

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at the DTSC office in Berkeley)**

March 4, 1993

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
Kenneth Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Scott Weber	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3400
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Randy Cate	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3716
Sherri Withrow	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3724
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP)	(510) 263-6241
Paul Pentony	NADEP	(510) 263-6294
Rudy Pontemayor	NADEP	(510) 263-6120
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Terry Ruitter	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(303) 295-1101
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. STATUS REPORT -- RI FIELD WORK

Phases 1 and 2A

- A. The Navy met with the DTSC on December 10, 1992, to discuss the approach and additional data needs for performing follow-on sampling of soils and ground water at the Phase 2A sites. Navy began working on a statement of work for the follow-on field investigations required for the Phase 2A sites.
- B. As per DTSC request, the Navy submitted on January 8, 1993, a chronology and written discussion of the history of the agency's review of the original Canonie quality assurance project plan documents as related to the data quality issues concerning the Canonie Phases 1 and 2A sites. At a monthly progress review meeting on January 15, 1993, the DTSC concurred with distribution of draft Phases 1 and 2A data summary report (DSR) to remaining agencies as a draft final document.
- C. On January 21, 1993, the DTSC responded to the Navy's chronology letter of January 8, 1993, by indicating that they will address consistency of the Phases 1 and 2A analytical data in their responses to the draft final Phases 1 and 2A DSR (expected in early March 1993). The draft final DSR was distributed on

January 29, 1993.

- D. On February 19, 1993, the Navy meet with the DTSC and RWQCB, where the agencies indicated that the Phases 1 and 2A data had been reviewed by a DTSC toxicologist, and because the data were analyzed following standard EPA procedures at DTSC-certified laboratories, it was agreed that the existing data was suitable for site screening, locating future data gathering sites, and risk assessment. The DTSC also indicated that it would likely request additional, though limited, confirmatory sampling during the follow-on work planned for the Phases 1 and 2A sites.

Phases 2B and 3 RI/FS

- A. The Navy finished contracting activities in December 1992, for the generation of the follow-on field sampling plan (FSP) for the Phases 2B and 3 sites. The Navy's contractor expects to deliver the draft final FSP to the regulatory agencies in early April 1993.
- B. On January 22, the DTSC gave it concurrence to Navy responses to earlier DTSC comments on the Draft Final Phases 2B and 3, Mod 1 DSR, and agreed that the document could be finalized.
- C. On February 16, 1993, the DTSC concurred with the draft final second round ground-water background sampling report (this is an addendum document supporting the Draft Final Phases 2B and 3, Mod 1 DSR).
- D. The Navy meet with the DTSC and RWQCB on February 19, 1993, to discuss sample locations and rationale for the follow-on filed work at the Phases 2B and 3 sites.
- E. Navy began generating a statement of work for completing field work activities at the Site 5 plating shop in Building 5.

Phase 4, Ecological Assessment Study

- A. The Navy completed contractual actions for the implementation of the ecological assessment field work in December 1992. Survey work activities at the wetlands were begun in January 1993, and sediment sampling activities began in mid-February 1993.

Phases 5 and 6 RI/FS (SWAT)

- A. The Navy finished contracting activities in December 1992, for the generation of the follow-on FSP for the Phases 5 and 6 sites (the landfill sites), and for revision of the Canonic RI/FS work plan documents. Submittal of the draft final FSP and revised RI/FS work plan to the regulatory agencies will occur in early April 1993.
- B. At two meetings with the DTSC and RWQCB, on February 2nd and

19th, 1993, the Navy presented its sampling locations and rationale for the follow-on work planned at the landfill sites.

2. Intermediate Maintenance Facility (IMF) Removal Action

- A. The Navy completed contracting activities in December 1992, for the generation of a work plan document outlining the approach and disposal alternatives following excavation of lead-laden soils around a single soil boring at the IMF site.
- B. After meeting with the DTSC and RWQCB on February 2nd and 19th to discuss the approach at the IMF site, The Navy presented, and the DTSC concurred with, an accelerated approach to perform a limited excavation and removal action of the lead-laden soils that reduces potential health risks until remediation of the entire IMF site can be accomplished at a latter date (following completion of the RI/FS). It was agreed at the February 19, 1993, meeting with the DTSC, that a single document addressing the excavation activity and the options for treatment and/or disposal of the excavated soils would suffice for agency review. This document will be submitted to the DTSC in early April 1993.
- C. Following free product sampling at monitoring well MW-IMF-01 at the IMF site by NAS Alameda/Navy Public Works Center personnel on November 4, 1992. NAS Alameda contractors plan to install a free product removal system in MW-IMF-01 and begin pumping free product in mid-March 1993.

3. OTHER

- A. It was agreed that referring to site investigation areas by "Phases" was somewhat confusing, and that subsequent work at the landfill sites (Sites 1 and 2) would not be referred to in the future as Phases 1, 5 and 6 activities, but rather simply as work at the "landfill sites."
- B. Apparently the short time-frame (about two-weeks) concerning the change of the meeting date from March 3rd to March 4th, prevented most of the regular participants of the Technical Review Committee meeting from attending. As reflected in the attendees listing, only Navy, DTSC and RWQCB representatives were present today. It was agreed that in the future, at least one month's notice would be required before a meeting date should be changed, so as to allow for the greatest number of participants.
- C. The next Technical Review Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 2, 1993, at the DTSC office in Berkeley. Randy Cate or Sherri Withrow (both of NAS Alameda) will prepare and distribute an agenda.



TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005

Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10075

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION: Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM: [Signature]
Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

BRAC Cleanup Team After Action Reports from 1990 through 2000 and 2001 through 2002
April 2, 2003

TYPE: [] Contractual Deliverable [] Technical Deliverable (DS) [X] Other (TC)

VERSION: NA REVISION #: NA
(e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final)

ADMIN RECORD: Yes [X] No [] CATEGORY: Confidential []

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/3C/4E
O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

Table with 3 columns: NAVY, TETRA TECH, OTHER. Rows include M. McClelland (06Camm), Diane Silva (05G.DS)*, and various copy counts like 3C/3E and 1C/1E.

Date/Time Received