

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 24-25, 2001

INDIAN HEAD INSTALLATION RESTORATION TEAM MEETING

INDIAN HEAD NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

INDIAN HEAD, MARYLAND

The meeting was held on April 24, 2001 and April 25, 2001, at the Wyndham Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland.

The following personnel attended the meeting on April 24, 2001:

Anne Estabrook – CH2M HILL
David Steckler – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Heidi Morgan – NSWC Indian Head
Jeff Morris – EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Armalia Berry-Washington - Tier II link

The following personnel attended the meeting on April 25, 2001:

Anne Estabrook – CH2M HILL
David Steckler – CH2M HILL
Curtis DeTore – Maryland Department of the Environment
Shawn Jorgensen – NSWC Indian Head
Heidi Morgan – NSWC Indian Head
Jeff Morris – EFACHES
George Latulippe – Tetra Tech NUS
Dennis Orenshaw – US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Armalia Berry-Washington - Tier II link

Wednesday, April 24, 2001

- **Introductions**

Familiarizing group, catching up:, Dennis Orenshaw, George Latulippe, Curtis DeTore (chair), David Steckler (minutes), Anne Estabrook (host), Jeff Morris (timekeeper), Shawn Jorgensen (scribe), and Heidi Morgan. Began meeting at 10 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

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

Specific comments noted at the meeting are as follows:

One team member felt the minutes could come across as condescending to the RAB. Specifically noted was the use of the phrase "manage the RAB" on Page 2.

Consensus Decision: Change minutes to rephrase statement.

Team Members discuss previous evaluation, focusing on Deltas

- **George: Long Term Monitoring Plan Outline**

Goal: Determine the order of discussion and the level of detail for the long term monitoring.

Leader opens the floor for questions and discussion. Specific questions are as follows:

Is there a place to allow for regulatory concurrence?

Would it be appropriate to add a section regarding base-wide LTM vs. site-wide LTM?

Members discuss format: First sections are "boiler plate"; following sections would be site-specific. Sections could be added as site-specific LTMs are developed.

A team member asked for a definition of the terms LUCIP and LUCAP:

LUCAP = Land Use Control Assurance Plan: documents the procedures to be followed to access sites at the facility

LUCIP = Land Use Control Implementation Plan: documents site-specific controls to be implemented to prevent land uses not permitted in the site ROD without following procedures outlined in LUCAP

LTM = Long Term Monitoring Plan: documents actions to be performed to ensure LUCIP controls are in good condition and selected remedy is providing desired levels of protection

The discussion turned to the format of the LTM/LUCIP/LUCAP document. One team member suggested that the LTM could include the LUCAP and the LUCIP. Another team member suggested that the LTM could be an appendix to LUCIP. A third team member suggested that the discussion of post closure maintenance be in the body of the LUCIP.

A summary of ideas about these documents is as follows:

LUCAP

- One basewide document; nonspecific
- Includes a general statement about periodic LUCIP maintenance procedures that will be performed to ensure LUCs remain effective

ROD

- Documents what institutional controls are required for protection of human health and the environment

LUCIP

- Documents how the institutional controls required in the ROD are implemented and maintained for a specific site
- Appendix to LUCAP

LTM

- Documents sampling, analysis, and evaluation of data for a specific site
- Attachment to LUCIP

Consensus Decision: Future LUCAPs, LUCIPs, RODs and LTMs for Indian Head will adhere to the general structure listed above.

Action Item: Jeff will scope LTM/LUCAP/LUCIP by 6/27/01

Action Item: George will check on LTM/LUCAP/LUCIP Guidance by 5/11/01

- **Lunch**
- **Shawn: Develop Process to Implement Institutional Controls**

Goal: Discuss processes in place, including strengths and weaknesses, to implement institutional controls. The discussion focused on the Base Master Plan (BMP): strengths, weaknesses, solutions (to weaknesses), and current progress. Member explains self-evaluation program at IH. The discussion turns to the contents of the BMP. One team member suggested the BMP may not be applicable to the IR Sites. A team member responded that all work at the base must be in accordance with the BMP. Team members discussed the purpose behind the BMP and its uses.

The discussion then moved to GIS. A team member asked if the base has personnel to maintain the GIS? Who 'owns' the GIS? A team member responded that it is Jeff Bossart at Natural Resources. Other questions raised were: Who can access the GIS? What information is in the GIS? (e.g. monitoring well locations, etc.)?

Another team member noted that at NAS Patuxent, national security issues arose because of the potential for terrorists to learn the layout of the base if the GIS was publicly accessible. It was noted that a similar concern may arise at IH.

The discussion next moved to the use of work permits. Specifically, whether or not permits are required for all uses of all sites. An example was provided that a family may want to have a picnic at a site. On the one hand, a permit seemed overkill just to have a picnic; however, on the other hand, the people having the picnic would be upset if they later found out that the site they (and possibly their kids) ate at was an IR site.

The discussion moved to the use of 'fact sheets'. A team member suggested fact sheets could be used to show all potential COCs based on available information. A team member noted that

credit card purchasers (Navy personnel who set up contractors without a contracting officer) would not understand environmental conditions of site. Team members discussed the number of credit card users at IH. A team member raised the issue of NEPA and 'categorical exclusions' such as normal maintenance. The discussion then turned to station instructions; use and implementation. A team member discussed how station instructions provide mechanisms for particular actions. The team then discussed how the use of station instructions could be used to limit land use at IR sites.

The discussion turned to the mechanisms in place to provide information to potential users of IR Sites. A team member suggested that the only authority keeping people from using IR Sites is the work permit procedure. A second member mentioned that the BMP is another layer of authority.

The following issues pertaining to implementing institutional controls were noted:

- Long term land use
 - Conform to BMP
- Credit Card purchasers
 - Issue requirements
- NEPA Categorical Exclusions (routine maintenance)
- Work Permits

A team member asked if the credit card 'overseer' could issue a statement to users informing them of issues pertaining to IR Sites. Team members discussed land uses that should be able to be controlled but are not (e.g. buildings must get NEPA permit prior to construction; however, it does not always happen that way). The team members discussed the need for the Navy to better enforce the use of station instructions as a mechanism for limiting access to sites.

The discussion turned to the use of the GIS to access IR reports. A team member suggested that CH2M HILL could provide support to input data into base GIS. Team members discussed the amount of data to be input into the GIS and the formats used by different contractors.

Action Item: Heidi will set up meeting with base personnel to discuss institutional controls by 5/23/01.

Action Item: Jeff will check with other RPMs on processes to implement institutional controls and relay that information to Heidi and Shawn by 5/23/01

Action Item: Jeff will scope for BMP Update by 5/23/01

Action Item: Jeff will talk to Steve Hurff about GIS format by 5/23/01

Action Item: Jeff will check on using Site contract to get GIS data into system by 5/23/01

George: Determine Level of Detail and Number of Submittals for Site 12 Design

Goal: Inform team regarding EFACHES requirements for the various levels of design submissions. The leader provided the team with a handout and explained that the handout is a distillation of the EFACHES guidance document. The percentages were explained as seen by the leader:

The 35% drawings would be conceptual. The 35% Basis of Design Report documents all calculations and assumptions. The 35% Outline specifications is a 'Table of Contents'. The 35%

Cost estimate is a rough estimate. The 35% Stormwater Management and Erosion/Sediment report is prior to any comments at local level.

The 60% drawings would be no less than 50% complete. The 60% Project specifications would be printed in draft form. The 60% Cost estimate has more detail than 35%. The 60% calculations include stormwater runoff, etc. Stormwater Management and Erosion/Sediment report should be 100% complete at this point.

The 100% drawings would be complete. The 100% Project specifications would be complete. The 100% calculations corrected as applicable to design disciplines. Stormwater Management and Erosion/Sediment report ready for submission to the state.

The team members concurred that 35%, 60%, and 100% were good points for submittals.

The leader then discussed the design for the raising the road at Site 12. A team member raised the question of when the RAC would get involved? The leader suggested somewhere around the 60% submission (May 10, 2001). This assumed no fundamental changes to the design. A team member used NAS Patuxent as an example of getting the RAC involved early (at 35% submittal).

A team member mentioned that LANTDIV requests electronic deliverables for drawings. The leader expressed a concern about electronic stamps for drawings. The leader was concerned that after a drawing was stamped, it could be altered.

Action Item: Jeff will get the RAC involved in Review of Site 12 RA Design by 5/23/01.

- **George: Site 41 and 44 Responsiveness Summary**

Goal: discuss comments received on Sites 41 and 44 . First, Elmer Biles' previous comments were discussed. The discussion then turned to his present comments. There was a feeling that his comments were more questions than comments. The approach to addressing Elmer's questions were discussed. Also noted was Elmer's statement that his Site 12 comments are also applicable to Site 41 and 44.

The discussion turned to specific questions in Elmer's letter.

Consensus: There was an agreement to submit formal responses to comments received by Elmer Biles.

A general response to the applicability of Site 12 comments to Sites 41 and 44 was to see the responses to Site 12.

Elmer asked if the scrapyard would continue to act as a scrapyard. The response was yes; procedures are in place to prevent future environmental contamination. Hazardous materials and PCBs will not be stored there. Current Station Instructions do not allow for the acceptance of hazardous materials at the scrapyard. A discussion ensued about the type of metal brought to the scrapyard.

The discussion then focused on the word 'restrict'. A general response was agreed upon. The following was noted: 'restrict' does not mean 'prohibit'. The institutional controls applied to the site allow for the continual use of the site for industrial purposes which is consistent with the assumptions of the HHRA.

The discussion then moved to the question of whether or not a certain road would remain in use. A general response is as follows: the road is still in use and will remain in use. No unacceptable human health risks exist from current or future use of the road as documented in the human health risk assessment.

- **Heidi: Site 28 Investigation Priority**

Goal: Inform the team of a potential priority change for Site 28 based on the TIE Study. The leader summarized Site 28 including a site description. A discussion ensued about the lay of the site. The leader returned to the history of the site. Past sampling indicated high zinc concentrations and site history indicated there was a zinc recovery operation in that area. Recent water samples collected in Mattawoman Creek contained 25,000 ppm zinc. Based on this, the leader suggested reevaluating the priority of Site 28. The discussion turned to a recalculation of the relative ranking score.

Action Item: Jeff will check the ranking of Site 28 using new data by 6/27/01.

The leader raised the issue that the new data may be an ecological issue as well as a human health concern. The leader also raised the issue of the Mattawoman Creek study.

The discussion turned to the general topic of disturbance of IR Sites. It was noted by a team member that soil should neither be brought to or removed from IR Sites. The team member suggested that when soil needs be removed from an IR Site, Heidi or Shawn should be notified prior to disturbance.

- **End meeting at 4:50 PM**

Thursday, April 25, 2001

- **Introductions**

Group discussed previous night: Dennis Orenshaw, George Latulippe, Curtis DeTore (chair), David Steckler (minutes), Anne Estabrook (host), Jeff Morris (timekeeper), Shawn Jorgensen (scribe), and Heidi Morgan. Began meeting at 8 AM.

- **Review today's agenda**

- **Anne: Sites 11, 13, 17, 21, and 25**

Goal: to provide team with a preview of findings from the RI report:

The highlights of Site 11 were:

- Lead concentrations up to 132,000 mg/kg in surface soil
- Some hits of lead above MCL in GW
- No explosives or VOCs in soil or GW at concentrations of concern
- SVOCs in soil may be of concern depending on the HHRA
- Lead in SD increases in downgradient direction from Site 17
- DRO spread evenly across the site at concentrations greater than 100 mg/kg

A team member asked why the MDE action level for DRO is 100 mg/kg. Another team member responded that the level is arbitrary (not based on risk).

The discussion then moved to lead in soil. A team member suggested that there may be a possible hot spot that could be removed. Another team member mentioned that due to active burning at Site 11, a large pad will be constructed at the site and that the proposed pad is due to be constructed at the location of the hottest soil samples. Team members discussed that the site will likely be capped in the future; therefore, the pad will be lost. A team member mentioned that fired rocket motors, painted with lead based paint, were burned at the site. The leader suggested collecting additional samples from the hot spot. A team member asked if leader would suggest sample locations at this point. The leader suggested waiting for the results of the HHRA.

The highlights of Site 17 were:

- Sediment concentrations of lead increase in a down stream direction,
- Some TCE in surface and subsurface soil
- GW samples contained high hits of DCE and VC,
- SVOC concentrations correspond to elevated VOC levels
- No VOCs in SW

The discussion focused on past processes at site 17. Motors were dipped in drums of TCE then in paraffin. A team member suggested waiting for the HHRA before suggesting further action. A team member asked if SVOCs were detected in sediment. The leader replied that SVOCs were not detected in sediment.

Action Item: Anne will send SW/SD coordinates to Kent by 5/4/01.

The highlights of Site 13 were:

- Metals not of concern; arsenic above reported background,
- One hit of GRO of 66 mg/kg by the side of the road,
- Two hits of DNT in surface soil

The discussion turned to past grading activities. Soil samples were taken from a soil pile but then the soil pile was removed from the site. The team discussed concentrations of constituents from soil samples from the soil pile. The leader suggested that the removal of samples 4, 5, and 6 (which were collected from the soil pile) will likely not affect the HHRA but may affect the ERA.

Action Item: Heidi will investigate topsoil removal from Site 13 and provide info to Anne by 5/4/01.

The highlights of Site 21 were:

- Limits of waste are as expected
- Some SVOCs in surface soil
- Metals in groundwater at low concentrations, no VOCs, no SVOCs.

The discussion focused on the present use of the site. Wet soil is brought to Site 21 to dry. A team member mentioned possible asbestos bags at site 21. The discussion turned to the type of potential cap to be used at the site. It was noted that waste is not within the water table; therefore, MDE will likely require an engineered cap (RCRA Subtitle D). Team members discussed what defines a landfill. It was noted that Site 21 does not have an engineered bottom. A team member asked if the soil being brought to Site 21 did not originate in an IR Site is it acceptable to place the soil there. There was a general opinion that it was okay.

The highlights of Site 25 were:

- The focus was to find silver, one sample collected east of the site contained 200 ppm
- Few VOCs and SVOCs
- Inorganics in GW not consistent with soil sampling

The discussion then turned to groundwater flow direction. It is not clear which way groundwater is flowing.

The leader noted that the ERA/HHRA is the critical path and the report will likely be coming in late May.

- **Anne: Site 47 Update**

Goal: Provide the team with a summary of the data available to date from the second phase of the investigation. The leader informed the team that the proposed monitoring wells were installed at the site. The leader also informed the team that the analytical data to be summarized was not back from the lab yet and therefore there was nothing to report at this time.

- **Anne: Preview of Site 5 Workplan**

Goal: to provide the team with a preview of the proposed scope of work at site 5. The leader informed the team that the purpose of the fieldwork is to investigate groundwater. To that end,

three 2-inch wells are proposed. The discussion focussed on the upgradient well. The team was concerned with the placement of the well. The Proposed location was moved across the road to avoid the berm surrounding the facility.

A team member asked whether or not any further soil sampling needs to be done. The member also wanted to know what the cleanup goal was. The response was 10 ppm. The discussion turned to past soil confirmatory sampling at the site. The team wanted to know whether the past removal action had sufficient confirmatory sampling.

Action Item: Anne will review soils data from confirmatory sampling at Site 5 including 'unknown' section of swale and determine if risk assessment was done by 5/23/01.

The discussion turned to a portion of Site 5 that will be addressed as part of an adjoining landfill. Areas south of Site 5 were shown as 'no risk' based on eco-toxicity work done in the past. A removal action was shown in the center of the site. No data is available in the southwest portion of the site. The discussion focused on the swale within Site 5. A team member suggested that the swale is scoured out periodically which likely means little sediment is left in the channel. A team member suggested getting the confirmatory sampling data and running an ERA on it and closing it on that basis. The leader responded that the team may not need to do that because regulators 'signed off' on the 10 ppm level. A team member mentioned the NPL review of past actions to determine the status of site. A team member raised the issue of what needed to be done to close the site. The discussion turned to the question of whether or not an HHRA would be needed for NFA close-out.

Action Item: Jeff will research/recommendation on closing out Site 5 (administrative requirements) by 5/23/01.

- **Armelia: Tier II Update**

The leader passed out a letter from Maryland Navy Tier II congratulating the team on graduating from partnering.

A Tier II joint meeting is suggested for all Maryland partnering teams in Lancaster on October 9 and 10, 2001.

The EPA wants to get all RODs coordinated now to avoid a September rush. The team briefly discussed IH RODs.

A team member asked about accommodations and funding sources for the October meeting. Team members discussed arrangements of previous meetings.

- **George/Kent: Mattawoman Creek Update**

Goal: to inform team of potential issues resulting from comments received regarding the draft workplan. An overview of the workplan is as follows:

- Section 1: An introduction to Mattawoman Creek, a summary of previous investigations (RIs, SIs, etc)
- Section 2: Objectives, overview of ERA/HHRA including methodology, areas of study (sets up sampling scheme)
- Section 3: Field activities
- Section 4: Field operations
- Section 5: Sampling procedures

The discussion focused on the sampling scheme. TTNUS looked at the locations of IR sites and outfalls. Five areas were identified to focus sampling; (MWC covers a very large geographic area). A sixth upstream location and a seventh location in Nanjemoy creek are proposed as references. At the seven locations the following will be collected:

- four surface water samples
- four sediment samples
- one composite fish sample
- one composite vegetation sample

Additionally, 4 surface water and sediment samples will be collected between areas where outfalls may exist.

One additional field visit is proposed to focus the sampling activities at the 7 locations.

The workplan discusses total samples, analyte list, QA/QC samples etc.

The discussion then turned to field screening methods developed by Jim Leather at SPAWAR. Numerous samples can be collected and screened to focus fixed-based lab samples. The methods can be used for metals, PAHs, and PCBs and have good detection limits. However, methods are not in place for mercury and silver. The leader noted silver and mercury are likely important at MWC.

The present sampling scheme is based on areas of likely impacts. The field methods could be used to focus sampling; however, without silver and mercury it may not be worth it. The leader then asked for a consensus on the use of field methods and a timeframe.

A team member asked the question "if the methods can't be used for silver and mercury and would need to be supplemented by fixed based sampling, is it worth using the field methods?"
Response: there may be some gain; however its not clear.

Another team member asked if the benefit of the field methods is the turn-around-time.
Response: yes, turn-around-time is the gain. You could field screen numerous samples to better define fixed-based sampling.

Another team member suggested that field methods could still help define impacts based on concentrations of related metals. The team member also noted that field methods are limited for organics which may limit their usefulness. The leader suggested a careful review of field methods is warranted before making a decision up or down.

A team member asked if it is worth while to ask Dean his opinion on screening methods.
Response: It may help to get another opinion.

Action Item: Kent will ask Dean about screening for Mattawoman Creek Study by 5/4/01.

A team member noted concerns about the water column. The leader replied that samples could be collected in deeper water. The work will be performed from boats which permits sampling from deeper water. A team member suggested the team review the workplan. Another team member asked the question "should there be a BTAG meeting"?

Action Item: George will set up an ECO subgroup meeting with BTAG and J. Bossart during the week of 5/7 by 5/4/01.

Action Item: Heidi will check with Jeff about the meeting by 5/4/01.

Action Item: Dennis will check with BTAG about meeting by 5/4/01.

Action Item: Kent will check w/Dean about meeting by 5/4/01.

- **Shawn: Document Review/Distribution to RAB**

Goal: Inform the team of the current process for document review and distribution of documents to RAB for review. A team member suggested a new process: prior to submitting a Draft Final document to the RAB, the consultant should present the scope to the partnering team. This may eliminate an additional review. The focus of the discussion turned to Site 5. A team member suggested better time management to ensure new process could be implemented.

A team member suggested there be a mechanism for an internal review prior to release to the RAB because there may be some changes between the document the RAB reviews and the final document. A team member asked if the public understands that planning is a big part of the process and initial plans may change with time. Another team member noted Elmer's comments rarely address specifics of the work plans such as sampling locations.

A suggestion is made that a letter could be sent to the RAB following the Draft Final in the event that there are significant changes. A team member asked whether there needs to be a different process for workplans? The team agrees that for an RI/FS or related document, there will generally be three formal submittals: 1) Draft 2) Draft Final (to RAB) and 3) Final.

Consensus: Team agrees that for documents where there are two formal submittals the RAB is given the first submittal. For documents where there are three formal submittals the RAB is given the second submittal.

- **Shawn: Team Building**

Goal: Help build the team.

Action Item: Shawn will determine if there is a more descriptive technique (SOP) for exotics analysis and send it to Dennis by 5/11/01.

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

Items left in the Parking Lot:

Parking Lot
Partnering Session (Team Building)
Where to take background samples on base vs. off base
Review model agenda
Discuss Team's involvement in construction changes
Update on institutional controls process
Screening Mattawoman Creek
Discuss policy on base for ICs after meeting w/base personnel
Sites 11, etc (June)

- **Close Out**

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

Next Agenda	Lead	Time (hr)
Site 47 update	Anne	1
Site 5 update	Anne	0.5
Site 6, 39, 45 update	Kelly	1
Lab Area update	Anne	0.5
Background Study data set	George	1
Background Study -develop a background data set w/samples of anthropogenic effects and what are the EPA, MDE, and Navy policies	Dennis	2
LTM format and Content	George	1
Review Model Agenda/deliverable	Shawn	1
Site 12 Remedial Design	George	1
Site 42 Draft FS	George	1

- **Schedule of Future Meetings**

Date of meeting	27-28 June 2001	15-16 August 2001	12-13 September 2001	9-10 October 2001	November 14-15
Location	Virginia Beach	Indian Head	Philadelphia	Lancaster	Baltimore
Host	CH2M HILL	Indian Head	Dennis	Tier II	CH2M HILL
Chair	Shawn	TBD	Dennis	Dennis	Curtis
Scribe	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Tier II Link	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Time Keeper	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Conference call will be on May 15 at 10 AM.

- **Meeting Evaluation**
(Separate file)
- **Adjourned at 2:35 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	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	270	Send site-specific background data to George	Anne Estabrook	03/21/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	271	Have statistician look at the data sent by Anne and see how it changes the background data set	George Latulippe	03/21/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Basewide Background Report	To be defined	272	Talk to Jim Dolph about historical use of pesticides/herbicides at the base	Heidi Morgan	03/21/2001	Completed	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	273	Get with PW, specifically Lou, about updating the master plan	Shawn Jorgensen	03/21/2001	Completed	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	274	Find out if DERA funds can be used to update the master plan due to institutional control concerns	Jeff Morris	03/21/2001	Completed	Completed

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
12	Mattawoman Creek Risk Study	In progress	275	Send surface water and sediment data from Sites 11 and 17 to Kent Cabbage	Anne Estabrook	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
3	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Site 47 by 07/17/00	In progress	276	E-mail groundwater data to team for discussion and a decision on the well locations at Site 47	Anne Estabrook	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	277	Provide IH laboratory procedures for exotics (UDMH and Acetal/Formal) to Dennis and Tony	Shawn Jorgensen	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	278	Have the EPA laboratory look at the procedures	Dennis Orenshaw	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	279	Provide Tony with any analytical information from the building demolitions at Site 39	Shawn Jorgensen	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	Finalize Remedial Investigation Report for Sites 6, 39, and 45	In progress	281	Talk to IH lab to get a unit cost and see how that unit cost changes with the number of samples. E-mail team the unit cost(s) for samples and a recommendation on the number of samples to be collected.	Tony Tomlin	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	282	Talk to John Fairbank about the need for 30-60-90 design submission packages	Curtis DeTore	03/22/2001	Completed	Completed

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

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	280	Check with Steve to find out the contact at the Army that may have risk numbers. Get the risk numbers if they exist.	Dennis Orenshaw	03/22/2001	In Progress	05/11/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	283	Scope LTM/LUCAP/LUCIP	Jeff Morris	04/24/01	In Progress	06/27/01
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	284	Check on LTM/LUCAP/LUCIP Guidance	George Latulippe	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/11/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	285	Set up meeting with base personnel to discuss institutional controls	Heidi Morgan	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	286	Check with other RPMs on processes to implement institutional controls and relay that information to Heidi and Shawn	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	287	Scope for BMP update	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	288	Talk to Steve Hurff about GIS format	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
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	05/23/2001

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
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	290	Get RAC involved in review of Site 12 RA design	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	291	Check ranking of Site 28 using new data	Jeff Morris	04/24/2001	In Progress	06/27/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	292	Send SW/SD coordinates to Kent	Anne Estabrook	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	293	Investigate topsoil removal from Site 13 and provide information to Anne	Heidi Morgan	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	294	Review soils data from confirmatory sampling at Site 5 including 'unknown' section of swale and determine if risk assessment was done	Anne Estabrook	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	295	Research/recommendation on closing out Site 5 (administrative requirements)	Jeff Morris	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/23/2001

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	296	Ask Dean about screening for Mattawoman Creek study	Kent Cabbage	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	297	Set up an Eco subgroup meeting with BTAG and J. Bossart for the week of 5/7/01	George Latulippe	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	298	Check with Jeff about meeting	Heidi Morgan	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	299	Check with BTAG about meeting	Dennis Orenshaw	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	300	Check with Dean about meeting	Kent Cabbage	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/04/2001
To be defined	To be defined	In progress	301	Determine if there is a more descriptive technique (SOP) for exotics analysis	Shawn Jorgensen	04/25/2001	In Progress	05/11/2001