EPA

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Work Assignment

Work Assignment Number: 4-01

☐ Other ☐ Amendment Number:

Contract Number	Contract Period	Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name
EP-W-10-016	08/09/2010 To 07/31/2017 Base Option Period Number 4	Support for NPL Updates

Contractor: CSC GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS LLC

Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW: Task 1, 4-7

Purpose:
- [X] Work Assignment
- [ ] Work Assignment Amendment
- [ ] Work Plan Approval
- [ ] Work Assignment Close-Out
- [ ] Incremental Funding

Period of Performance: From 08/01/2016 To 07/31/2017

Comments:
Award Term 2

[X] Superfund — Accounting and Appropriations Data — [ ] Non-Superfund

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations date use EPA Form 1900-69A.

SFO (*Max 2*) [ ]

Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars)	(Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period: 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2017 Cost/Fee: LOE:

This Action:

Total:

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated: Cost/Fee LOE:

Cumulative Approved: Cost/Fee LOE:

Work Assignment Manager Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Project Officer Name Crystal Gatson (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 703-603-9023 FAX Number:	
Other Agency Official Name (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number:	
Contracting Official Name Mark Heare (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-4774 FAX Number:	

Performance Work Statement
Work Assignment Number: 4-01
August 1, 2016-July 31, 2017

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Title: Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates

B. Work Assignment Contracting Officer Representative (WA COR):

Terry Jeng
EPA/OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8852, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: jeng.terry@epa.gov

Alternate WA COR:

Jennifer Wendel
EPA/OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (404) 562-8799, Fax (404) 562-8788
email: wendel.jennifer@epa.gov

C. OBJECTIVE

This work assignment provides technical support to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Agency's technical review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised Hazard Ranking System (HRS). The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

This work assignment also supports other HRS and NPL rulemaking activities. This includes NPL site characteristic information and tracking, web posting and Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) support.

D. BACKGROUND

Federal responsibility for the assessment and cleanup of sites contaminated by hazardous wastes resides with the U.S. EPA under the authority of several statutes, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), is one of EPA's primary offices for implementation of CERCLA.

CERCLA enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provides the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The EPA responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to

establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. The HRS is the primary mechanism used to add sites to the NPL.

The Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch (SARDB) in OSRTI is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, proposing and adding them to the NPL and maintaining public information regarding these activities via the web and other OSRTI data systems. A key component of implementing the HRS is evaluating exposure pathways, including surface and groundwater contamination.

This Performance Work Statement is to be used as a notice of a continuation of work currently being performed under EPA contract EP-W-10-016.

E. Quality Assurance:
The tasks in this assignment require the use of secondary data. Collection, use and analysis of data will governed by procedures described in the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and consistent with the Agency's quality assurance (QA) requirements. The project specific quality assurance requirements must be addressed in the monthly progress reports.

II. TASK DETAIL

The contractor shall perform the following tasks:

TASK 0: WORK PLAN AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

The contractor shall prepare a detailed work plan and budget for the accomplishment of the indicated tasks in accordance with the clause *Work Assignments* (EPAAR 1552.211-74), Alternate I. The work plan shall include cost estimates and a description of: (a) proposed staff; (b) the number of hours and labor classifications proposed for each task, to include both prime contractor and subcontractor labor; and (c) a list of deliverables, with due dates and schedule for deliverables. This task also includes weekly telephone conferences between the WA COR and the project manager, to coordinate and confirm task performance. The contractor shall also submit monthly progress and financial reports pursuant to clause F.2 MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT (EPAAR 211-70).

Prior to initiating any action under technical direction, the EPA WA COR shall ensure that the technical direction falls within the scope of work for this Work Assignment. The contractor shall charge and track time site-specifically whenever applicable. With a few exceptions where general support is given, most of the work under Task 1 (QA) and Task 3 (Technical Assistance) should be charged to specific sites. Site Spill Identifier (SSID) numbers used for tracking the sites shall be provided to the contractor by EPA for the purpose of site-specific charging.

TASK 1: QA REVIEW

EPA will provide the contractor with a list of sites that have been approved to go forward for QA review, and the EPA will provide the contractor with the site HRS documentation records and

associated references (hard and/or electronic copies). The contractor shall assign contractor Regional Coordinators (RCs), who will serve as the points of contact for QA issues with the respective EPA HQ RCs and the Regional NPL Coordinators. Task 1 will consist of the following components:

Subtask 1 - QA Review

Upon receipt, the contractor shall review each HRS package to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied and identify data gaps to help assure that the site scoring approach has the best chance of meeting legal challenges. Based on the litigation potential, complexity of the site scoring approach or other factors, the EPA WA COR will identify the level of QA review to be performed on each HRS package. Unless otherwise specified by the EPA WA COR, all levels of QA review will include a documentation completeness check, qualitative reference check, mathematical/assigned values check, issue identification, and qualitative analytical data documentation check. The EPA WA COR will identify in writing the sites for which QA review shall be initiated and the level of QA review that each site is to receive. The contractor shall identify the level of QA review conducted in the QA letters and monthly progress and status reports. The levels of QA review are:

- Full or Standard QA Review – The full QA review shall consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, and a review of all assertions made in HRS documentation records, all calculated and assigned values and all reference citations supporting those assertions and values. The proportion of time spent during the QA review shall reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score shall be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.

- Streamlined QA Review - This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. The EPA will provide guidance for performing the QA for that specific site, which shall generally follow the below format:

    - Perform a preliminary review of the HRS documentation record, narrative and score sheets to identify the critical or key scoring/policy factors. Ensure minimum partial attribution if needed for key factors.
    - Ensure proper HRS values have been assigned to critical information.
    - Review reference citations and analytical data for the critical or key scoring factors. Identify any key factor concerns.
    - Perform low level review of entire document at least once for any glaring errors not associated with critical scoring factors. This shall include math calculation errors, internal inconsistencies, and repetitious materials. Check reference list to make sure it matches the references identified in the HRS documentation record.
    - Prepare QA letter.
    - Identify which parts of this review took the most time.

- Abbreviated QA Review – The abbreviated QA review shall consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, which shall include identification of technical, policy and HRS scoring and application issues. The primary distinction between the abbreviated QA review and full QA review is that no reference citations will be verified during the abbreviated QA review and, typically, there will be only one round of review on an HRS package and one final summation of any issues not resolved by the Region in the final submission.

- Intensive QA Review – Under certain cases where the EPA perceives a high risk of litigation regarding a site, the EPA may task the contractor to perform one or more of the following assignments:

  - Review Sampling Documentation and Procedures
    - Review sampling logbooks and primary sampling reports (e.g., expanded site inspections [ESIs], remedial investigations/feasibility studies [RI/FSs], etc.) from cover to cover to ensure that documentation is accurate and consistent for key samples and key sample locations, and that sample location maps are consistent with sample location descriptions.
    - Review whether field standard operating procedures (SOPs) for collection of critical samples were documented in the HRS package and whether, based on information presented in the HRS package (e.g., logbooks, primary sampling reports), SOPs were followed. Request sampling SOPs and sample plans from the Regions, as needed.
    - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that samples are consistently identified (or adequate information is provided to crosswalk sample ID numbers definitively).

  - Review Data Quality
    - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that holding times were met. Review sample handling procedures and sample preservation and identify field duplicates.
    - Evaluate whether adequate quality control (QC) samples (field blanks, duplicates, etc.) were collected.
    - Review laboratory reports and/or data validation reports and procedures to identify deviations from laboratory QC guidelines. In cases where deviations from sample handling procedures or laboratory QC guidelines are apparent, review whether either: 1) deviations are accounted for through data validation; or 2) adequate information is provided in the HRS package to validate the data, if necessary. Review whether analytical data are adjusted according to HRS policy.

  - Ensure Package Integrity
    - Examine information included in references with the HRS package but not used in scoring to identify issues that could be raised during response to public comments or that could contradict the scoring strategy.

- Ensure that documentation included in the HRS package (e.g., maps, field logbooks) is adequate to characterize and/or rule out contributions from other potential sources in the area.

If at any time during QA review issues are identified that could cause the site score to drop below 28.50 using the HRS, the contractor shall promptly alert the EPA WA COR.

Subtask 2 - QA Letter

After completing QA review on an HRS site package submission, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the EPA HQ RC prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of the QA letter is to provide EPA HQ and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in HRS documentation records and, as appropriate and according to the level of QA review, the reference packages. These letters shall be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Upon completion, the contractor shall send each QA letter concurrently to the EPA WA COR, appropriate EPA HQ RC (who serves as task monitor), and the appropriate EPA NPL Coordinator in the Region, unless otherwise instructed. The Regional NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. When time permits during a scheduled NPL update and depending on the level of QA review selected, there may be several rounds of QA letters and full or partial HRS package resubmissions. After all issues are addressed to the extent feasible by the Region and primarily editorial comments remain, the contractor shall provide the EPA WA COR and the Region with a redlined version of the HRS documentation record showing any remaining proposed corrections. Once the Region has reviewed and accepted these corrections, the EPA WA COR will notify the contractor, who shall make these corrections, producing a final version of the HRS documentation record. The contractor shall follow the format of the QA letter provided by the EPA in Attachment #1.

Subtask 3 - Conference Calls

Following issuance of QA letter, the contractor shall have their Regional Coordinator and QA reviewers participate in conference calls when necessary with the EPA WA COR, EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA (approximately 30 packages undergo QA per year). The contractor's Regional Coordinator and appropriate technical staff shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call. These same staff people shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA WA COR with conference call notes (telecons) summarizing any action items and decisions within 3 business days following the call.

TASK 2: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Subtask 1 - Trips to Regions
The contractor shall travel to the Region in response to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support. These requests will be relayed to the contractor by the EPA WA COR through written technical direction. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, shall provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package, including any changes in approach that require immediate attention. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS documentation record package.

Assumptions:
Three trips needing technical assistance during each year of contract performance which will include visits to 2 locations. For estimation purposes, assume the following technical assistance trips:

- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 2 for 3 days
- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 5 for 2 days.

Should the support involve a site visit with potential review of the contaminated area, the contractor shall comply with the Eight-Hour OSHA training requirements, per 29 CFR 1910.120 Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Training. OSHA defines this as an eight-hour refresher course. In addition, to ensure adequate protection, the contractor shall consult with Regional personnel to inquire about any possible risks posed at the site.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls and Other General Technical Assistance Support:
Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region. Discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and review of written materials. The contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the conference call. The EPA WA COR will inform the contractor which sites have been approved for technical assistance.

TASK 3: MEETINGS AND CONSULTATION WITH SARD BRANCH

Subtask 1 - Status Meeting
As provided in technical direction by the EPA WA COR, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may

be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Post-Rule QA Site Briefings
If determined necessary by the EPA WA COR and requested via technical direction, shortly after rule publication, the contractor shall prepare briefings that will help identify potential issues for response to comments as well as common themes that came up in QA. The briefings shall include a summary of highlights for all of the sites. For each site, the briefings shall include some brief site background and discuss QA issues that went unresolved as well as other interesting/controversial QA-type issues. Following submittal of written materials to EPA, the contractor shall deliver the briefings via conference call to EPA HQ and Regions.

The contractor shall use the information collected for purposes of the site briefings to maintain a collection of QA issues and their resolutions, grouped by issues type and including site name, so that they can easily be referenced by EPA. This shall include common QA issues that can be applied to other sites or particularly unusual QA issues.

Subtask 3 - Status Report
Each month a report on the status of all sites in QA or technical assistance shall be delivered concurrently to the EPA WA COR, HQ RCs, and NPL Coordinators in each region. The report shall be delivered as part of the monthly report.

Subtask 4 – Conference Support
The contractor may be requested to attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this-work assignment. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested (via written technical direction) and approved by EPA approximately 16 calendar days prior to the conference. For estimation purposes, the contractor shall assume sending one staff member to Denver for 3 days to support this task.

Subtask 5 – Meeting and Workgroup Support
The contractor shall support OSRTI in developing and preparing for meetings, briefings, workgroups, conferences, etc., at which guidance and related issues are communicated to the site assessment community by EPA. The contractor shall perform activities such as: (1) gather and summarize technical information; (2) analyze technical and related data; (3) prepare technical reports and related materials on activities, operations, problems, and trends; (4) develop presentations and briefings (oral, written, and audiovisual); (5) plan, coordinate, and prepare materials for meetings, workgroups, and conferences; (6) present and demonstrate materials at meetings, workgroups, and conferences; and (7) make available all necessary services, equipment, and materials to supply full audiovisual and graphics capabilities. The contractor shall anticipate support for 1 meeting per year.

TASK 4: RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS OF HRS DOCUMENTATION RECORDS

The contractor shall respond to up to two special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200 hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management. This research and analysis could apply to all sites proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS documentation records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate 40 hours of research and analysis per request (total 80 hours).

TASK 5: SUPPORT FOR NPL RULE PUBLICATION AND SCORING INFORMATION

The contractor shall support activities related to NPL proposed and final rule publication. These activities shall consist of the following components for each NPL rulemaking:

1) Reviewing, formatting and creating PDFs with 508 compliance the narrative summaries for each site.

2) Delivering electronic versions of the HRS documentation records, supporting documentation and any other necessary associated documents.

3) Filling in names and addresses on congressional notification letters using an EPA-provided MS Word template. The contractor shall verify congressional district and verify senator and representative names on the house.gov and senate.gov websites. The Contractor shall deliver letters and associated mailing labels electronically to EPA WA COR via email.

4) For each final rule, the contractor shall compile all support documents into PDF files; files shall be paginated and meet agency requirements. The contractor shall prepare the title page, abstract, contents, executive summary, introduction, and glossary for the PDF files. The PDF files shall be delivered by email to the EPA WA COR for posting on the web along with the other NPL rule information.

5) On an as-needed basis, the contractor shall prepare necessary public information documents and background information. This shall be tasked via technical direction by the EPA WA COR.

The contractor shall post these documents plus state concurrence letters (provided by the EPA WA COR) to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) no later than 5 business days prior to FR publication (with the exception of last minute changes to documents by EPA).

The contractor shall prepare NPL listing information (including state correspondence documents) for website publication and provide it to the WA COR and OSRTI web change request mailbox by 9:00 am at least one day prior to the issuance of the EPA press release (which generally occurs 2 days prior to FR publication date). The EPA WA COR will give the contractor at least 5 days advance notice of the exact date of NPL rule publication. However, the projected date of rule publication shall be given to the contractor by EPA at least 4 months in advance. EPA anticipates two rule publications each year (each rule publication consisting of one proposed and one final rule). The contractor shall convert HRS documentation records to PDF format for publication on the Internet.

Four days prior to rule publication, the contractor shall send the EPA WA COR an electronic spreadsheet containing site names, locations, CERCLIS ID #s, HRS scores, federal facility indicators, FDMS docket numbers, and NPL status for the sites being proposed and added to the NPL.

Maintain Scoring Information
The contractor shall maintain a subset of listing-related data including, but not limited to: HRS scores, site narratives, listing dates, etc. The contractor shall provide EPA data and analysis support including responding to ad hoc requests for reports and analyses of site characteristics and scoring information from existing electronic data sources and HRS-related documents. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate up to six queries per year.

TASK 6: ANALYZE HRS ISSUES

When issues that are not specifically or clearly addressed in existing guidance surface during the contractor's preparation or QA review of an HRS package, the contractor shall notify the WA COR regarding a need for additional analysis. The contractor shall prepare an analysis and present the issue to the EPA WA COR and the SARD Branch. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for five such analyses during twelve month period. The contractor is responsible for all research and write-up as well as attending meetings or participating in conference calls where the issue is discussed and offering solutions or past experiences from other sites relevant to the case, as appropriate.

> The analyses shall be concise and, where applicable, shall provide the following information:
> --Considerations affecting a decision.
> --Several options for resolving the issue.
> --Advantages and disadvantages of different options.
> --Recommended approach with rationale for recommendation.
> --Estimated percentage of sites affected by issue (if requested by the EPA WA COR).

The contractor shall provide electronic copies of draft HRS analysis papers and supporting documentation to the WA COR. SARDB will then meet to decide the best way to resolve the issues. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, and/or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest shall participate in the meeting and summarize all discussions. Following each meeting, the contractor shall finalize the resolution of each issue, using EPA's input/recommendation. For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate a total of 80 hours.

TASK 7: SUPERFUND CHEMICAL DATA MATRIX (SCDM) – Updating Values for Particular Substances and Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool

During QA review of an HRS documentation record, there may arise a need for the contractor to evaluate and/or update SCDM values for particular substances by reviewing current references and databases, searching for new data sources, reviewing risk exposure assumptions, reviewing current algorithms and laws, and regulations/rules on benchmark-setting criteria.

For the particular chemical/substance, the contractor shall provide updated values for each associated HRS factor value (e.g., toxicity, mobility) and benchmark values presented in SCDM. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for six SCDM analyses during the contract year.

Further, the contractor shall provide maintenance support for the SCDM Data Management Tool previously developed, and update the tool in the future as necessary. This shall involve following up and finalizing the SCDM benchmark revisions and implementing the data management tool. The contractor shall anticipate the need for user support and tool refinements during the early months of implementation, as normal for initial startup after database development.

The contractor shall continue to support EPA in the final revision effort of the SCDM benchmarks. This may include follow up discussions with EPA to answer questions and incorporating changes before the values and methodology are finalized. Once values are updated and incorporated into the SCDM data management tool, the contractor shall provide reports to replace those currently posted on the SCDM website. The contractor shall also coordinate with HRS site scorers, QuickScore developers, and/or EPA developers of Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) regarding the updated SCDM values.

TASK 8: OTHER ANALYSIS

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the collection, extraction, analysis and quality assurance of data (for example, site assessment technical information, State and tribal data, etc.) maintained in Agency information systems. These systems include but are not limited to CERCLIS, SCDM, and HRS QuickScore. For estimation purposes, plan on one analysis per year averaging 100 hours each.

TASK 9: SUPERFUND ALTERNATIVE APPROACH (SAA)

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the implementation of the Superfund Alternative Approach policy and guidance. This support may include technical analysis, support for. workgroups, tracking of SAA data or assistance drafting technical guidance. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 100 hours per year.

TASK 10: POLICY, REGULATION, AND LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

The contractor shall perform technical analyses associated with policy development, regulations, and legislative initiatives. Example of issues associated with this support are analyses concerning the role of the NPL; policy options for addressing mega sites via site listing; States' roles within the waste cleanup program and state cleanup accomplishments; and program performance measures beyond construction completions (e.g., Superfund Alternative Approach). For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

III. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the WA COR all deliverables and drafts in electronic format only. Electronic files shall also be provided upon completion of the work assignment.

	Deliverable	**Due Date**
Task 0:	Work Plan	Within 20 days after receipt of work assignment.
	Monthly Progress Report	15th of each month.
Task 1:		
Subtask 2	QA Letter	Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway, or as determined by the EPA WA COR.
Subtask 3	Teleconference Call Notes	Due within 3 business days following conference call.

Task 2:		
Subtask 1	Technical Assistance Trips	Travel will be tasked by the EPA WA CR. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due five business days after conclusion of the trip.
Subtask 2	TA Conference Call Notes	Due within 3 business days following conference call.
Task 3:		
Subtask 1	Status Meeting	Meeting upon request of EPA WA COR.
	Contact with EPA HQ RCs	Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed).
Subtask 2	Post-Rule HQ Briefings	No later than 12 business days following publication of proposed rules (if tasked by WA COR).
Subtask 3	Monthly Status Report	Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format.
Subtask 4	Conference Support	Will be specified 14 days prior to conference.
Subtask 5	Meeting and Workgroup Support	Will be specified by the WA COR.
Task 4:	Research/Analysis of HRS Doc Records	As specified by EPA WA COR. Due between 1 and 14 days from start of task depending on complexity of request.
Task 5:	Ad hoc NPL data queries	24 hours unless specified differently by WA COR
	Support for NPL rule	Files formatted, Internet-ready and delivered to EPA by 9:00 am one day prior to NPL rule publication
	Spreadsheet with site info	Four business days prior to rule publication
	Site Packages	Due two weeks prior to the projected Federal Register publication date, as established by the NPL Rule Manager.
	Documentation Records	Docket submission at least 5 business days prior to

	And Support Documents	NPL rule publication.
	Posting to FDMS:	No later than 5 business days prior to rule publication unless otherwise directed by EPA WA COR
	Public Information Materials	Will be specified by EPA WA COR
Task 6:	Analyze HRS Issues	Work will be initiated by EPA WA COR. Draft HRS issues analyses are due 4 business prior to discussion call with EPA. Records of discussion, including draft resolution, are due 5 business days after the discussion conference call. The WA COR or task monitor will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final resolution writeups are due 2 business days following receipt of WA COR or task monitor comments.
Task 7:	Update SCDM value	Work will be initiated when a change in value for a particular chemical causes SCDM values to change. Draft SCDM analyses are due 21 business days after change of value causing SCDM value to change. The WA COR will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final SCDM values are due 7 business days following receipt of WA COR comments.
	Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool	Deliverable due dates will be negotiated with contractor prior to start of work either verbally or via technical direction, issued by either WA COR or alternate.
Task 8:	Other analysis	Will be specified by EPA WA COR.
Task 9:	Superfund Alternative Approach	Will be specified by EPA WA COR.
Task 10:	Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support	Will be specified by the WA COR.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Software Application Files and Accessibility
Software Application files, if delivered to the Government, shall conform to the requirements relating to accessibility as detailed to the 1998 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, particularly, but not limited to, § 1194.21 Software applications and operating systems and § 1194.22 Web-based intranet and internet information and applications. See: http://www.section508.gov/

Preferred text format:	MS Word, 2007 or higher (Office 2007 or higher)
Preferred presentation format:	Power Point, Office 2007 or higher
Preferred graphics format:	Each graphic is an individual GIF file
Preferred portable format:	Adobe Acrobat, version X
Preferred chart format:	MS Excel/Access for tables

APPENDIX A

EPA Work Assignment Contracting Officer Representative (WA COR):

Has overall responsibility for monitoring contractor performance on Work assignment; also provides written technical direction.

Task Monitors:

Regional NPL Coordinators: Also known as Regional Technical Contact (in lieu of Regional NPL Coordinator). The Headquarters contractors will interface with the Regional NPL Coordinator and will discuss with them issues regarding the preparation of the HRS Documentation Record packages, site-specific issues or general HRS or site assessment issues.

Headquarters Regional Coordinator: The Headquarters Regional Coordinator is responsible for clarifying policy and guidance issues during preparation of the HRS package. The HQ Regional Coordinator shall serve as the main EPA HQ contact and participate in all discussions regarding sites in their Regions.

R1: Terry Jeng
R2: Terry Jeng
R3: Terry Jeng
R4: Robert Myers
R5: Robert Myers
R6: Terry Jeng
R7: Robert Myers
R8: Robert Lausch (Drew)
R9: Robert Myers
R10: Robert Myers

ATTACHMENT 1

X^{xx} *(e.g., 1st, 2nd)* QA Review of HRS Scoring Package for Proposal XX

Site Name:	**Region:**
Location:	**Preparer:**
Site Score:	**Reviewer:**
Number of Pathways:	**Date:**

1.0 Site Description and General Comments

1.1 Site Description
1.2 General Comments

2.0 Cross-Cutting and Source Characterization Issues

3.0 Technical Issues *(by Pathway)*

3.1 Likelihood of Release
3.2 Waste Characteristics
3.3 Targets

4.0 Referencing and Editorial Issues

5.0 Potential Listing Policy Issues

ATTACHMENT 2

HRS Documentation Record
Information Requiring Support by Documentation and Possible References For Major HRS Pathways

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Site Introduction		
	Address	City Plat Map, tax records, police and fire departments, government records
	Center Point for Latitude/Longitude	USGS map, GIS data, TopoZone
	History	Company records and documents, Chamber of Commerce, tax records, Sanborn maps, news articles
	Information on Site Vicinity	USGS map, Enviromapper
Sampling & Analytical Data		
ALL Sampling Data	Sampling Date	Field logbook, chain-of-custody form, sampling trip report
	Sample Location	Field logbook, sampling trip report, sample location map
	Sample Description	Field logbook, sampling trip report
	Sampling Method and Procedures	Program-wide or site-specific field SAP, QAPP, field logbooks, sampling method document
EPA/ CLP or Equivalent	Sample Analysis & Quality Control (QC)	CLP Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Data Validation Report
	Detection/Quantitation Limits	Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report), CLP Statement of Work (SOW), CLP National Functional Guidelines
	Detection/Quantitation Limit Calculations	Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Form 10 (instrument detection limit sheet), Form 13 (preparation log), Form 14 (analysis run log), calculation worksheet
	Concentration Adjustment Calculations	EPA fact sheet "Using Qualified Data to Document an Observed Release or Observed Contamination," calculation worksheet
	Verification of CLP Analysis	CLP documentation package, sampling trip report
EPA/Non-CLP	Sample Analysis Results & QC	Instrument-generated data sheets for sample results, QC data results as required by the method, data validation report, EPA programmatic standard documentation requirements
	Method Detection Limit (MDL) or equivalent	Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report)
	MDL Calculations	Definition and sample calculation in the data deliverable report; if not MDL, documentation of equivalence

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
	Method/Procedure Used for Analysis	SAP, QAPP, statement of work, data deliverable report, or equivalent
	Other QC Documentation	Regulatory data from other EPA programs and standard documentation as required by program
Other Federal Program	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data above
	Other QC Documentation	Regulatory data from other programs and standard documentation reports required by the program
State/Non-CLP	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data above SAP, QAPP
	Other QC Documentation	State regulatory program data, discharge permit compliance forms, standard documentation as required by State program
PRP/Non-CLP equivalent	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data, SAP, QAPP
	Other QC Documentation	Administrative Consent Order (ACO) or Agreement on Consent (AOC) and required documentation, statements of data usability
Removal Actions		
	Date of Removal Initiation and Completion	EPA Removal reports, RCRA Corrective Action reports, private industry compliance reports, State regulatory reports, aerial photographs
	Description of Removal/Containment Action	
	Cleanup Criteria	
	Confirmatory Sampling	
	Contamination/Past Release Remaining	
Sources		
	Source Location and Description	Company records, permit applications, visual observations and measurements in field logbooks, aerial photographs, "as built" drawings, MSDS forms, company products lists, TRI and other EPA regulatory databases, NPDES permit applications and compliance reports, air permits, sampling trip reports (same as PA/SI and other sampling events), State records, Sanborn maps, Enviromapper
	Source Type	
	Containment Features	
	Associated Substances by	
	Sampling	
	Manifest	
	Discharges	
	Waste Quantity	
	Estimation Method	
	Reproducible Measurements	
Ground Water Pathway		
Aquifer Description		
	Strata	Topographic and geologic maps and cross sections, USGS and State survey studies, well logs, sampling reports, pump test reports, State well databases, sampling trip reports
	Aquifers	
	Confining Layers/Interconnections	
	Discontinuities	

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
	Flow Direction	Field logbooks, sampling trip reports, test pits, local geologic maps indicating the dips, strikes, and faults, topographic maps if ground water flow follows topography, previously assembled local potentiometric gradient documentation
	Ground Water Use	USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State well databases, local water purveyors and drillers, well surveys, site reconnaissance logbooks
Likelihood of Release		
Observed Release by Direct Observation	Depth to Ground Water	Well logs, test pits, sampling trip reports/logbooks
	Depth of Contamination	Test pits, soil borings, source descriptions in regulatory documents/PRP reports, engineering plans, disposal records
Observed Release by Chemical Analysis	Well Type (public, private, monitoring)	Water resources reports, water utilities, sampling trip reports, water purveyors and drillers, well permits, State and county water databases
	Well Depth	
	Aquifer Tapped	
	Well Development (conventional, direct push)	
	Sample Similarity	Sampling and analysis plans and reports, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, sample filtering information
	Sample Preparation	
	Attribution	
	Association with Source	See **Sources** information
	Other Possible Sources/Sites	Enviromapper, Federal and State regulatory databases, Sanborn maps, Phase I site assessment studies
Targets		
Target Detection Limit (TDL)	TDL delineation	Source boundary information, USGS maps, GIS
	Wells per Distance Category	State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, site reconnaissance logbooks
	Well Location	USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, site reconnaissance logbooks, sampling trip reports
	Level of Contamination	Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) benchmarks
Population	Residents	
	Count per household	U.S. Census, field logbooks, interviews, access permission forms, water utilities
	Apportionment	Water utilities
	Workers	Interviews, Chamber of Commerce
	Closed Wells	Government closure document, water utility, public health department
	Date of Closure	
	Rationale	
	Sample at Closure	Sample reports
	Targets at Closure	See Residents under **Population** above

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Other Targets	Wellhead Protection Area	State government agencies and laws and regulations, delineation maps
	Resources	State and Federal water resources programs and studies, water purveyors, county and local water utilities
Surface Water Pathway		
Likelihood of Release		
Observed Release by Direct Observation	Discharge or Spill	Interviews, affidavits, visual observations, photographs, field logbook, permit violations, other recorded violations, TDL map, sample location map, County records, flood zone maps, stream gauge records, News media reports of spills and floods
	Water Body Boundaries	
	Source Sample Location & Depth	
	Flood (including date and boundaries)	
Observed Release by Chemical Analysis	Sample Locations	Sampling plan, field logbooks, sample maps, USGS maps, sampling trip reports, laboratory analysis sheets with percent organic information
	Sample Type (water, sediment, fish tissue)	
	Sample Descriptions	
	Sample Similarity	
	Attribution	
	Association with Sources	See **Sources** section
	Other Possible Sources	Windshield survey, Enviromapper, EPA and State regulatory databases, CERCLIS, site historical information
Waste Characteristics		
	Salinity	Analytical results, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, topographic map, field logbook, field biologist
	Water Body Type	
Targets		
	Zones of Contamination by Threat	Sample location map, TDL map, USGS maps
Drinking Water Threat	Intakes	Public water utility, intake location map, USGS/water resources stream flow data, field logbook, State databases
	Location	
	Stream Flow at Intakes	
	Population Served including Date and Apportionment)	
Human Food Chain Threat	Fisheries	U.S. and State fish and wildlife programs, observations in field logbook, State fisheries programs, interviews, State and local tourist agencies
	Human Consumption	
	Fishing Locations	
	Catch data	
	Closed Fisheries	State official closure notice, State database
Sensitive Environments	Listed Environments	U.S. Fish and Wildlife/State wildlife biologist, National Heritage Program data, Federal and State authorizing legislation, Federal Register, State maps and brochures
	Specific Targets	
	Habitat Range	
	Location/Boundaries	
	Official Designation	
	Wetlands	National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, wetland specialist, State and Federal GIS databases
	NWI Designation	
	Measurements	

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Resources	Resources	Enviromapper, topographic map, windshield survey, public water authority, State and county offices (e.g., health department, land use office), Chamber of Commerce
Soil Exposure Pathway, Resident Population Threat		
Observed Contamination		
	Contaminated Soil: Background and Release	Sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, site history, soil survey, sample location map
	Sample locations	
	Sample depth	
	Sample similarity	
	Interference Rationale	Information on mode of deposition
	Other Sources	Site history, sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, survey sample location map, topographic map
	Sample Location	
	Sample Depth	
	Source Boundary	
	Attribution	See **Surface Water Pathway** suggestions
Waste Quantity		
	Source Type	Site history, field logbook, survey, affidavits, manifests
	Calculations	Field logbook, survey, affidavits, field logbook, topographic map, sample location map, measuring instruments with worksheets
Targets		
	Residents	Field logbook, sample location map, sampling and analysis plan, plat maps, House by House survey (actual count), U.S. Census Bureau Web site
	On Property and within 200 feet	
	Population per household	
	Students	Topographic map, sample location map, board of education, survey/interview with school management staff (actual count)
	School Location	
	Number of Students	
	Workers	Topographic map, sample location map, field logbook, survey (actual count), facility records, Chamber of Commerce
	Location	
	Number	
	Level of Contamination	Sample analytical result, HRS/SCDM benchmark
	Sensitive Environments	U.S. Fish and Wildlife, USDA Forest Service, National Park Service NWI map, sample location map, field biologist, field logbook
	Official Designation	
	Location	
	Habitat Range	

[a] Whenever secondary references are cited (e.g., most sample investigation reports), the scoring information should be further supported by a primary reference (e.g., field logbooks). See the *Regional QC Guidance Manual* (EPA Publication 9345.1-08, December 1991), Section 2.4.1, p. 16, for examples of primary versus secondary reference sources.

EPA

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Work Assignment

Work Assignment Number: 4-01

☐ Other ☒ Amendment Number: 000001

Contract Number	Contract Period	Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name
EP-W-10-016	08/09/2010 To 01/31/2018 Base Option Period Number 4	Support for NPL Updates

Contractor	Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW
CSRA LLC	Task 1, 4-7

Purpose:
- ☐ Work Assignment
- ☒ Work Assignment Amendment
- ☐ Work Plan Approval
- ☐ Work Assignment Close-Out
- ☐ Incremental Funding

Period of Performance: From 08/01/2016 To 01/31/2018

Comments:
The purpose of this work assignment amendment is to extend the period of performance of this WA 4-01 to January 31, 2018. The contractor shall submit a revised work plan and cost estimate for the period of the extension. All other task requirements from the WA 4-01 PWS remain unchanged.

☒ Superfund — Accounting and Appropriations Data — ☐ Non-Superfund

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations date use EPA Form 1900-69A.

SFO (*Max 2*) ☐

Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars)	(Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period: 08/09/2010 To 01/31/2018 Cost/Fee: LOE:

This Action:

Total:

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated: Cost/Fee LOE:

Cumulative Approved: Cost/Fee LOE:

Work Assignment Manager Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Project Officer Name Crystal Mitchell (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 703-603-9023 FAX Number:	
Other Agency Official Name (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number:	
Contracting Official Name Jose E. Ortiz (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-6762 FAX Number:	

EPA

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Work Assignment

Work Assignment Number: 4-01

☐ Other ☒ Amendment Number: 000002

Contract Number	Contract Period	Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name
EP-W-10-016	08/09/2010 To 05/31/2019 Base Option Period Number 4	Support for NPL Updates

Contractor	Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW
CSRA LLC	Task 1, 4-7

Purpose:
- ☐ Work Assignment
- ☒ Work Assignment Amendment
- ☐ Work Plan Approval
- ☐ Work Assignment Close-Out
- ☐ Incremental Funding

Period of Performance: From 08/01/2016 To 06/14/2018

Comments:
In accordance with Mod 66, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the period of performance through June 14, 2018.

☒ Superfund — Accounting and Appropriations Data — ☐ Non-Superfund

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations date use EPA Form 1900-69A.

SFO (*Max 2*) ☐

Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars)	(Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period: 08/09/2010 To 05/31/2019 Cost/Fee: LOE:

This Action:

Total:

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated: Cost/Fee LOE:

Cumulative Approved: Cost/Fee LOE:

Work Assignment Manager Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Project Officer Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Other Agency Official Name (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number:	
Contracting Official Name Jose E. Ortiz (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-6762 FAX Number:	

Performance Work Statement
Work Assignment Number: 4-01
February 1, 2018 to May 31, 2018

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Title: Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates

B. Work Assignment Manager:

Terry Jeng
EPA/OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8852, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: jeng.terry@epa.gov

Alternate Work Assignment Manager:

Jennifer Wendel
EPA/OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8861
email: myers.robert@epa.gov

C. OBJECTIVE

This work assignment provides technical support to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Agency's technical review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised Hazard Ranking System (HRS). The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

This work assignment also supports other HRS and NPL rulemaking activities. This includes NPL site characteristic information and tracking, web posting and Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) support.

D. BACKGROUND

Federal responsibility for the assessment and cleanup of sites contaminated by hazardous wastes resides with the U.S. EPA under the authority of several statutes, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), is one of EPA's primary offices for implementation of CERCLA.

CERCLA enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provides the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers

posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The EPA responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. The HRS is the primary mechanism used to add sites to the NPL.

The Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch (SARDB) in OSRTI is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, proposing and adding them to the NPL and maintaining public information regarding these activities via the web and other OSRTI data systems. A key component of implementing the HRS is evaluating exposure pathways, including surface and groundwater contamination.

This Performance Work Statement is to be used as a notice of a continuation of work currently being performed by CSC under EPA contract # EP-W-10-016.

E. Quality Assurance:
The tasks in this assignment require the use of secondary data. Collection, use and analysis of data will governed by procedures described in the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and consistent with the Agency's quality assurance (QA) requirements. The project specific quality assurance requirements must be addressed in the monthly progress reports.

II. TASK DETAIL

The contractor shall perform the following tasks:

Task 0 – Work Plan and Budget Development
The contractor shall prepare a detailed work plan and budget for the accomplishment of the indicated tasks in accordance with the clause *Work Assignments* (EPAAR 1552.211-74), Alternate I. The work plan shall include cost estimates a description of: (a) proposed staff; (b) the number of hours and labor classifications proposed for each task, to include both prime contractor and subcontractor labor; and (c) a list of deliverables, with due dates and schedule for deliverables. This task also includes weekly telephone conferences between the WAM and the project manager, to coordinate and confirm task performance. The contractor shall also submit monthly progress and financial reports pursuant clause, F.2, MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT (EPAAR 211-70)

Prior to initiating any action under technical direction, the EPA WAM shall ensure that the technical direction falls within the scope of work for this Work Assignment. The contractor shall charge and track time site-specifically whenever applicable. With a few exceptions where general support is given, most of the work under Task 1 (QA) and Task 3 (Technical Assistance) should be charged to specific sites. Site Spill Identifier (SSID) numbers used for tracking the sites shall be provided to the contractor by EPA for the purpose of site-specific charging.

Task 1: QA Review

EPA HQ will provide the contractor with a list of sites that have been approved by EPA management to go forward for QA review, and the EPA will provide the contractor with the site HRS documentation records and associated references (hard and/or electronic copies). The contractor shall assign contractor Regional Coordinators (RCs), who will serve as the points of contact for QA issues with the respective EPA HQ RCs and the Regional NPL Coordinators. Task 1 will consist of the following components:

1) QA Review

Upon receipt, the contractor shall review each HRS package to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied and identify data gaps to help assure that the site scoring approach has the best chance of meeting legal challenges. Based on the litigation potential, complexity of the site scoring approach or other factors, the EPA WAM will identify the level of QA review to be performed on each HRS package. Unless otherwise specified by the EPA WAM or EPA HQ RC, all levels of QA review will include a documentation completeness check, qualitative reference check, mathematical/assigned values check, issue identification and qualitative analytical data documentation check. The EPA WAM will identify in writing to the contractor WAM the sites for which QA review shall be initiated and the level of QA review that each site is to receive. The contractor shall identify the level of QA review conducted in the QA letters and monthly progress and status reports. The levels of QA review are:

- Full or Standard QA Review – The full QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, and a review of all assertions made in HRS documentation records, all calculated and assigned values and all reference citations supporting those assertions and values. The proportion of time spent during the QA review will reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score will be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.

- Streamlined QA Review - This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. The EPA will provide guidance for performing the QA for that specific site, which will generally follow the below format:

    - Perform a preliminary review of the HRS documentation record, narrative and score sheets to identify the critical or key scoring/policy factors. Ensure minimum partial attribution if needed for key factors.
    - Ensure proper HRS values have been assigned to critical information.
    - Review reference citations and analytical data for the critical or key scoring factors. Identify any key factor concerns to HQ.
    - Perform low level review of entire document once for any glaring errors not associated with critical scoring factors. This includes math calculation errors, internal inconsistencies, and repetitious materials. Check reference list to make sure it matches the references identified in the HRS documentation record.
    - Prepare QA letter.

- Identify which parts of this review took the most time.

- Abbreviated QA Review – The abbreviated QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, which will include identification of technical, policy and HRS scoring and application issues. The primary distinction between the abbreviated QA review and full QA review is that no reference citations will be verified during the abbreviated QA review and, typically, there will be only one round of review on an HRS package and one final summation of any issues not resolved by the Region in the final submission.

- Intensive QA Review – Under certain cases where the EPA perceives a high risk of litigation regarding a site, the EPA may task the contractor to perform one or more of the following assignments:

  - Review Sampling Documentation and Procedures
    - Review sampling logbooks and primary sampling reports (e.g., expanded site inspections [ESIs], remedial investigations/feasibility studies [RI/FSs], etc.) from cover to cover to ensure that documentation is accurate and consistent for key samples and key sample locations, and that sample location maps are consistent with sample location descriptions.
    - Review whether field standard operating procedures (SOPs) for collection of critical samples were documented in the HRS package and whether, based on information presented in the HRS package (e.g., logbooks, primary sampling reports), SOPs were followed. Request sampling SOPs and sample plans from the Regions, as needed.
    - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that samples are consistently identified (or adequate information is provided to crosswalk sample ID numbers definitively).

  - Review Data Quality
    - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that holding times were met. Review sample handling procedures and sample preservation and identify field duplicates.
    - Evaluate whether adequate quality control (QC) samples (field blanks, duplicates, etc.) were collected.
    - Review laboratory reports and/or data validation reports and procedures to identify deviations from laboratory QC guidelines. In cases where deviations from sample handling procedures or laboratory QC guidelines are apparent, review whether either: 1) deviations are accounted for through data validation; or 2) adequate information is provided in the HRS package to validate the data, if necessary. Review whether analytical data are adjusted according to HRS policy.

  - Ensure Package Integrity
    - Examine information included in references with the HRS package but not used in scoring to identify issues that could be raised during response to public comments or that could contradict the scoring strategy.

- Ensure that documentation included in the HRS package (e.g., maps, field logbooks) is adequate to characterize and/or rule out contributions from other potential sources in the area.

If at any time during QA review issues are identified that could cause the site score to drop below 28.50 using the HRS, the contractor shall promptly alert EPA HQ.

2) QA Letter

After completing QA review on an HRS site package submission, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the EPA HQ RC prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of the QA letter is to provide EPA HQ and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in HRS documentation records and, as appropriate and according to the level of QA review, the reference packages. These letters will be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Upon completion, the contractor shall send each QA letter concurrently to the EPA WAM, appropriate EPA HQ RC (who serves as task monitor) and the appropriate EPA NPL Coordinator in the Region, unless otherwise instructed. The Regional NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. When time permits during a scheduled NPL update and depending on the level of QA review selected, there may be several rounds of QA letters and full or partial HRS package resubmissions. After all issues are addressed to the extent feasible by the Region and primarily editorial comments remain, the contractor shall provide the EPA WAM and the Region with a redlined version of the HRS documentation record showing any remaining proposed corrections. Once the Region has reviewed and accepted these corrections, the EPA WAM will notify the contractor, who will make these corrections, producing a final version of the HRS documentation record. The contractor shall follow the format of the QA letter provided by the EPA in Attachment #1.

3) Conference Calls

Following issuance of QA letter, the contractor shall have their Regional Coordinator and QA reviewers participate in conference calls when necessary with the EPA WAM, EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA (Approximately 30 packages undergo QA per year). The contractor's Regional Coordinator and appropriate technical staff shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call. These same staff people shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA WAM with conference call notes (telecons) summarizing any action items and decisions within 3 business days following the call.

TASK 2: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Subtask 1 - Trips to Regions: The contractor shall travel to the Region in response to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support. These requests will be relayed to the contractor by the EPA WAM through written technical direction. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, shall provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package, including any changes in approach that require immediate attention. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS documentation record package.

Assumptions:
Three trips needing technical assistance during each year of contract performance which will include visits to 2 locations. For estimation purposes, assume the following technical assistance trips:

- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 2 for 3 days
- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 5 for 2 days.

Should the support involve a site visit with potential review of the contaminated area, the contractor shall comply with the Eight-Hour OSHA training requirements, per 29 CFR 1910.120 Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Training. OSHA defines this as an eight-hour refresher course. In addition, to ensure adequate protection, the contractor shall consult with Regional personnel to inquire about any possible risks posed at the site.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls and Other General Technical Assistance Support:
Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region. Discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and review of written materials. The contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the conference call. The EPA WAM will inform the contractor which sites have been approved for technical assistance.

TASK 3: Meetings and Consultation with SARD Branch
The contractor shall support EPA as follows:

Subtask 1- Status Meeting: As directed by the EPA WAM, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may

be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Post-Rule QA Site Briefings: If determined necessary by EPA WAM and requested via TDD, shortly after rule publication, the contractor shall prepare briefings that will help identify potential issues for response to comments as well as common themes that came up in QA. The briefings will include a summary of highlights for all of the sites. For each site, the briefings will include some brief site background and discuss QA issues that went unresolved as well as other interesting/controversial QA-type issues. Following submittal of written materials to EPA, the contractor shall deliver the briefings via conference call to EPA HQ and Regions.

The contractor shall use the information collected for purposes of the site briefings to maintain a collection of QA issues and their resolutions, grouped by issues type and including site name, so that they can easily be referenced by EPA. This will include common QA issues that can be applied to other sites or particularly unusual QA issues.

Subtask 3 - Status Report: Each month a report on the status of all sites in QA or technical assistance shall be delivered concurrently to the EPA WAM, HQ RCs, and NPL Coordinators in each region. The report shall be delivered as part of the monthly report.

Subtask 4 – Conference Support: The contractor may be requested to attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this-work assignment. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested (via written technical direction) and approved by EPA approximately 16 calendar days prior to the conference. For estimation purposes, the contractor should assume sending one staff member to Denver for 3 days to support this task.

Subtask 5 – Meeting and Workgroup Support:
The contractor shall support OSRTI in developing and preparing for meetings, briefings, workgroups, conferences, etc., at which guidance and related issues are communicated to the site assessment community by EPA. The contractor shall perform activities such as: (1) gather and summarize technical information; (2) analyze technical and related data; (3) prepare technical reports and related materials on activities, operations, problems, and trends; (4) develop presentations and briefings (oral, written, and audiovisual); (5) plan, coordinate, and prepare materials for meetings, workgroups, and conferences; (6) present and demonstrate materials at meetings, workgroups, and conferences; and (7) make available all necessary services, equipment, and materials to supply full audiovisual and graphics capabilities. The contractor shall anticipate support for 1 meeting per year.

TASK 4: Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records
The contractor shall respond to up to two special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200

hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management. This research and analysis could apply to all sites proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS documentation records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate 40 hours of research and analysis per request (total 80 hours).

TASK 5 - Support for NPL Rule Publication and Scoring Information:
The contractor shall support activities related to NPL proposed and final rule publication. These activities will consist of the following components for each NPL rulemaking:

1) Reviewing, formatting and creating PDFs with 508 compliance the narrative summaries for each site.

2) Delivering electronic versions of the HRS documentation records, supporting documentation and any other necessary associated documents.

3) Filling in names and addresses on congressional notification letters using an EPA-provided MS Word template. The contractor shall verify congressional district and verify senator and representative names on the house.gov and senate.gov websites. Contractor shall deliver letters and associated mailing labels electronically to EPA WAM via email.

4) For each final rule, the contractor shall compile all support documents into PDF files; files shall be paginated and meet agency requirements. The contractor shall prepare the title page, abstract, contents, executive summary, introduction, and glossary for the PDF files. The PDF files shall be delivered by email concurrently to the EPA WAM for posting on the web along with the other NPL rule information, and to the EPA WAM.

5) On an as-needed basis, preparing any necessary public information documents and background information. This shall be tasked via TD by the EPA WAM.

The contractor shall post these documents plus state concurrence letters (provided by the EPA WAM) to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) no later than 5 business days prior to FR publication (with the exception of last minute changes to documents by EPA).

The contractor shall prepare NPL listing information (including state correspondence documents) for website publication and provide it to the WAM and OSRTI web change request mailbox by 9:00 am at least one day prior to the issuance of the EPA press release (which generally occurs 2 days prior to FR publication date). The EPA WAM will give the contractor at least 5 days advance notice of the exact date of NPL rule publication. However, the projected date of rule publication shall be given to the contractor by EPA at least 4 months in advance. EPA anticipates two rule

publications each year (each rule publication consisting of one proposed and one final rule). The contractor shall convert HRS documentation records to PDF format for publication on the Internet.

Four days prior to rule publication the contractor shall send the WAM an electronic spreadsheet containing site names, locations, CERCLIS ID #s, HRS scores, federal facility indicators, FDMS docket numbers and NPL status for the sites being proposed and added to the NPL.

Maintain Scoring Information
The contractor shall maintain a subset of listing-related data including, but not limited to: HRS scores, site narratives, listing dates, etc. The contractor shall provide EPA data and analysis support including responding to ad hoc requests for reports and analyses of site characteristics and scoring information from existing electronic data sources and HRS-related documents. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate up to six queries per year.

TASK 6: Analyze HRS Issues
When issues that are not specifically or clearly addressed in existing guidance surface during the contractor's preparation or QA review of an HRS package, the contractor shall notify the WAM regarding a need for additional analysis. The contractor shall prepare an analysis and present the issue to the EPA WAM and the SARD Branch. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for five such analyses during twelve month period. The contractor is responsible for all research and write-up as well as attending meetings or participating in conference calls where the issue is discussed and offering solutions or past experiences from other sites relevant to the case, as appropriate.

> The analyses shall be concise and, where applicable, shall provide the following information:
> --Considerations affecting a decision.
> --Several options for resolving the issue.
> --Advantages and disadvantages of different options.
> --Recommended approach with rationale for recommendation.
> --Estimated percentage of sites affected by issue (if requested by the EPA WAM).

The contractor shall provide electronic copies of draft HRS analysis papers and supporting documentation to the WAM. SARDB will then meet to decide the best way to resolve the issues. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, and/or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest shall participate in the meeting and summarize all discussions. Following each meeting, the contractor shall finalize the resolution of each issue, using EPA's input/recommendation. For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate a total of 80 hours.

TASK 7: Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) – Updating Values for Particular Substances and Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool

During QA review of an HRS documentation record, there may arise a need for the contractor to evaluate and/or update SCDM values for particular substances by reviewing current references and databases, searching for new data sources, reviewing risk exposure assumptions, reviewing current algorithms and laws, and regulations/rules on benchmark-setting criteria.

For the particular chemical/substance, the contractor shall provide updated values for each associated HRS factor value (e.g., toxicity, mobility) and benchmark values presented in SCDM. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for six SCDM analyses during the contract year.

Further, the contractor shall provide maintenance support for the SCDM Data Management Tool previously developed, and update the tool in the future as necessary. This will involve following up and finalizing the SCDM benchmark revisions and implementing the data management tool. The contractor shall anticipate the need for user support and tool refinements during the early months of implementation, as normal for initial startup after database development.

The contractor shall continue to support EPA in the final revision effort of the SCDM benchmarks. This may include follow up discussions with EPA to answer questions and incorporating changes before the values and methodology are finalized. Once values are updated and incorporated into the SCDM data management tool, the contractor shall provide reports to replace those currently posted on the SCDM website. The contractor shall also coordinate with HRS site scorers, QuickScore developers, and/or EPA developers of Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) regarding the updated SCDM values.

Task 8: Other Analysis
The contractor shall support OSRTI in the collection, extraction, analysis and quality assurance of data (for example, site assessment technical information, State and tribal data, etc.) maintained in Agency information systems. These systems include but are not limited to CERCLIS, SCDM, and HRS QuickScore. For estimation purposes, plan on one analysis per year averaging 100 hours each.

Task 9: Superfund Alternative Approach (SAA)
The contractor shall support OSRTI in the implementation of the Superfund Alternative Approach policy and guidance. This support may include technical analysis, support for. workgroups, tracking of SAA data or assistance drafting technical guidance. For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 100 hours per year.

Task 10: Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support
The contractor shall also support OSRTI by performing technical analyses associated with policy development, regulations, and legislative initiatives. Example of issues associated with this support are analyses concerning the role of the NPL; policy options for addressing mega sites via site listing; States' roles within the waste cleanup program, and state cleanup accomplishments; and program performance measures beyond construction completions (e.g., Superfund

Alternative Approach). For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

III. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the WAM all deliverables and drafts in electronic format only. Electronic files must also be provided upon completion of the work assignment.

	Deliverable	Due Date
Task 0:	Work Plan	Within 20 days after receipt of work assignment.
	Monthly Progress Report	15th of each month.
Task 1:		
Subtask 2	QA Letter	Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway, or as determined by the EPA WAM.
Subtask 3	Teleconference Call Notes	Due within 3 business days following conference call.
Task 2:		
Subtask 1	Technical Assistance Trips	Travel will be tasked by the EPA WAM. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due five business days after conclusion of the trip.
Subtask 2	TA Conference Call Notes	Due within 3 business days following conference call.
Task 3:		
Subtask 1	Status Meeting	Meeting upon request of EPA WAM.
	Contact with EPA HQ RCs	Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed).
Subtask 2	Post-Rule HQ Briefings	No later than 12 business days following publication of proposed rules (if tasked by WAM).

Subtask 3	Monthly Status Report	Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format.
Subtask 4	Conference Support	Will be specified 14 days prior to conference.
Subtask 5	Meeting and Workgroup Support	Will be specified by WAM .
Task 4:	Research/Analysis of HRS Doc Records	As specified by EPA WAM. Due between 1 and 14 days from start of task depending on complexity of request.
Task 5:	Ad hoc NPL data queries	24 hours unless specified differently by EPA WAM
	Support for NPL rule	Files formatted, Internet-ready and delivered to EPA by 9:00 am one day prior to NPL rule publication
	Spreadsheet with site info	Four business days prior to rule publication
	Site Packages	Due two weeks prior to the projected Federal Register publication date, as established by the NPL Rule Manager.
	Documentation Records And Support Documents	Docket submission at least 5 business days prior to NPL rule publication.
	Posting to FDMS:	No later than 5 business days prior to rule publication unless otherwise directed by EPA WAM
	Public Information Materials	Will be specified by EPA WAM
Task 6:	Analyze HRS Issues	Work will be initiated by EPA WAM. Draft HRS issues analyses are due 4 business prior to discussion call with EPA. Records of discussion, including draft resolution, are due 5 business days after the discussion conference call. The WAM or task monitor will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final resolution writeups are due 2 business days following receipt of WAM or task monitor comments.

Task 7:	Update SCDM value	Work will be initiated when a change in value for a particular chemical causes SCDM values to change. Draft SCDM analyses are due 21 business days after change of value causing SCDM value to change. The WAM will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final SCDM values are due 7 business days following receipt of WAM comments.
	Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool	Deliverable due dates will be negotiated with contractor prior to start of work either verbally or via TD, issued by either WAM or alternate.
Task 8:	Other analysis	Will be specified by EPA WAM.
Task 9:	Superfund Alternative Approach	Will be specified by EPA WAM.
Task 10:	Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support	Will be specified by the WAM.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Software Application Files and Accessibility

Software Application files, if delivered to the Government, shall conform to the requirements relating to accessibility as detailed to the 1998 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, particularly, but not limited to, § 1194.21 Software applications and operating systems and § 1194.22 Web-based intranet and internet information and applications. See: http://www.section508.gov/

Preferred text format:	MS Word, 2007 or higher (Office 2007 or higher)
Preferred presentation format:	Power Point, Office 2007 or higher
Preferred graphics format:	Each graphic is an individual GIF file
Preferred portable format:	Adobe Acrobat, version X
Preferred chart format:	MS Excel/Access for tables

APPENDIX A

EPA Work Assignment Manager (WAM):

Has overall responsibility for monitoring contractor performance on Work assignment; also provides written technical direction.

Task Monitors:

Regional NPL Coordinators: Also known as Regional Technical Contact (in lieu of Regional NPL Coordinator). The Headquarters contractors will interface with the Regional NPL Coordinator and will discuss with them issues regarding the preparation of the HRS Documentation Record packages, site-specific issues or general HRS or site assessment issues.

Headquarters Regional Coordinator: The Headquarters Regional Coordinator is responsible for clarifying policy and guidance issues during preparation of the HRS package. The HQ Regional Coordinator shall serve as the main EPA HQ contact and participate in all discussions regarding sites in their Regions.

R1: Terry Jeng
R2: Terry Jeng
R3: Terry Jeng
R4: Jennifer Wendel
R5: Sun Yi/Jennifer Wendel
R6: Terry Jeng
R7: Terry Jeng
R8: Jennifer Wendel
R9: Jennifer Wendel
R10: Jennifer Wendel

Attachment 1

X^{xx} *(e.g., 1st, 2nd)* QA Review of HRS Scoring Package for Proposal XX

Site Name:	**Region:**
Location:	**Preparer:**
Site Score:	**Reviewer:**
Number of Pathways:	**Date:**

1.0 Site Description and General Comments

1.1 Site Description
1.2 General Comments

2.0 Cross-Cutting and Source Characterization Issues

3.0 Technical Issues *(by Pathway)*

3.1 Likelihood of Release
3.2 Waste Characteristics
3.3 Targets

4.0 Referencing and Editorial Issues

5.0 Potential Listing Policy Issues

Attachment 2

HRS Documentation Record
Information Requiring Support by Documentation and Possible References For Major HRS Pathways

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Site Introduction		
	Address	City Plat Map, tax records, police and fire departments, government records
	Center Point for Latitude/Longitude	USGS map, GIS data, TopoZone
	History	Company records and documents, Chamber of Commerce, tax records, Sanborn maps, news articles
	Information on Site Vicinity	USGS map, Enviromapper
Sampling & Analytical Data		
ALL Sampling Data	Sampling Date	Field logbook, chain-of-custody form, sampling trip report
	Sample Location	Field logbook, sampling trip report, sample location map
	Sample Description	Field logbook, sampling trip report
	Sampling Method and Procedures	Program-wide or site-specific field SAP, QAPP, field logbooks, sampling method document
EPA/ CLP or Equivalent	Sample Analysis & Quality Control (QC)	CLP Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Data Validation Report
	Detection/Quantitation Limits	Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report), CLP Statement of Work (SOW), CLP National Functional Guidelines
	Detection/Quantitation Limit Calculations	Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Form 10 (instrument detection limit sheet), Form 13 (preparation log), Form 14 (analysis run log), calculation worksheet
	Concentration Adjustment Calculations	EPA fact sheet "Using Qualified Data to Document an Observed Release or Observed Contamination," calculation worksheet
	Verification of CLP Analysis	CLP documentation package, sampling trip report
EPA/Non-CLP	Sample Analysis Results & QC	Instrument-generated data sheets for sample results, QC data results as required by the method, data validation report, EPA programmatic standard documentation requirements
	Method Detection Limit (MDL) or equivalent	Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report)
	MDL Calculations	Definition and sample calculation in the data deliverable report; if not MDL, documentation of equivalence

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
	Method/Procedure Used for Analysis	SAP, QAPP, statement of work, data deliverable report, or equivalent
	Other QC Documentation	Regulatory data from other EPA programs and standard documentation as required by program
Other Federal Program	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data above
	Other QC Documentation	Regulatory data from other programs and standard documentation reports required by the program
State/Non-CLP	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data above SAP, QAPP
	Other QC Documentation	State regulatory program data, discharge permit compliance forms, standard documentation as required by State program
PRP/Non-CLP equivalent	Sampling & Analysis Information	See references identified for **EPA/Non-CLP** data, SAP, QAPP
	Other QC Documentation	Administrative Consent Order (ACO) or Agreement on Consent (AOC) and required documentation, statements of data usability
Removal Actions		
	Date of Removal Initiation and Completion	EPA Removal reports, RCRA Corrective Action reports, private industry compliance reports, State regulatory reports, aerial photographs
	Description of Removal/Containment Action	
	Cleanup Criteria	
	Confirmatory Sampling	
	Contamination/Past Release Remaining	
Sources		
	Source Location and Description	Company records, permit applications, visual observations and measurements in field logbooks, aerial photographs, "as built" drawings, MSDS forms, company products lists, TRI and other EPA regulatory databases, NPDES permit applications and compliance reports, air permits, sampling trip reports (same as PA/SI and other sampling events), State records, Sanborn maps, Enviromapper
	Source Type	
	Containment Features	
	Associated Substances by	
	Sampling	
	Manifest	
	Discharges	
	Waste Quantity	
	Estimation Method	
	Reproducible Measurements	
Ground Water Pathway		
Aquifer Description		
	Strata	Topographic and geologic maps and cross sections, USGS and State survey studies, well logs, sampling reports, pump test reports, State well databases, sampling trip reports
	Aquifers	
	Confining Layers/Interconnections	
	Discontinuities	

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
	Flow Direction	Field logbooks, sampling trip reports, test pits, local geologic maps indicating the dips, strikes, and faults, topographic maps if ground water flow follows topography, previously assembled local potentiometric gradient documentation
	Ground Water Use	USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State well databases, local water purveyors and drillers, well surveys, site reconnaissance logbooks
Likelihood of Release		
Observed Release by Direct Observation	Depth to Ground Water	Well logs, test pits, sampling trip reports/logbooks
	Depth of Contamination	Test pits, soil borings, source descriptions in regulatory documents/PRP reports, engineering plans, disposal records
Observed Release by Chemical Analysis	Well Type (public, private, monitoring)	Water resources reports, water utilities, sampling trip reports, water purveyors and drillers, well permits, State and county water databases
	Well Depth	
	Aquifer Tapped	
	Well Development (conventional, direct push)	
	Sample Similarity	Sampling and analysis plans and reports, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, sample filtering information
	Sample Preparation	
	Attribution	
	Association with Source	See **Sources** information
	Other Possible Sources/Sites	Enviromapper, Federal and State regulatory databases, Sanborn maps, Phase I site assessment studies
Targets		
Target Detection Limit (TDL)	TDL delineation	Source boundary information, USGS maps, GIS
	Wells per Distance Category	State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, site reconnaissance logbooks
	Well Location	USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, site reconnaissance logbooks, sampling trip reports
	Level of Contamination	Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) benchmarks
Population	Residents	
	Count per household	U.S. Census, field logbooks, interviews, access permission forms, water utilities
	Apportionment	Water utilities
	Workers	Interviews, Chamber of Commerce
	Closed Wells	Government closure document, water utility, public health department
	Date of Closure	
	Rationale	
	Sample at Closure	Sample reports
	Targets at Closure	See Residents under **Population** above

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Other Targets	Wellhead Protection Area	State government agencies and laws and regulations, delineation maps
	Resources	State and Federal water resources programs and studies, water purveyors, county and local water utilities
Surface Water Pathway		
Likelihood of Release		
Observed Release by Direct Observation	Discharge or Spill	Interviews, affidavits, visual observations, photographs, field logbook, permit violations, other recorded violations, TDL map, sample location map, County records, flood zone maps, stream gauge records, News media reports of spills and floods
	Water Body Boundaries	
	Source Sample Location & Depth	
	Flood (including date and boundaries)	
Observed Release by Chemical Analysis	Sample Locations	Sampling plan, field logbooks, sample maps, USGS maps, sampling trip reports, laboratory analysis sheets with percent organic information
	Sample Type (water, sediment, fish tissue)	
	Sample Descriptions	
	Sample Similarity	
	Attribution	
	Association with Sources	See **Sources** section
	Other Possible Sources	Windshield survey, Enviromapper, EPA and State regulatory databases, CERCLIS, site historical information
Waste Characteristics		
	Salinity	Analytical results, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, topographic map, field logbook, field biologist
	Water Body Type	
Targets		
	Zones of Contamination by Threat	Sample location map, TDL map, USGS maps
Drinking Water Threat	Intakes	Public water utility, intake location map, USGS/water resources stream flow data, field logbook, State databases
	Location	
	Stream Flow at Intakes	
	Population Served including Date and Apportionment)	
Human Food Chain Threat	Fisheries	U.S. and State fish and wildlife programs, observations in field logbook, State fisheries programs, interviews, State and local tourist agencies
	Human Consumption	
	Fishing Locations	
	Catch data	
	Closed Fisheries	State official closure notice, State database
Sensitive Environments	Listed Environments	U.S. Fish and Wildlife/State wildlife biologist, National Heritage Program data, Federal and State authorizing legislation, Federal Register, State maps and brochures
	Specific Targets	
	Habitat Range	
	Location/Boundaries	
	Official Designation	
	Wetlands	National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, wetland specialist, State and Federal GIS databases
	NWI Designation	
	Measurements	

HRS Section/Topic	Information requiring Documentation	Possible Reference(s)[a]
Resources	Resources	Enviromapper, topographic map, windshield survey, public water authority, State and county offices (e.g., health department, land use office), Chamber of Commerce
Soil Exposure Pathway, Resident Population Threat		
Observed Contamination		
	Contaminated Soil: Background and Release	Sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, site history, soil survey, sample location map
	Sample locations	
	Sample depth	
	Sample similarity	
	Interference Rationale	Information on mode of deposition
	Other Sources	Site history, sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, survey sample location map, topographic map
	Sample Location	
	Sample Depth	
	Source Boundary	
	Attribution	See **Surface Water Pathway** suggestions
Waste Quantity		
	Source Type	Site history, field logbook, survey, affidavits, manifests
	Calculations	Field logbook, survey, affidavits, field logbook, topographic map, sample location map, measuring instruments with worksheets
Targets		
	Residents	Field logbook, sample location map, sampling and analysis plan, plat maps, House by House survey (actual count), U.S. Census Bureau Web site
	On Property and within 200 feet	
	Population per household	
	Students	Topographic map, sample location map, board of education, survey/interview with school management staff (actual count)
	School Location	
	Number of Students	
	Workers	Topographic map, sample location map, field logbook, survey (actual count), facility records, Chamber of Commerce
	Location	
	Number	
	Level of Contamination	Sample analytical result, HRS/SCDM benchmark
	Sensitive Environments	U.S. Fish and Wildlife, USDA Forest Service, National Park Service NWI map, sample location map, field biologist, field logbook
	Official Designation	
	Location	
	Habitat Range	

[a] Whenever secondary references are cited (e.g., most sample investigation reports), the scoring information should be further supported by a primary reference (e.g., field logbooks). See the *Regional QC Guidance Manual* (EPA Publication 9345.1-08, December 1991), Section 2.4.1, p. 16, for examples of primary versus secondary reference sources.

EPA

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Work Assignment

Work Assignment Number: 4-01

☐ Other ☒ Amendment Number: 000003

Contract Number	Contract Period	Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name
EP-W-10-016	08/09/2010 To 05/31/2019 Base Option Period Number 4	Support for NPL Updates

Contractor: CSRA LLC

Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW: Task 1, 4-7

Purpose:
- ☐ Work Assignment
- ☒ Work Assignment Amendment
- ☐ Work Plan Approval
- ☐ Work Assignment Close-Out
- ☐ Incremental Funding

Period of Performance: From 08/01/2016 To 05/31/2019

Comments:
In accordance with Mod 67, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the period of performance through May 31, 2019.

☒ Superfund — Accounting and Appropriations Data — ☐ Non-Superfund

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations date use EPA Form 1900-69A.

SFO (*Max 2*) ☐

Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars)	(Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period: 08/09/2010 To 05/31/2019 Cost/Fee: LOE:

This Action:

Total:

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated: Cost/Fee LOE:

Cumulative Approved: Cost/Fee LOE:

Work Assignment Manager Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Project Officer Name Jennifer Wendel (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 404-562-8799 FAX Number:	
Other Agency Official Name (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number:	
Contracting Official Name Marneice Bivins (Signature) (Date)	Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-4513 FAX Number:	