



Chron No.: CTO-076/0516

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: Meeting Minutes - MCAS El Toro	Meeting Date: 22 January 1997 Meeting Time: 10:00 a.m. Meeting Place: SWDIV Building Meeting Notes Prepared By: Tim Latas	
Attendees:		
<u>SWDIV</u> Lynn Hornecker Bernie Lindsey Andy Piszkin	<u>Bechtel</u> 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 to review the results of an aerial photo review of Site 2 and discuss actions to be taken on the Site 3 and 5 FS reports.

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH REVIEW OF SITE 2

Tim Latas reviewed aerial photos of Site 2 from the 1950s to the 1980s. He found no evidence in these photos that the Marine Corps placed wastes in Area D1 and found some indications that such placement was unlikely. Review results are summarized as follows:

- Fill appeared in Area D1 in the late 1970s to 1980. This was the same time as wastes appeared on the Orange County portion of the Site 2 study area.
- Fill in the streambed was used to restrict flow in the wash downstream of Site 2.
- Fill appears to have been dumped from trucks that backed into a small access road on the Orange County property.
- There is a small dirt road that leads from the lower access road on MCAS El Toro to the Orange County property, but barbed wire and trees appear to prevent access from this road to Area D1. The road appears never to have been heavily used.
- Aerial photos show activity in Areas A and B from the 1960s to 1980.

MEETING MINUTES (continued)

Aerial photos show Area C2 was constructed in the early 1960s. This area was used for equipment staging. This may explain the presence of VOCs if equipment was serviced in this area. Bechtel will add a discussion of the staging area to the FS and will expand the discussion of the aerial photo review in the FS.

The area to the north of Areas A and B shows up on photos as graded and tilled. This area is part of the Retrograde Area (Magazine area operations).

The Navy suggested that Bechtel recontact Dave Salas and ask about use of the borrow source and the wash restrictions.

SITE 3

The issue of benzene which is present in the groundwater at Site 3 was discussed. The FS speculates that this contaminant may have originated from Tank Farm 5 and not from Site 3. Tim noted that aerial photos show that Site 3 was not used after 1952. Bernie noted that Site 3 was an incinerator site and that wastes may have been soaked in flammable liquid before burning. If so, this might explain the presence of benzene. However, the fact that benzene is present at higher concentrations in a well downgradient of Tank Farm 5 adds credence to the theory that the source was the tank farm. There is also a pipeline from Norwalk to Tank Farm 5. This pipeline supplies Tustin and El Toro and could be the source of the benzene. The Navy and Bechtel agreed to retain the current discussion of benzene in the FS.

Andy noted that if the monolithic cap can be demonstrated to be equivalent to the Title 23 prescriptive cap, the Navy would prefer this type of cap for Site 3 because it would maintain flexibility in reuse of the site.

SITE 5

Since the proposed reuse of Site 5 is recreational (golf), Bechtel will perform two sets of HELP runs - one using normal precipitation and one assuming that the site is irrigated. Tim believes that an FML liner may be necessary at Site 5 because of the proposed reuse of the site.

CLEAN CLOSURE

Tim will prepare a clean closure estimate from Sites 3 and 5 using unit rates from the Site 2 estimate. He will assume that the amount of hazardous waste ranges from 25% to 50% in Site 5 order to account for chemicals such as dioxins that may have been produced during incineration. We may also want to consider moving the upper 4 feet of Site 3 so that the cover can be placed level with the ground surface rather than appearing as an imposing 4-foot high berm. Bechtel will look at the feasibility of this option through review of the unit costs.

MEETING WITH REX CALLAWAY

Jane summarized the meeting she and Steve DeYoung had with Rex Callaway on 14 January. Basically, Rex wanted Table 3-1 to reflect the minimum requirements for a landfill cover. Alternative 3 would meet these requirements. Rather than have Table 3-1 enumerate detailed

MEETING MINUTES (continued)

requirements for the cap design (e.g., requirements for a filter layer, drainage layer, etc.), the table should show that the final cover design is allowed to vary as long as it can be demonstrated to be equivalent to a Title 23 prescriptive cap. This way, Table 3-1 is not likely to be picked up and used outside of the context of the FS itself.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

The Site 2 boundary will be moved up to Areas A and B. This means that the small TCE plume at Site 2 will definitely extend outside the point of compliance (waste management unit boundary). To determine the actual extent of the plume, Bechtel should add a well directly adjacent to the property boundary on the Station side of the boundary (and abandon 02NEW7). This should allow us to better define the downgradient edge of the plume. Bechtel also needs to add a well upgradient of 02NEW8A and downgradient of Areas A and B to determine if the plume originates within the landfill or is the result of a point source at the equipment staging area. This well would be close to the location of the proposed lysimeter in the FS but would not replace the lysimeter which is necessary for monitoring leachate and soil gas.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. Tim will prepare slides for Bernie to use at the BCT meeting. He should bring these over on Wednesday, 29 January, to review informally.
2. Bechtel to expand the discussion of the aerial photo review in the Site 2 FS and introduce discussion of the staging area.
3. Bechtel to contact Dave Salas and ask about the Site 2 borrow source and the restriction on the wash.
4. Bechtel to present two sets of HELP results in the Site 5 FS. The base case will represent the site as it is, with no irrigation. The second case will include irrigation and will represent the site under the proposed reuse of recreation (golf).
5. Tim to prepare a clean closure estimate for Sites 3 and 5 and fax to Bernie as soon as possible.
6. Tim to fax Table 3-1 to Bernie so that Rex can review the table prior to issue of the FS.
7. Bechtel to add 2 wells to the Site 2 FS. One well will be located downgradient of Areas A and B near the location of the proposed lysimeter. The second will be just upgradient of the Station boundary. Bechtel should also address abandonment of 02NEW7 in the proposed monitoring plan.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

No additional issues identified.