

Chron No. CTO-056/

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: CTO-56 Draft EE/CA Response to Regulatory Comments and Draft Work Plan Addendum		Meeting Date: September 24, 1996 Meeting Time: 2:00 PM Meeting Place: NTC Meeting Notes Prepared By: Kathryn Parker	
Attendees:			
<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Other</u>	
Content P. Arnold Janet Corbett Keith Forman, NTC Greg Sheffer, NTC	Brian Cundeland Jerry Bailey Kathryn Parker	Martin Hausladen, USEPA Corey Walsh, CRWQCB Aaron Yue, DTSC	
Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees): T. Zielinski (CIWMB), S. De Young, A. Findikakis, D. Obenauer, B. Kown, and B. Tait (BNI)			

Description of Discussion/Action Items:

Item No.	Action Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date/ Status
1.	Revise response to comments and Draft EE/CA as described in numbers 1,2, and 3 below.	BNI	ASAP
2.	Participate in Telecon on 26 Sept. at 11am	ALL	9/26/96

K. Parker distributed copies of revised responses to comments, the revised Draft Work Plan Addendum, results of additional HELP model runs, and past meeting minutes. C. Arnold and K. Forman began the meeting by expressing their concern that the project schedule and budget have been impacted considerably due to continual iterations of comments and responses to comments on the Draft EE/CA. They requested concurrence on solutions to open issues as a team without continued iterations.

The most recent comments to the responses to comments on the Draft EE/CA dated 13 September from John P. Anderson were discussed. Topics included;

- the water needs for appropriate landfill vegetation
- HELP model runs
- groundwater monitoring frequency and number of wells

Based upon these discussions the following agreements to revisions were made;

1. Soil Cover, Response 2- In the second sentence, "native species" will be change to "appropriate species". A more detailed discussion of the vegetative cover will be added

which will include; vegetation will be planted just before the growing season, annual maintenance activities will be conducted to control plant growth, and specifications for the vegetative cover will be addressed during the design phase.

2. HELP Model, Response 3-Three additional HELP model runs will be performed and presented side-by-side for comparative purposes. The three runs will be;

- (1). 24" beach sand with an fml (flexible membrane layer),
- (2). 24" beach sand with 12" of 5 X 10-5 silty sand
- (3). 24" beach sand with 12" crushed rock and 12" of 1 X 10-6 clay

In addition, verbiage will be added in the text to emphasize the importance that the single layer cap meets the stated performance goals. The cost advantage of the single layer cap should be put in perspective. The infiltration issue should also be put in perspective, especially since the waste is sitting in groundwater and there is no known correlation between increasing infiltration rates and increasing concentrations of contaminants in the groundwater.

3. It was agreed that figure 4-3 should be revised to clarify that the cap design is for a minimum of 3' of cover above the landfill waste. - -

4. Groundwater Monitoring Program, Response 1, 3rd paragraph-The proposed groundwater monitoring program will be revised back to the original program outlined in the Draft EE/CA.

Addendum to the Work Plan- Since T. Zielinski was unable to attend the meeting, a telecon meeting will be held on September 26 at 11AM to address comments on the Addendum to the Work Plan.