be nominal.
- Are mercury and silver detectable? Yes, but with a detection limit at 1-10 ppm.
- Does the schedule fit with ours? Possibly.

The discussion turned to the value of using the field screening methods. A team member asked whether the data generated from the screening methods would fill a hole or bolster work already planned. The response was that the data would bolster the data generated during the study.

Consensus Decision: The team agrees to proceed with the rapid screening method approach provided that the three criteria above are met.

Break

- **Anne: Discussion Phase I sampling at Sites 6, 39, and 45**

Goal: Share results of first phase of sampling and agree on whether or not phase 2 (installation of monitoring wells is necessary).

The leader opened the discussion by explaining what data was collected at Site 39. Inorganics (arsenic and chromium) were detected at elevated levels relative to SSLs (DAF 20); however, not by a large margin. Nitrocellulose was detected at the site at very low concentrations. There was one detection of 2-amino-4,6-DNT.

The discussion turned to the potential need for groundwater sampling. A team member asked about the depth to groundwater. The leader replied that it's not known at this time but based on topography it is anticipated to be deep. There was a general feeling among team members that groundwater sampling is not needed.

Consensus Decision: The team agrees that the installation of monitoring wells and groundwater sampling is not necessary at Site 39 based on the low potential for compounds detected in surface and subsurface soils to impact groundwater.

The leader then turned the discussion to Site 45. Filtered and unfiltered *in situ* groundwater samples were collected. In the unfiltered sample all inorganics were above RBCs. In the filtered samples, only manganese was detected at a concentration above the RBC and only in one sample.

The discussion turned to the need to install monitoring wells and collect groundwater samples. There was a general feeling among team members that, based on the *in situ* groundwater results, the installation of monitoring wells is not needed. Two team members, however, wanted to check with other individuals in their organizations prior to making a final decision.

Action Item: Dennis to check with hydro about Site 45 monitoring wells (filtered vs. unfiltered results) by 7/20/01

Action Item: Anne to finalize memo on Sites 39 and 45 to include discussion of Site 45 surface water sampling results and distribute results to team by 7/13/01

- **Anne and David: Discussion of RI Report for Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25**

Goal: Provide team with a summary of the RI Report.

The leader opened with a discussion of Site 11. The primary concerns at Site 11 are inorganics. Specifically arsenic, iron, and lead. Arsenic was detected in all the surface soil samples; in most instances, at concentrations above the background 95% UCL. A team member asked if arsenic was detected in the background monitoring well. The response was that it was. The leader remarked that in fact, the highest arsenic detection was observed in an upgradient well (at 8.2 ppb). The discussion then turned the risk drivers at the site. In surface soil the driver is cadmium. In sediment the risk is from iron. The discussion turned to the presence of lead. Lead was detected at high concentrations in several media but was not flagged as a health concern. A team member explained that this is not out of the ordinary because lead is treated differently from other inorganics.

The leader turned the discussion to Site 13. Surface and subsurface soil samples were collected. Surface soil samples contained inorganics at concentrations that exceeded facility-wide background. Subsurface soil samples did not. There was a slight risk to a child resident using the reasonable maximum exposure; however, there was no risk based on the central tendency.

The leader then turned the discussion to Site 17. Primarily of note at Site 17 are VOCs. Specifically, trichloroethene (TCE), dichloroethene (DCE), and vinyl chloride (VC). These compounds were detected in surface and subsurface soil. VC and DCE were detected in one monitoring well at concentrations in the thousands of ppb. The risk factors at the site are from exposure to DCE and VC as well as some inorganics. Iron was identified as posing some risk. It was noted, however, that ingestion of soil would only lead to the intake of iron at concentrations below the USDA recommended daily allowance.

The leader then turned the discussion to Site 21. The initial discussion focused on the extent of the former landfill. The risk at the site was to a future child resident due to manganese in groundwater. The risk primarily comes from one monitoring well that contained over 23,000 ppb of manganese.

The leader turned the discussion to Site 25. Silver was detected around building 588 but not in the adjacent swale. The risk at the site was to a future child resident due to manganese in groundwater. There were also small risks to future child and adult residents from iron, aluminum, arsenic, chromium, thallium, and vanadium in soil.

- **Shawn: Reconsider February 8, 2001 Consensus Agreement Regarding Background Issues**

Goal: Compare consensus agreements (2/8/01 vs. 5/24/01).

The leader opened the discussion by reviewing the consensus agreement of 2/8/01. A discussion ensued around the definition of 'anthropogenic' and the use of reference areas. Team members discussed why anthropogenic was considered 'effects from activities off-base' in the 2/8/01 agreement. A team member suggested continuing the discussion after a later presentation.

Lunch

Brad: Tier II Input

The leader opened the discussion by reminding the team to e-mail goals, updates, agendas, etc. to all Tier II members.

Action Item: David will e-mail goals, minutes, agendas, etc. to all Tier II members by 7/13/01.

The leader then discussed the WLT. Tier II asks that the WLT be sorted by Site.

Action Item: David will sort WLT by time and by site for future meetings.

The leader then turned to Site 5. The leader asked what has happened to the silver-contaminated soil that was removed from the site. A team member responded that soil from Swale 1 is encapsulated under the berm between Buildings 731 and 728 and the soil from Swale 2 went to reclaim the Rum Point borrow pit.

The leader conveyed two more requests from Tier II: 1) that the team not schedule any meetings when Tier II has their meeting; and 2) not to schedule a meeting unless all team members can be there. The leader then asked whether or not the team intends to meet on the second day of the joint meeting. The response was that we would.

Anne: Site 5 Update

Goal: Discuss the Site 5 RI workplan and obtain team input

The leader explained that based on discussions of the team, the plan should be to analyze surface soil samples for silver only and groundwater samples for metals. However, the risk assessor felt that it may not be possible to close the site using a screening level risk assessment without having any VOC samples. A short discussion began regarding the need for the analysis of additional parameters

Action Item: Dennis will check with Alvaro regarding his acceptance of screening of Site 5 for silver only by 7/13/01

- **Lee Ann: Suite of Analytes for Background Sampling**

Goals: Provide team with a summary of actions to date regarding background study

Goals: Discuss potential analytes for background sampling

The leader opened by discussing the objectives and sampling locations of the 1997 background investigation. Explanation of the methodology used to determine sampling locations and the analytical program were provided. The leader then turned to the results. In surface and subsurface soils acetone, phthalate, DDE, and DDD were detected. Inorganics in surface and subsurface soils were compared to published values and risk based values. A discussion of the descriptive statistics was then provided. This was followed by a discussion of geologic units and surface soils present at NSWC-IH. The leader and a team member compared soils maps and

geologic maps covering the base. The leader explained that uplands/lowlands designations would be assigned to soil samples based on descriptions of the soils at the time of collection.

The leader then moved to recommendations. The leader suggested sampling for full TAL and full TCL, grain size, and TOC. A team member asked whether the additional parameters were designed to build a database of these parameters or to ensure that the areas that the samples were collected from have not been impacted. The leader replied that both are valid reasons to analyze for a broader list of analytes. A team member noted that so far, the analyte list for site-specific samples has not included PCBs/pesticides and asked should we include that in the background list. Another team member noted that SVOCs do not usually fall out as risk drivers and asked whether or not it is prudent to sample for them in the background sample set. A discussion ensued about the value of having an expanded background data set. The discussion turned to the cost of the pesticide/PCBs analysis. A team member informed the team that the cost is about $250/sample.

Consensus Decision: The team agrees that the suite of analytes for background samples will include VOCs, SVOCs, TAL inorganics, pesticides/PCBs, grain size, and TOC.

- **Lee Ann: Determine Background Sample Locations for Surface and Subsurface Soil**

Goal: Provide team with potential sample locations, including rationale.

The leader opened the discussion by explaining the relationship between the soil and geology maps of Charles County. The western section of the base is a given soil type which also corresponds to a geologic formation. A team member suggested that a sample be collected from this area. The leader pointed out several areas where no sample had been collected. A team member asked if the objective of the additional sampling is to better characterize lowlands areas. The leader replied that that was one of the objectives. Team members looked at the various maps and suggested areas for sampling. A team member asked the leader to review the criteria used to select sampling locations. The leader replied that the idea was to create a data set that encompasses all soil types and geologic units.

The discussion turned to the use of the classification scheme. The leader showed a graphic that showed aluminum vs. elevation and explained that the graphic can be used to help define a classification scheme. A team member noted that it had been agreed to in the past that the intent of the background study was to get an accurate picture of the background data set but for it to remain simplified.

Action Item: Lee Ann will develop key tables and figures for background study workplan and share recommendations through e-mail by 7/20/01.

- **Curtis: Location of Site 12 Monitoring Wells**

Goal: Discuss Placement of Site 12 monitoring wells after remediation

The leader opened by relating a past discussion he had with a representative (rep) from Solid Waste at MDE. The rep had asked the leader if the wells present at the site would be abandoned. The leader replied that they would be.

The leader then proceeded to point out locations for monitoring wells on a map suggested by the rep. A team member asked for some frames of reference. The leader pointed out some landmarks. The leader returned to the discussion of the wells and the rep's point of view. The

rep wants points of compliance at the point where water that is leaving the landfill is entering a surface water body. The leader also mentioned that the rep approved the one area of the cap that will have less than a 4% grade due to the low elevation.

A team member asked why monitoring wells need to be installed and sampled as opposed to directly sampling the ponds. The leader responded that sampling the pond water would provided unreliable data due to the effects of dilution and volatilization and because the pond receives stormwater. The leader conceded that a monitoring well near the edge of the pond may draw in some surface water but that it would still provide a more representative sample of the water leaving the landfill. The discussion then turned to use of 'background' monitoring wells. One team member noted that upgradient wells will not provide data pertaining to the effectiveness of the proposed remedy. The leader explained the rep at Solid Waste requires these wells at all sites that are capped. The upgradient wells provide baseline data that can be used to compare against the down gradient wells. A team member suggested that if the upgradient wells need to be installed, the analyte list could be less than that of the other compliance points.

The team briefly discussed the logistics of installing the downgradient monitoring wells. Team members felt that it would be difficult due to the slope of the landfill. The team decided at that point that the design could proceed but needs to incorporate the Solid Waste rep's suggestions.

- **End meeting at 4:00 PM**

Thursday, June 28, 2001

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up:, Dennis Orenshaw, Tim Smith, Curtis DeTore (time keeper), David Steckler (minutes), Anne Estabrook (scribe and host), Lee Ann Sinagoga, Jeff Morris, Brad Rock (Tier II Link), and Shawn Jorgensen (chair). Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

- **David: Groundwater Flow Direction at Site 47**

Goal: Provide data on additional monitoring wells.

The leader began the discussion by explaining that the new monitoring wells had been surveyed and a groundwater flow map had been generated but one of the wells had an anomalous head value. The leader informed the team that a new round of water levels was scheduled to confirm or refute the anomalous head value. Based on this, the leader conveyed to the team that the discussion of groundwater flow direction at Site 47 should be postponed until the new data was collected. A new map could be generated and e-mailed to the team to be discussed at the monthly conference call.

A discussion ensued regarding VOC concentrations observed in MW05 and MW10. Two team members noted that additional wells would likely be needed. The rest of the team generally agreed. The discussion turned to the possible approach needed to ensure that if a new field effort is undertaken, it is the last field effort. Suggestions were as follows:

- Monitoring well installation
- In-situ groundwater sampling followed by monitoring well installation
- MIP followed by monitoring well installation
- In-situ groundwater sampling with an on-site GC followed by monitoring well installation

Action Item: Dave will investigate alternatives for investigation at Site 47 (including onsite GC, MIP, off site lab, etc.) and prepare memo to team with recommendations and cost comparison by 7/20/01.

One team member asked whether preparation of the RI report could continue while additional field work was being performed. The discussion turned to whether to incorporate new data into a 'pre-FS' or to hold the RI report to incorporate the new data. There was no general consensus.

Break

Curtis: Site 42 Alternatives

Goal: Discuss feasibility and requirements for Site 42 alternatives.

The leader opened the discussion by summarizing discussions he had with the head of Solid Waste at MDE regarding Site 42. The leader had provided engineered drawings to Solid Waste to gain input.

Solid Waste suggested 5 additional monitoring wells. A team member asked whether a bituminous concrete cap is acceptable. The leader explained that Solid Waste's position was that because of the cost constraints at the site, it was acceptable over a limited portion of the site. The leader told the team that Solid Waste wants to determine whether or not there is a plume emanating from the landfill. If there is, then an impermeable cap is required. If not, then a soil cap will meet their requirements. A team member asked about the depth of the pedestals that hold the steam lines. A team member responded that field work is presently occurring to determine that. A discussion ensued about the structure of the pedestals and whether or not it was feasible to add new concrete on top of the pedestals. A team member noted that, at present, the pedestals are exposed enough to install the bituminous concrete. Another team member asked whether or not the pedestals are in the waste. The response was that they are. A team member asked when the last time waste was disposed of at the site. A second team member responded that the last time was in 1985.

The leader returned to the installation of monitoring wells. Solid Waste suggested general areas for monitoring well installation but remains flexible as to the specific locations. Two team members examined a map and discussed specific locations. The team members discussed the extent of the landfill. One team member noted that there may be areas considered landfill where waste was not disposed of.

Action Item: Shawn will ask base personnel if there has been filling around steam line footers at Site 42 by 7/13/01.

Two team members discussed contaminant concentrations at Site 42. The discussion then turned to the direction of groundwater flow at Site 42. The leader noted the presumed direction of groundwater flow and showed monitoring well locations suggested by Solid Waste. The leader also explained the thought process leading to the locations. The leader reiterated that Solid Waste is flexible about the exact locations of the wells. A discussion ensued about the downgradient locations for monitoring wells. The discussion focused on whether wells installed across a stream would catch groundwater from the landfill. Team members discussed the discharge points for groundwater flow. The discussion then turned to samples collected from surface water and the results. A team member suggested the discussion back up a bit. The discussion returned to concentrations observed in groundwater. A team member noted that monitoring wells installed across the creek are not downgradient wells

Action Item: Dennis will ask EPA hydrogeologist to look at RI (regarding flow directions) for Site 42 and schedule conference call by 7/20/01.

The leader returned to the Solid Waste requirements. The leader said that at this point a variance from the requirement of an engineered cap would not be provided.

Action Item: Lee Ann will set up conference call with MDE, EPA and TTNUS hydrogeologists by 8/15/01.

Dennis: Team Building Exercise

Goal: Work together as a team.

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

Action Item: David will distribute updated WLT with the minutes by 7/13/01.

Action Item: Dennis will distribute marked up Site 12 ROD and set up conference call by 7/13/01.

Action Item: Shawn will provide BMP to Jeff by 7/13/01.

Action Item: Shawn will send GIS contract information to Jeff by 7/13/01.

Action Item: Shawn will revise 2/8 consensus agreement and distribute to team by 7/20/01.

Items left in the Parking Lot:

Parking Lot
Partnering session (Team building)
Update on institutional controls process
Discuss policy on base for ICs after meeting w/base personnel
Old acid waste disposal pit in lab area

- **Close Out**

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

Next Agenda	**Lead**	**Time (hr)**
Site 42 # of wells, GW characterization	George	1
OHM attendance at meetings	Dennis	0.5
Discuss teams involvement in construction changes	Dennis	0.5
Sites 6, 39, 45 update	Cindy	0.5
Site 5 update on field work	Anne	1.0
Site 47 update	David	1.5
Background study	Lee Ann/George	1.0
Mattawoman Creek field work update	Kent/George	1.0
Design issues 12, 41, and 42	George	1.5

- **Schedule of Future Meetings**

Date of meeting	15-16 August 2001	12-13 September 2001	9-10 October 2001	14-15 November 2001	15-16 January 2002	February 2002 TBD
Location	Indian Head	Philadelphia	Lancaster	Annapolis	Indian Head	TBD
Host	Shawn	Dennis	Tier II	Curtis	Shawn	TBD
Chair	Jeff	Dennis	Dennis	Curtis	Shawn	TBD
Scribe	Dennis	Jeff	George	Shawn	Curtis	TBD
Tier II Link	Steve	John T.	Brad	John F.	TBD	TBD
Time Keeper	Anne	Heidi	Shawn	George	Dennis	TBD

Conference calls will be on July 31 (to discuss the next meeting and the background study) and August 1st (to discuss Sites 6 and 47) at 10:00 AM.

- **Meeting Evaluation**

  (Separate file)

- **Adjourned at 1:30 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
To be defined	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45**	In Progress	302	Check on the possibility of doing fieldwork at Site 6 on Sundays (2 consecutive weekends)	Shawn Jorgensen	05/23/2001	Completed	06/08/2001
To be defined	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45**	In Progress	303	Check on what could have come out of the stack at Site 39	Shawn Jorgensen	05/23/2001	Completed	06/08/2001
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	307	Send groundwater elevation information for Site 42	George Latulippe	05/23/2001	Completed	06/01/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	308	Check on the need to have 2 feet of soil over the waste before a geomembrane can be installed	George Latulippe	05/23/2001	Completed	06/01/2001
To be defined	**Basewide Background Report**	In Progress	310	Prepare some suggestions for additional sampling for background/incorporation of existing data	Lee Ann Sinagoga	05/24/2001	Completed	06/27/2001

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
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	312	Prepare Site 12 Long Term Monitoring Plan, LUCAP, and LUCIP	George Latulippe	05/24/2001	Completed	06/27/2001
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	314	Ask Solid Waste where monitoring wells should be placed at Site 12 and generally	Curtis DeTore	05/24/2001	Completed	06/08/2001

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
To be defined	**To be defined**	In progress	287	Scope for BMP update	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In progress	289	Check on site contract to get GIS data into system	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	304	Check on historical information for abandoned waste acid disposal pit in lab area	Heidi Morgan	05/23/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	305	Check on the posting of the minutes on the website (printability)	Anne Estabrook	05/23/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	306	Report to team on LUCAP/LUCIP after meeting with Navy council	Jeff Morris	05/23/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
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	309	Check on as-builts for the steamline footers at Site 42	Shawn Jorgensen	05/23/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001
To be defined	**Basewide Background Report**	In Progress	311	Send Lee Ann CH2M HILL site-specific background sampling information	Anne Estabrook	05/24/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001

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
To be defined	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45**	In Progress	313	Send Anne information on risk numbers for exotic chemicals	Dennis Orenshaw	05/24/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45**	In Progress	315	Check with hydro about Site 45 monitoring wells (filtered vs. unfiltered results)	Dennis Orenshaw	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/20/2001
To be defined	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45**	In Progress	316	Finalize memo on Sites 39 and 45 to include discussion of Site 45 surface water sampling results and distribute results to team	Anne Estabrook	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	317	E-mail goals, minutes, agendas, etc. to all Tier II members	David Steckler	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**Work Load Tool**	In Progress	318	Sort WLT by time and site for future meetings	David Steckler	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	319	Check with Alvaro regarding his acceptance of screening of Site 5 for silver only	Dennis Orenshaw	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001

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
To be defined	**Basewide Background Report**	In Progress	320	Develop key tables and figures for background study workplan and share recommendations through e-mail	Lee Ann Sinagoga	06/27/2001	In Progress	07/20/2001
3	**Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00**	In Progress	321	Investigate alternatives for investigation at Site 47 (including onsite GC, MIP, off site lab, etc.) and prepare memo to team with recommendations and cost comparison	David Steckler	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/20/2001
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	322	Ask base personnel if there has been filling around steam line footers at Site 42	Shawn Jorgensen	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
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	323	Ask EPA hydrogeologist to look at RI (regarding flow directions) for Site 42 and schedule conference call	Dennis Orenshaw	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
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	324	Set up conference call with MDE, EPA, and TTNUS hydrogeologists	Lee Ann Sinagoga	06/28/2001	In Progress	08/15/2001

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
To be defined	**Work Load Tool**	In Progress	325	Distribute updated WLT with the minutes	David Steckler	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
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	326	Distribute marked up Site 12 ROD and set up conference call	Dennis Orenshaw	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	327	Provide BMP to Jeff	Shawn Jorgensen	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	328	Send GIS contract information to Jeff	Shawn Jorgensen	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/13/2001
To be defined	**To be defined**	In Progress	329	Revise 2/8 consensus agreement and distribute to team	Shawn Jorgensen	06/28/2001	In Progress	07/20/2001