

6.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

The RFI-Phase I objectives at each SWMU were to identify the presence or absence of contamination and to recommend further investigation where appropriate. Section 6.1 summarizes the recommendations for each SWMU, and Sections 6.2 through 6.4 summarize the soil, groundwater, and other types of investigations recommended at various SWMUs. Previous versions of this report included a section on priority of proposed investigations. This section was included so that if all Phase II investigations could not be performed at once, the Phase I report would include recommendations on which potential human and ecological health risks should be addressed first. This section is no longer needed because all Phase II investigations are either underway, or can begin as soon as the Phase I conclusions have been finalized and approved by the State of Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste. The priority of proposed investigations section has therefore been deleted.

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations for the suspected releases SWMUs include no action, Phase II investigations, and annual groundwater monitoring, according to the completeness and interpretation of the Phase I data. These recommendations are made on the following basis:

- No action - the Phase I program is judged to provide adequate coverage of a SWMU and to show conclusively that no contaminant releases have occurred.
- Phase II investigation - Phase I data indicate a need for an RFI-Phase II program leading to human health and ecological risk assessments that are sufficient to determine whether or not a corrective measures study (CMS) is required.
- Annual groundwater monitoring to detect any future releases at SWMUs where wastes remain buried.

Annual groundwater monitoring is recommended at SWMUs with buried wastes to provide timely detection of any future releases. This monitoring frequency is considered to be adequate as groundwater flow velocities at the site generally range from 4 to 24 ft/yr (Weston 1991), and no groundwater use points are expected within 1000 ft of any SWMU.

The need for additional data at each SWMU has been compared to the minimal environmental impact of data collection. Data collected under the Phase II program will also be developed to support NEPA requirements for examining the environmental consequences of any corrective measures that may eventually be proposed. Table 6.1-1 summarizes the recommendations described below for each of the Suspected Releases SWMUs.

**Table 6.1-1 •
Summary of
Recommendations
for Suspected
Releases
SWMUs**

SWMU No.	Recommendations			Other Recommendations and Comments
	No Action	Phase II	Annual Groundwater Monitoring	
1		•		
2	•		•	CMS at time of SWMU 11 closure
3		•	•	
5		•		
8		•		
9		•		
11		•		
14	•			
15	•			
19		•		
20		•		
21, 22				Removal of basins sediments as hazardous waste
23	•			
25		•		
26	•		•	
27	•			
28	•		•	
29				Solid waste scrap metal debris should be removed to SWMU 26
30		•	•	
31		•		CMS and closure under RCRA Part B Permit
32	•			
33		•		CMS and closure under RCRA Part B Permit
34	•			Closure under RCRA Part B Permit
36	•			Fill depressions to grade
37		•		

Note: SWMU 4 is located within SWMU 1 which is to be investigated during Phase II

SWMU 1 - Although little contamination has been detected in downgradient groundwater samples, a Phase II program is proposed to evaluate munitions burning and burial pits that are probable contaminant sources according to the site history. This Phase II program will be extended into areas of SWMU 25 that had a similar use history. The Phase II investigations will include soil, groundwater, and air quality monitoring; an inventory of disposal pits and their contents; explosive risk determination; and an ecological survey. These data will be used to conduct human health and ecological risk assessments.

SWMU 2 - Annual monitoring of existing wells is recommended at this SWMU while the pit contents remain buried. This sampling will also serve to confirm the Phase I and previous detections of low levels of organics, explosives, and IMPA. However, because the buried munitions are located near chemical agent stored in SWMU 11, the pit contents and surrounding soil should not be disturbed by excavation or drilling and no Phase II investigation is recommended. A Corrective Measures Study is recommended but implementation of the study should be delayed until closure of SWMU 11.

SWMU 3 - Groundwater samples indicated no significant contamination during the RFI-Phase I; however, Phase II soil samples are recommended to characterize the burial trench contents, surficial soils, and underlying soil. This Phase II program will include excavation and inventory of test pits in the covered section of the burial trench and collection of soil samples from both the covered and uncovered portions of this trench. In addition, soil borings are recommended around the wood and corrugated tin building, to identify possible contamination in shallow soils. Also, an ecological survey and explosive risk determination are recommended. Continued annual groundwater sampling of the existing groundwater monitoring wells is recommended to detect any potential releases from this SWMU until the Phase II program can be completed. During this monitoring, the Phase I explosives results, which failed to meet QA requirements, will be replaced.

SWMU 4 - This SWMU should be deleted from the list of suspected releases units since it is included in SWMU 1.

SWMU 5 - Because of elevated heavy metals concentrations that were detected in the soil below the drainage pond and organic solvents detected in downgradient monitoring wells, a Phase II program is recommended for further investigation of both soil and groundwater. A soil gas program is recommended around the Building 600 foundation and around the ramp structure to guide the selection of possible soil sampling locations where releases may have occurred but have not yet been characterized. The underground storage tank should be removed and any hazardous contents or contaminated soil should be sampled and disposed of. Also an ecological survey and explosive risk determination are recommended.

SWMU 8 - Although Phase I soil sampling revealed no contamination in the firing range area, a Phase II program is proposed to sample soil in other possible locations of the former drop tower and in a streambed that drains the area. In addition, burial pits will be excavated to

evaluate the trench contents and underlying soil. An ecological survey is recommended if sampling results indicate contamination. Because of UXO observed at this SWMU, an explosive risk determination is also recommended. At the end of the Phase II program an area of overlap between SWMUs 8 and 31 should be assigned to one SWMU or the other.

SWMU 9 - Because of previously detected elevated levels of heavy metals in Old Area 2, additional soil samples will be collected under a Phase II program to delineate this contamination. In addition, soil samples and groundwater samples will be collected and test pits excavated to evaluate whether releases occurred in the former open storage section of Area 2, where chemical agent containers were once stored and in the burning area to the east of Old Area 2. An ecological survey is recommended if warranted by sampling results. Also, a determination of explosive risk should be conducted.

SWMU 11 - A Phase II investigation will be conducted at SWMU 11. This investigation will include a thorough review of igloo construction and sampling where releases are indicated.

SWMU 14 - Phase I results indicate no need for additional investigation of this SWMU since contaminant concentrations in soils are low and can be attributed to use of the area as a parking lot.

SWMU 15 - Since methylene chloride detections in groundwater during the Phase I RFI were not repeated during additional sampling conducted in 1992, no additional sampling is recommended during Phase II.

SWMU 19 - Although limited soil sampling did not detect contaminants at this SWMU, additional soil gas and soil sampling are recommended to confirm the Phase I soil gas indications of contamination. PCBs will be added to the analyte list for soil sample analysis for this SWMU since hydraulic fluids may have been used or disposed of here during rail car maintenance. Groundwater monitoring wells are proposed to evaluate possible releases to groundwater. Additionally, it is recommended that the sludge and liquid contained within the septic tank be sampled to evaluate possible releases through the septic system. Also, an ecological survey and explosive risk determination should be conducted at this SWMU.

SWMU 20 - Phase I samples of septic tank sludge and liquid indicate the potential for contaminant releases through the septic system. Therefore soil samples are recommended near the septic tank to evaluate the potential for releases. Also, an ecological survey and explosive risk determination are recommended.

SWMUs 21 and 22 - No significant contamination was detected during the Phase I program in groundwater or soils at this SWMU. Therefore no Phase II sampling is proposed. It is recommended that basin sediments be removed and disposed of properly as a hazardous waste. The State of Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste will be notified prior to sediment removal.

SWMU 23 - Phase I sampling results indicated no evidence of contaminant release. However, an explosive risk determination is recommended because of UXO that was found here during the Phase I investigation.

SWMU 25 - Although soil, surface water, and groundwater samples from this SWMU have indicated little contamination, a Phase II program is recommended to further characterize four separate areas in which the site history indicates potential contamination. In the formerly cratered area, a determination of explosive risk should be conducted since this area was used for open detonation. In the windrows and ash piles areas, soil gas, soil, and groundwater samples should be collected to evaluate whether contaminant releases have occurred during waste burning and disposal. In the southeastern part of this SWMU, munitions disposal pits similar to those found in SWMU 1 should be excavated and sampled to detect any contaminant releases. Air monitoring and an ecological survey of this SWMU are recommended because of the multiple potential contaminant sources and the potential for agent and other chemical contamination. The additional data collected should be used to support a human health and ecological risk assessment.

SWMU 26 - Organic and inorganic contamination detected in trench samples from this landfill were not detected in downgradient groundwater. Therefore no Phase II investigation is warranted. However, annual monitoring of downgradient wells is recommended since wastes remain buried at this SWMU.

SWMU 27 - No significant contamination release was indicated by Phase I soil gas and soil sampling results in the lagoon or adjacent ditch. Therefore, no Phase II sampling is recommended.

SWMU 28 - The one time, low concentration detection of cyclohexanone in groundwater does not warrant further delineation. However, annual groundwater monitoring is recommended since wastes remain buried at this SWMU.

SWMU 29 - No additional investigation of this SWMU is recommended. The solid waste scrap metal debris should be removed to SWMU 26 - Sanitary Landfill.

SWMU 30 - A Phase II investigation is recommended to characterize the covered disposal pit contents and the underlying soil. Geophysical techniques will be used to locate the pits. Test pits will be excavated to reveal and allow sampling of the fill. Surface soils will also be sampled around the disposal pit. Annual monitoring of groundwater is also recommended. If warranted by sampling results, an ecological survey should be conducted. Also, an explosive risk determination should be performed.

WMU 31 - A Phase II investigation is recommended to characterize potential soil and groundwater contamination associated with operations at this SWMU. Soil and surface water sampling will be included in this program. If warranted by sampling results an ecological survey

should be conducted. Also, an explosive risk determination should be performed. At the end of the Phase II program, an area of overlap between SWMUs 8 and 31 should be assigned to one SWMU or the other. Since this SWMU is operating under an interim RCRA Part B Permit, it is recommended that the CMS be delayed until formal closure of the unit.

SWMU 32 - No action is planned at this SWMU since Phase I observations indicated no significant potential for contaminant release.

SWMU 33 - Soil samples are recommended during a Phase II RFI to determine the lateral and vertical extent of agent breakdown product and metal contamination at SWMU 33. Also, an ecological survey and explosive risk determination are recommended. This additional data should be used to support a human health risk assessment of this SWMU. Also, an ecological survey and explosive risk determination are recommended. Since this SWMU is operating under an interim RCRA Part B Permit, it is recommended that the CMS be delayed until formal closure of the unit.

SWMU 34 - No further investigation of this SWMU is recommended since Phase I observations and the site history do not indicate any contaminant release. Routine inspections of the building and its contents should be continued. This SWMU will be closed under the RCRA Part B Permit.

SWMU 36 - During 1991, SWMU 25 windrow materials were moved to the parking area at this SWMU. Data from the Phase II investigation at SWMU 25 should be used to determine whether sampling should be conducted in this part of SWMU 36. In other areas of SWMU 36, the Phase I results indicate no contamination, and no further investigation is recommended there. However, dry ponds should be filled in and brought to natural grade.

SWMU 37 - Since this SWMU was named after completion of the Phase I field program, the Phase II program will include collection of samples from the slag piles and from soils in the bomb fragment areas to determine the presence or absence of contamination. If warranted by sampling results an ecological survey is recommended.

Meteorological Stations - No additional characterization of these sites is recommended since Phase I results indicated no mercury concentrations significantly above the 5 ppm action level previously established for soil at known release SWMU 17.

6.2 PROPOSED SOIL INVESTIGATIONS

Table 6.2-1 summarizes the number and proposed depth intervals of additional soil and water samples at each SWMU. Where potential contamination has been detected, Phase II sampling is recommended to delineate the extent of contamination and to provide surface soil concentrations for use in assessing the risks posed by the contamination. Part of the Phase II sampling is proposed for locations where no contamination has been detected, but additional review of historical information indicates that potential contamination may exist in areas not sampled the RFI-Phase I or previous investigations. The analyses recommended for each sample

Table 6.2-1 • Proposed Soil and Surface Water Investigations

SWMU No. and Area	Number and Depths of Samples (ft)											Number and Type of Analyses							
	Test Pit Samples	0 - 0.5	0 - 0.5 - 1	1.0 - 1.5	2 - 3	4 - 5	9 - 10	14 - 15	19 - 20	Volatiles Organics	BNAs	PCBs	Explosives	Agent Breakdown Products	Metals	pH	Total Organic Carbon	Electrical Conductance	TCLP Analytes
1 Disposal Pits		30							30	30					6	6	6		
3 Trench Building	12	6							18	18		18	18	18	3	3	3		
		8			8				16	16		16	16	16	1	1	1		
5 Pond		4	4		2	2									12	2	2	2	
Surface Soil		4													4	1	1	1	
Ditch		4	4		4										12	2	2	2	
UST						1	1	1	3	3					3				
Building 600 Foundation/Ramp		16			16				32	32					32	2	3	3	
8 Ground Scars		6	6		6				18	18		18	18	18	2	2	2		
Streambed		3			3				6	6		6	6	6	1	1	1		
Trenches	24								24	24		24	24	24	2	2	2		
9 Old Area 2		12	12		12	12									48	3	3	3	
Streambed		8													8				
Area 2		5	5		5	5									20	2	2	2	
Burn Area	16								16	16		16	16	16	2	2	2		
19 Sump					2	2	2	2	8				8	1	1	1			
Septic Sludge		1							1	1	1								
Septic Liquid		1							1	1	1								
20 Septic Tank					2	2					4				4				
25 Ash Mounds		2	2		2				6	6	6	6	6	6	1	1	1		
Windrows		3	3		3				3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1		
Disposal Pits	16	16							32	32	32	32	32	32	3	3	3		
30 Trench	9								9	9	9	9	9	9	3	3	3		
Surficial Soil		6							6	6	6	6	6	6	1	1	1		
31 Crater Soil		4	4		4							12			12	2	2	2	
Crater Water		4										4			4	1	1	1	
Ditch Soil		2							2	2		2	2	2					
33		22	10	10										27	27				
37 Slag																		1	
Slag Piles		3	3		3				9	9		9	9	9					
Bomb Fragments		2	2		2				6	6		6	6	6					
Background Soil		10			10										20				
Totals	77	182	55	10	80	24	5	3	2	246	250	58	217	256	402	43	43	39	3

BNAs - Base/Neutral/Acid Extractable Semivolatile Organics

PCBs - Polychlorinated Biphenyls

TCLP - Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure

Note - Proposed sampling for SWMU 11 will be determined after the igloo construction is evaluated.

are specific to the contaminant history of the SWMU or to previous analytical results. Some additional analyses, including pH, total organic carbon, and electrical conductance, are proposed for a subset of the recommended samples to characterize the fate and mobility of soil contaminants. TCLP methods are proposed where corrective action is anticipated.

6.3 PROPOSED GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATIONS

Table 6.3-1 describes the proposed groundwater sampling program, including the numbers of existing and proposed wells and the appropriate analyses for groundwater samples at each SWMU. The recommended analyses are intended to address not only the nature and extent of contamination through chemical analyses of groundwater samples, but also groundwater migration pathways and rates through aquifer testing and aquifer material sampling and testing.

6.3.1 Contaminant Concentrations and Distributions

Contaminant concentrations and distributions should be further assessed through resampling of selected existing wells and installation of additional wells where exposure pathways must be characterized.

Since contaminant levels are relatively low in TEAD-S groundwater, and in general contaminants are not found in plumes extending over large areas or between SWMUs, no site-wide monitoring for a complete suite of contaminants may be necessary in Phase II. Therefore, Table 6.3-1 lists only selected analyses appropriate to the history and previous detections at each SWMU.

Also because of the relatively low levels of groundwater contamination and the consistency of groundwater flow directions at the site, monitoring should be relatively infrequent. Review of water levels collected quarterly between April 1990 and February 1991 indicates that although the elevation of the potentiometric surface may vary by several feet in some wells over the year, the direction of the hydraulic gradient remains relatively constant. However, at SWMUs where waste burial has occurred and groundwater sampling and analysis is the only proposed method of monitoring for future releases, this sampling is proposed to occur annually until the SWMUs are found to be nonhazardous or are cleared up. Annual groundwater monitoring is proposed for SWMUs 2, 3, 26, 28, and 30. Water levels should be collected from all monitoring wells and piezometers across the site when chemical samples are collected.

The RFI-Phase I data evaluation resulted in recommendations on replacing or discontinuing some previously used analytical methods. These recommendations are the following:

- Continue analysis of groundwater samples for base/neutral/acid extractables where semivolatile organic contaminants are suspected.
- Use alternate analytical methods for metals since matrix interference may have reduced the accuracy of the RFI-Phase I data.

Table 6.3-1 • Proposed Groundwater Investigations

SWMU No.	Existing Wells	Proposed Wells	Number and Type of Analyses												
			Volatile Organics	BNAs	PCBs	Explosives	Agent Breakdown Products	Metals	Anions	pH	Dissolved Oxygen	Aquifer Test	Porosity	Aquifer Grain Size	Total Organic Carbon
1	S-4, S-5; S-69-90, S-70-90, S-71-90	2	7	7		7	7	7	7	7	7	6	2	2	2
2 *	S-3; S-46-90	0	2	2		2	2	2		2	2				
3 *	S-61-90, S-62-90, S-63-90	0	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	3				
5	S-2; S-50-90, S-51-90, S-53-90	2	6					6	6	6	6	2	2	2	2
9	S-10	3		4			4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
19	No existing wells	3	3	3	3			3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
25	S-6, S-7; S-18-88, S-19-88, S-64-90, S-65-90, S-66-90, S-67-90, S-68-90	8	17	17		17	17	17	17	17	17	14	8	8	8
26 *	S-35-90, S-36-90, S-37-90, S-38-90, S-39-90, S-40-90, S-41-90	0	7	7		7		7	7	7	7				
28 *	S-32-90, S-33-90, S-34-90	0	3	3		3				3	3				
30 *	S-1; S-56-90, S-57-90, S-58-90, S-59-90, S-60-90	0	6	6		6	6	6	6	6	6				
Totals	40 wells	18	54	52	3	45	39	55	55	58	58	28	18	18	18

BNAs - Base/Neutral/Acid Extractable Semivolatile Organics

* - Annual Monitoring

Note - Proposed sampling for SWMU 11 will be determined after the igloo construction is evaluated.

- Discontinue site-wide analyses for radiological parameters since a thorough review of the history of TEAD-S indicates no disposal of radioactive wastes. Some radioactive materials may have been used at SWMU 21; however, no potential sources of radioactive contaminants are expected at TEAD-S.

6.3.2 Migration Pathways

To support contaminant fate and transport evaluation, additional information is needed at some SWMUs on the physical characteristics of the vadose zone and aquifer. Aquifer parameters that are recommended for investigation are the following:

- Vertical and lateral hydraulic gradients, through installation of additional wells and measurement of water levels in the new and existing wells at the time of chemical sampling. This information is needed for calculating groundwater flow rates.
- Hydraulic conductivity, through aquifer testing in areas of groundwater contaminant plumes (data exist for some previously installed wells). This information is needed for calculation of groundwater flow rates.
- Porosity and grain-size distribution, through laboratory analyses of core samples from the screened intervals of new wells. This information is needed for calculation of groundwater flow rates.
- Total organic carbon content, through laboratory analysis of core samples from the screened intervals of new wells. This information is needed to estimate migration rates of contaminants that may be adsorbed to organic carbon in the aquifer.

6.4 OTHER PROPOSED INVESTIGATIONS

Table 6.4-1 lists other investigations that are recommended at some SWMUs. These investigations include trench inventories intended to provide supplemental data on the nature and extent of contaminant sources and biological surveys to identify potential ecological receptors.

Trench inventories are proposed at SWMUs 1 and 25. The trench inventories should include information trenches that are to remain open and a complete written listing of their contents, such as munitions, that could be potential contaminant sources. Similar observations should be made during excavation of test pits in SWMUs 3, 8, and 30. At SWMU 30, geophysical techniques should be used to locate these trenches.

Table 6.4-1 • Other Proposed Investigations

SWMU No.	Proposed Investigations							
	Trench Inventory	Ecological Survey	Explosive Risk Determination	Air Monitoring	Soil Gas	PCB Survey	Geophysics	Building Inspection
1	•	•	•	•				
3	•	•	•					
5		•	•		•			
8	•	•	•					
9		•	•					
11								•
19		•	•		•	•		
20		•	•					
23			•					
25	•	•	•	•	•			
30	•	•	•				•	
31		•	•					
33		•	•					
34								•
37		•	•					

In areas where surface soil contamination could have a significant effect on vegetation and wildlife, including game species, vegetation surveys and reconnaissance habitat mapping are proposed to identify abundant and sensitive species and delineate their distributions. These data are intended for use in any ecological risk assessment of the site. The need for these surveys should be reevaluated after review of the proposed surface soil sampling analytical results. SWMUs that may require biological surveys are clustered in the southeastern one-third of TEAD-S; therefore, each SWMU with potential surface soil contamination could be addressed by one survey of this region.

Collection of air monitoring data is proposed at SWMUs 1 and 25 to support preliminary analysis of this exposure pathway and to aid in the identification of potentially exposed populations. In addition, more data should be collected on potential off-post receptors identified during the RFI-Phase I (e.g., wells or other water use points in off-site areas near SWMUs 1, 25, and 26). Information should be gathered on the usage types and usage rates of these water sources, as well as potentially exposed populations and behavior patterns that could influence exposure.

Soil gas programs are recommended at SWMUs 5, 19, and 25 to detect soil contamination by volatile organic compounds. These soil gas results will be confirmed by soil and groundwater data included in Tables 6.2-1 and 6.3-1. Continued routine building inspections at SWMU 34 are sufficient monitoring of waste drums stored there. A PCB survey is also recommended at SWMU 19.

Explosive risk determinations are recommended at 12 of the SWMUs (SWMUs 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 19, 20, 23, 25, 30, 31, and 33).

6.5 SCHEDULE

As required by the Corrective Action Module, the Army will submit a draft RFI-Phase II (Task II and III) workplan and schedule within 45 calendar days of the Executive Secretary's approval of this final Task I Report. Within 60 calendar days of the Executive Secretary's approval of the Task II and Task III workplan and schedule, the RFI-Phase II activities will commence.

Table 6.4-1 • Other Proposed Investigations

SWMU No.	Proposed Investigations							
	Trench Inventory	Ecological Survey	Explosive Risk Determination	Air Monitoring	Soil Gas	PCB Survey	Geophysics	Building Inspection
1	•	•	•	•				
3	•	•	•					
5		•	•		•			
8	•	•	•					
9		•	•					
19					•	•		
23			•					
25	•	•	•	•	•			
30	•	•	•			•		
31		•	•					
34							•	
37		•						

Trench inventories are proposed at SWMUs 1 and 25. The trench inventories should include information trenches that are to remain open and a complete written listing of their contents, such as munitions, that could be potential contaminant sources. Similar observations should be made during excavation of test pits in SWMUs 3, 8, and 30. At SWMU 30, geophysical techniques should be used to locate these trenches.

In areas where surface soil contamination could have a significant effect on vegetation and wildlife, including game species, vegetation surveys and reconnaissance habitat mapping are proposed to identify abundant and sensitive species and delineate their distributions. These data are intended for use in any ecological risk assessment of the site. The need for these surveys should be reevaluated after review of the proposed surface soil sampling analytical results. SWMUs that may require biological surveys are clustered in the southeastern one-third of TEAD-S; therefore, each SWMU with potential surface soil contamination could be addressed by one survey of this region.

Collection of air monitoring data is proposed at SWMUs 1 and 25 to support preliminary analysis of this exposure pathway and to aid in the identification of potentially exposed populations. In addition, more data should be collected on potential off-post receptors identified during the RFI-Phase I (e.g., wells or other water use points in off-site areas near SWMUs 1, 25, and 26). Information should be gathered on the usage types and usage rates of these water sources, as well as potentially exposed populations and behavior patterns that could influence exposure.

Soil gas programs are recommended at SWMUs 5, 19, and 25 to detect soil contamination by volatile organic compounds. These soil gas results will be confirmed by soil and groundwater data included in Tables 6.2-1 and 6.3-1. Continued routine building inspections at SWMU 34 are sufficient monitoring of waste drums stored there. A PCB survey is also recommended at SWMU 19.

Explosive risk determinations are recommended where open detonation has occurred or where UXO were observed during the RFI-Phase I. The SWMUs where this determination should be made are 1, 3, 8, 25, and 31.

6.5 SCHEDULE

As required by the Corrective Action Module, the Army will submit a draft RFI-Phase II (Task II and III) workplan and schedule within 45 calendar days of the Executive Secretary's approval of the final Task I Report. Within 60 calendar days of the Executive Secretary's approval of the Task II and Task III workplan and schedule, the RFI-Phase II activities will commence.