

ISSUES AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES REGARDING
THE RELOCATION OF DRMO TO SHIPYARD IR SITE 12.

C. ANNA ULASZEWSKI C/106.32
9 DECEMBER 93

BACKGROUND

In order to accommodate the Port of Los Angeles proposed Grade Separation Project on NAVSTA IR Site 6A, it has been necessary to expedite the characterization and remediation of at least those sections of the site that will be used to construct the by-pass road and tracks. The site is primarily unpaved and the DRMO scrapyard is located at the site. It will be necessary to relocate the DRMO prior to the start of construction, or sooner if remediation of the site is required. The estimate start date for POLA construction at Site 6A is late 1994.

Several sites have been suggested for the relocation of the DRMO. After considering the advantages and disadvantage of the various sites, a determination was made to relocate the DRMO on the area south of Shipyard Building 314, which is identified as Parking Lot X. The disadvantage of the site being that it is IR Site 12. There are two areas of concern at Site 12, the drum crushing area, which is fenced off and a pit containing TBT, location unknown.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

There are several issues that should be considered before preceding with plans to relocation the DRMO to an IR site:

- 1) Navy policy, as stated in the Navy/Marine Corps Installation Restoration Manual (February 1992), requires that contaminated sites be identified and avoided. To specifically relocate DRMO on a potentially contaminated site runs contrary to this policy.

RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES/ACTIONS:

1. Select another location.
2. Accelerate the IR Remedial Investigation for the new DRMO site. similar to what is being done for IR Site 6A.

REQUIREMENTS:

- a. This would require approval of DTSC and a contract modification to the present delivery order for the RI/FS. If the site is found to be "clean", than the issue is a moot point. This alternative, and its feasibility and timing should be discussed with Joseph Joyce, SWDIV. (Since the POLA's construction schedule has slipped, this may be a feasible alternative timewise.)
- b. If remediation is required, DTSC would most likely require a public meeting.

2) While routinely DON policy seems to discourage the use of contaminated sites for construction, according to the DON's procedures for implementing NEPA, there are procedures to following for actions which "may affect ... hazardous wastes sites [typically IR sites]." However, it's very specially stated that a Categorical Exclusion can not be used.

REQUIREMENTS:

- a. The DRMO relocation would require at least an Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impacts (EA/FONSI). In order to justify a FONSI, the determination will have to be made that: 1) the proposed project does not interfere with further investigations; 2) construction does not preclude any remedial action at the site; 3) construction will not affect public health or safety and 4) construction will "not significantly affect the quality of the human environment". Alternative sites will have to be discussed and evaluated as part of the documentation. FONSI's are reviewed and approved by CNO. (CNO will require that the lead agency involved in this project [DTSC] approve the proposed action.) This can be a 4-6 month process, at best.
- b. Site specific plans must be prepared with mitigated measures built into the proposed design.
- c. The cost for writing an EA/FONSI is approximately \$15,000-20,000. If interaction with regulators is required, it could cost more. Funding will have to be made available and a contract awarded. It may take as long as 30-60 days to write the first Draft, which will have to be reviewed.
- d. Under NEPA, a public meeting is not required, only publication of the FONSI in the Federal Register; however, DTSC may require one.
- e. DTSC approval may trigger CEQA for them. They will have to make that determination.