

M60050.000822 MCAS EL TORO SSIC # 5090.3	PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0145-88 CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063	PROJECT NO. 01-F145-H6
--	--	---------------------------

CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE X	DATE HELD	26-27 May 1993
	TELECOM	DATE ISSUED	29 June 1993
	OTHER	RECORDED BY	Y. Chuang/CH2M HILL
		PLACE	RWQCB/Riverside
SUBJECT	Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 145 Remedial Project Manager's Meeting Minutes MCAS El Toro RI/FS		

PARTICIPANTS: (* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)	
See list on last page	TITLE: REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS (RPM) MEETING MINUTES AUTHOR: YUEH CHUANG/CH2M HILL DATE: 06/29/93 CATEGORY: 11.5

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>The monthly Remedial Project Managers' (RPM) Meeting for the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) was held on 26-27 May 1993 at the Riverside, CA. office of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Region 8 (RWQCB). Representatives of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances - Region 4 (DTSC), RWQCB, MCAS El Toro, Navy SOUTHWESTDIV, Orange County Water District (OCWD), Bechtel Corporation (EPA's contractor), IT Corporation and CH2M HILL attended the meeting. Marlon Mezquita/EPA filled in for John Hamill/EPA, the EPA RPM.</p> <p>These meeting notes summarize the decisions reached, the action items, and the discussions of the meeting. The discussions of the meeting are not necessarily summarized in the order in which they were discussed, but rather summarized under logical topic headings.</p> <p>Decisions Reached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o An additional Data Quality Objective (DQO) meeting is tentatively scheduled for 12-13 August 1993. o For the DQOs, best available technologies/best practical technologies (BATs/BPTs) will not be used to help set cutpoints for soil. o Two Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Assessment (RFA) sites, Solid Waste Management Unit/Area of Concern (SWMU/AOC) 300 (Solvent Spill Area) and SWMU/AOC 194 (Incinerator Site), will be included in the RI/FS for further investigation.



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SWMU/AOC 131 (Engine Test Cell) will be investigated further outside the RI/FS. o CH2M HILL will update the OU-1 FS schedule. <p>Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Navy will request an extension to the due date for the Phase II Work Plan specified in the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) based on the proposed redefinition of Operable Unit (OU)-2/OU-3/OU-4 sites. The new definition includes the possible creation of sites specifically targeted at locating source areas. o The Navy will request immediate action by the agencies to approve the proposed risk-based criteria for use during the DQOs. o The Navy will write EPA a letter detailing the OU-1 FS consensus approach. o MCAS El Toro will provide documentation on the research done to determine the typical depth of construction (8 feet) in areas surrounding the Station. o At DTSC's request, MCAS El Toro will put up warning placards on wellheads at irrigation wells potentially contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs). o EPA will develop a position on how to deal with concentrations of "essential nutrients" in the risk assessment process. o EPA will develop a position on the use of background data to evaluate pesticides and herbicides as chemicals of potential concern (COPC's). o RWQCB will provide the Navy with a letter, similar to the one given to March Air Force Base (AFB), explaining the agency's approach on setting soil and groundwater cleanup levels. o RWQCB will reply to the Navy's request for action-specific and chemical-specific applicable, relevant and appropriate regulations (ARARs). o At Bechtel's request, the Navy will ensure that Bechtel receives copies of all meeting agendas, memoranda and position papers. o CH2M HILL will prepare a Phase I RI summary for the 30 June Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting. <p>Team Health and Miscellaneous Issues</p> <p>Various team health and miscellaneous issues were discussed prior to the start of discussions on scheduled agenda items. Some of the issues are discussed under their own separate headings; the rest are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Andy Piszkin/SOUTHWESTDIV felt that the first DQO Meeting did not foster team spirit primarily because of comments made by Sebastian Tindall/Bechtel CORP.



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

He felt there was too much of an "us-them" mentality, and there was room for improvement toward better teamwork. A. Piszkin thought there were still many scheduling issues to deal with, and it was important for the team to work together.

- o LCDR L. Serafini/MCAS El Toro stated the Station will be initiating a removal action (by August) at Site 2, the Original Landfill. He asked whether any agency, other than the RWQCB, is interested in participating in a walk-through of the site. The removal action has been funded and the Station has begun contracting for the work. M. Mezquita asked to be filled in on the situation. Joe Zarnoch/DTSC indicated that his agency would like to participate.
- o J. Zarnoch asked about the status of placards on wellheads at irrigation wells. LCDR L. Serafini replied that he is awaiting Chrisa Mitchell/MCAS El Toro to return to work next week (week of 31 May).

Navy's Request for State ARARs

The Navy had sent DTSC a letter to request a list of ARARs with a stipulated deadline for response. J. Zarnoch indicated that the state will probably respond by citing Carole Browner's (EPA Administrator) decision that EPA has the final say on ARARs. The decision stated that the Air Force and Navy are not exceptions to this rule. John Broderick/RWQCB voiced strong objections to the Navy's tactic to force the State to respond within 30 days of the letter request. He indicated most of RWQCB's ARARs are action-specific, and not chemical-specific; if the Navy does not identify actions, the State cannot identify ARARs. Also, since the COPC's have not been identified yet, chemical-specific ARARs cannot be specified either. M. Mezquita said, at this stage, only relevant regulations can be identified, not action- and chemical-specific ARARs. J. Zarnoch indicated that it is premature even to identify action-specific ARARs for OU-1. J. Broderick concurred with J. Zarnoch by adding that the FS will more than likely identify a whole array of alternatives even for OU-1. He felt the identification of ARARs should be an iterative process, not a one-time response as requested by the Navy.

Data Quality Objectives Schedule

Chuck Elliott/CH2M HILL voiced concerns on the current schedule for completing the DQOs process. He reintroduced the proposal for submitting the Work Plan (WP) by 09 August, and completing DQOs in October. M. Mezquita indicated he spoke with J. Hamill, and said EPA had a negative experience with Yuma submitting a work plan without DQOs. C. Elliott said if the agencies expect to receive a work plan (with full DQOs) by 09 August, then the DQOs process will have to proceed without team collaboration; this would be contrary to what was originally envisioned. LCDR L. Serafini stated MCAS El Toro wants consensus along the way, and to avoid getting too many adverse review comments at the end of the DQOs process. He indicated MCAS El Toro does not want to produce a "shell" document (work plan without DQOs); however, he also said the Station is not prepared to ask for an extension.

John Dolegowski/CH2M HILL said implementing the DQOs process is complicated. He indicated that it is physically impossible to accomplish DQOs as envisioned by the



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

team by 09 August. J. Dolegowski further stated that, in the name of team spirit, it is unfair for CH2M HILL to shoulder sole responsibility for keeping the FFA schedule on track. He urged each agency RPM to ask for support from their superiors. J. Broderick indicated it is out of the team's control; he has been told by his superior that the work plan submitted on 09 August must be complete and implementable, or else RWQCB will reject the document. Both J. Zarnoch and M. Mezquita indicated that their management said the exact same thing: the work plan must be completed as specified in the FFA schedule. LCDR L. Serafini replied that the Station is only obligated to follow the National Contingency Plan. A. Piszkin indicated that the FFA spelled out additional requirements. S. Tindall voiced support for a collaborative approach to the DQOs process, to be completed with adequate time, but indicated political motives are at play as well. Roy Herndon/OCWD reminded the team that DQOs were not part of the process when the FFA was signed. LCDR L. Serafini felt the RPM's can play a larger role in all this; he challenged the RPM's to lobby for whatever gets submitted on 09 August. J. Broderick indicated that no decision can be made without J. Hamill being present. A. Piszkin asked the team to reconsider the approach agreed to previously: completion of DQOs for OU-1 and OU-2 by 09 August. He indicated the Navy will take responsibility for technical decisions, and proposed to eliminate the DQOs meetings all together. M. Mezquita thought A. Piszkin's proposal had technical merit and suggested the Navy document the proposal formally. LCDR L. Serafini wanted to defer the final decision until the following week's conference call. He reiterated that the Station is unwilling to ask for an extension, and asked that the discussions be tabled until he had a chance to confer with the Navy and CH2M HILL during lunch break.

After lunch break, LCDR L. Serafini stated that MCAS El Toro is committed to submit a work plan with full DQOs in order to meet the 09 August 1993 deadline. He wanted to discuss what constitutes an "implementable" document at the following weekly conference call. He also suggested all DQO meetings be canceled. J. Dolegowski said that by reverting back to the 09 August deadline constitutes a scope change because one of the major assumptions of the Phase I Technical Memorandum was to postpone comparisons against applicable standards until the DQOs. Proposing to forego the collaborative approach to DQOs did not negate the fact that a major delay in schedule had already occurred. J. Broderick said that the Navy never requested an extension. A. Piszkin replied that the Navy could not request an extension. LCDR L. Serafini asked rhetorically on what grounds the agencies would accept an extension request. S. Tindall urged the team to find a way to continue with the DQOs process while seeking for a resolution on the FFA schedule. J. Dolegowski thought the agencies were renegeing from earlier agreements to separate OU-1/OU-2 from OU-3. He felt the addition of DQOs alone is grounds for an extension. J. Broderick disagreed with J. Dolegowski, and asked whether it is reasonable for the Navy to now also request OU-1/OU-2 be dropped from the FFA schedule. LCDR L. Serafini again asked rhetorically what justification exists for an extension request. S. Tindall cited the dispute resolution passage in the FFA, and suggested that the RPMs and their superiors confer as soon as possible to break the impasse. J. Zarnoch concurred, and urged further discussions by conference call on Wednesday, 02 June, before the agencies meet with the Navy on Thursday, 03 June.



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>OU-2 versus OU-3 Sites</p> <p>Based on findings of the Phase I RI/FS investigation, it seems reasonable to reassign sites between OU-2 and OU-3. J. Zarnoch proposed to reassign Site 3 (Original Landfill), Site 5 (Perimeter Road Landfill) and Site 17 (Communication Station Landfill) from OU-2 to OU-3, but keep Site 2 (Magazine Road Landfill) and Site 10 (Petroleum Disposal Area) as part of OU-2. He further proposed to add Site 7 (Drop Tank Drainage Area No. 2), Site 8 (DRMO Storage Yard), Site 9 (Crash Crew Pit No. 1) and Site 22 (Tactical Air Fuel Dispensing System) to OU-2.</p> <p>M. Mezquita asked why retain two different OUs when they are on the same schedule. D. Richards answered that the schedule for the two OUs may diverge in the future. LCDR L. Serafini said the regional groundwater contamination (OU-1) and source areas (OU-2) are the main concerns. A. Piszkin provided an additional reason that funding problems in the future may dictate changes in emphasis. J. Broderick indicated that the main difference lies in the fact that OU-2 sites have both soil and groundwater problems, whereas OU-3 sites only have soil problems; therefore, cleanup of OU-2 sites are likely to be more complicated.</p> <p>C. Elliott presented a counterproposal: keep Site 2 as part of OU-2, add Sites 7 and 8 to OU-2, and reassign Sites 3, 5, 10 and 17 from OU-2 to OU-3. J. Broderick objected to the reassignment of landfill sites (i.e., Sites 3, 5 and 17) because by doing so, he felt they are being designated as less important. He said, by definition, OU-3 sites are less important than OU-2 sites. Furthermore, he indicated the Station may still want to send wastes generated at other sites to the landfills. A. Piszkin asked whether removal actions can be initiated at the landfills.</p> <p>The discussions then turned to the need to locate source areas. J. Broderick felt it is important to find the source areas. He urged performing vapor extraction if one of the suspected source areas is below the hangars (area between Sites 7 and 10). LCDR L. Serafini indicated implementing such a remedial action may be difficult because of ongoing operations in the area. A. Piszkin volunteered that the Navy is willing to perform a pilot-scale vapor extraction study; the Navy is directed to spend a large portion of funds for treatment and removal actions. J. Broderick thought it would be a good idea. M. Mezquita said a comprehensive remedial action can be handled as an interim Record of Decision; there would be minimal paperwork and approval can be expected expeditiously from the agencies since they all prefer such a proactive alternative. S. Tindall called implementing the removal action a "bean" for the agencies and the Navy. C. Elliott felt the DQO process will address adequately the benefits of additional sampling versus cleanup. LCDR L. Serafini indicated the Navy wants to implement cleanup but will document the decisions during DQOs. J. Broderick expressed concerns about Sites 5 and 19 (Aircraft Expeditionary Refueling [ACER] Site) groundwater data. He felt because the concentrations detected are low, one round of groundwater samples is insufficient to determine whether there are problems at the two sites. Both J. Broderick and Garey Stewart/RWQCB are worried that when the "worst-first" scenario becomes reality, cleanup of OU-3 sites (the new proposals would include landfill sites) will be delayed.</p> <p>LCDR L. Serafini opened discussions to the possibility of creating two new sites to address finding the source areas. C. Elliott asked whether these sites would be Sites</p>



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

23 and 24 (G. Stewart later corrected the site designations as Sites 24 and 25 because Site 23 [Sewer Lines] already exists). Yueh Chuang/CH2M HILL agreed with the idea because known operations at Sites 7 and 8 do not necessarily support their being the source areas. He urged the team to be more flexible and allow for creation of new sites with boundaries that include many of the sites in the southwest quadrant of the Station. J. Broderick thought the proposal is worthwhile. He argued that it is easier to explain to the public that two new sites are created to focus on finding source areas. By assigning Sites 7 and 8 as the problem sites given the findings does not make sense; it may be difficult to eliminate them from being higher priority sites. J. Broderick further suggested the creation of OU-4 to consist of low priority sites which can proceed at a slower schedule; the OU would be created specifically as a management tool, and it would not be part of the DQO process. A. Piszkin asked whether the work plan for OU-4 would also have to be submitted by 09 August. S. Tindall read the portion of the FFA which outlined procedures allowing significant findings that lead to the establishment of new sites justify an extension request. J. Zarnoch was uncomfortable with the proposal; he objected to using the creation of new sites as justification for an extension. J. Broderick defended the idea by stating that although volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are known to exist in groundwater, the investigations have not located the source areas yet. A. Piszkin also supported the proposal; he said since the FFA was negotiated when only 22 sites were known, creation of two new sites represent significant changes. M. Mezquita agreed that an extension at this stage is justified since Phase II field work is still slated to begin in March 1994. J. Zarnoch reluctantly acquiesced on the condition that the team is only considering a two-month, and not a longer, extension.

Modeling Update and Status of OU-1 Feasibility Study

Hooshang Nezafati/CH2M HILL described the progress made on groundwater modeling issues. He indicated the Modelers' Meeting is still scheduled for 08 June. J. Dolegowski summarized review findings on OCWD's model. He said that no changes will be made to the proposed modeling approach without a thorough discussion of CH2M HILL's findings.

M. Mezquita requested that the meeting agenda be sent to Richard Freydas, EPA's regional hydrogeologist. H. Nezafati said an agenda is required for the meeting. J. Dolegowski indicated the need to meet with R. Herndon to decide on the agenda before it can be sent out on 04 June. R. Herndon suggested CH2M HILL come up with an agenda. LCDR L. Serafini wanted a presentation on a relatively basic level. A. Piszkin felt that since only the modelers will be in attendance, the discussions can be focused and such a presentation would not be necessary. M. Mezquita thought it more important to discuss the assumptions used, and not the mechanics of running the model. S. Tindall asked why the meeting is even necessary; he thought only one model is needed. Davi Richards/CH2M Hill replied that since there are disagreements among the modelers, the meeting would provide a forum for discussion of the issues. S. Tindall then stated that his understanding of the meeting objective is to make sure the model is valid for both the Navy and OCWD. LCDR L. Serafini said things have evolved beyond that. He indicated there is agreement on the model; however, the Navy is evaluating possible modifications to the model. H. Nezafati said that another goal is to incorporate Phase I data into the model. A. Piszkin stated the Navy wanted an independent check on the ability of the Irvine Desalter to capture the plume before



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

proceeding with funding. He indicated the Navy needs assurance that MODFLOW, and not a different model, is appropriate to evaluate the Desalter. S. Tindall stated that Bechtel believes it may be entirely appropriate for OCWD to use MODFLOW to model the Desalter; however, the Navy's needs may be different and may very well consider using a different model. R. Herndon felt the Navy and OCWD have the same objectives for OU-1.

D. Richards provided a status report on the OU-1 FS. She indicated that the OU-1 FS is currently tied closely to modeling issues. A. Piszkin indicated he has yet to write the letter to EPA detailing the FS consensus approach; but he will do so. S. Tindall said it is a certainty the Desalter will be operational in the near future. He indicated EPA is promoting the Superfund Accelerated Cleanup Model (SACM) streamlining process to accelerate the usual nine-step FS process. He urged the Navy to be creative and to send the letter out immediately. General discussion followed on whether the normal public comment period would derail the expedited schedule for OU-1.

R. Herndon thought regular status updates on the OU-1 FS should be a permanent agenda item. D. Richards said that for this meeting, progress on the FS is under the topic of "modeling." R. Herndon asked whether the Navy can provide Bill Mills, the General Manager of OCWD, with positive news for his trip to Washington, D.C., in June. CH2M HILL agreed to update the OU-1 FS schedule. A. Piszkin indicated the Navy needs an invoice for the MCAS wells from OCWD; he felt that would speed up the process. R. Herndon said the invoice is 90 percent complete. He reiterated that OCWD is looking for positive news, such as a progress report. J. Dolegowski indicated that CH2M HILL can write a memorandum describing the progress made so far, and state the remedial objectives of the FS.

RCRA Facility Assessment

J. Zarnoch led a discussion on RFA issues of concern to DTSC. He prepared and distributed a hand-out with information on 14 SWMUs/AOCs for discussion. The following summarizes the issues:

- o J. Zarnoch thought that further action may not be necessary at SWMU/AOC 26 (Hazardous Waste Storage Area [HWSA]) because the petroleum hydrocarbon level was low (i.e., less than 1,000 mg/kg). Mike Arends/CH2M HILL stated that excavation of the stained soil adjacent to the HWSA was recommended as a best management practice for the Station. He said the presence of stained soil near HWSAs can encourage the continued practice of storing waste outside the HWSA.
- o J. Zarnoch suggested that SWMU/AOC 131 (Engine Test Cell) be included in the RI/FS due to the presence of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in one hand-augered boring. The team agreed that this SWMU/AOC should be further investigated outside of the Superfund Program, and should therefore not be included in the RI/FS.
- o Several SWMUs/AOCs (e.g., 39, 88, and 171) investigated with 60-foot angle borings had low levels of PAHs and/or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in the 10-foot samples. Due to the low mobility of these compounds, DTSC is



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>concerned that higher concentrations may exist in soils above (note that angle borings are drilled at a 30° angle from vertical). For this reason, DTSC suggested that additional shallow soil samples be analyzed for PAHs and/or PCBs at these SWMUs/AOCs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The potential for release of metal plating wastes from SWMU/AOC 265 (Abandoned Metal Plating Sewer Lines), and SWMU/AOC 90 (Former Sewage Treatment Plant) was discussed. M. Arends explained that the lines were constructed in 1945, and were only used to convey metal plating waste for about one year. In addition, these lines were separate from the active sanitary sewer lines. Since this information was not explicitly stated in the Draft Preliminary Review/Visual Site Inspection Report, clarification will be provided in the Final RFA Report. o It was agreed that both SWMU/AOC 300 (Solvent Spill Area) and SWMU/AOC 194 (Incinerator Site) will be included in the RI/FS. C. Elliot stated the Site 3 (Original Landfill) boundaries will be expanded to include the two SWMUs/AOCs. <p>A. Piszkin and J. Broderick felt that a site should not be included as part of the RI/FS unless additional investigation is needed. LCDR L. Serafini thought even sites that require additional work should not be included in the RI/FS process. He voiced his preference for conducting the additional work under other programs. General discussion followed on how the work can be funded outside of the RI/FS framework. J. Broderick suggested the sites be included in OU-4, which would allow for further investigation to confirm or to deny whether contamination exists. M. Mezquita said that the RFA can be extended into a RCRA Facility Investigation under the auspices of RCRA, not Superfund. No consensus was reached.</p> <p>M. Arends was given the opportunity to respond to EPA's comments on the Draft RFA Report. He expressed concerns on EPA's general comments provided on the first page of the review comments. EPA stated that one objective for the RFA was "...to identify all potentially contaminated areas at MCAS El Toro." EPA then commented that there were deficiencies in the Navy's work in fully achieving the objective. M. Arends said it was unreasonable for EPA to assign such a clearly impossible objective to the RFA, and then to criticize the Navy for failing to achieve the goal. He pointed out the significant effort performed to date, which included an extensive field program involving 140 SWMUs/AOCs, and approximately 1,300 VOCs analyses. He said that the RFA has been conducted thoroughly, and that it is always possible to identify additional areas of potential contamination.</p> <p>S. Tindall responded that he did not personally write the RFA comments and that they came from an experienced Bechtel reviewer. He said that the Navy did not have to address general comments, just specific comments; the Navy has the right to disagree with any of the comments provided. S. Tindall indicated that in EPA's stated objective for the RFA, the word "all" can be replaced by "most." M. Arends said that the Navy will respond to specific comments provided by EPA.</p> <p>J. Broderick indicated his primary objection to the Draft RFA Report was the use of the El Toro Model; he felt it to be simplistic and not appropriate for MCAS El Toro site conditions. He will accept the use of VLEACH, a vadose zone model currently being</p>



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

evaluated. J. Broderick also said that he does not have specific comments on the Navy's recommendations in the RFA report; he would be satisfied if the Navy addresses the issues and concerns raised by DTSC.

Risk-Based Concentrations

At the start of the meeting, J. Zarnoch provided clarification that the more than 140 chemicals with State cancer potency factors are pharmaceutical chemicals, and other chemicals not typically found at hazardous waste sites. He expressed doubts that they would be applicable at an RI/FS site such as MCAS El Toro.

Liz Miesner/CH2M HILL requested that DTSC and RWQCB toxicologists review the methodology used for the risk calculations (separate memorandum listing risk-based concentrations [RBCs]). M. Mezquita indicated EPA is interested in the factors used, and not necessarily the RBCs generated. L. Miesner explained that more exposure pathways were considered than EPA's preliminary risk-based goals (PRGs). However, some of the RBCs may be more conservative because a child-adult scenario was assumed in all the calculations, and different saturation concentrations were used. M. Mezquita reiterated EPA's position that PRGs are to be used only for prioritization of work, not elimination of sites from further investigation. C. Elliott said RBCs will be used instead of PRGs, and only the surface soils will be screened against RBCs.

J. Zarnoch indicated DTSC cannot complete its review of the RBCs earlier than 60 days. C. Elliott said that approval is needed immediately for DQOs. S. Tindall complained that Bechtel did not receive a copy of the RBC memorandum. J. Dolegowski apologized for mistakenly assuming Dan Stralka/EPA would be reviewing the risk section. LCDR L. Serafini asked A. Piszkin to formally request the agencies review Section 7.0 immediately. S. Tindall indicated Bechtel can complete the entire TM review by 07 June. J. Zarnoch promised to assign the highest priority to the review of Section 7.0. C. Elliott ended discussions on risk calculations with a reminder to the team that consensus is critical at each step of the DQO process.

Pesticides and Herbicides

C. Elliott proposed a two-tier screening procedure for pesticides and herbicides: these compounds will be investigated further during Phase II only if their concentrations exceed both background levels and RBCs (as normalized against classes of compounds analyzed). In other words, the risks associated with pesticides and herbicides will be considered only if their concentrations exceed those found in the background. M. Mezquita asked why the comparison against background. LCDR L. Serafini answered that the proposal accounts for typical area application of pesticides and herbicides. J. Zarnoch agreed with the two-tier screening procedure. S. Tindall objected to the screening procedure for herbicides. He stated that pesticides are exempted because of their agricultural status; herbicides are for cost control, and therefore are not exempted chemicals. S. Tindall indicated he needs to consult with D. Stralka on the issue. LCDR L. Serafini thought it unfair to hold the Station to different standards compared to surrounding communities. The discussions ended with the understanding that the issue will be brought up again at the second DQO meeting.



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>Best Available Technologies/Best Practical Technologies as Cutpoints for Soil</p> <p>The Navy had requested Bechtel's help in assembling a list of BATs/BPTs for DQOs in order to consider them in setting cutpoints for soil. S. Tindall indicated Bechtel is not properly funded to research BATs/BPTs. C. Elliott and D. Richards presented reasons for eliminating BATs/BPTs from consideration all together. The major reason is that BATs/BPTs are for treatment of water, not soil. Additionally, cleanup levels achieved are dependent on site conditions; usually the effectiveness of cleanup technologies vary and exact cutpoints are difficult to set. J. Broderick said RWQCB cutpoints are background levels, unless it can be demonstrated the application of BATs is prohibitively expensive. Under such circumstances, site-specific cleanup levels will be based on site conditions and cleanup technologies used. G. Stewart indicated RWQCB wants to set cleanup technology goals, not concentration cutpoints.</p> <p>Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) - Status of MCAS El Toro</p> <p>LCDR L. Serafini said the Marines are fighting hard to keep the Station open. He indicated MCAS El Toro cannot close at the same time as March AFB. J. Zarnoch felt it is important to know the ultimate fate of the Station before proceeding with DQOs. LCDR L. Serafini said the residential risk scenario is still relevant but cleanup will be affected by the final Master Plan. J. Zarnoch expressed concern that funds may be spent unnecessarily on characterizing surface soils at landfills when the sites will have deed restrictions. LCDR L. Serafini replied that the landfills will probably go through closure. D. Richards indicated that the alternatives for landfills are relatively few, and they generally do not include cleanup to residential use standards. She said the second step of DQOs does consider possible remedial actions at each of the RI/FS sites. Additional discussions followed on how remedial action alternatives would affect decisions on further investigations during Phase II.</p> <p>Land Use Zoning</p> <p>LCDR L. Serafini reported that most commercial construction in the MCAS El Toro area does not extend below eight feet (top of pile caps); all utilities are buried at depths above eight feet. J. Zarnoch still wanted the Navy to comply with State guidance for residential scenario of 10 feet. J. Broderick defended the Station's research and reminded J. Zarnoch that two extra feet translates to a great increase in volume during excavation/cleanup. J. Zarnoch said he felt uncomfortable in neglecting the State's guidance default depth of 10 feet. M. Mezquita stated that site-specific data outweighs default values. S. Tindall also defended the use of site-specific data; he felt it is unfair for the agencies to insist the Navy performs research, and when the data returns a shallower depth that the Navy still be asked to use the greater default depth. J. Broderick expressed similar sentiments. J. Zarnoch indicated he cannot agree to the 8-foot depth without presenting some written documentation to his superiors. LCDR L. Serafini said he would provide the necessary documentation. C. Elliott requested a resolution by the second DQO meeting (09-10 June).</p>



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>Strategy for Petroleum Sites Outside the Federal Facilities Agreement</p> <p>LCDR L. Serafini wanted to deal with petroleum-contaminated sites outside the framework, and therefore schedule constraints, of the FFA. He is in favor of expediting work even at sites currently part of the RI/FS (e.g., Sites 13, 14 and 15).</p> <p>J. Broderick presented RWQCB's policy as one of anti-degradation. It is always RWQCB's goal to clean up impacted groundwater to background levels. However, when cleanup to background levels is unattainable even using BATs, RWQCB is flexible and willing to consider a cost-benefit analysis: evaluation of cleanup achieved between use of BATs versus BPTs. J. Broderick said RWQCB has accepted remedial actions based on limitations of current cleanup technologies.</p> <p>J. Broderick indicated the need to demonstrate that leaching will not occur at sites with soil contamination but where there is no groundwater impact. However, once the groundwater is shown to be impacted, the anti-degradation policy for groundwater supersedes.</p> <p>Technical Review Committee Meeting Agenda</p> <p>LCDR L. Serafini wanted to know what will be on the agenda for the 30 June TRC Meeting. He indicated a flyer will be ready for distribution before the meeting, and an executive summary of Phase I findings will also be ready by 16 June. LCDR L. Serafini wanted a presentation of the investigation at the meeting (including slides of field investigation and laboratory findings presented on plume maps, the future direction of the investigation, DQO process, modeling effort, Desalter project, and results of the Public Health Assessment). M. Mezquita informed the team that the new EPA public relations specialist is Dorothy Wilson. A. Piszkin requested that all review comments on the flyer be sent to C. Mitchell. G. Stewart wanted advance copies of the flyer for review. LCDR L. Serafini indicated that the Station appreciates the review comments but reserves the right not to address them all.</p> <p>Tank 398 Investigation</p> <p>Maria Shayegan/IT Corporation presented the findings of Tank 398 investigations. Her presentation included a handout of findings at the tank site.</p>



PROJECT NOTE NO.
PN-0145-88
CLE-C01-01F145-I2-0063

PROJECT NO.
01-F145-H6

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM		
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="324 472 779 871"> <p>Attendees</p> <p>M. Arends - CH2M HILL/SCO Y. Chuang - CH2M HILL/SDO J. Broderick - RWQCB/Region 8 C. Elliott - CH2M HILL/SAC J. Dolegowski - CH2M HILL/SCO M. Mezquita -EPA A. Piszkin - Code 1812.AP LCDR L. Serafini - MCAS El Toro D. Richards - CH2M HILL/CVO S. Tindall - Bechtel J. Zarnoch - DTSC/Region 4</p> <p><u>Nonparticipant Distribution</u></p> <p>R. Green - Code 0232 File - CTO Notebook/PMO File - CH2M HILL</p> </td> <td data-bbox="860 472 1323 1018"> <p>* Part-time Attendee</p> <p>* G. Cummings - Code 1853.VC * J. Corbert - Code 1852.JC * R. Herndon - OCWD * D. Hernandez - CH2M HILL/SCO * L. Miesner - CH2M HILL/SFO * H. Nezafati - CH2M HILL/SCO * T. Smith - CH2M HILL/SCO * M. Shayegan - IT Corporation G. Stewart - RWQCB/Region 8</p> <p>K. Reynolds - Code 1841 File - PMO</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Attendees</p> <p>M. Arends - CH2M HILL/SCO Y. Chuang - CH2M HILL/SDO J. Broderick - RWQCB/Region 8 C. Elliott - CH2M HILL/SAC J. Dolegowski - CH2M HILL/SCO M. Mezquita -EPA A. Piszkin - Code 1812.AP LCDR L. Serafini - MCAS El Toro D. Richards - CH2M HILL/CVO S. Tindall - Bechtel J. Zarnoch - DTSC/Region 4</p> <p><u>Nonparticipant Distribution</u></p> <p>R. Green - Code 0232 File - CTO Notebook/PMO File - CH2M HILL</p>	<p>* Part-time Attendee</p> <p>* G. Cummings - Code 1853.VC * J. Corbert - Code 1852.JC * R. Herndon - OCWD * D. Hernandez - CH2M HILL/SCO * L. Miesner - CH2M HILL/SFO * H. Nezafati - CH2M HILL/SCO * T. Smith - CH2M HILL/SCO * M. Shayegan - IT Corporation G. Stewart - RWQCB/Region 8</p> <p>K. Reynolds - Code 1841 File - PMO</p>
<p>Attendees</p> <p>M. Arends - CH2M HILL/SCO Y. Chuang - CH2M HILL/SDO J. Broderick - RWQCB/Region 8 C. Elliott - CH2M HILL/SAC J. Dolegowski - CH2M HILL/SCO M. Mezquita -EPA A. Piszkin - Code 1812.AP LCDR L. Serafini - MCAS El Toro D. Richards - CH2M HILL/CVO S. Tindall - Bechtel J. Zarnoch - DTSC/Region 4</p> <p><u>Nonparticipant Distribution</u></p> <p>R. Green - Code 0232 File - CTO Notebook/PMO File - CH2M HILL</p>	<p>* Part-time Attendee</p> <p>* G. Cummings - Code 1853.VC * J. Corbert - Code 1852.JC * R. Herndon - OCWD * D. Hernandez - CH2M HILL/SCO * L. Miesner - CH2M HILL/SFO * H. Nezafati - CH2M HILL/SCO * T. Smith - CH2M HILL/SCO * M. Shayegan - IT Corporation G. Stewart - RWQCB/Region 8</p> <p>K. Reynolds - Code 1841 File - PMO</p>		