

5090

Ser 09ER3GK/L4311

25 JUL 1994

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

Subj: PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES, NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS),
ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes for July 6, 1994

1. Enclosure (1) is the Progress Review Meeting Minutes for the meeting held on July 6, 1994 on the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS).
2. If you have any questions regarding this matter, the point of contact is Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 09ER3GK, (415) 244-2559; FAX (415) 244-2553.

Original signed by:
GARY MUNEKAWA
By direction

Distribution:

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

Copy to (w/encl):

NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)
NADEP Alameda (Attn: Paul Pentony/Roger Caswell)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Ken Leung)

Blind Copy to:

T4E, 09ER;09ER3;09ER3GM;09ERDW;09ER3GK
Admin. Record (w/3 copies)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Kikugawa/09ER3GK
FILE: Alameda/NAS

1075

**PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
BRAC CLEANUP ACTIVITIES
NAS ALAMEDA
(Held at Building 1, NAS Alameda, Alameda, California)**

July 6, 1994

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA, Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	510/540-3809
Diana Peebler	Cal-EPA, (DTSC)	916/255-2015
James Nusrala	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	510/286-0301
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	415/744-2402
Sophia Serda	U.S. EPA	415/744-2307
Robin Streeter	ERM-West	510/946-0455
Susanne von Rosenberg	ERM-West	510/946-0455
Dan Baden	International Technology Corp. (ITC)	510/372-9100
John Baur	ITC	510/372-9100
Tim Winn	ITC	510/372-5259
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	510/975-3460
Kelli Shuter	Montgomery Watson	510/974-3473
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	415/543-4880
Teresa Bernhard	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	510/263-3723
John Headlee	NAS Alameda	510/263-3728
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	510/263-3729
Mike Petouhoff	NAS Alameda BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)	510/263-3726
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot Alameda (NADEP)	510/263-6241
Guy Cook	Naval Exchange Service Station at NAS Alameda	510/748-8199
Stewart Cheang	Naval Fac. Eng. Command, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	415/244-2528
Lee Cherry	WESTDIV	415/244-2587
John Corpos	WESTDIV	415/244-2578
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	415/244-2559
Larry Lind	WESTDIV	415/244-2527
Dennis Wong	WESTDIV	415/244-2526

AGENDA ITEMS

I. Current Sampling Activities at Site 5.

Opening: Navy (PRC team).
Process: Discussion of current sampling activities at Site 5, including discussion of sample locations that must be relocated because of restricted access.
Goal: Provide an update for regulators on current sampling activities at Site 5 and obtain concurrence on relocation of samples.
Closing: Discussed results of yesterday's (July 5, 1994) site walk-through with the DTSC and
ENCL (1)

RWQCB at Site 5 (and at Site 4). Proposed CPT/HydroPunch locations (3 sets) within Site 5 (surrounding the plating shop) will need to be relocated due to space/height constraints within the building.

ACTION: Working with NADEP personnel, Navy will relocate proposed CPT/HP locations while investigating the possibility of using a modified (small, cart-mounted) Geoprobe rig to gain access to limited space areas within Site 5 (and also for sampling in the cleaning shop area at Site 4). PRC agreed to meet with the BCT on July 15 and 29, and again on August 5 to discuss the results of ongoing CPT/HP work results (and any other field work activities) so as to make real-time decisions to alter field sampling approaches or locations, as deemed necessary.

II. Results of Soil Sampling at IR Sites 4, 5, and 14

Opening: Navy (PRC team), NADEP
Process: Presentation and discussion of preliminary soil sampling results from Sites 4, 5, and 14.
Goal: Provide additional data with which to assess currently proposed sample locations, with special emphasis on Sites 4 and 5, and update regulators on current sampling activities at Site 5.
Closing: Initial soil analysis results for the recent follow-on field work at Sites 4, 5, and 14 were discussed and elevated analyte levels and their locations were presented. These data were, at the time of this presentation, unvalidated, but gave a good idea of the constituents of concern being encountered thus far.

At Site 4 elevated levels of TPH purgeables (weathered gasoline?) and TPH extractables (mixtures of weathered motor oil products and heavy fuel oils) were found in most of the soil borings, including a level of 2300 mg/kg at B04-35. An elevated level of 1500 mg/kg was found at NPS-S4-03 on the south side of Site 4. Gasoline constituents xylene(s) and ethylbenzene were found at low levels (10 to 25 ug/kg) in nearly all soil samples. Boring B04-37 had a hit as high as 86 ug/kg. SVOCs were detected in most samples though high TPH values caused matrix interferences such that SVOC specific compounds could only be estimated. 1,1,1 TCA was found in surface soil samples north (Boring B04-42) and south (B04-23) of the plating shop at low levels (7 and 8 ug/kg) just above detection limits. Cyanide was detected at 2.5 feet bgs in B04-31,-32,-33,-35,-36,-39,-42, and at wells (boring) M04-05 and M04-06. The cyanide analyses suffered from lots of spike recovery problems so the values are all estimated at concentrations of 0.25 mg/kg (detection limit) to as high as 1.4 mg/kg.

Most contamination in soils found at Site 5 was associated with the NPS samples. VOCs and metals were very high in several NPS samples, particularly NPS-S5-01. Chlorinated hydrocarbon hits, including TCE, TCA DCE, DCE and PCE were measured. 1,1,1, TCA was measured up to 1700 mg/kg. Metals were elevated in NPS-05-01, with lead at 2400 mg/kg, and chromium at 1300 mg/kg. TPH extractables (diesel and motor oil fractions) were detected at 24,000 mg/kg and 5200 mg/kg, respectively, in NPS-05-01. Though matrix interference will cause these values to be validated as estimated, they are nonetheless very high.

At Site 14, pesticides DDT and DDD were found at the detection limit and were estimated due to TPH interference problems. Concentrations ranged from 3.4 to 36 mg/kg (the highest at S14-03 in the surface sample). S14-06 had chlordane hits at 150 mg/kg (alpha) and 180 mg/kg (gamma). Endrin aldehyde was present at S14-02 at 14 mg/kg. S14-02 also had the highest level for PCBs (Arochlor 1260) at 280 mg/kg. Elevated dioxin (OCDD) hits were found, ranging from 0.43 to 17.6 mg/kg (highest value found at S14-03). TPH was found in nearly all surface soils with S14-07 having 2900 mg/kg of what may be Bunker C or fuel oil #4. B14-03 had TPH identified as JP-% at 2400 mg/kg at 2.5 feet bgs, decreasing to 23 mg/kg at 5 feet bgs. Detected VOCs were associated with JP-5 hits found in the TPH analyses. Most VOC levels were relatively low.

It was noted that all these values are currently being validated, and were presented for the purpose of giving the regulatory agencies an initial feeling for the number and type of hits encountered to-date. During validation it has been observed that petroleum hydrocarbons found in most soil samples have caused interference problems, such that many samples required dilution, resulting in elevated detection limits. For example the lab was unable to reach the required quantitation limits for lead, mercury and silver. As the data are validated, all appropriate documentation discussing these quantitation limits will be provided in the data validation reports.

ACTION:

As more data become available from the lab, and the chemists continue validating the analyses, these data will be verbally summarized at the upcoming review meetings. It was discussed on how quickly, and in what format, chemical data could be presented to the Navy and the BCT. It was suggested that "spider" maps incorporating hits-only data be generated for the new data, and that similar maps be generated for previously collected data so that a direct comparison can be made. It was emphasized that this type of "near real-time" review of data would be more quickly facilitated by getting the geographic information system (GIS) and database management system up and running as soon as possible.

III. Site 7A Current Plans and Reuse Potential

Opening: Navy
Process: Navy presentation of potential interest from reuse group for the gas station and discussion between Navy, BCT, and the Naval Exchange (NEX) personnel about possible steps to complete removal action.
Goal: Establish regulatory requirement and responsible party for the tanks.
Closing: General consensus was reached that the planned removal action for Site 7A should include all eight USTs. Meanwhile, Navy Public Works Center (PWC) personnel will remove at a minimum, the four abandoned USTs at the site, sometime between August and November 1994. Concerns about worker safety were expressed by the NEX when it was brought up that PWC felt they could also remove the inactive tank adjacent to the three active USTs. RWQCB will investigate the possibility of approving the suggestion that the inactive UST set with the three active USTs be left in-place until late 1995, when the actual removal action would actually be implemented.

ACTION: The PRC team agreed to generate an updated removal action time line to the Navy so that the NEX could anticipate when they would actually have to shut down completely. The RWQCB agreed to check into the possibility of leaving the inactive UST in the ground until the removal action is implemented in November 1995.

IV. Phase 2A FSP Response to Agency Comments

Opening: Navy (PRC team)
Process: Presentation and discussion of further comments from Cal EPA on the responses to previous comments
Goal: Finalize responses to comments
Closing: It was pointed out that the Navy had just received the DTSC/RWQCB responses to Navy responses on regulatory comments on July 1, 1994 (letter dated June 29, 1994). It was agreed that at an upcoming meeting (July 15, 1994), that the Navy would discuss its responses and appropriate modifications so that the Phase 2A follow-on FSP could be finalized.
ACTION: Navy will present responses and alternative actions that address DTSC/RWQCB concerns at the July 15 review meeting.

V. Site 15 Removal Action

Opening: Navy (PRC team)
Process: Discussion of technology and vendor issues identified during June 28 meeting between WESTDIV, PRC team, and IT.
Goal: Provide an update for the regulators on the removal activities at Site 15 and identify if and what additional documentation might be needed.
Closing: A brief summary of the June 28, 1994, meeting between Navy, PRC, and ITC was discussed. The possibility of using soil washing technologies versus the EE/CA-recommended solvent extraction/acid washing technology was discussed. Comments centered on the soil washing vendors ability to demonstrate the effectiveness of their process and on whether or not they had performed a pre-analysis of the composite soil sent to them for a bench-scale treatability study. Discussions were also conducted to clarify the amount of NC documentation required if an alternative process were chosen over on approved during public notice of the EE/CA.
ACTION: ITC agreed to assess whether or not the soil washing vendor could substantiate its performance claim. The BCT indicated that if this alternative technology were chosen for the removal action, then the action memorandum and attached final EE/CA would be amended to reflect this change, and that these documents would be 30-day public noticed (along with the CEQA documentation provided by the DTSC).

VI. Shell Work Plan for Parcel Investigations

Opening: Navy (ERM-West)
Process: Presentation by ERM-West followed by discussion
Goal: Understanding of the shell protocol and identification of potential modifications
Closing: Discussion of the general format of the work plans was followed by a lengthy review

of the proposed soil and industrial hygiene action levels for investigation of each parcel. Navy, EPA and DTSC personnel agreed to conduct telephone conferences with the DTSC's toxicologist, to discuss these action levels with respect to EPA PRG and the DTSC's latest guidance for preliminary endangerment assessments (PEAs). Investigative methods for storm/sewer lines and fuel lines were discussed, including the possibility of using continuous imaging technologies, rather than spatial distributed sampling points along linear areas of concern (fuel lines) or sampling only at sewer line laterals, etc.

ACTION: Navy, EPA and DTSC agreed to conduct conference calls with their toxicologists on July 12, to discuss soil action levels, and on July 18, to discuss industrial hygiene action levels. PRC agreed to meet with ERM-West on July 12, to review sampling plans for parcels at and immediately surrounding CERCLA investigation sites. ERM-West requested that any comments related to the shell work plan being discussed today be sent to them by July 14. ERM-West indicated that they would be prepared to distribute approximately two-thirds of the parcel FSPs by July 20, and that they would require any comments be ready for discussion by the July 27 review meeting.

VII. Compliance Activities

Opening: Navy
Process: Presentation of current and future compliance activities and discussion of integration of compliance activities with IR activities.
Goal: Establish a means of coordination between compliance and IR activities and identify action items critical to current IR field investigation.
Closing: Due to time constraints, this topic was deferred. A RCRA tiger team meeting was held at NAS Alameda yesterday (July 5) and copies of that meeting's agenda should be available from Randy Cate, NAS Alameda, 510-263-3724.

VIII. Action Items/Next Technical Progress Review Meeting

ACTION: Important Dates:

July 12, 1994: Soil Action Levels Conference Call, 9 AM.
July 14, 1994: Comments due on Shell Work Plan, particularly Section 5.
July 15, 1994: Meeting with BCT to discuss field work activities at IR Sites; NAS Alameda, 9 AM.

July 18, 1994: Industrial Hygiene Action Levels Conference Call; 1 PM.
July 19, 1994: DTSC meeting to discuss Site Mgmt. Plan; 9:30 AM.
July 20, 1994: Submittal of Draft Phase II FSPs to BCT.

July 25, 1994: CERFA meeting, EBS Update; 10 AM.
July 27, 1994: Meeting with ERM-West, Phase II FSPs, NAS Alameda, Building 1, 9:00 AM.
July 28, 1994: Pre-RAB Meeting, NAS Alameda, 1:30 PM.
July 29, 1994: Meeting with BCT to discuss field work activities at IR Sites; 9 AM.

August 5, 1994: Technical Review Meeting, NAS Alameda, Building 1, 9:00 AM.