



BECHTEL NATIONAL INC.

M60050.001752
MCAS EL TORO
SSIC # 5090.3

CLEAN II TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N-68711-92-D-4670

Document Control No.: CTO-0076/0513

File Code: 0208

TO: Commanding Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
Mr. Richard Selby, Code 57CS.RS (O)
Building 128
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA. 92132-5187

DATE: January 23, 1997

CTO #: 0076

LOCATION: MCAS El Toro

FROM:

[Signature]
D. K. Cowser, Project Manager

DESCRIPTION: Meeting Minutes, DTD 15 January 1997

TYPE: Contract Deliverable CTO Deliverable X Other
(Cost) (Technical)

VERSION: NA REVISION #:

ADMIN RECORD: Yes X No Category Confidential
(PM to Identify)

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: 1/23/97 ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 1/23/97

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED: 10/6C/6E

COPIES TO (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and No. of Copies):

SWDIV:

J. Rogers, Code 5723.JR (1C/1E)
T. Broussard, Code 56MC.TB (1C/1E)
L. Hornecker Code 56MC.LH (1C/1E)
V. Garelick, Code 5722.VG (1C/1E)
B. Lindsey, Code 56MC.BL (1C/1E)
A. Piszkin, Code 56MC.AP (1C/1E)

BECHTEL (Distributed by Bechtel):

J. Kluesener (1C)
D. Cowser(1C/1E)
T. Latas (1C/1E)
B. Coleman (1C/2E AR, 1E IR)
J. Wilzbach (1C/1E)
El Toro File (1C/1E)
BNI Document Control(1C/1E)

OTHER (Distributed by Bechtel):

J. Joyce, El Toro (BEC) (1C/1E)

O = Original Transmittal Sheet
C = Copy Transmittal Sheet
E = Enclosure

Date/Time Received

217 01 15 1997
RECEIVED



Chron No.: CTO-076/0513

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: Meeting Minutes - MCAS El Toro	Meeting Date: 15 January 1997 Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m. Meeting Place: SWDIV Building Meeting Notes Prepared By: Tim Latas	
Attendees:		
<u>SWDIV</u> Doris Broussard Lynn Hornecker Bernie Lindsey Andy Piszkin	<u>Bechtel</u> David Cowser Tim Latas Jane Wilzbach	<u>Other</u>
Additional Distribution: John Kluesener Joseph Joyce El Toro File BNI Document Control		

Summary of Meeting Discussion Topic(s)/Action Items :

PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting was for the Navy to share information regarding Site 2 and solicit Bechtel's input regarding the appropriate course of action for this site. Discussion focused on the following issues:

- concerns about the site boundary and off-Station wastes;
- source and extent of TCE plume; and
- schedule for the Site 2 draft final FS.

SITE BOUNDARY

The Navy is concerned about the boundary of Site 2 as shown in the draft FS. The boundary in that document implies that landfill activities took place not only in the main landfill area (areas A and B), but also in areas C1, C2, D1, and D2. In actuality, the Marine Corps operational landfill occurred in areas A and B while wastes in areas C1, C2, D1 and D2 are primarily surficial and are loosely consolidated. This implies that the wastes in areas C and D were the result of uncontrolled, indiscriminated dumping, not placed as part of Marine Corps landfill operations.

The Navy believes that it is doubtful that the off-Station wastes were placed in this area by the Marine Corps because the area is so far removed from the main landfill and is not easily accessed. These wastes could be from the Orange County Honor Farm, the result of indiscriminate dumping, or could be wastes from TIC. In fact, since the sampling activities took

MEETING MINUTES (continued)

place at Site 2 in 1996, there have been wastes dumped in this area (photographs provided by Lynn Hornecker showed recent piles of refuse which contained a magazine with an October 1996 date). Employee interviews support the concept that wastes were not placed in this area by the Marines because these interviews indicate that there were no waste disposal activities south of the access road.

The Navy believes that the boundary of Site 2 should include only areas A and B, since these comprised the operational landfill. Bechtel should consider the ramifications of moving this boundary and determine whether they feel such a move is defensible. A aerial photograph review and search of Station maps should be performed to locate all evidence for and against removing areas C1, C2, D1, and D2 from the Site 2 boundary. If Bechtel concludes that such an action is defensible, they should identify portions of the FS that would be impacted. Potential impacts are:

- remove discussion of off-Station wastes;
- clarify that consolidation of wastes from C1, C2, and D2 is being performed as part of "housekeeping" and not part of the CERCLA cleanup of Site 2;
- reduce types and amount of confirmation sampling;
- use results of potholing being performed by OHM to define wastes in each area more clearly (e.g., compare waste types and depths); and
- introduce concept of operational landfill areas vs. non-operational areas.

Although the illegal dumping areas are not considered part of the CERCLA landfill site, since these areas are on Station property, the Navy plans to consolidate wastes from areas C1, C2, and D2 into the main landfill as part of routine housekeeping measures. This could be done now as part of the OHM removal activities or in the future as part of the remedial action resulting from the FS.

EXTENT OF TCE

One problem with moving the landfill boundary is that the highest reported TCE concentration was from a groundwater well situated outside areas A and B (and outside the boundary in the draft FS). The Navy would like to further delineate the extent of the TCE plume to determine whether it originates from the main landfill or from a point source near monitoring well 02_DGMW60. To conduct such an investigation, a well immediately downgradient of area A would be installed and a series of wells upgradient from 02_DGMW60 may be installed. The downside of this is that if the concentrations of TCE are high and extend from area A to 02_DGMW60, groundwater remediation (vs. natural attenuation) may be necessary. This work will be performed under a separate CTO.

SCHEDULE FOR SITE 2 FS

Waiting until new wells are drilled and sampled could delay the FS process by up to 10 months. For this reason, the Navy would like to proceed with the FS process. We will amend the FS (and ROD if required) at a later time if this is necessary.

MEETING MINUTES (continued)

The Navy realizes that the changes to the Site 2 FS will require additional time to complete. Therefore, Bechtel should plan to complete the FSs for Sites 3, 5, and 17 prior to the Site 2 FS and complete the Site 2 FS approximately 2 weeks after the due date of 13 February 1997.

Closeout for CTO 76 is currently scheduled for January 31, 1997. This will need to be moved to May or June 1997. The Navy and Bechtel will agree on a new date and let Doris know the date before 30 January.

MISCELLANEOUS

Site 17 FS is also completed and ready to be issued draft final. The Navy agreed that this document can be issued once it is complete.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. Bechtel to discuss the issue of moving the Site 2 boundary back to the operational landfill area (areas A and B) internally and let the Navy know whether they consider this defensible by Wednesday, 22 January 1997.
2. If moving the boundary is defensible, Bechtel to revise text to explain why the study boundary is not the same as the FS boundary and have Lynn review this discussion before issuing.
3. Lynn to furnish Bechtel with trench logs for Site 2 waste areas so that the FS discussion of wastes in these areas can be expanded.
4. Bechtel to add to the monitoring plan one groundwater monitoring well immediately downgradient of the main landfill area (where a lysimeter is currently proposed) and make the necessary text/cost changes.
5. Bechtel to reduce the number of confirmation samples for areas C1 and C2 since these areas are being consolidated for "housekeeping" purposes and not as part of the CERCLA landfill site. Costs for confirmation sampling will not be reduced since this is only an order-of-magnitude cost estimate.
6. Bechtel to revise the FS discussion to remove discussion of consolidation of off-Station wastes. Consolidation costs will not be reduced since this is only an order-of-magnitude cost estimate.
7. Bechtel to revise the final RI to show the new landfill boundary.
8. Navy to discuss boundary revision at the 30 January BCT meeting. Tim Latas and Jane Wilzbach will attend.
9. A follow-on meeting will be held on Wednesday, 22 January, to discuss issues related to the Site 2 landfill boundary.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

No additional issues identified.