

MEETING MINUTES

<p>Meeting Subject: MONTHLY STATUS MEETING CTO-037 (RI/FS)</p>	<p>Meeting Date: July 13, 1994 Meeting Time: 0830</p>																		
<p>Attendees: (*Part Time)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Navy</u></td> <td><u>Bechtel</u></td> <td><u>State</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alan Lee</td> <td>Krish Kapur</td> <td>John Christopher, DTSC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chris Leadon</td> <td>David Liu*</td> <td>Allen Winans, DTSC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LCDR Kevin Barre</td> <td>Omer Kadaster (Kleinfelder)</td> <td>Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mike Radecki</td> <td>Lynn Edlund (B&C)</td> <td>Hugh Marley, RWQCB</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Jacqueline Heskett</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>State</u>	Alan Lee	Krish Kapur	John Christopher, DTSC	Chris Leadon	David Liu*	Allen Winans, DTSC	LCDR Kevin Barre	Omer Kadaster (Kleinfelder)	Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC	Mike Radecki	Lynn Edlund (B&C)	Hugh Marley, RWQCB		Jacqueline Heskett	
<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>State</u>																	
Alan Lee	Krish Kapur	John Christopher, DTSC																	
Chris Leadon	David Liu*	Allen Winans, DTSC																	
LCDR Kevin Barre	Omer Kadaster (Kleinfelder)	Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC																	
Mike Radecki	Lynn Edlund (B&C)	Hugh Marley, RWQCB																	
	Jacqueline Heskett																		
<p>Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees)</p>																			

Description of Discussion/Action Items: (Next Page)

Background:

The fifth monthly progress review meeting for CTO-037 regarding the RI/FS activities currently being performed at the Naval Shipyard Long Beach (LBNSY) was opened by Mike Radecki, SWDIV RPM.

Allen Winans and John Christopher are in process of moving and phone/Fax numbers will be changing. Allen Winans will be out of town during last week of July; Hugh Marley will stand in for Allen if there are field issues.

Susan Livenick presented a status review of administrative issues on CTO 37. No open administrative action items remain from last month. The Final H&S Supplement has been issued, and SWDIV will issue a memo accepting the Final on July 15. Response from DTSC on proposed "response to comments" for the Tech Memo #1 and the Data Management, Risk Assessment and Investigation-Derived Waste Management plans had not yet been received.

The job site trailer is in place on the LBNSY, and final stages of field planning are in process. Intrusive work mobilization is scheduled for 25 July. Planned sampling work should be complete by 9/1. Alvaro Gutierrez stated that the State has no objection to responses proposed for comments on the draft documents and called for finals to be issued. DTSC will send letter of concurrence to SWDIV on H&S Plan by 15 July.

4 09:52AM FROM BECHTEL ENVIRONMENTAL INC
Subsequent monthly progress meetings are scheduled for 8/16 and 9/13. The status of field activities and a summary of analytic results obtained to date will be a key subject of the September agenda.

The technical status summary began with a summary of the results of utility clearances activities on the Shipyard. Some areas could not be cleared, including the SW quadrant at Site 10. Only one location, with an anomaly which may be stratigraphic, was potentially drillable. Susan Livenick proposed to treat that site as a contingency location; the site is upgradient. Allen Winans, DTSC agreed; Hugh Marley requested an opportunity to review the location, stating that he would call Susan on Monday 7/18 with his opinion.

Allen pointed out that the area is "rich" with utilities and suggested brass hand augers. Susan Livenick agreed with his point, stating that electric safety is being given a high priority, that hand augers and ANSI Class II equipment will be used and drill rigs will be grounded. Field activities will be very conservative.

Site 9 is a very complex site from the point of view of utilities. At Bldg. 129 where a soil gas survey is to be performed, no locations within the building or outside within five (5) feet of the structure could be cleared. Some discussion ensued. John Christopher (DTSC) stated that modelling of soil gas inside the building is would be acceptable using values from outside the building. Interior air samples should be taken only to confirm modelled values. He did not offer specific guidance for the soil gas survey risk assessment field activities, but advised to use best judgement. Allen Winans advised stepping out as long as reasonable, ultimately presenting what information can be acquired. Susan Livenick stated that there CTO technical staff had identified no confirmation of the Work Plan and SAP which described trenches inside the east and west sides of the building in which solvents were collected and transported to four sumps on the corners of the building. She stated that the field team had identified one sump at the south east corner of the building, and unrelated gutters in the diesel test cells. Hugh Marley stated that Duane Rollefson was involved in removal of four sumps from the building area. Susan Livenick agreed to talk with Duane.

At Site 8, all planned locations were successfully cleared, with no room for error. At Sites 12 & 13, many locations had to be moved of anomalies, but acceptable locations for all planned locations were identified. At Site 11, no utilities which would interfere with proposed activities were identified.

Susan Livenick brought up field screening criteria to be used in choosing contingency sampling. She proposed using the same set of PRGs used on CTOs 15 and 16. Hugh Marley stated that the PRG background concentrations for metals in water were acceptable because the screening criteria are actually lower than background. Allen Winans found the PRG criteria acceptable. Chris Leadon stated that the SI screening criteria was developed from El Toro. For organics, Hugh Marley stated that anything above non-detect should be considered a hit and contingency sampling conducted to confirm, using ARARs a basis. A general discussion over screening criteria, ARARs and background concentrations followed.

Allen Winans pointed out that non-detects are unlikely anywhere on a site which is man-made fill, where. In general, the PRG screening criteria will provide sufficient information on the site. Another iteration of sampling prior to finalizing remedial action may be acceptable. Chris Leadon recommended using residential PRGs for soil.

Krish Kapur pointed out that the Work Plan doesn't say 'never stop sampling' but that use of non-detect as a screening criteria will be counter-productive; it will only result in determining that "detect" extends to the edge of the site. The need is to define the hotspots within the site and acquire the optimum amount data to prepare the RI/FS.

Chris Leadon expressed concerns about cost control.

John Christopher asked that MCLs be compared to the proposed screening criteria for water and that MCLs be used where available. He stated that soil must be reviewed considering groundwater as a receptor. He suggested that screening criteria be changed for mobile chemicals. Additional samples might be wise. Allen Winans did not agree, noting that "you can get to a point where the problem goes beyond the scope of the RI site".

Krish Kapur commented that the overall purpose of an RI is to define the entire site. Locking in ARARs now is a "catch 22". In absence of ARARs, requiring non-detect as a standard is not acceptable.

John Christopher suggested dividing hits into 3 categories: for metals, use background as screening criteria; for organics with MCLs (eg. TCE) use the MCL; for organics without MCLs, use proposed PRG criteria or some other compromise criteria.

Hugh Marley agreed to discuss the matter with his management at LARWQCB and get back to Alvaro on 7/18 with the Regional Board's position. Alvaro Gutierrez agreed to disagree, stating that Hugh should clear the Water Board's position with Jim Ross.

David Liu (who entered the room during this discussion) pointed out screening criteria for water are based on dermal exposure and could be adjusted to drinking water. Hugh Marley continued to state that background or ND is required, not just protection of human health. David Liu countered that MCLS are for human health.

John Christopher stated that the real issue is whether there is future beneficial use of this shallow groundwater. Hugh Marley stated that everything is potentially potable unless the basic plan is amended to indicate it is not. John Christopher stated residential drinking water risk assessment scenario adds nothing to our knowledge of the site.

Alvaro Gutierrez will respond to Susan Livenick on the State's position as to screening criteria after conference call with Hugh, Allen, John and Jim Ross and will get back to Mike Radecki and Susan Livenick by 7/18 Monday.

Mike Radecki reminded the State that chemical and location specific ARARs are to be

developed. Alvaro Gutierrez stated that he will have preliminary ARARs next week.

Susan Livenick discussed with LCDR Barre the need for a Pre-construction meeting, stating that Anna Ulazsewski had suggested that the June 7 RI facilities coordination meeting had effectively covered covered most LBNSY departments' concerns.

MEETING MINUTES			
Item No	Description of Discussion/ Actions Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date
1.	LARWOCB to define position on not drilling in SW quadrant Site 10.	Hugh Marley	7/18
2.	Establish if Duane Rollefson can contribute to knowledge of Building 129 sumps.	Susan Livenick	
3.	Inform SWDIV (Mike Radecki) of results of conference call among State agencies (Gutierrez, Winens, Christopher, Marley) on use of PRGs as a screening criteria.	Alvaro Gutierrez	7/18
4.	Provide preliminary ARARs.	Alvaro Gutierrez	7/18

Prepared By: Susan Livenick	Date: May 17, 1994
Approved By (DON):	Date:
Approved By (DTSC):	Date: