

**MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at DTSC, Berkeley)**

February 02, 1993

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
Chein Kao	DTSC	(510) 540-3822
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Kenneth Leung	J.M. Montgomery (JMM)	(510) 975-3460
Rich Halket	JMM	(510) 975-3518
Scott Weber	JMM	(510) 975-3511
Jeff Liu	JMM	(510) 975-3400
Kelli Shuter	JMM	(510) 975-3473
Steve Newton	JMM	(510) 975-3400
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. POAM and EE/CA For Soil Containing Low pH and Elevated Lead at the IMF Site
A. Technical Approach

- The Navy, PRC and JMM prefaced the discussion of the IMF site POAM and EE/CA by informing the DTSC and RWQCB that the contract to perform these activities had recently been awarded to PRC (1/28/93); and that the purpose of today's meeting was to discuss a streamlined approach for doing the POAM and EE/CA, and to reach an agreement in principal that the approach used is acceptable to the DTSC and RWQCB.
- The PRC team indicated that following U.S. EPA suggested EE/CA guidance (EPA, 1987), and EE/CA activities described under 40 CFR 300.415 (EPA, 1990), could take until approximately late September 1993, depending on the length of time required for regulatory review.
- The Navy stated that currently approved funding for the IMF site POAM and EE/CA did not include funding for the actual "removal" action to be eventually agreed upon. Mr. Chein Kao stated that he had understood that the Navy had allocated funding for the "removal" in fiscal year 1993 (through the end of September 1993). Mr. Gary Munekawa clarified that the Navy had reprioritized existing funding for getting funding allocated to

perform the plans and specifications for the chosen response in fiscal year 1993, assuming the EE/CA could be finished before the end of the fiscal year.

- Given the desire by all parties to initiate a suitable response or removal action in a timely fashion, the PRC team suggested that the engineering evaluation of the possible response actions concentrate upon the most likely scenario addressing regulatory concerns of the presence of elevated levels of lead in a low soil pH environment. A limited excavation of the affected soils based on contaminant level was suggested and discussed.
- Mr. Ken Leung presented an iso-concentration map for total lead in soil at the IMF site. The map data were based on surface and subsurface soil samples collected from 13 soil borings located within 5, 25, and 50 feet of the Harding Lawson Associates B-7 soil boring which had elevated lead levels (13,000 milligrams per kilogram [mg/kg]) and low pH (<2) in a soil sample located four feet below ground surface (bgs). As presented to the DTSC, a rectangular representation (45 by 50 feet square) of the area enclosed by the 100 mg/kg lead isochore indicated that approximately 400 cubic yards of soil (not adjusted for expansion if removed) would need to be excavated (to a depth of 5 feet bgs) to remove lead laden, low pH soils with mapped concentrations greater than or equal to 100 mg/kg. The DTSC agreed that the areal extent covering the 100 mg/kg or greater concentration would be an acceptable excavation limit for completion of the "removal action."
- Mr. Chein Kao indicated that if the "removal action" were to concentrate on this approach, followed by an evaluation of possible soil disposal or treatment options, then following federal EE/CA guidance would not be required by the DTSC, and that the DTSC would not require an evaluation of potential ARARs, or the screening of general response actions. The soil excavation approach was acknowledged to be an "interim remedial action" with the intent to reduce the degree of the problem around boring B-7, and that future remedial action at the IMF site in general will address the remaining affected soils.
- Mr. Chein Kao also indicated that a fact sheet (in lieu of a formal public notice) would be needed to inform the public of the planned removal action activity.

B. Schedule

- As depicted in the timeline handed out for this meeting, the formal EE/CA process could have extended through September 1993. After agreeing to a modified approach concentrating on limited soil excavation, it was discussed that a technical memorandum summarizing the approach and suggested soil disposal and/or treatment options could be generated, replacing a POAM document, for DTSC and RWQCB review within two to three weeks. It was agreed that a draft technical memorandum would be generated for

review before the next scheduled progress review meeting with the DTSC and RWQCB on February 19, 1993.

II. Removal Actions at Sites 3, 7A, and 15

A. Approach

- Three sites currently under investigation as a part of the Phases 2A, 2B and 3 activities were identified for discussion as possible removal action sites. These sites were preliminarily selected based on knowledge of the existence of contaminants at levels considered hazardous to human health and the environment, based on proximity to potential off-site receptors, and the relative ease at which the majority of a site's affected soils might be "removed" or treated to lessen or eliminate potential exposures.
- **Site 3** includes the former aviation gas storage tank area west of the East Gate. It was identified due to its proximity to the eastern boundary of the air station and due to the presence of benzene in the shallow soils. After discussion, it was agreed that additional field investigative work would still be required before a interim remedial action could occur. Given that the site encompasses a large area of streets and buildings, future remedial activity will more likely include soil vapor extraction over simple excavation of affected site soils. Rather than recommend a removal action, it was agreed that this site should be addressed under the additional site investigations currently planned for Fall of 1993.
- **Site 7A** includes the existing, operating Naval Exchange gasoline fuel service station. Located along the west side of Main Street, at the eastern boundary of the air station, this site was also chosen due to its proximity to potential off-site receptors, and due to the known presence of volatile organic substances, including benzene, in soils. Ground water gradient information for the site is unclear, and off-site migration of affected ground water to the southeast requires investigation.
- An approach that would address removal of abandoned USTs and associated affected soils, and old buried fuel lines, was discussed. The inclusion of east boundary wells would be required to confirm the lateral extend of contamination east off-site, and to assess the ground water gradient. Concerns about existing active UST was discussed (one of which is inactive after recently failing a leak test). Funding for the removal and replacement of the existing active USTs is different from that which would address the removal action related to the old USTs and pipe work. The Navy agreed to inquire as to any activity planned by WESTDIV's underground storage tank program group, and to assess if a joint effort might be made to address the removal of affected soils around the old USTs and pipe work.
- **Site 15** was proposed due to the presence of PCBs above 1 mg/kg in

surface soils. At present the lateral and vertical extent of the PCB at this site has not been determined. However, sufficient information concerning the extent of elevated PCBs within the site is known and limited excavation of the apparently highest levels of PCB-laden surface soils could be excavated and removed.

Confirmatory sampling would be required at the base of the excavation (the excavation would be to two feet bgs). Additional discussions included delineating the actual lateral extent of the proposed removal excavation, and for addressing ways to prevent clean back-fill, if used, from being recontaminated by the surrounding unexcavated soils still containing low levels of PCBs.

B. Schedule

- No definitive schedule was discussed for implementing removal activities at these sites. Mr. Gary Munekawa indicated that the Navy had made a commitment to fund removal-type activities in the near-term, and that such funding would include funds required to generate a scaled-down EE/CA such as in the approach discussed earlier in the meeting for the IMF site. Current funding commitments, however, do not include the actual implementation of the removal actions for Sites 7A and 15. The DTSC agreed that they would be amenable to a modified EE/CA approach for Sites 7A and 15, and it was agreed that the Navy would prepare a more specific scope of work using this approach for discussion at the upcoming February 19, 1993 progress review meeting.

III. Site 18 - Station Sewer System Investigation

- A brief discussion concerning how past activities have addressed aspects of the base-wide industrial sewer and storm water discharges was conducted.
- It was pointed out that no single Phase or activity had been implemented to study the station sewer system beyond limited activities around each IRP site as part of each individual site investigation.
- It was acknowledged that recent stormwater system studies had occurred (a stormwater system survey was conducted by A.N. West for the NAS Alameda Public Works Center in January 1991 to inspect for possible damage from the October 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake; and a stormwater pollution prevention plan nearing completion). Copies of these reports would be used in conjunction with future field investigations discussed below.
- The Phase 4 ecological assessment (EA) currently underway will address sediment and water sampling at selected stormwater discharge points.
- Current work plan preparations for additional field work at Phases 2B and 3 sites will include investigation of non-point sources around the immediate site facilities (to also be

specified for the Phase 2A sites when the additional investigation work plan is generated).

- It was agreed that further investigation of the station sewer system will not involve sampling of materials within the industrial waste sewer, but rather selected sampling of stormwater manholes and drainage points (beneath storm drains).
- Further station sewer system work will evolve as a result of the findings of the Phase 4 EA activities, and based on the results of the additional field work planned for the Phases 2A, 2B and 3 sites.

IV. Phases 5 and 6 (Sites 1 and 2) Follow-on Work Plan

A. Status

- The Navy awarded the contract to the PRC team to generate the work plans for the additional field investigation work at the Phases 5 and 6 sites (the two landfill sites on the west end of Alameda Island) on January 28, 1993. JMM, PRC's CLEAN team subcontractor has begun activities towards completing work plans for the additional work required to complete the RI/FS investigations at the Phases 2B/3 and 5 and 6 sites.

B. Sampling Locations and Rationale

- Mr. Scott Weber handed out a table and supporting figures that showed the proposed additional surface soil sampling locations, soil boring locations, cone penetrometer test (CPT) locations, and monitoring well locations. A discussion of rationale for the selected locations followed.
- Mr. Tom Lanphar discussed locating two to three well clusters at Site 1, and generally agreed with the other proposed surface and subsurface sampling and CPT locations. It was agreed that well completions would be located across the "A, E, and C" intervals identified in the upper and lower aquifers.
- Mr. Lanphar indicated that pending DTSC toxicologist review (by Mr. Jim Polisini) of the Canolie surface sample data collected at Site 1, additional surface sampling may be required.
- Additional surface soil sampling for PCBs at Site 1 was suggested at areas around past Canolie "detects" above 1 mg/kg.
- CPT locations along the south side of Site 2 will be hydropunch water sampled from the "B" and "C" portions of the aquifer.
- Discussion over locating wells within Site 2, indicated that while surface conditions around the wetlands portions of the site might allow a drilling rig to gain access, the possibility of hitting subsurface waste materials, and of cross-contamination of lower strata preclude such an attempt. Mr. Scott Weber stated that the geophysical survey showed numerous subsurface anomalies

that were not well enough defined to avoid the possibility of hitting a foreign object (such as unexploded ordnance).

- Mr. Tom Lanphar inquired as to additional information about the lateral and vertical extent of the existing slurry wall located along the northwest side of Site 2. JMM indicated that little was known about its condition, and that additional inquiries would be made of the air station facility personnel for any as-built drawings, or any other information available concerning its construction.

C. Schedule

- A timeline was handed out that showed an estimated completion date of late September 1993, for the final work plan addendum (essentially the field sampling plan for the additional field work). However, in conversation with the DTSC and RWQCB, the two 60-day regulatory review times shown on the timeline can be reduced and it is possible that the final work plan addendum could be presented as early as June 1993. It was agreed by all parties that every effort would be made to streamline the review process by discussing field approach and methodologies regularly while the work documents were being prepared.

V. Phases 2B and 3 Sites Follow-on Work Plan

A. Status

- See comment under IV. A. above.

B. Sampling Locations and Rationale

- Mr. Rich Halket and Ms. Kelli Shuter provided the meeting participants with draft copies of tables and figures showing proposed additional surface soil sampling locations, soil boring locations, cone penetrometer test (CPT) locations, and monitoring well locations. Also included was a listing of documents being reviewed for updating of the existing RI/FS work plan documents.
- The meeting was adjourned at this point to allow DTSC and RWQCB time to review the Final Phases 2B/3 Data Summary Report before the next monthly progress review meeting scheduled for February 19, 1993, and to allow them to independently review the hand outs depicting the proposed additional sampling point locations for the Phases 2B/3 sites.

C. Schedule

- A timeline was handed out that showed an estimated completion date of late September 1993, for the final work plan addendum (essentially the field sampling plan for the additional field work).

VI. Other

- PRC indicated that copies of the draft final Phases 1 and 2A Data Summary Report (DSR) had been mailed out January 29, 1993, to the remaining regulatory agencies on the normal distribution list for deliverable documents. Mr. Tom Lanphar indicated that he was still preparing DTSC comments on the Phases 1 and 2A DSR, and that he would have his comments to the Navy in time for the upcoming progress review meeting on February 19, 1993.



TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005

Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10075

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION: Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM: Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

BRAC Cleanup Team After Action Reports from 1990 through 2000 and 2001 through 2002
April 2, 2003

TYPE: Contractual Deliverable, Technical Deliverable (DS), Other (TC)

VERSION: NA REVISION #: NA

ADMIN RECORD: Yes No CATEGORY: Confidential

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/3C/4E
O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

Table with columns: NAVY, TETRA TECH, OTHER. Includes entries for M. McClelland, Diane Silva, and Courtney Colvin.

Date/Time Received