

CONFIRMATION OF: CONFERENCE ☒ TELECOM ☒ OTHER:	DATE HELD: SEPTEMBER 29 & 30, 2009 DATE ISSUED: OCTOBER 9, 2009 RECORDED BY: ANNA TIEDEMAN PLACE: CH2M HILL ANCHORAGE DOCUMENT CONTROL NO:
<b>SUBJECT: DRAFT RI REPORT COMMENT RESOLUTION MEETING (EXTERNAL)</b>	

<b>PARTICIPANTS - ANCHORAGE:</b>		
TERRY HEIKKILA - JACOBS SARAH BELWAY - JACOBS ANNA TIEDEMAN – JACOBS ALEX THOMAS – JACOBS DAVE FRANDSEN - JACOBS MARILYN - USAED MESERET GHEBRESLASSIE - USAED EARL CRAPPS - DEC DEB CAILLOUT - DEC GUY WARREN - DEC	BETH ASTLEY - CRREL DAVID BEISTEL – DPW JOSEPH MALEN – DPW RIELLE MARKEY - DPW NEIL KINNBREW – CH2MHILL JEREMY BLEI – CH2M HILL MARILYN GAUTHIER - CH2M HILL DENNIS SHELTON – CH2M HILL WIN WESTERFIELD – CH2M HILL JOE KING - AEC	MARTY BREWER – DEC JACK GUSMANO - EPA CRAIG SCOLA – ARMY CORPS FRANKIE JEWEL – TECH LAW  TELE: CLAIR MARCUSSEN CATHY DARE

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p><b>Day 1 – Start time 8:00am</b> (1)</p> <p>Discuss EPA Comments:</p> <p>11 EPA Comments 22 DEC Comments</p> <p>*Deb: How were these ranked priority-wise? (22 out of 600 were priority).</p> <p>Jeremy: Those comments that suggested that the RI wasn't complete or data gaps or issues like the acceptability of radon. Comments that would drastically affect the RI. In order to get through this in two days we had to address the comments that needed immediate attention. It was understood and agreed upon that all those that are not considered "high priority" are in the process of being worked or are understood and action being taken.</p> <p>Dennis: It will take approximately 45 days to get all comments assimilated and re-entered into draft. We are looking at January time-frame.</p> <p><b>EPA 2-3 Executive Summary</b> ***Cathy: It's reflective of a tone throughout the document where you didn't feel like the plumes that were potentially getting in close proximity to the drinking water well was a problem.</p> <p>Joe M: So, the response should be that the document should reflect that the Army will be more aggressive when sampling, making sure that the plume is not reaching the drinking water wells.</p> <p>Jack: Water monitoring needs to be done right now and not wait until the FS is done. There may be monitoring now or there may be an intent to monitor, but there is nothing that says in the operable unit that says you WILL. It needs to be on the record. You need to be more specific on positive actions of continuous and scheduled well monitoring. There needs to be a separate document Interim Institutional Control which says we are going to monitor these wells to show there is no increase in movement toward the production well. This is not a trend</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>analysis, this is a health and safety issue, so you might want to do it more frequently. If the RI makes reference to an interim action that will be taken to the century wells and the drinking water well itself. The Technical Memorandum could be more specific about when, where, how and what analytes, etc.</p> <p><b>EPA 1-1 Physical Characteristics of Study Area</b>  ***Jack is thinking of doing more of a Conceptual Geological Model and not just a box conceptual model. He wants to be able to show a progressive knowledge type model. Also showing fate and transport over time. It would also enhance the geophysics that drove this study. Want to show the evolution of the study. Background, hydrogeology and permafrost (CRREL's report), need to be more specific.</p> <p>Cathy: When you start using the word "confining", meaning it will limit things as it relates to the conceptual model which raises a red flag. So if permafrost is not a controlling interest then I don't think the statement should not be in the executive summary.</p> <p><b>EPA 1-6 Remedial Investigation Activities</b>  ***Deb: As I am reading it the response, you are misinterpreting the value of the groundwater contaminants. They may very well contain the volatiles that may or may not be going into the buildings. But if your groundwater plume that's full of volatiles is only on the north end of the house, and you sample on the south end of the house, you may not see any influence from that groundwater plume. That's where I think you're missing some of the intent there.</p> <p>Jack: This is an issue on how being ultra conservative can punish you. The groundwater plumes were at such low levels that vapor intrusion is extremely unlikely. The reason why you chose to go to each house is to be able to say that each house is protected even though we did not have any volatile sources that we zeroed in on at the time. So, we went on a hunt for vapors to check the box saying you're all fine and what we found is a whole lot of introduced volatiles from construction material and inside the houses and that there are more volatiles in the houses than outside. Now we have to recreate the logic.</p> <p>Jack: Either we go back and sample other areas or we live with what we did and make the best of it. We need to explain our logic and the reason we did it was because we wanted to be conservative and have a point at each house. If someone looked at what we did, they wouldn't understand why we did it. A conceptual model will show our train of thought. Action is to revise RI to include configurations.</p> <p>Cathy: First problem is when you do sampling you have a set of data quality objectives or questions you're supposed to answer. So, you are telling me your questions could not gear towards your average RI Investigation and that's ok if you set up a sampling event that answers very specific questions but you need to explain that to everyone. The other problem is when you do vapor intrusion sampling of any kind you need to know where the breaks in the slabs are. You need to know if it's under a slab that is continuous or if it will pull there or in the center or the edges or are there natural breaks in the construction. Nowhere in this document is there a floor plan of any of the structures which should be readily available if they were recently constructed, that shows where if there is monolithic pour for all of these or are there natural breaks in the core slab.</p> <p>Jeremy: We will provide additional information about the location and the design of the soil gas ports. We will show floor plans for each of the five different floor plans used in this development. We will also show where the garages are and where the ports were installed. We are accepting this comment and following your recommendation to revise the RI to include those configurations for each model.</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>Jeremy: It was mentioned whether we should screen the soil gas data against the groundwater. The reason we didn't do that was because we had 110 subslab soil gas results. We have better data to support decisions about what risk groundwater may be contributing to vapor intrusion is answered by all the subslab data we have.</p> <p>Deb: Is the subslab data from the correct locations? Did you actually take a sample where that pathway is complete? If not, then it doesn't matter. The issue isn't that there isn't enough data; it's just not presented where the answers become black and white in the document.</p> <p>Dennis: We can provide some description of the construction design. The anticipation is that vapors coming through the soil column would reach a much more permeable layer of gravel then laterally across the whole slab. And that is what will explain in the RI. We are not screening against the groundwater.</p>
	<p><b>9:45 First Break</b></p> <p>(2)</p> <p><b>EPA 2-66 Remedial Investigation Activities</b>  ***Dennis: ITRC Practical Guide, section D.11.2 needs to be added into the document as a reference.</p> <p>Marty: Site specific attenuation factor needs to be documented clearly in the report.</p> <p>Deb: Screening is not clear in here anywhere.</p> <p>Marilyn (CH2MHill): All the data that was presented in the brown report is presented and evaluated. We didn't exclude any data. It's evaluated in section five and I agree we can be clearer about the process but no data was excluded.</p> <p>Cathy: The figure is a color metric figure and I have no idea what these screening measures mean. You color coded it with some results but its only limited constituents. They don't like this watered down, "here's the big picture stuff". They like to see all the data in tables at some point. Is that in here somewhere?</p> <p>Marilyn (CH2MHill): Refers back to section five regarding constituents.</p> <p>Cathy: Wants tables better evaluated including with legend, shaded columns, values and results need to be more specific, clearer.</p> <p>Jeremy: Footnotes need to be made underneath all tables noting where to find all surface soil data (electronic data).</p> <p>***Cathy: Regarding disturbance of subsurface, how does that impact the results, the fact that you had trenches which could be construed as preferential pathways for groundwater flow? Does it discuss how the disturbance of the subsurface could have impacted or influence this process?</p> <p>Jeremy: We can add that. These were built by late 2005 and most of these soil samples that were taken are in 2009-2009 so you are talking 3 ½ years.</p> <p>Cathy: Does the document assess the sensitivity of what we are doing to that potential influence? I see that as something that needs to be addressed in here.</p> <p>Dennis: We are not really seeing VOC hot spots that one would think a preferential pathway</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>should be guarded from.</p> <p>Joe M: Discussion can be added that it will at least be considered and addressed?</p> <p>Dennis: YES</p> <p>Deb: I'd like to see both sets of data evaluated with the default end of site specific and not as a baseline for risk assessment.</p> <p>***Deb requested the meeting minutes where DEC agreed to use the Radon to calculate attenuation factor.</p> <p>Dennis agreed to provide her the minutes.</p> <p><b>EPA 1-4 N&amp;E of Contamination</b>  ***Dioxins and Furans  Jeremy: That case is not referred in our report but they will be. All of the burned areas have been excavated and removed. So, this is more of a disposal discussion than a risk assessment. Report will be revised to include reasoning for not including dioxins and furans as chemicals of interest in burned areas.</p> <p><b>EPA 1-9 N&amp;E of Contamination</b>  ***Jeremy: Next version will include results from groundwater sampling characterization north of the FCS Taku site and maybe additional in the east.  Cathy: What about additional wells? Is that up for discussion?  Jeremy: Additional temporary probes were installed along the northern area of the site across Neely Rd. and the Army is planning on installing additional permanent wells to the east.</p> <p>***Cathy: Where do we stand on the arsenic?  Jeremy: It is everywhere. Figure 5-4 shows concentration consistently range from 8mg/kg to 12mg/kg.  Marty: Were other metals determined to be background? Are there similar statistics?  Dennis: Arsenic was the only chemical we did the statistical comparison, everything else was carried through the risk assessment.  Dennis: Going to go back and evaluate the risk of the background arsenic on the Risk Assessment. Concentrations of arsenic will be evaluated.  IR Draft version report will include results of additional groundwater sampling north and east of the FCS. We will also provide the perspective both with and without arsenic and what the risks from the background arsenic are as well.  Jeremy: Please revise the 2009 draft RI allowed for installation for additional wells.</p> <p><b>EPA 2-69 Human Health &amp; Ecological Risk Assessments</b>  ***Claire: Need clarification why you wouldn't have groundwater exposure even if it's non potable to a construction worker.  Dennis: All utilities are above groundwater. Where a worker would be would be working there is a utility trench and that wouldn't reach groundwater.  Claire: Maybe add this into the report. Please also state that there is no digging or planting and that you could not test any homegrown produce because it is prohibited base wide (stated by Joe M.).</p> <p>***Claire: We had a workplan (older version) and it calculated the exposure factors used in the risk calculations and yet, we saw there were a lot of risk calculations that we could not verify because we saw discrepancies.  Dennis: We are going to go through and make sure that everything is up to date in terms of</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	factors that have been pointed out.
	<p><b>11:30am – Break for Lunch</b> (3)</p> <p><b>ADEC-20 Site Development &amp; Investigation summary 2003-2006</b> 2007-2008 Report: Stockpiled areas are noted but it's still in draft. Deb: Talked about this report being in draft status at the last meeting and never got an answer back from Jacobs. Sarah: The report has been put on hold because it was requested that the 2009 data be included. Check validity on section 3.2.1 and expand story.</p> <p><b>ADEC-34 Pre-RI Investigation Findings</b> Deb: Explain the explosives method. Explain data quality concern pre-RI or refer to the appropriate section. Jack: Are your non-detects below the screening levels? Marilyn: We did do an evaluation of the explosives and not all of them are non-detects. So we did have detections but they do not exceed the groundwater criteria that are being cited. The data usability table summaries are in section 5-6. The full data set for 2005 for the PSE is in an electronic appendix. Jeremy: We will include some information about why we found it appropriate to exclude all the other wells from continued sampling. Jack: Maybe a graphic that shows PSE 1, PSE 2, Pre-PSE, each year of the list of the wells when they were installed.</p> <p><b>ADEC-18 Remedial Investigation Activities</b> Marilyn: Will provide some information in RI on Wells MW1-16 and which ones were sampled and why. Accepted with modification</p> <p><b>ADEC-92 Phase II RI Approach &amp; Field Activities</b> Deb: Why wells were sampled and not sampled. Jack and Deb: Need meeting minutes about following up on monitoring wells. Jeremy: Will apply graphical differentiation between wells routinely sampled and those sampled only 1 or 2 times.</p> <p><b>ADEC-104 Phase II RI Approach &amp; Field Activities</b> ***Jack: You might want to add in the document that you used the tiered approach. Marty: It was presented to us after it had already been done. Dennis: There was a TM that was laid out that tracked the process and neither Jeremy nor myself could not remember any comments from that. Jack: I can remember you discussed it but whether you got passive approval or actual approval we can go ahead with this at this meeting. Based on what we presented is it feasible to go ahead with this Radon matched with tier attached with all that was discussed. Or at least go ahead with the abstinence of 1 or 2 RPMs. Jeremy: I want to say the first mention of Radon came up on a Taku Tuesday call. Jack: We have a right to argue, disagree and strategize. When we finally make a decision, we need to say RPMs agree. Don't go hunt for when we originally approached the idea, what we originally agreed upon, but more important is do we agree now. Dennis: Our expectation at the beginning was not to use Radon. The workshop was brought up as an upcoming thing. At the same time we were collecting the indoor pairing subslab from 10 houses to look at the chemicals specifically. Unfortunately the data on that evaluation didn't allow us to get that separation we talked about. It would have been great if an expert would</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>have initially mentioned radon as a line of evidence. It turned out that it provides the best line of evidence now.</p> <p>Jack: Tiered approach is a plausible tool. That's what we want documented.</p> <p>Marty: Nowhere is it recommended that this is the suggestion for risk assessment. It's not unreasonable to ask that this be presented as a line of evidence. No one that I've spoken to has flat out recommended that this is the way to go as definitive guidance. It's new technology and science and I value that, but are we willing to jump there without checking the boxes? When this was initially presented to us I wasn't educated on the use of Radon. It's an education process to educate the reader why this is important. And it's also perception issue as to why was my house handled differently, why wasn't an attenuation study done on my house, and you are going to have to answer those questions. Why is it that you consider 10 houses representative for 110 residents? If you go with the very conservative tiered process and you present your line of evidence to support your conclusion it will be better accepted.</p> <p>Dennis: Everything that needs to be there is there. It may not be presented in a format that is convincing. We looked at 10 houses and if we saw incredible variability. When we start seeing the same answers at all 10 homes and the variables are imminent to what vapors are beneath the house. When you start seeing the same type of numbers for attenuation you tend to believe the sub sample you selected is representative of the bulk, assuming you weren't biased on how you selected them, and we weren't. We basically spread them out and found different home styles. It's irrespective if there was a blatant recommendation to use this as the approach is scientifically reliable enough to make a risk management decision. And that's the question here.</p> <p>Deb: We are at a disadvantage because you know all this information so much better that we do and we need to be able to read it to come to the same conclusions.</p> <p>Jeremy: We need to provide that information. We need to do some re-writing to provide everybody with the information we have and understand, reference the ITRC, provide the thorough discussion of how the attenuation factors are developed, how they compare to Radon, variability, and provide data evaluation.</p> <p>Earl: When we agreed to the tiered approach if I'm clear, the baseline calculations will be based on the default 10 and your site specific attenuation factors will be a site- wide level. Is that what we are going to do?</p> <p>Dennis: Baseline Risk Assessment will be based on Radon. The screening step of the risk assessment is and will be based on a default of 10. That is provided in the report and will all be structured in the tiered process.</p> <p>Earl: I haven't heard that DEC has agreed to that approach</p> <p>Marty: It may not be settled today because I don't have all my notes on all the people I've talked to about this.</p> <p>Dennis: It is posted as a line of evidence in addition to consistency with reported attenuation levels from EPA's database.</p> <p>Marty: It may be that we just need to see the write up and the whole tiered process and how you got to where you are. I don't know that I'm willing to let it go today.</p> <p>Dennis: If you want to make a risk management decision on 10 then that is your prerogative but we are going to provide the most realistic estimate of indoor air concentration at risk that we can. The information you are looking for will be in the report and there will be a way to find it. We will need to revisit this and make sure we've covered everyone's issues.</p> <p>Rielle: Is there a Tech Memo about this approach of using Radon, was it presented at a meeting?</p> <p>Dennis: There was a presentation of the initial results about two meetings ago, January of 2009?</p> <p>Rielle: I heard that DEC didn't put the approval on that but maybe that's a good place to start with something to circulate, to flush out a little better your explanation so that Marty can run it by those people who are not here.</p> <p>Dennis We built in conservatism understanding that it may be a new approach that others haven't seen before. It does have peer reviewed literature and is being presented at the ITRC</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>workshop. It should provide reliable enough approach for a site like this.            Deb: We just need to be able see it in a final report then we will be able to say "yeah, this makes sense". We'll wait to make our final call on it.            Jeremy: We can agree that this is not resolved yet.</p>
	<p><b>2:20pm Break</b></p> <p>(4)</p> <p>ADEC-209 (Chemicals of Potential Concern)            Discussion about putting a well in a contaminated area.....changing text to clarify. Accepted</p> <p>ADEC-212 (Chemicals of Potential Concern)            Arsenic discussion we had this morning...cont. (EPA10....) Accepted</p> <p>ADEC-247 (Human Health Risk Assessment)            Army has agreed to evaluate all soil samples down to 15ft bgs and all GW wells.</p> <p>ADEC-264 (Ecological Risk Assessment)            Put attenuation perspective on groundwater and add information on how we are supporting the background investigations. Also, we need to structure it so it closely aligns with the process of DEC guidelines.</p>
	<p><b>Break 3:15pm</b></p> <p>(5)</p> <p><b>ADEC-301 Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b></p> <p>Dennis: Area A issue is the only area we were concerned about. In addition to area A investigation, we took 10% of the anomalies in the other places above and below 75 to prove out that the fact that there wasn't anything else that was there to be discovered was in excess or below 75 that we had a concern about. All the big anomalies have been investigated, removed and backfilled.</p> <p>Deb: So little of it was adequately documented in the RI. There were quite a few comments on how much was removed, what was left, what wasn't left. When you went in and hang dug around pipelines, did you remove everything or not? What did you actually pull out of there? Was it all construction debris if it was in another area? These questions are answered in the RI.</p> <p>Dennis: Those questions go back to the D&amp;D Removal Report from Jacobs. This should address everything they found with pictures, coordinates, the type of item and what samples were taken in and around those areas. That report should cover what you just brought up. I will find report and send it out.</p> <p>Discussion on what is considered significant. Why did geophysics lead us to 75? You need to be very clear as to why you picked the areas you did. Add why you are going to have isolated anomalies all over the site. You need to get out of generalizations and get very specific.</p> <p>Jack: You are going to make some conclusions based on the construction of what is under the houses. You are going to use what you dug up everywhere else as a possible comparison of what is left under that house.</p> <p>Jeremy: We will compare our soil gas observations with previous Northwind passive soil gas sampling and results from other media. The most recent soil and groundwater data has not been incorporated in this report but it will be in the interim draft.</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p><b>DAY 2</b></p> <p>( 6 &amp; 7)</p> <p><b>CH2MHill Presentation</b></p> <p>***1-2-3 Trichloropropane  Discussion of GORE Sorbers and Jacob's figure with data.  Jeremy: (GORE Sorbers) If we want to space them 50-100 ft then it would be more like a grid. One of the objectives is to determine whether the source is on or off Taku. Our plan is to consult with GORE to explain the situation and see what they recommend.  Cathy: Is the sampling that you are doing covering all the biodegradation constituents?  Marilyn: The target analytes lists don't include a lot of the parameters that you would normally analyze MNA for natural attenuation type remedy.  Jeremy: We will add parameters.</p> <p>***Building 49  Ch2MHill tasked Jacobs to come up with a conceptual plan to remove drums (12ft down). SW Corner of the building underneath the garage.  Sarah: We will be using helical piers that will be connected to the foundation which will support foundation while we dig underneath. Helical piers will remain in the foundation after all is said and done. We will be going after the first layer of drums we've seen in photos. We do not plan on having our equipment or our people underneath the foundation. We are still trying to figure out what type of equipment to use.  Jack: What kind of radius are we talking about?  Sarah: We are still theorizing. It will be equipment dependent depending on how far we can reach.  Joe M.: They do have the excavators that will go 18ft out.  Joe M.: The other thing that looks like we won't have to go too far underneath the slab is when we look at the original EM that we did in 2004 that showed all the blobs. The blob ends just a couple of feet underneath the corner of the garage.  Jack: How much do we know what is underneath the buildings? What you see underneath is just as important as getting the drums out themselves.  Cathy: How much do we know about the construction process for these buildings. Was there construction oversight? Normally you would have to write a report.  Jack: Yes, there was a form of oversight. We do have notes from Shannon Wilson and photos as well.</p> <p>Marty: I'd like to inquire as to what the backup plan if you find more than you expect?  Joe M.: We plan on providing additional support if we find additional drums. We are going to try and give the contractor what they need to go in and get what they have to get. We are just going to have to wait and see what they find.</p> <p>Jacobs will get together with Chemtrack and to establish a remote way of getting a sensor that they can remotely get underneath and check for metal.  Jack would also like to have the soil sampled underneath building 49.  When is the 2009 delivered? Sarah is not sure, hasn't looked at the schedule. Messerett will find out when 2009 report will be delivered and let Sarah know. Building 49 is a standalone report</p> <p><b>ADEC-309 Fate and Transport Considerations for Residual Contamination</b>  Marty: I found it very difficult to support the weight of evidence that was in the RI because I had</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>to go back to D&amp;D and PCB Removal Report to figure out what data was used and associated with the Report.</p> <p>Jack: We need to make a separate section for how much you know about the debris, site, what contents might be, how much debris might be under the house, where it might be located etc. Then we say what we think we know, what we feel comfortable with and probability of material under buildings.</p> <p>Dennis: We know what a protective level for various constituents are in ambient indoor air. We know what the attenuation is for subslab. So we can calculate what the protective level is subslab soil gas. Moving from there is the most difficult part because you have to convert from concentration to mass. And you have to make some assumptions.</p> <p>Deb: Well then what we need to do is design a remedy of protecting that worse case scenario.</p> <p>Cathy: Can we use the data we have? Do we have enough circumstantial information to say this is the maximum volume of liquid we found in any drum? Is it plausible to say it's full?</p> <p>Jack: No, and we do have that kind of information on about 75% of the site it's underneath building we are not sure of.</p> <p>Dennis: What is the probability of having an intact drum? Of those drums that are intact, what is the probability if not containing bad stuff? If there have been drums out there that have leaked, what would you expect to see to find today? For TCE, you would expect to see evidence of DNAPL. You don't see evidence of that. You would expect to see higher concentrations in soil gas. You don't see that either. We are trying to reconstruct a future with what we know about the past.</p> <p>Marty: You can't calculate a risk with an unknown. We can monitor what is coming off of it, but we are never going to know unless we dig it up. We can back from that and say, look at the probabilities but you still have to communicate that to whomever is living in that house and are they willing to accept that probability.</p> <p>Marty: Weight of evidence needs to support that you are saying there is only drums underneath this house and not others.</p> <p>Dennis: We can agree, however, that there is no way to come up with a numerical estimate.</p> <p>Jack: We are going to have to come up with a level of probability. Will be monitoring after this is done. The frequency of it needs to be discussed.</p> <p>Joe M: Sampling plan will be that all of them will be sampled no less than every three years.</p> <p>Marty: You also have to take into consideration that in the field log books there are reports of leaks and cracks in the slabs. How do you account for that?</p> <p>Dennis: Requested Marty find field notes that note port leakage and cracks. Then they will have to get with field team to discuss because Dennis cannot find any notes on leakage.</p> <p>Jack: We can build into the report that not only will we monitor at least once a year but also at the request of the resident and any sign of breakage. There is not much else you can do.</p> <p>Deb: Right now the RI needs to present us with all the known facts and risk data so we know where our baseline is. Then we can extrapolate from that the "what if" scenarios that are necessary in an FS for protectiveness.</p> <p><b>JACOBS IS CURRENTLY FINISHING CONSTRUCTION PLAN FOR BUILDING 49</b></p> <p><b>Closing Comments, Questions</b></p> <p>Joe asks if there are any additional questions/concerns/additions to the RI.</p> <p>***Deb: What kind of ventilation is actually in these homes and would you expect that they were actually being ventilated the outdoor and indoor COCs would end up being similar.</p> <p>Dennis: Yes, except for two cases.</p> <p>Deb: Can you make that point clearer in the RI? And also add some validity to the studies to say that the buildings have been stabilized long enough before you take samples.</p> <p>Dennis: Yes.</p> <p>Deb: My only other concern is Phase I and II RI. Are we getting rid of phases in reports?</p> <p>Jeremy: Replace Phase I with 2007 and Phase II with 2008. PSE I and II are pre-RI.</p> <p>Joe M: Changes will be made.</p>

ACTION REQ'D BY	MEETING NOTES ITEM
	<p>Jack: What interesting reading material will we have between now and the version of the RI?            Joe Malen:            -Jacobs Drum Debris Report (all encompassing 2007, 2008, &amp; some 2009)            -Frost Jacking Report (already exists)            -Report on the GORE Sorber Well for the 123 TCB. (Report will be done around beginning Dec)</p> <p>Jack wants to have a Tuesday conference call when the excavation starts and let them know what exactly it is that they saw, in case it is not as much as they thought it would be they would like to know right away.            Joe M: We can arrange a Taku Tuesday meeting when they begin construction.</p> <p><b>Meetings and Timelines:</b>            All comments will be input and completed by 21<sup>st</sup> of Oct.            Will give everyone 30 days to review and comment back by 25 Nov.            Joe Malen: Have a meeting in Dec 7<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> 9<sup>th</sup> in Fairbanks – A comment resolution meeting. If anyone has issues with response to comments.            Interim RI Draft Date – February</p> <p>***Joe Malen is requesting that we find the Background Document for Pesticides. Win he will look for it and get back with Joe.</p>