

5090
Ser 09ER3GK/L4395
13 Sep 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 August 19, 1994

1. Enclosure (1) is the Progress Review Meeting Minutes for the meeting held on August 19, 1994 on the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study at NAS Alameda.
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:
CAMILLE GARIBALDI
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 (w/encl):

09ER; 09ER3; 09ER3GM; 09ER3DW; 09ER3GK; 09EC2LL
Admin. Record (3 copies, w/encl)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Kikugawa/09ER3GK
FILE: Alameda/NAS

**PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
NAS ALAMEDA**

Date: August 19, 1994, Friday

Time: 9:00 am - 3:30 pm

Place: Naval Air Station Alameda, Building 1, Alameda, California

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA, Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	510/540-3809
James Nusrala	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	510/286-0301
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	415/744-2402
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	510/975-3460
Teresa Bernhard	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	510/263-3723
John Headlee	NAS Alameda	510/263-3728
Mike Petouhoff	NAS Alameda BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)	510/263-3726
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Alameda	510/263-6241
David Klemme	NADEP	510/263-6224
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	916/852-8300
Susan Willoughby	PRC-EMI	916/852-8300
Camille Garibaldi	Western Div. (WESTDIV), Naval Facilities Engrg. Command	415/244-2516
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	415/244-2559
Larry Lind	WESTDIV	415/244-2527
Dennis Wong	WESTDIV	415/244-2526

AGENDA ITEMS

Item: #1 **Site 15 Removal Action Status**
Opening: Navy
Process: Update on status of selection remedial action vendor by Navy's RAC contractor.
Goal: Update removal action schedule based on expected award date to RAC subcontractor.
Closing:

Lt. Mike Petouhoff, along with WESTDIV's Ms. Camille Garibaldi, provided an update of the current technical and contractual issues related to the use of BioGenesis for the Site 15 removal action. *The BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) will allow BioGenesis to perform a full-scale treatability study of up to 40% of the Site 15 excavated soils but only under the oversight of the US EPA's Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) program.* PRC will make minor text changes to the action memorandum to reflect the SITE program involvement. Mr. Lanphar indicated he thought that the DTSC would want a signatory line added to the cover page of the action memorandum. To accelerate BCT review, copies of the action memorandum (without reference to the SITE program) was distributed to the BCT.

ACTION ITEM(S):

- PRC -Will make changes to action memorandum text to reflect SITE program oversight of BioGenesis by Monday August 22, 1994.
- DTSC -Will notify PRC on Monday August 22, 1994, as to signature lines requested by DTSC and the EPA on the action memorandum cover page (later in the meeting Mr. Ricks of the US EPA said that the EPA did not need its signature on the action memorandum). **NOTE:** Since the August 19, 1994 meeting, the DTSC has decided to send a separate letter of concurrence rather than sign the action memorandum approval page. On August 24, the DTSC requested that the action memorandum not be released until a letter of concurrence could be written, which will be after a 30-day public notice and review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) negative declaration).
- BCT -To provide comments on the action memorandum by Tuesday August 23, 1994, distributing it by Friday August 26, 1994 (Delayed now until after 30-day public review of the CEQA negative declaration).

ITEM: #2 UNDERGROUND FUEL TANKS/FUEL LINE REMOVAL

Opening: WESTDIV

Process: Presentation of planned UST and fuel line removal activities as per WESTDIV scope of work.

Goal: Plan for developing necessary coordination between IR program and contractors, and identify potential impacts to schedules and parcel leasing.

Closing:

Mr. Larry Lind passed out a schedule for the upcoming removal of 69 USTs, to occur between August 1994 and March 1995. A public notice will be issued in the local newspaper early next week. ERM-West is generating UST removal work plans by September 7, 1994, for specific UST sites (Tanks #117; 282-1,-2; 372; 398; and 584), as well as a plan for a generic site for future tank pulls. PWC will do the tank pulls and soil sampling, while ERM-West will conduct sampling if the UST site is found to require further characterization (for USTs not associated with an IR site). PWC will be back-filling the tank pits after removal. PRC suggested that PWC/ERM-West might consider backfilling those tank pits with obvious soil/groundwater impacts with pea-gravel, and setting a large diameter slotted PVC pipe for possible use as a simple liquid extraction point while plans are made for additional action at the impacted site. A distinction was made for future investigation of UST sites at or near IR sites that might be discovered to have contamination, that is, a tank site that services an IR site that is found to have contamination during the tank removal would be considered part of the IR site itself and further assessed as part of the IR site investigation.

With respect to fuel lines, Mr. Lind said he had scaled off about 30,000 linear feet of abandoned lines within NAS Alameda. Mr. Lind indicated that an A&E firm had been solicited for preparing plans and specifications for removal of abandoned fuel lines at NAS Alameda, to be ready by May or June 1995. After which the plans would go out to bid by July 1995, with actual work to start in late fiscal 1995 or early FY 96. It was pointed out that if funding wasn't secured for removal of the fuel lines until 1996 that the data collected along the lines would be too late for inclusion in the RI report and for the risk assessments. Therefore, funding will be needed for conducting field screening (innovative geophysical methods) of both abandoned and active fuel lines in 1995, or the overall cleanup schedule at NAS Alameda will be impacted. A decision was made to schedule one of the meetings planned in September 1994 to have the BCT address issues, such as the fuel lines, that are in the critical path for completion of the RI/FS.

ACTION ITEM(S):

- BCT -Schedule a meeting in September that addresses critical path issues (such as one-time compliance, RCRA closure plan reviews, etc.).
- PRC -Continue to assist WESTDIV's Mr. Lind in identifying which IR sites may need additional sampling and analyses once associated USTs are pulled and found to have impacted the soil/groundwater.

ITEM: #3 SITE 4 ZYGLO AREA SPILL, SITE 11 TPH SPILL

- Opening: NADEP
- Process: Discuss recently noted conditions beneath zyglo area inside Building 360 and recent TPH spill at Site 11 (Building 14). Request guidance from DTSC.
- Goal: Plan for addressing these issues correctly; DTSC and NADEP/Navy to discuss.
- Closing:

Mr. Caswell described extent and cleanup efforts of reported spills at both sites. Zyglo, a penetrative chemical compound used to inspect aircraft engine parts, had been accidentally released through a broken floor drain, to the surface beneath the flooring at Building 360. An area of 30 by 100 feet appear to have been affected. Mr. Caswell estimated between 100 and 200 gallons released. He said that Navy Public Works Center (PWC) personnel were scheduled to clean up the spill this week.

At Site 11, about 30 gallons of jet fuel, JP-5, was released through fuel line/water condensation unit that structurally failed. Impacted surface soils were cleaned up by removal in May and further removed in June 1994.

Lt. Petouhoff noted that as the process for getting parcels to FOSL, keeping track of building activities and any associated releases of hazardous substances is very important. US EPA's Mr. James Ricks stated that a protocol must be developed to ensure the appropriate transfer of information is made to all the right parties, and that proper notification be documented. The protocol should also be noted in the updated BCP.

ACTION ITEM(S):

- BCT *-Develop a protocol by which to document and share information on such releases/spills between the Navy, regulators, and various cleanup contractors. This protocol will be incorporated into the next revision of the BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP). Assess whether a time-critical removal action documentation (beyond the standard spill control/response report) is required for these releases and any future similar releases, whether or not they are at IR sites.*
- NAVY -Lt. Petouhoff will call a meeting with the NAS Alameda/WESTDIV compliance folks to identify and clarify appropriate responses/communication actions for incidents similar to those that occurred at Site 4 and Site 11.

ITEM: #4 APPROACH/PROTOCOL FOR DOCUMENTING DECISION-MAKING

- Opening: Navy, PRC team
- Process: Discuss pros/cons of real time decision documentation (field variance reports, technical memoranda, FSP addenda, etc.)
- Goal: Selection of most efficient and correct method; method must be most appropriate for admission to administrative record.
- Closing:

DTSC's Mr. Tom Lanphar lead the discussion on possible documentation of decisions made during these progress review meeting and other related meetings. Mr. Lanphar suggested a

"consensus development document" which would outline the "who, what, why, where and when" of how working decisions are made during technical meetings, progress review meetings, or during any other forum or meetings. The BCT desires to document a process that exhibits the Navy's and regulatory agencies accountability during decision-making activities. Through the course of the discussion the following key decision-making elements were identified: 1) identifying key issues, 2) recording key issues in meeting minutes and/or a letter, which documents the resulting action identified for responding to each issue (such as phone calls, memoranda, future meetings, etc.), and highlighting in the minutes decisions made during meetings, 3) generating a consensus statement, in the form of a letter which summarizes the issues identified, actions taken (or to be taken), and the decisions made, which could then be signed by the BCT, and 4) developing a "record of consensus" file within the administrative record for NAS Alameda, into which the signed consensus statements would be filed and made available for review. As a side issue, it was pointed out that a relational database could be easily developed that would cross-reference to the consensus statements and to topics in the meeting minutes for reviewing the "who, what, why, where and when" of how key issues, actions, and decisions were made.

ACTION ITEM(S):

PRC -Continue to provide meeting minutes and other documentation as requested to assist the Navy and regulatory agencies in the tracking of key issues, actions, and decisions. *A one-page "consensus development document" will be drafted by the next progress review meeting for BCT review, which details the process described above.* This document of decision-making protocol will be incorporated in a section of the updated BRAC Cleanup Plan.

Navy *-The Navy will create a "record of consensus" file area within the NAS Alameda administrative record.*

ITEM: #5 PRELIMINARY GEOPROBE SCREENING RESULTS FOR SITES 3 & 13

Opening: Navy, PRC

Process: Presentation of geoprobe screening results from field test kits and mobile laboratory for soil and groundwater collected at Sites 3 and 13.

Goal: Discuss boring/well locations for both sites

Closing:

PRC presented a summary of the analytical results collected using the Geoprobe at both Sites 3 and 13. Twenty screening penetrations were advanced around Site 3, from which water was screened for hydrocarbons using a field test kit. Soils were sent to a PRC mobile lab at Mare Island Naval Shipyard (20% were sent to a CLP lab for confirmation). Only water results were discussed, indicating that the groundwater was impacted at all but one of the sample points. Field test kits show that the level of hydrocarbons in water is greater than 165 parts per million (ppm) and many samples were above 1650 ppm. At Site 13, three water samples collected along the west edge of the old refinery boundary screened at levels between 165 and 1650 ppm hydrocarbons, while three water samples collected along the northern boundary of the old refinery showed slightly lower levels of hydrocarbons (one sample was between 165 and 1650 ppm, while the other two were less than 165 ppm). Soil results are under review and will be discussed at the next progress review meeting.

PRC briefly summarized the results of the optical cone penetrometer (SCAPS) field work conducted by NRaD at Site 13 last March-April 1994 (the draft report will be distributed to the Navy on August 22, 1994). The study indicated a fairly well defined area of heavy hydrocarbon impacts from the old refinery site, as well as possible free-product (likely gasoline) due south of Site 7A, and apparent JP-5 jet fuel near Building 397.

The PRC team field crew handed out a sampling calendar and time-line for field activities under CTO 0280 (covering work at Sites 1, 2, 3, 6, 7A, 7B/11, 13, 16, and 19).

ACTION ITEM(S):

PRC -It was agreed that additional field screening should be conducted at Site 3 before a consensus can be reached on the location of soil borings and monitoring wells. PRC will coordinate the remobilization of the Geoprobe equipment, pending review of current funding constraints, the possible shifting of planned actions at other IR sites, and the possible addition of screening sampling activities for inclusion under the parcel evaluation work plan.

PRC -When practical for all parties, PRC and Nrad will make a presentation to the RAB of the SCAPS results at Site 13.

ITEM: #6 SITES 4, 5, AND 14 HITS MAPS PRESENTATION

Opening: Navy, PRC team

Process: Presentation and discussion of preliminary soil sampling results from Sites 4, 5, and 14.

Goal: Update BCT on field investigation.

Closing:

Only briefly touched on this item, indicating that the hits maps were updates of the data discussed at the July 15, 1994 data presentation. Basically ran out of time, and deferred discussion to a future date when deep well locations need to be selected at each site or site area.

ACTION ITEM(S):

PRC -PRC will present data at next progress review meeting.

ITEM: #7 COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES

Opening: Navy

Process: Presentation of current and future compliance activities and discussion of integration of compliance activities with IR activities (update of the July 5, 1994 RCRA "tiger team" meeting).

Goal: Clarify coordination of compliance and IR activities, and identify action items critical to current IR field investigation.

Closing:

Topic was deferred due to time constraints. It was noted that this item had also been deferred from the previous meeting. Lt. Petouhoff stated that a meeting with the BCT on compliance issues is scheduled for September 6, 1994 at the DTSC office in Berkeley.

ACTION ITEM(S):

Navy -A meeting to discuss operational and one-time compliance issues is scheduled for September 6, 1994.

ITEM: #8 ACTION ITEMS UPDATE

Opening: Navy, BCT, PRC Team

Process: Discuss and present resolution/findings from August 5 Action Items.

Goal: Identify unresolved/outstanding action items requiring more time/effort/information.

Closing: Did not address this item due to time constraints.

ACTION ITEM(S):

PRC -Will readdress this item at the next progress review meeting as part of identifying key issues and reviewing that appropriate actions have been taken for action items previously identified (most are, of course, discussed as part of the individual items on each meetings agenda).

ITEM: #9 OTHER ITEMS/ACTION ITEMS/NEXT PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING
Opening: Navy, BCT
Process: Discuss any additional items of interest/concern and/or action items generated during the meeting.
Goal: Summarize action items and associated dates, identify agenda items for the next Progress Review Meeting and the next RAB Meeting; and confirm date for the next Progress Review Meeting
Closing: Consensus on the above listed action items was reached, and the date for next progress review meeting agreed upon.
ACTION: Important Dates:

AUGUST

August 23, 1994: CERCLA presentation to RAB, 1900-2100.
August 26, 1994: Reuse authority meeting: Compliance, Building 1, 1400-1430.
August 29, 1994: Reuse meeting regarding leasing, NAS Alameda, 0900-1100.
August 31, 1994: Final EBS comments due.

SEPTEMBER

September 2, 1994: BCT schedules/strategy meeting: FOSL, Env. Conditions, NEPA, DTSC-Berkeley, 0900-1600.
September 6, 1994: BCT schedules/strategy meeting: Reuse, operational and one-time compliance, RCRA corrective actions, DTSC-Berkeley, 0900-1600.
September 7, 1994: DTSC/Navy federal facility workshop, Berkeley, 0900-1600.
September 12, 1994: Comments due on Draft EBS Mod 1.
September 13, 1994: RAB meeting, Miller School, 1900-2100.
September 15, 1994: Progress Review Meeting, EBS Mod 1 Comments, IR data dump, NAS Alameda, 0900-1600.
September 20, 1994: BCT schedule/strategy meeting, RCRA integration, OU definition, DTSC-Berkeley, 0900-1600.
September 21, 1994: Technical meeting, EBS, NAS Alameda, 0900-1600.
September 23, 1994: BCT meeting; EBS comments due. Time/place unspecified.
September 27, 1994: BCT schedules/strategy meeting, early actions, DTSC-Berkeley, 0900-1600.
September 29, 1994: Pre RAB meeting, NAS Alameda, 1330-1600.
September 30, 1994: BCT schedules/strategy meeting, schedule refinement, DTSC-Berkeley, 0900-1600.