

5090
Ser 1811GM/L3156

12 MAR 1993

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes of February 19, 1993

1. Enclosure (1) provides the minutes of our Progress Review meeting held on February 19, 1993 at the Department of Toxic Substances Control in Berkeley, CA.
2. If you have any questions, please contact either Mr. Gary J. Munekawa, Code 1811GM, (415) 244-2524 or Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 1811GK, (415) 244-2559.

original signed by:

LOUISE T. LEW
By direction

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: James Nusrala)
US Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Julie Anderson)

Copy to:

NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)
James M. Montgomery Consulting Engineers (Attn: Ken Leung)

Blind copy to:

1811, 1811GM, 1811GK, 16, 164, 182, 1826
Admin Record (w/3 copies)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Munekawa/1811GM/X2524
TYPIST: George Munekawa
FILE: Alameda/NAS

944

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at the DTSC, Berkeley)

February 19, 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 |
| Joe O'Connor | Kinnetics Laboratories, Inc. | (408) 426-3900 |
| Mike Petouhoff | Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda | (510) 263-3726 |
| Randy Cate | NAS Alameda | (510) 263-3716 |
| Sherri Withrow | NAS Alameda | (510) 263-3724 |
| 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. RI/FS Schedule

- The Navy, PRC and JMM handed out copies of draft schedules showing the estimated timeframes for performing the follow-on field work at NAS Alameda, for conducting the remedial investigation report, and for performing the feasibility study. As projected, the RI/FS would be completed in late 1996 or early 1997.
- The DTSC's Mr. Chein Kao indicated that he felt that this timeframe was too long and that he had expected that the Navy would make a financial commitment to allocate funding to NAS Alameda to finish the RI/FS sooner (by summer of 1995).
- The Navy's Mr. Munekawa reiterated the funding constraints that WESTDIV presently faces, and enumerated the Navy's best estimate for funding the various scheduled activities for the RI/FS at NAS Alameda.
- Discussion followed on the unilateral aspect of the DTSC's 1988 remedial action order (RAO) for NAS Alameda and of the Navy's desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement on future scheduling of RI/FS activities, given the current financial situation.
- Mr. Chein Kao indicated that he could send a letter to NAS Alameda outlining the impact that a draft "Imminent and Substantial Endangerment" order might have on the facility. He

said that since the facility was already under an RAO, that his agency would not enter into a bilateral agreement such as a federal facilities site remediation agreement (FFSRA). He stated that if a draft order were issued, the Navy could stipulate or request to modify portions of the order, but that once a decision was made on a particular issue (or issues) and the order became final, the Navy would be legally bound to the order, with all the potential penalties associated for noncompliance.

- The Navy indicated that it would propose an RI/FS schedule that was technically feasible, but does not take into account unforeseeable funding constraints. Mr. Chein Kao stated that he wants to see a funding commitment on the part of the Navy to get the RI/FS done as soon as possible. It was agreed that after the upcoming Technical Review Committee meeting on March 4, 1993, the Navy would present to the DTSC its best estimate for completing the RI/FS based on current information.

II. Interim Remedial Actions

- As depicted in the timeline handed out for this meeting, the modified technical approach for handling lead-laden soils at the Intermediate Maintenance Facility (IMF) site, as agreed to by the Navy and DTSC on February 2, 1993, showed a completion date of May 15, 1993.
- A draft copy of a technical memorandum summarizing the approach and suggested soil disposal and/or treatment options was presented to the DTSC. Rather than review this memorandum separately from a follow-up memorandum outlining the soil treatment/disposal options at the IMF site, Mr. Kao requested that both memorandums be combined for DTSC review by April 1, 1993. Navy agreed to combine both documents into one deliverable.
- Brief discussions were held concerning similar interim remedial actions at Sites 7A and 15. The Navy stated that it was working on preparing statement of works (SOWs) for addressing these sites.
- NAS Alameda's Lieutenant Mike Petouhoff gave an update on the status of the soil excavation activities around Building 397. Navy contractors are slated to start field activities the last week in February. Excavated soils will be hauled off-site and treated at a permitted facility (Gibson Oil) in Bakersfield, California for conversion into asphaltic road base materials. Lt. Petouhoff also indicated that a free-product recovery system would be installed in a monitoring well at the IMF site.
- Mr. Chein Kao requested that the Navy prepare some type of public notice to communicate these interim remedial activities to the local citizens. Navy agreed to generate an informal newsletter and/or a press release in the local newspaper. It was also pointed out that Fact Sheet No. 4 was in final review and was scheduled for release to the community relations mailing list in

early March 1993, and that the IMF activity was included in the fact sheet.

III. Status of Ecological Assessment

- Mr. Joe O'Connor, of Kinnetics Laboratories, Inc. (Kinnetics) gave a brief summary of activities that have occurred related to the ecological assessment field work at NAS Alameda (since award of the contract to PRC and Kinnetics in December 1992)
- Wetlands delineation and surveying work were started in late January. A global positioning system (GPS) was also being set up to assist in the accurate locating of offshore sampling points.
- Mr. O'Connor discussed stormwater discharge sampling problems due to tidal influences being seen within the discharge lines. Mr. Tom Lanphar asked about the quality, and comparability, of discharge water data collected after so many recent storm events, and how they might differ from data that would have been collected during the first storm of the season (which did not occur for the NAS Alameda work). Mr. O'Connor stated that available research provides contradictory information, such that differences are not clearly quantified.
- Mr. O'Connor indicated that, weather permitting, Kinnetics would be collecting bioassay samples offshore and within the wetlands area. They were currently awaiting approval by the Army Corp of Engineers of their delineation of the wetlands boundaries.

IV. Phases 1 and 2A Data Issues

- Mr. Lanphar indicated that DTSC's Mr. Jim Polisini, a toxicologist, had reviewed the draft final of the Phases 1 and 2A DSR, and that it was his opinion that the data collected during that investigation would be acceptable for use in risk assessment activities, as well as for future site screening and locating of samples for additional work at the Phases 1 and 2A sites.
- Mr. Lanphar also stated that the DTSC's comments on the draft final Phases 1 and 2A DSR would be forthcoming soon (in early March).

V. RI/FS Work Plan Revision

- The Navy stated that its contractor was currently reviewing the existing Canonie RI/FS work plan documents, and had begun preparing revisions to be incorporated based on changing regulations and technical data collected since the work plans were generated. The revised RI/FS work plan addendum is scheduled for submittal to the DTSC by May 14, 1993.

VI. Status of Phases 5 and 6 Follow-on Work Plan

- 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 5 and 6 sites.
- Based on current projections, the DTSC will receive a draft final copy of the follow-on work plan (actually a field sampling plan) for the Phases 5 and 6 sites (Sites 1 and 2) on April 8, 1993. This document will incorporate DTSC/RWQCB comments generated during the February 2, 1993, technical review meeting at DTSC. However, it was noted that the document may be completed prior to receipt of DTSC comments to the Phase 1 (Sites 1 and 2) portion of the draft final Phases 1 and 2A DSR, and thus might not cover additional sampling requests or activities unknown to the Navy at this time.
- Mr. Lanphar indicated that DTSC comments on the Navy's response to comments (submitted on January 15, 1993) on the draft final SWAT report would be coming in about two weeks.

VII. DTSC Responses to Phases 2B and 3 Sampling Locations, and Rationale

- JMM's Mr. Rich Halket handed out tables and supporting figures that showed the proposed additional surface soil sampling locations, soil boring locations, cone penetrometer test (CPT) locations, and monitoring well locations at the 2B and 3 sites.
- Mr. Tom Lanphar discussed the observation that some of the sampling activities, for example at Site 4, were actually screening activities, and it was acknowledged that after receipt of preliminary analytical results, a second round of confirmatory sampling would be conducted. Other sites, such as Sites 7A, 7B, and 11, would also be prioritized early in the sampling program to allow for follow-up sampling during the entire additional field work program.
- In general, no major revisions to the sampling locations was made during the discussion. Of greater general concern was insuring that the field effort be well coordinated to optimize timely sampling and analyses, to closely coordinate with the DTSC and RWQCB during the cone penetrometer test (CPT) activities for selecting deeper aquifer well points, and to maintain open communications during the field work so as to react quickly to changing site conditions and information.