

**Worksheet B-3. Inventory Project Report (INPR) Checklist
(Use space at bottom of this worksheet for continuation)**

Checklist Preparer:		Date: March 2007	
Name: Bill Kowalewski		Title: Project Manager	
District: Buffalo		Phone Number: (716) 879-4418	
Email address: William.E.Kowalewski@lrb01.usace.army.mil			
Property information:			
Property Name: Lake Ontario Ordnance Works (LOOW)			
Previous Names, if any: Various names/period of use - see narrative comments			
Former Service: Army, Air Force, and Navy			
Property Location (Section, Township, Range): Lewiston/Porter, New York			
Street: Porter Center Road			
City: Lewiston/Porter,		County: Niagara County	State: New York
Latitude (D/M/S): 43° 12' 47" N		Longitude (D/M/S): 78° 58' 41" W	
Primary Property Owner Information (address multiple owners in Comments):			
Name: Various owners - see narrative comments			
Address (if other than above):			
Street:			
City:			
Phone Number:		County:	State:

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
Property Document Search:				
Were the following records available and used in the preparation of the INPR?				
1	Archive records	X		
2	Site maps, including facility as-built drawings	X		
3	Aerial or ground photographs	X		
4	Prior studies, documents, reports, property contamination records, or public/private sampling data	X		
5	Compliance orders issued to current or past owners/operators	X		
6	Real estate records, deeds, or property transfer records	X		
7	Local historical societies and public libraries	X		
8	EPA/State environmental records or reports	X		
9	EOD incident reports		X	
10	Other documentation	X		
Property Visit:				
Indicate whether the following have been contacted and interviewed to obtain information.				
11	Current landowner(s)	X		
12	Neighbors	X		

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
13	Previous landowner(s)	X		
14	Prior employee(s)	X		
15	Federal agencies, including regulatory agencies	X		
16	State agencies, including regulatory agencies	X		
17	Local agencies, including regulatory and law enforcement agencies	X		
18	Other available sources	X		
19	Was access to the property possible (right of entry provided by landowner)?	X	X	
20	Was the property physically visited?	X	X	
21	Was access sufficient to allow for a thorough property inspection?	X		
22	Was access sufficient to identify potential hazards?	X		
23	Did regulatory agencies accompany USACE on the property visit?		X	
24	Did the landowner accompany USACE on the property visit?	X		
25	Was there evidence of a release of hazardous material or use/disposal of military munitions during DoD control?	X		
26	Was there evidence of a release of potential DoD hazardous material into a public or private drinking water supply? ¹		X	
27	Is there evidence of a release into a public or private drinking water supply due to deterioration of the system through ordinary use? ²		X	
28	Is there evidence of a release from products that are part of the structure of, and result in exposure within, residential buildings or businesses or community structures? ²		X	
29	Is some other program actively involved with the property (i.e., another Federal, state, or tribal program)?	X		
30	Is there evidence that activities by non-DoD parties at the property may be the source of potential contamination?	X		
31	Was information on hazards found at similar types of FUDS properties considered in identifying potential hazards at this property?	X		
32	Were site maps compared to actual conditions during the site visit?	X		
33	Were photographs taken?	X		
34	Were property owners advised to contact USACE if evidence of potential hazards is found later?	X		
35	Was a trip report of the property visit prepared?	X		
Property Eligibility Determination (refer to Chapter 3):				
36	Is the property Categorically Excluded?		X	
37	Are there release, hold harmless, "as-is", or indemnification clauses in deeds or property transfer documents that limit DoD liability?		X	
38	Is there evidence of this property being a Third Party Site?		X	

¹ This can be determined by reviewing public water supply sampling data. Provide discussion of how it was determined to be release due to DoD activities rather than by current or past owners/operators.

² This question is from the EPA Pre-CERCLIS Screening Assessment Checklist/Decision Form, EPA-540-F-98-039 "Improving Site Assessment: Pre-CERCLIS Screening Assessments."

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
39	Is the property eligible under FUDS?	X	X	
40	If necessary, has a “ <i>Categorical Exclusion or Ineligible Property</i> ” worksheet been prepared (Worksheet B-1)	X		
FUDS Property Screening:				
41	Was a CERCLA Preliminary Assessment completed?		X	
42	Was a MMRP/MEC RAC Worksheet prepared for the property?	X		
Project Eligibility Determination (refer to Chapter 3):				
43	Have all typical hazards been investigated for possible occurrence at this type of property?	X		
44	Were hazards identified?	X		
45	Are identified hazards of DoD Origin?	X		
46	If identified hazards were of non-DoD origin, has the lead regulatory agency been informed? (Provide name, phone number, date)	X		
47	Is the current owner under a RCRA or CERCLA clean-up order?	X		
48	Has the “right of first refusal” been exercised by an adjacent DoD installation?			X
49	Is there evidence of beneficial use?	X		
50	Are there other policy considerations against recommending a project?	X		
51	Are eligible FUDS projects recommended? (If yes, identify projects below)	X		
INPR Preparation and Review:				
52	Is the INPR prepared consistent with INPR Content Matrix (Table B-2)?	X		
53	Is the INPR Property Survey Summary Sheet consistent with Table B-3?	X		
54	Is the Project Summary Sheet(s) consistent with Table B-4?	X		
55	If appropriate, has a “ <i>BD/DR Project Summary Sheet Checklist</i> ” been prepared? (See Worksheet B-2)	X		
56	If the INPR recommends a PRP/HTRW project, has the PRP District reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
57	If the INPR recommends a PRP/HTRW project, has the HTRW Center of Expertise reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
58	If the INPR recommends a MMRP or PRP/MMRP project, has the MM Center of Expertise reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
59	Was the draft INPR coordinated with Office of Counsel and Real Estate?	X		
60	Was the draft INPR shared with the Lead Regulatory Agency after internal USACE review?	X		

Narrative comments to explain above notations: (Key your comments to the checklist item number)

Current owners of the eligible portion of the former Lake Ontario Ordnance Works (LOOW) property include the Town of Porter, CWM Chemical Services Inc. (CWM- which operates the Model City Treatment Storage Disposal and Recovery [TSDR] Facility), Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, The Somerset Group (which operates the Lew-Port Industrial Park), Town of Lewiston (including the Lew-Port School), Modern Disposal Services Inc. (which operates Modern Landfill), the Department of Energy (DOE –which operates the Niagara Falls Storage Site [NFSS]), Occidental Chemical Corporation (which has a vacant parcel of land), and numerous private residents. Owner contact and address information available in CELRB and CENAB files.

5 – A consent order to perform a RCRA facility investigation (RFI) was issued by EPA to CWM on 30 August 1988. The consent order was superseded by an EPA Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments Act of 1984 (HSWA) permit issued in September of 1989, which delineated several solid waste management units for investigation as part of the RFI.

9 – No EOD reports identified for the site, but other HTRW MEC removal actions/reports reviewed.

19 and 20 – This was an INPR addendum and the site visit concentrated on the former industrial area of LOOW that was determined to have environmental issues. The majority of the 5,000 + acres associated with the buffer zone was not visited. Site visit personnel were denied access to the approximately 191 acres associated with the DOE site known as Niagara Falls Storage Site (NFSS).

23 – Regulatory agencies did not take part in the 2001 site visit, but they are actively involved in the ongoing HTRW investigation and they have been to the site during previous visits.

25 – There is evidence of a release of HTRW and munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), including TNT, metals, volatiles, and other constituents during DOD ownership and control of the site.

29 – FUSRAP is currently involved in the investigation/cleanup of the 191-acre NFSS and the vicinity properties which were part of the former LOOW.

30 – Several different GOCO operations occurred at the site during the period of DOD ownership including the original TNT manufacturing operations when the site was known as LOOW as well as subsequent operations when the site was known as Air Force Plant (AFP) 68, AFP-38, and the Navy Interim Pilot Production Plant (IPPP). These GOCO operations occurred at various times and had separate operators. Additionally, subsequent owners' operations were of types that could have contributed to potential contamination observed at the site.

39 – Approximately 86% of the area of the former LOOW is FUDS-eligible, but the remainder of the site which includes the former AFP-38/WETS and the former NIKE Battery NF 03/05 launch area are still under the jurisdiction of DOD and therefore ineligible for remediation under DERP-FUDS.

41 – This is an INPR addendum. Extensive history and investigation has already been performed on this FUDS, at least equivalent to the information gathered for a Preliminary Assessment. The existing information is more than adequate to determine the need for response action and for EPA to apply its Hazard Ranking System.

44-46 – CON/HTRW, HTRW, and MMRP hazards have been identified and linked to DOD and/or DOD GOCO contractor operations. In addition, the State has identified and monitored current owner-generated hazards, and is well aware of the potential for non-DOD hazards from

Narrative comments to explain above notations: (Key your comments to the checklist item number)

previous non-DOD owners/users. The contact at NYSDEC is Kent Johnson, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), (518) 402-8594

47 – A portion of the site owned by CWM is under a RCRA cleanup order.

49 – There is evidence that some buildings/structures, USTs, ASTs, and transformers have been beneficially used.

50 – Policy considerations preclude proposal of a BD/DR project because none of the BD/DR hazards are located on property continuously owned by a state or local government. An MMRP project is being proposed to include those areas not addressed under the ongoing HTRW project.

51 – CON/HTRW, MMRP, and PRP/HTRW projects have been proposed.

Worksheet B-3. Inventory Project Report (INPR) Checklist
(Use space at bottom of this worksheet for continuation)

Checklist Preparer:		Date: April 2005
Name: Dave Romano		Title: Project Manager
District: Buffalo	Phone Number: (716) 879-4119	
Email address: David.Romano@LRB01.usace.army.mil		
Property information:		
Property Name: Lake Ontario Ordnance Works (LOOW)		
Previous Names, if any: Various names/period of use - see narrative comments		
Former Service: Army, Air Force, and Navy		
Property Location (Section, Township, Range): Lewiston/Porter, New York		
Street: Porter Center Road		
City: Lewiston/Porter,	County: Niagara County	State: New York
Latitude (D/M/S): 43° 12' 47" N		Longitude (D/M/S): 78° 58' 41" W
Primary Property Owner Information (address multiple owners in Comments):		
Name: Various owners - see narrative comments		
Address (if other than above):		
Street:		
City:		
Phone Number:	County:	State:

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
Property Document Search:				
Were the following records available and used in the preparation of the INPR?				
1	Archive records	X		
2	Site maps, including facility as-built drawings	X		
3	Aerial or ground photographs	X		
4	Prior studies, documents, reports, property contamination records, or public/private sampling data	X		
5	Compliance orders issued to current or past owners/operators	X		
6	Real estate records, deeds, or property transfer records	X		
7	Local historical societies and public libraries	X		
8	EPA/State environmental records or reports	X		
9	EOD incident reports		X	
10	Other documentation	X		
Property Visit:				
Indicate whether the following have been contacted and interviewed to obtain information.				
11	Current landowner(s)	X		
12	Neighbors	X		

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
13	Previous landowner(s)	X		
14	Prior employee(s)	X		
15	Federal agencies, including regulatory agencies	X		
16	State agencies, including regulatory agencies	X		
17	Local agencies, including regulatory and law enforcement agencies	X		
18	Other available sources	X		
19	Was access to the property possible (right of entry provided by landowner)?	X	X	
20	Was the property physically visited?	X	X	
21	Was access sufficient to allow for a thorough property inspection?	X		
22	Was access sufficient to identify potential hazards?	X		
23	Did regulatory agencies accompany USACE on the property visit?		X	
24	Did the landowner accompany USACE on the property visit?	X		
25	Was there evidence of a release of hazardous material or use/disposal of military munitions during DoD control?	X		
26	Was there evidence of a release of potential DoD hazardous material into a public or private drinking water supply? ¹		X	
27	Is there evidence of a release into a public or private drinking water supply due to deterioration of the system through ordinary use? ²		X	
28	Is there evidence of a release from products that are part of the structure of, and result in exposure within, residential buildings or businesses or community structures? ²		X	
29	Is some other program actively involved with the property (i.e., another Federal, state, or tribal program)?	X		
30	Is there evidence that activities by non-DoD parties at the property may be the source of potential contamination?	X		
31	Was information on hazards found at similar types of FUDS properties considered in identifying potential hazards at this property?	X		
32	Were site maps compared to actual conditions during the site visit?	X		
33	Were photographs taken?	X		
34	Were property owners advised to contact USACE if evidence of potential hazards is found later?	X		
35	Was a trip report of the property visit prepared?	X		
Property Eligibility Determination (refer to Chapter 3):				
36	Is the property Categorically Excluded?		X	
37	Are there release, hold harmless, "as-is", or indemnification clauses in deeds or property transfer documents that limit DoD liability?		X	
38	Is there evidence of this property being a Third Party Site?		X	

¹ This can be determined by reviewing public water supply sampling data. Provide discussion of how it was determined to be release due to DoD activities rather than by current or past owners/operators.

² This question is from the EPA Pre-CERCLIS Screening Assessment Checklist/Decision Form, EPA-540-F-98-039 "Improving Site Assessment: Pre-CERCLIS Screening Assessments."

Indicate the status of the following checklist items in determining the completeness of the INPR. Provide a narrative in the comments section below to explain, and keyed to, the shaded boxes checked:

		Yes	No	NA
39	Is the property eligible under FUDS?	X	X	
40	If necessary, has a " <i>Categorical Exclusion or Ineligible Property</i> " worksheet been prepared (Worksheet B-1)	X		
FUDS Property Screening:				
41	Was a CERCLA Preliminary Assessment completed?		X	
42	Was a MMRP/MEC RAC Worksheet prepared for the property?	X		
Project Eligibility Determination (refer to Chapter 3):				
43	Have all typical hazards been investigated for possible occurrence at this type of property?	X		
44	Were hazards identified?	X		
45	Are identified hazards of DoD Origin?	X		
46	If identified hazards were of non-DoD origin, has the lead regulatory agency been informed? (Provide name, phone number, date)	X		
47	Is the current owner under a RCRA or CERCLA clean-up order?	X		
48	Has the "right of first refusal" been exercised by an adjacent DoD installation?			X
49	Is there evidence of beneficial use?	X		
50	Are there other policy considerations against recommending a project?	X		
51	Are eligible FUDS projects recommended? (If yes, identify projects below)	X		
INPR Preparation and Review:				
52	Is the INPR prepared consistent with INPR Content Matrix (Table B-2)?	X		
53	Is the INPR Property Survey Summary Sheet consistent with Table B-3?	X		
54	Is the Project Summary Sheet(s) consistent with Table B-4?	X		
55	If appropriate, has a " <i>BD/DR Project Summary Sheet Checklist</i> " been prepared? (See Worksheet B-2)	X		
56	If the INPR recommends a PRP/HTRW project, has the PRP District reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
57	If the INPR recommends a PRP/HTRW project, has the HTRW Center of Expertise reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
58	If the INPR recommends a MMRP or PRP/MMRP project, has the MM Center of Expertise reviewed the INPR? (See Figure B-1)	X		
59	Was the draft INPR coordinated with Office of Counsel and Real Estate?	X		
60	Was the draft INPR shared with the Lead Regulatory Agency after internal USACE review?	X		

Narrative comments to explain above notations: (Key your comments to the checklist item number)

Current owners of the eligible portion of the former Lake Ontario Ordnance Works (LOOW) property include the Town of Porter, CWM Chemical Services Inc. (CWM- which operates the Model City Treatment Storage Disposal and Recovery [TSDR] Facility), Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, The Somerset Group (which operates the Lew-Port Industrial Park), Town of Lewiston (including the Lew-Port School), Modern Disposal Services Inc. (which operates Modern Landfill), the Department of Energy (DOE –which operates the Niagara Falls Storage Site [NFSS]), Occidental Chemical Corporation (which has a vacant parcel of land), and numerous private residents. Owner contact and address information available in CELRB and CENAB files.

5 – A consent order to perform a RCRA facility investigation (RFI) was issued by EPA to CWM on 30 August 1988. The consent order was superseded by an EPA Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments Act of 1984 (HSWA) permit issued in September of 1989, which delineated several solid waste management units for investigation as part of the RFI.

9 – No EOD reports identified for the site, but other HTRW MEC removal actions/reports reviewed.

19 and 20 – This was an INPR addendum and the site visit concentrated on the former industrial area of LOOW that was determined to have environmental issues. The majority of the 5,000 + acres associated with the buffer zone was not visited. Site visit personnel were denied access to the approximately 191 acres associated with the DOE site known as Niagara Falls Storage Site (NFSS).

23 – Regulatory agencies did not take part in the 2001 site visit, but they are actively involved in the ongoing HTRW investigation and they have been to the site during previous visits.

25 – There is evidence of a release of HTRW and munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), including TNT, metals, volatiles, and other constituents during DOD ownership and control of the site.

29 – FUSRAP is currently involved in the investigation/cleanup of the 191-acre NFSS which was part of the former LOOW. —

30 – Several different GOCO operations occurred at the site during the period of DOD ownership including the original TNT manufacturing operations when the site was known as LOOW as well as subsequent operations when the site was known as Air Force Plant (AFP) 68, AFP-38, and the Navy Interim Pilot Production Plant (IPPP). These GOCO operations occurred at various times and had separate operators. Additionally, subsequent owners' operations were of types that could have contributed to potential contamination observed at the site.

39 – Approximately 86% of the area of the former LOOW is FUDS-eligible, but the remainder is not, because it is still under the jurisdiction of DOD components.

41 – This is an INPR addendum. Extensive history and investigation has already been performed on this FUDS, at least equivalent to the information gathered for a Preliminary Assessment. The existing information is more than adequate to determine the need for response action and for EPA to apply its Hazard Ranking System.

44-46 – CON/HTRW, HTRW, and MMRP hazards have been identified and linked to DOD and/or DOD GOCO contractor operations. In addition, the State has identified and monitored current owner-generated hazards, and is well aware of the potential for non-DOD hazards from previous non-DOD owners/users. The contact at NYSDEC is Kent Johnson, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), (518) 402-8594

Narrative comments to explain above notations: (Key your comments to the checklist item number)

47 – A portion of the site owned by CWM is under a RCRA cleanup order.

49 – There is evidence that some buildings/structures, USTs, ASTs, and transformers have been beneficially used.

50 – Policy considerations preclude proposal of a BD/DR project because none of the BD/DR hazards are located on property continuously owned by a state or local government. No MMRP project is being proposed because that work was already encompassed by an HTRW project approved and placed in FUDSMIS before the MMRP category was established. No PRP/MMRP project is being proposed because the GOCO operator/successor of the TNT production facility and the contractors that performed partial decontamination at the TNT facility are no longer viable.

51 – CON/HTRW and PRP/HTRW projects have been proposed.
