

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0249-35 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0018	PROJECT NO. 01-F249/250-YS	N60258.000740 NSY LONG BEACH SSIC # 5090.3
--	-------------------------------	--

CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE X	DATE HELD	17, 18 June 1993
	TELECOM	DATE ISSUED	30 June 1993
	OTHER	RECORDED BY	Peter Torrey/CH2M HILL
		PLACE	Long Beach, California
SUBJECT	Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 249/250 Comment Discussion Meeting Naval Complex (NC) Long Beach Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plans		

PARTICIPANTS: (* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)

Hugh Marley/RWQCB
Bill Fisher/Code 231.WF

See attached sign-in sheet

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
------------------	------

	<p>A meeting was held between representatives of Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the Jacobs Team to discuss preliminary comments on the Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Work Plans and Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAPs) for Naval Station (NAVSTA) Long Beach and Naval Shipyard Long Beach (LBNSY) and the schedule for implementation. Bechtel National, Inc. (Bechtel), the CLEAN 2 contractor that will implement the Work Plans, was present as an observer. On 17 June, the meeting commenced at 0830 and ended at approximately 1600 hours. On 18 June, the meeting lasted from 0800 to 1000 hours.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>The discussion on 17 June centered on the preliminary comments on the Draft RI/FS Work Plans and SAPs. After Craig O'Rourke/DTSC presented the agenda, Al Hurt/SWDIV stated that the RI/FS will be implemented under the CLEAN 2 contract by Bechtel. Bechtel representatives Bong Kown and Edward Morelan were introduced. A. Hurt stated that the NAVSTA Long Beach and LBNSY RI/FS implementations will be awarded approximately on the first of August and the end of October, respectively. Anand Rege/DTSC asked that a schedule for the implementation be included in the Final Work Plans.</p> <p>C. O'Rourke provided the following general Work Plan comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Add tabs in Section 4.0 of the SAPs for specific sites. o Correct typographical errors, especially in Appendix D of the NAVSTA Work Plan
--	--



PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0249/250-35 PROJECT NO. 01-F249/250-YS
CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0018

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

In addition, he stated that more samples should be collected to avoid an extensive second phase. For instance, more cone penetrometer tests (CPT) and field screening should be employed. P. Torrey/CH2M HILL stated that specific concerns should be addressed on a site-by-site basis, and conditional sampling was proposed for a number of sites. To further limit a second phase, the Jacobs Team agreed to reevaluate if conditional samples could be included at additional sites.

In general, the numbers of samples were determined using a statistical approach. At each site, areas of concern (AOCs) were identified. An AOC is an area where, based on available information, the potential for contamination is similar (and the distribution is considered homogeneous) because of site history or physical characteristics. Using the binomial sampling strategy, analysis of three samples, for example, provides over 85 percent confidence that the highest value found is greater than the median value. If the highest value is above the established cleanup level, then the cost of additional sampling and obtaining a higher confidence level is weighed against simply remediating the entire AOC. The Jacobs Team agreed to consider describing these options in the SAP. A. Rege said that DTSC is willing to "partner" and provide quick regulatory review for additions to the RI/FS Work Plans required after field work begins.

H. Marley stated that, in general, the RWQCB does not agree with the risk assessment approach. The investigation should focus on determining the lateral and vertical extent of contaminant plumes, if any, not just on assessing the risk.

Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)

John Christopher noted that state ARARs are not identified in the RI/FS Work Plan. The Jacobs Team said that state ARARs will be evaluated in the Final RI/FS Work Plans after further consultation with the State. Currently, DTSC is identifying state ARARs for Camp Pendleton and MCAS El Toro. This should assist in their evaluation of ARARs for NC Long Beach. H. Marley/RWQCB stated the chemical and site-specific ARARs will be decided after the RI/FS. In response to LCDR Snyder, he stated that the RI/FS Work Plans contained sufficient sampling for the RWQCB to assess potential ARARs. The RWQCB is specifically interested in the levels of total dissolved solids (TDS) in the groundwater (and the applicability of resolution 88-63) at NC Long Beach to determine if groundwater is a potential source of drinking water.

After the general discussion of ARARs, some participants left to address risk assessment issues, including Site 7, while the remainder of the group focused on the specifics of the other sites.

Risk Assessment

J. Christopher stated the method for preliminary screening of sites proposed for MCAS El Toro, developed since the NC Long Beach approach was established, is more appropriate and should be used. This newest approach includes the dermal exposure pathway in screening risk assessment, adding that this would lower the preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) by a factor of 2 to 10. The Jacobs Team stated that this will require revisions to the RI/FS Work Plans, but it is not expected to greatly alter the SAP. The Jacobs Team will more thoroughly evaluate the effects of the revised



PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0249/250-35 PROJECT NO. 01-F249/250-YS
 CLE-C01-01F249/250-12-0018

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

approach. Specific comments were also discussed and will be addressed in the Response to Comments on the Draft RI/FS Work Plans.

Site-Specific Comments

There was considerable discussion about the use of geophysical techniques such as ground penetrating radar (GPR). DTSC asked why the use of GPR at Site 12 depends on finding disposal locations in aerial photographs, and why not just survey the entire area. J. Friedman stated that because a majority of the area is fill material, disposal areas will be indistinguishable from the numerous other subsurface anomalies. It would be cost prohibitive to sample all anomalies likely to be identified. Consequently, aerial photographs will be used to locate potential disposal areas for geophysical surveys. C. O'Rourke asked for justification for not using comprehensive geophysical surveying at Site 12 in the SAP. He also asked for stronger justification for the proposed background sampling; enough data may already be available.

In addition, the following comments were discussed:

- o The DTSC would like to review and discuss photographs found during the aerial photograph review.
- o For the aerial photograph review, include where aerial photographs will be obtained.
- o Sites 1 and 2 - Make sure that new ballfield dirt is not sampled as part of the surface soil sampling.
- o Site 3 - More conditional well point sampling should be proposed to define the eastern and western boundaries of the site. Three deep well points should be proposed to assess potential dense nonaqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) migration.
- o Site 4 - Additional sampling should be proposed to characterize the interior of the Mole east of the jogging path and temporary well points along the outside edge of the Mole.
- o Site 5 - One well is not enough. Some wellpoints should be installed irregardless of the results of the sampling of the proposed monitoring well.
- o Site 8 - The sampling strategy (originally suggested by Mark Pumford/RWQCB) was discussed. After it was explained that soil samples would be collected at the water table, the strategy was deemed satisfactory.
- o Site 8 and 9 - The SAP should propose sampling of the Gaspur Aquifer as a contingency if groundwater is found to flow toward abandoned oil wells and if contamination has reached the oil wells.
- o Site 11 - After initial groundwater flow information is obtained, place two of the three monitoring wells at Site 11, downgradient of the site.



PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0249/250-35 PROJECT NO. 01-F249/250-YS
CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0018

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

- o Site 12 - C. O'Rourke expressed concern about general sandblast grit disposal in the area. He will express his specific concern in the final comments.
- o Site 13 - The lateral and vertical extent of groundwater contamination should be defined.

On Friday, 18 June, the schedule for implementation of the RI/FS and other Installation Restoration (IR) Program activities was presented and discussed. C. O'Rourke will be delayed in submitting the comments on the RI/FS Work Plans until 9 July 1993 because of the DTSC's fiscal year-end activities. Based on this date, comments are due to the Jacobs Team on 16 July and Final Work Plans will be submitted on 14 September 1993. Final regulatory approval is due 14 October 1993. A. Rege stated that implementation can proceed before final approval because all major regulatory comments on the RI/FS Work Plans will be submitted by the 19 July 1993 Comment Resolution Meeting.

The Navy awards dates for future projected activities as follows:

- o Site 6A Investigation - 12 July 1993
- o Site 6B Work Plans - 15 July 1993
- o NAVSTA RI/FS Implementation - 2 August 1993
- o LBNSY RI/FS Implementation - 2 November 1993

Bill Fisher/SOUTHWESTDIV stated that field work should be conducted between 15 September and 15 March to avoid questions from California Department of Fish and Game. B. Kown said it is likely that the field work will be initiated some time in October 1993. A detailed schedule of the implementation of the activities will be presented to DTSC at the 19 July meeting. DTSC requested that this schedule include when the geophysical surveying will occur and when the review of aerial photographs will take place.

Nonparticipant Distribution

R. Green - Code 0232	K. Fredrickson - CH2M HILL
K. Reynolds - Code 1841	K. Tomeo - CH2M HILL
J. Joyce - Code 1832.JJ	K. Brewer - CH2M HILL
A. Lee - Code 1823.AL	B. Wong - CH2M HILL
D. Villanueva - Code 0232.DV	File - CTO Notebook/PMO
R. Udabe - JEG/Pas	File - PMO
G. Guha - JEG/Pas	File - CH2M HILL

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL
 REGION 4, LONG BEACH
 FACILITY PERMITTING BRANCH

SIGN-IN SHEET

MEETING NAME: LBNC - DRAFT RIFES WORKPLAN
COMMENT DISCUSSION
 PROJECT: LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX

DATE: 6/17/93

NO.	NAME	COMPANY	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER
1	CRAIG D'ROUQUE	DTSC, REG. 4		(310) 590-4875
2	ALAN HURT	SW DIV		619 532396-
3	Don Heinle	CH2M HILL		206 453 5000
4	DENNIS SHELLON	CH2M HILL		(503) 7524271
5	C. ANNA ULASZEWSKI	LBNSV		(310) 547-7336
6	Peter Tarrec	CH2M HILL		714-250-5500
7	Joffrey Friedlman	IT Corp		714/666-5311
8	Anand Rega	DTSC, Region 4		(310) 590-4880
9	JOSEPH JOUCE	SW DIV		(619) 532-3872
10	Alan Lee	SW Div		(619) 532-1250
11	Duane Rollefson	NAVAL STATION LONG BEACH		(310) 547-7086
12	Nancy F. Briseno	SW DIV CONTRACTS		(619) 532-1225
13	John Christopher	CalEPA/DTSC	SACRAMENTO	916 255 2038
14	Bong T. Koun	Bechtel	San Francisco	415) 768-4035
15	Edward A. Morelan	Bechtel	Norwalk	310-307-2369
16	JOHN SNYDER	NAUSTA LB BEACH		310 547 7513
17				
18				