

5090  
Ser 09ER3GK/L4238  
27 May 1994

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
To: Distribution

Subj: MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES, NAVAL AIR  
STATION (NAS), ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes for April 13, 1994  
(2) Progress Review Meeting Minutes for April 29, 1994

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are Progress Review Meeting Minutes for two meetings held in April on the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS).

2. If you have any questions regarding this matter, the point of contact is Mr. Gary MuneKawa, Code 09ER3GM, (415) 244-2524 or Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 09ER3GK, (415) 244-2559; FAX (415) 244-2553.

**Original signed by:**

GARY MUNEKAWA  
By direction

**Distribution:**

US Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: James Ricks)  
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: James Nusrala)

**Copy to (w/encl):**

NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)  
NADEP Alameda (Attn: Paul Pentony/Roger Caswell)  
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)  
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Terry Ruiter)  
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)  
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Ken Leung)

Blind Copy to:

BCM (LCDR Lutkenhouse), 09ER, 09ER3

09ER3GM, 09ERDW, 09ERG

Admin. Record (w/3 copies)

WRITER: G. Kikugawa/09ER3GK

TYPIST:

FILE: Alameda/NAS

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES  
BRAC CLEANUP ACTIVITIES  
NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA  
(Held at Building 1, NAS Alameda, Alameda, California)**

April 13, 1994

**Attendees:**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Kelli Shuter	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3473
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3729
John Headlee	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3728
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP); Alameda	(510) 263-6241
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Susan Willoughby	PRC EMI	(916) 852-8300
June Mire	PRC EMI	(415) 222-8282
Terry Ruiter	PRC EMI	(303) 295-1101
Dirk Applegate	PRC EMI	(303) 295-1101
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2559
Gary Munekawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2524
Jeff Lewis	WESTDIV	(415) 244-3722

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Ecological Assessment Update (CTO 226)**

- PRC's Terry Ruiter gave a brief history on the ecological assessment (EA) activities. The EA work plan was first developed in 1989-1990 by Canonie, and PRC subsequently took comments on that document and incorporated them into a new approach after meeting with the BTAG (Biological Technical Advisory Group) for Region IX. The BTAG included NOAA, USEF&WS, CDFG, and USEPA, among others. The emphasis at that time was on aquatic ecosystems, as there was not as much interest in onshore ecosystems and the air station was not yet slated for closure. The ecological assessment covered five general areas: three subtidal areas (Sites 17 and 20, and offshore west and south of the landfill sites) and two wetland areas.
- The draft EA report was distributed to the community and regulatory agencies on February 18, 1994. A sixty-day review period was indicated to all recipients. Comments are expected by April 18, 1994.

- In the interim PRC found that the semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOC) analyses performed on EA samples could not be validated due to the contracted lab's (ToxScan) lack of quality control and calibration data. New samples are being recollected and analyzed at no additional expense to the Navy. Revised data will be available in early June and incorporated into a revised draft of the EA report in July.
- Lt. Mike Petouhoff expressed concern over potential delays in the RI/FS schedule and in getting to FOST. Terry Ruiter and June Mire explained that the areas that are currently considered as significantly impacted by hydrocarbons and/or metals would not be changed by the new SVOC data; that the SVOC does not drive any toxicity evaluations, and that the EA report can be used in for preliminary decision-making.
- With the revision of the SVOC data yet to occur, there was discussion as to when to submit regulatory comments on the draft EA report. Assuming that the new SVOC data would not change the overall assessment of the condition of the impacted sites, it was agreed that any comments from the regulators should be provided as soon as possible. It was pointed out that schedule impacts could occur if the agencies wait until June-July to review the new validated SVOC data.
- Lt. Petouhoff asked how the EA fit into the entire RI/FS. The EA follow-on work will address recommendations made in the EA report for the sites that were studied. Ecological risk assessment work at the remaining onshore IR sites will be performed under CTO-0316 in conjunction with the human health risk assessment for all IR sites.
- Discussions ensued over the original design of the EA, which was based on the "sediment triad" concept. This concept was accepted by the agencies after development by the BTAG in 1991. USEPA's most recent concepts for EAs look at the development of conceptual models, and to model the food web.
- The ecological risk assessment under CTO-0316 will not model the food web, as most of the IR sites are in relatively urban areas of the base; however, the evaluations will address qualitative food web issues.
- Plans were discussed for a future presentation to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and other natural resources trustees, as a way of discussing with them the EA data and for presenting proposed plans and approaches for future ecological work. The DTSC indicated that they had been negotiating with the CDFG to get them funding for their regulatory reviews.

- A tentative date sometime in mid-May was suggested for the CDFG meeting (since scheduled for May 17 at WESTDIV). It was stated that this meeting, by providing a summary of the EA report and discussing future ecological work recommendations, could act as a real time response period whereby the natural resources trustees could provide the BCT with appropriate comments and suggestions.

## **II. Site 15 EE/CA and Removal Action**

- The draft engineering evaluation and cost analysis (EE/CA) for the removal action at Site 15 will be available for public review and comment effective April 19. NAS Alameda will handle publication of the public notice in the local newspapers to coincide with the restoration advisory board (RAB) meeting the evening of April 19, 1994. PRC offered to generate an abbreviated version of the public notice text for submittal to the local newspaper by April 14.

- The due date for receipt of public comments on the Site 15 EE/CA is May 19. A draft removal action implementation plan will be generated for BCT/agency review on May 26, and the action memorandum and final EE/CA will be distributed about June 2.

## **III. CTO 260 Update**

- An update on the shallow well, cone penetrometer test (CPT) and Hydropunch® activities at sites 4, 5, 8, 10A, 12 and 14 was briefly presented. Soil borings and shallow wells have been completed at these six sites as per the follow-on Phases 2B/3 field sampling plan (FSP).

- Reference borings adjacent to selected CPT points will be installed after BCT review of Navy location recommendations, and after the Hydropunch® analytical results are reviewed.

## **IV. Site 7A EE/CA and Removal Action**

- Projected date for submittal of responses to agency comments on the field work implementation plan is April 20, after which the plan will be distributed as final. Field work will start by early May with the installation of transponders in selected wells.

- The RWQCB expressed concerns about how the written comments to the implementation field work plan were distributed. PRC indicated that responses to comments would be included as an appendix to the final work plan. A facsimile copy of the responses to comments will be sent to the RWQCB as well.

- Lt. Petouhoff mentioned that the NEX station owners may want to close the station down, and Gary Munekawa said that WESTDIV (Larry Lind) has plans to pull the inactive and abandoned underground storage tanks (USTs) in June.
- Discussion followed as to whether or not all eight USTs on site would be pulled in June. One option discussed included pulling all eight existing tanks, replacing the current active tanks at the same time the old USTs are removed. This scenario would depend upon future reuse of the site as a gas station to justify the expense of the new tanks. Lt. Petouhoff requested that any schedule information (for implementing a removal action of the USTs and the surrounding affected soils/groundwater) be conveyed to Ann Klimek so that she can keep the current gas station owners apprised of our activities.

#### **V. CTO 280 and CTO 316 Updates**

- Funding for the follow-on field work under CTO 280 is expected within the week, though Navy is still considering letting the laboratory portion of the work to the remedial action contractor (RAC).
- Both DTSC and USEPA expressed concerns over the potential impact to the overall RI/FS schedule should the laboratory work be let to a separate contractor. Tom Lanphar stated that if such an action were to delay the schedule, that his agency would seriously consider issuing a notice of violation under the original remedial action order.
- The work plan/cost estimate for CTO 316 was submitted to the Navy in early April. The CTO was divided at Navy request to be submitted as a base effort with two options, with total funding dependent on available funds across fiscal years 1994 and 1995. As with CTO 280, portions of these activities (the feasibility studies and record of decisions) may be divided among the PRC team and the follow-on CLEAN II contractors. Once again, the DTSC and USEPA expressed serious concern about the continuity of the base closure and cleanup process at NAS Alameda with the introduction of new contractors, and the associated delays resulting in the hand-off of technical data between different contractors.

#### **VI. Environmental Assessment Technical Memorandum**

- Lt. Petouhoff stated that ERM-West will be doing the field interviews and site inspections, as part of finishing the environmental baseline study (EBS) contract (essentially Phase I as outlined in the environmental assessment technical memorandum or EATM). ERM-West will develop the sampling plans for the Phase II investigations, and another

contractor (unspecified as yet) would implement the sampling plans. These activities will be funded with compliance program dollars.

- As an appendix to the BCP, Lt. Petouhoff discussed changes to the existing EATM and his desire to see these changes implemented quickly to finalize the EATM. Outstanding issues requiring closure for finalizing the EATM include clarification of categorizing parcels that may have been impacted by common pesticide usage.
- A revised flow chart for tracking how category 7 parcels will be evaluated, recategorized and ultimately reach a finding of suitability for transfer (FOST) was drawn up and will be included within the final EATM. The revised flow chart also shows how the parcel evaluations relate to ongoing CERCLA processes.

#### **VII. RI/FS Work Plan Revision**

- The DTSC stated that its only comments on the draft RI/FS Work Plan Addendum are limited to chemical quantitation issues that have already been addressed under separate letters of correspondence. A letter from the DTSC will be generated for finalizing the document in May.

#### **Phase 2A FSP, Phases 2B and 3 FSP, and Phases 5 and 6 FSP**

- A brief summary was provided by PRC as to the status of the three follow-on FSPs. Currently all responses to regulatory and community comments have been completed, and additional text has been added, including new sampling locations on the appropriate figures, as a result of the December 7, 1993, site walk by DTSC. Upon review by the Navy the revised text and figures will be submitted to the BCT so that, with DTSC approval, the follow-on field work FSPs can be finalized for the administrative record.

#### **Site 5 Plating Shop Letter Report**

- After responding to Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP) comments, the Site 5 letter report is ready for final review by the BCT. A brief letter from the DTSC concurring that all comments have been addressed adequately, will allow the Navy to incorporate the letter report into the August 1992 draft final "Background and Tidal Influence Studies and Additional Work at Sites 4 and 5 Data Summary Report." Along with the November 1992 draft final addendum "Second Round Background Groundwater Sample Results and Resample Results for Sites 4 and 5," this will complete the parent document making it ready for final distribution.

#### VIII. IMF Interim Removal Action

- Discussions ensued as to the appropriateness of continuing the removal action at Site 13 as requested by the DTSC and RWQCB, or to defer further action until the final remedial action for the entire site is chosen (after treatability and feasibility studies are completed). The DTSC and RWQCB stated that their management would be firm in their desire to see the excavation of lead- and pH-affected soils be completed as originally agreed in February 1993.
- A tentative meeting date to discuss this issue between the Navy and the regulators was set for April 29, though Lt. Petouhoff stated that he felt some type of agreement could be reached before that date. One option briefly discussed included using removal action forces for the upcoming Site 15 removal action to handle the additional soils excavated at Site 13, should the Navy decide to continue removal of soils at Site 13.
- PRC agreed to review how this combination of activities might impact each other (changes to the EE/CAs and action memoranda) and report to the Navy potential options for addressing agency concerns.
- A summary of the optical cone penetrometer screening device used at Site 13 in late March-early April was given. Initial data suggests that the heavy hydrocarbons encountered beneath the site are concentrated in the vicinity of the IMF removal action. Additional data will be discussed at the next progress review meeting.

#### IX. Site Management Plan (SMP)

- Navy submitted a draft copy of the Site Management Plan (SMP) to the DTSC and RWQCB. The SMP will be incorporated into the proposed Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA) for NAS Alameda. The final SMP will include a two-year schedule with firm target deliverable dates, and a five-year schedule with target goals for future work and deliverables. Currently little action will occur on updating the SMP until the FFSRA is signed and finalized.
- The FFSRA itself has been reviewed by both Navy and DTSC legal counsel, and language between the two groups should soon be resolved. Therefore, finalization of the FFSRA is expected to occur soon.

#### X. Other Issues

- A technical review meeting to prepare for the upcoming RAB meeting on April 19, is scheduled for 1000 on April 15, at

Building 1, NAS Alameda. The RAB meeting will announce and introduce the newly selected RAB members. The next progress review meeting is scheduled for 1330 on April 29, 1994, at Building 1, NAS Alameda.

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**  
**BRAC CLEANUP ACTIVITIES**  
**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA**  
(Held at Building 1, NAS Alameda, Alameda, California)

April 29, 1994

**Special Note to Meeting Minute Recipients:**

Starting with these meeting minutes, a revised reporting format will be used that will be "action item" oriented, rather than "summary" oriented. A revised agenda format was used for the April 29, 1994, progress review meeting which focused more closely on what the goals and objectives were for each agenda item, as well as a suggested process and closing (or action) that each item should generate.

These minutes reflect that agenda format, and the resulting "action item(s)" generated after processing each agenda item has been added as part of these minutes. It is hoped that both the revised agenda format, and the resulting minutes will be more focused towards achieving "the end in mind." Given the ever increasing number of issues (and meetings!) the BCT project team must address, this format will allow for the faster written dissemination and tracking of the resulting action items generated at each meeting.

**Attendees:**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Kelli Shuter	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3473
Jeff Liu	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3578
Mike McDonald	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3511
Ross Wagner	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3428
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3729
John Headlee	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3728
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Rob Barry	PRC EMI	(916) 852-8300
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Deep Monitoring Well Locations**

Opening: PRC/Montgomery Watson (PRC Team).  
Process: Review of recent data/maps; identifying data needs.  
Goal: Consensus on locations at Sites 5, 8, 10A, 12 and 14.

APRIL29MTG.MIN

Closing: After brief discussion of the CPT/Hydropunch results for these sites, considerable discussion ensued on the approach to be taken at Site 4, since it alone had elevated levels of chlorinated hydrocarbons.

**ACTION:** It was agreed to draft up a memorandum summarizing an approach for at least three deep wells (to the Yerba Buena Mud) at Site 4 by May 6, 1994, and provide it to the BCT. A separate memorandum with the locations for the other five sites will be generated that shows the proposed reference boring/deep well locations.

## **II. Comprehensive Assessment of Parcels to Attain FOST**

Opening: Lt. Petouhoff/PRC Team

Process: Brainstorm: a) Environmental assessment technical memorandum (EATM) pesticide issue; b) Getting to Categories 1-4; c) Navy plans for implementation.

Goal: "Comprehensive Strategy to establish FOST"; consensus on approach and resultant deliverable (the Final EATM).

Closing: Discussion of the revision to the flow-chart that shows the relationship of Category 7 parcels to the CERCLA/RCRA process (and for getting to FOST) occurred, and a desire to bring the document to closure requires clarification of the approach to evaluate for pesticides was expressed by Lt. Petouhoff.

**ACTION:** The BCT indicated that it would get clarification on the pesticide issue from the EPA by May 6, 1994. It was suggested that a meeting be held with ERM-West on May 25, 1994, to clarify their data needs for generating the Phase II field sampling plans, and to bring the EATM to closure.

## **III. Planning for the Ecological Assessment Meeting on May 17**

Opening: Lt. Petouhoff/PRC Team

Process: Select date to review/prepare outline of eco-risk assessment approach to CDFG.

Goal: Consensus on general content of May 17 presentation, identifying appropriate personnel needed for EA approach discussion with CDFG.

Closing: The BCT said they would have comments on the EA report back to the Navy by May 6, 1994, and recommended a "dry-run" presentation of the EA meeting prior to the May 17, 1994, meeting with the natural resources trustees.

**ACTION:** Agreement to meet on May 12, 1994, at NAS Alameda for a "dry-run" presentation of the EA report and to discuss the direction of future planned EA and ecological risk work required for the entire integrated environmental activities at NAS Alameda.

## **IV. Future Removal Actions at Sites 6, 8, 12, 14 and 16**

Opening: PRC Team

Process: Quick review of recent data/maps; identifying timing of SOWs, funding, scheduling of WPs/FSPs/EECAs & Action Memos, overall schedule as it relates to the OU and getting to ROD.

Goal: Consensus on priority of removal actions, understanding of critical paths.

Closing: Discussed providing revised schedules, priorities, and critical path for all planned removal actions at these OU-1 sites.

**ACTION:** The PRC team agreed to provide the requested information for discussion at the upcoming May 25, 1994, progress review meeting at NAS Alameda. The PRC team will contact Ann Klimek to clarify potential operational limitations for proposed removal actions at each OU-1 site.

#### **V. Follow-Through on Outstanding RI/FS Documents**

Opening: PRC Team

Process: Describe current location/status of: RI/FS Work Plan Addendum; Phase 2A FSP; Phases 2B/3 FSP; Phases 5/6 FSP; Site 5 Plating Shop Letter Report (for the Mod 1 DSR); the FFSRA and the SMP; and Site 13 removal action documentation.

Goal: Consensus on return of review comments/responses to comments and dates targeted for final submission of the documents

Closing: Discussed current status on outstanding comments, responses to comments, and text and figure changes made to the FSPs as a result of the December 7, 1993, site-walk by the DTSC.

**ACTION:** PRC agreed to get the text/figures changes made on the FSPs through the QC process, and then submit to the Navy for their review and distribution to the BCT. The DTSC and RWQCB agreed to return their comments on the Site 13 removal action work plan, the Site 5 letter report and the RI/FS work plan addendum by May 6, 1994.

#### **VI. Update on Removal Actions at Site 7A and 15**

Opening: PRC Team

Process: Quick review of recent activities/schedule for implementing the removal at Site 15 (in conjunction with the RAC contractor), and the status of the EE/CA and projected schedule of actions for Site 7A.

Goal: Understanding of key issues (RCRA interfacing on the tank pulls) and other (RAC) contracting needs that are along the critical path to successful/timely completion of these removal actions.

Closing: Public notification of the EE/CA was made on April 19, 1994. Comments are due back from the public and agencies by May 19, 1994. A meeting was conducted today (April 29, 1994) to discuss the interface between the Navy, PRC team, and IT Corp on the Site 15 removal action, and the results of that meeting were discussed. The Site 7A removal action was reviewed and concerns were expressed over the number of tanks to be pulled in June by PWC personnel.

**ACTION:** IT Corp indicated that they would submit copies of their Site 15 removal action draft health and safety plan, and their draft demolition and disposal plan by May 23, 1994, as requested by the DTSC and RWQCB. IT Corp also agreed to forward weekly field work schedules and field work summaries to the Navy and BCT during the Site 15 removal action. Further discussions with PWC and the NEX operators will be required to clarify the number of tanks to be pulled and under which scenario that would be most acceptable to the BCT, PWC, WESTDIV and the operators.

**VII. Summarize New Action Items/Discuss Future Agenda Items**

**Opening:** BCT/PRC Team  
**Process:** Summarize action items generated from items listed above in this agenda; identify agenda items for the next Monthly Progress Review Meeting, and for the next RAB Meeting (beyond issues that the RAB itself will bring to the meeting, i.e. technical presentations on planned removal actions. etc.).  
**Goal:** To respond to agreed upon action items; to select agenda items/target approximate meeting dates  
**Closing:** USEPA's James Ricks summarized most of the action items listed above, and important action/meeting dates were agreed to and verified.

**ACTION:** Important Dates:  
May 3, 1994: Dry-run pre-RAB meeting, NAS Alameda, 1:30 PM  
RAB meeting, Miller Elementary School, Alameda, 7:30 PM.  
May 4, 1994: Site visit at Site 8 (Building 114) to witness installation of reference boring.  
May 6, 1994: Tech memo to BCT on deep well approach to Site 4; comments to be received from DTSC/RWQCB on Site 5 Letter report, on RI/FS Work Plan Addendum, and Site 13 draft final work plan.  
May 12, 1994: Dry-run pre-meeting on EA presentation to natural resources trustees, NAS Alameda, AM.  
May 17, 1994: EA meeting for natural resources trustees at WESTDIV, San Bruno, 10 AM.  
May 18, 1994: Draft agenda for next MPR meeting distributed for comments.  
May 25, 1994: Next MPR meeting at NAS Alameda, Building 1, 8:30 AM.