

5090
Ser 09ER3GK/L5219
20 Mar 1995

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities
Engineering Command

To: Distribution

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

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes

1. Enclosure (1) is the Progress Review Meeting Minutes for the meeting held at NAS Alameda on January 18, 1995, for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study being conducted at NAS Alameda.

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

Original signed by

CAMILLE GARIBALDI

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

Blind copy to (w/enclosure):

09ER, 09ER3, 09ER3GM, 09ER3DW, 09ER3GK, 09ER2, 09EC2LL
Admin Record (3 copies, w/enclosure)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Kikugawa/09ER3GK
FILE: Alameda/NAS

**PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
NAVAL COMPLEX ALAMEDA
(Held at Building 1, NAS Alameda, Alameda, California)**

January 18, 1995

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	(510) 286-0301
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Teresa Bernhard	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda Environmental Office	(510) 263-3723
John Headlee	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3728
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3729
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (EMI)	(916) 852-8300
Stacey Lupton	PRC EMI	(415) 222-8245
Susan Willoughby	PRC EMI	(916) 852-8300
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
Larry Lind	U.S. Navy, Engineering Field Activity (EFA) WEST	(415) 244-2527
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, EFA WEST	(415) 244-2559
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, EFA WEST	(415) 244-2524
Dennis Wong	U.S. Navy, EFA WEST	(415) 244-2533

AGENDA ITEMS:

Item #1: Removal Actions/Treatability Studies

Opening: BCT/EFA West/PRC

Process: Discuss status of removals (including time frames for required documentation [work plan, action memorandums, reports]) at Site 13 and 15; status of the "pump/treat" at Site 5; action levels at Site 7A; actions at Sites 7C and 16; and, discussion of institutional controls at selected IRP sites (e.g. Site 17 signs and/or fencing, etc.).

Discussion of status of planned treatability studies tasked to the UC Berkeley groups, as well as possible interim remedial measures for groundwater.

Goal: Update project teams, reprioritize actions as needed, and identify key process deadlines.

Closing: Site 5: Agreed that a "pump/treat" removal action was not appropriate at Site 5 because the hydrologic conditions beneath the building are not yet well understood. The PRC team will be conducting an aquifer pump test near the northwest corner of the building in the spring of 1995, and any groundwater interim action should be delayed at least until hydrologic data are collected. Also discussed the question of having the industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) at Site 5 as part of an interim action or the final remedy. If an interim action looks feasible after the aquifer test results are in, then the PRC team should start looking into the feasibility of using the IWTP. The RPMs should be careful to public notice such an action.

Site 7A: PRC noted that without action levels, the EE/CA preparation will get stalled. During a January 5, 1995 meeting with PRC and EFA West, PRC was asked to look into the possibility of developing petroleum cleanup levels as was done for Moffett Field. This will take time, and action levels will still need to be negotiated or agreed on by all parties.

Sites 7C & 16: George Kikugawa mentioned that the Sites 7C & 16 removal actions would be handled by the Navy's indefinite quantity contractor.

Site 13: PRC to update the action memorandum regarding the selection of 100 ppm cleanup level as agreed to during project meetings, and also make sure the public notification text is noticeable

and easy to find in the document. All parties agreed that the removal action is complete, and no further excavation is needed (there was a question about this as two confirmation samples contained 105 ppm and 120 ppm). PRC explained that the confirmation samples were collected as splits, and that one set of analytical results showed the samples contained approximately 10 to 20 ppm, while the other set of analytical results showed 105 and 120 ppm. We discussed the problem in view of the inherent heterogeneity of soil. From this time forward, Site 13 will be addressed during the feasibility study where further action will be recommended for the petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil.

Site 14: George Kikugawa mentioned that the Site 14 EE/CA would be prepared by IT Corporation.

Site 15: Discussed the one month delay in field work due to localized flooding. BioGenesis may be on site March 1, 1995. Also discussed the ACOE's involvement, and that they would not need a right of entry permit to work at Site 15, because by the time they will begin their work (September 1995), the site will no longer be a hazardous waste site.

Site 17: Teresa Bernhard mentioned that institutional controls are being considered (fencing around the Seaplane Lagoon). Gary Munekawa mentioned that UC Berkeley will soon deliver their proposal for characterization of the Seaplane Lagoon (to provide data for their treatability study).

Site 18: Teresa Bernhard mentioned that IT is currently collecting data from the storm sewer system.

Item # 2:

RI/FS Status

Opening:

PRC/EFA West

Process:

Discussion items included:

- Ongoing RI/FS field work (quarterly monitoring, additional Site 4 hydropunch & wells, radiation survey, field trailer relocation)
- Data Transmittal Memoranda
- ARARS response from DTSC
- Data base management and GIS
- Ecological assessment follow-on actions
- Filtered/unfiltered water analyses
- "Background" well sampling
- Basewide SVOC issues
- Risk assessments
- FFSRA and SMP
- EBS Phase II data integration

Goal:

Update attendees on RI/FS progress

Closing:

Updates were as follows:

- CTO 280 second quarter/CTO 260 third quarter groundwater monitoring started second week of January 1995.
- PRC will bring a basewide TDS map to the February progress review meeting.
- Site 4 hydropunch will be completed February 1 and wells will be installed starting February 6. Wells will be installed as presented in the "Site 4 Tech Memo" reviewed by Navy and agencies during May 1994.
- The Draft Data Transmittal Memorandum will be delivered to the Navy on January 31.
- The radiation survey is to begin on February 6. Tom Lanphar expressed concern that work would start before comments were received from the DHS. George Kikugawa explained that he had sent a letter to DHS advising them we needed comments by December 30, 1994 so as not to cause delays in the field work. PRC agreed that they would look into delaying the field work. (Since the meeting, the Navy has received DHS comments, and will respond before implementing field work).
- Tom Lanphar said the Navy would receive DTSC's ARARs by January 31, 1995. Other agencies had not responded to the request from DTSC yet. The Navy and PRC pointed out that the RI and

FS reports were getting started now, and if ARARs are not determined soon, there would be delays in the development of these documents.

- The follow-on work to the ecological assessment will first be addressed in a work plan to be prepared by PRC. At present, PRC has provided the Navy a work plan/cost estimate for this work, and the proposed schedule would provide for having a draft field work plan in July 1995.

- James Nusrala asked about the possibility of installing wells between the West Beach Landfill wetlands and the landfill, and whether the wells could be sampled for two or three quarters. The Navy and PRC reported that the wells could probably be installed and data for two quarters could be collected. EFA West and PRC agreed to look into implementing this request.

- Regarding the filtered/unfiltered groundwater analyses, a letter from RWQCB is being forwarded to the Navy through DTSC. The Navy is continuing to look into the possibility of implementing this request.

- The "background" wells that were sampled under CTO 121 were not included in the field sampling plans for the current field work. (The wells were sampled twice during the CTO 121 field work.) This omission will be corrected by sampling the wells for two quarters during the current field work. Tom Lanphar asked that we rename the wells.

- Basewide SVOC issue: all parties agreed this will be a difficult issue and that it will be addressed during the risk assessment, along with the topic of "background" soil levels. The draft human health and ecological risk assessment work plans will be delivered to the Navy on January 31, 1995. Once the agencies receive these work plans, the Navy and agencies will need to negotiate on several issues, including the concept of "background" for soil and groundwater, and the SVOC issue.

- The FFSRA and SMP are at the Navy. Tom Lanphar said it would be necessary to plan a meeting with lawyers from Navy, DTSC and RWQCB.

- EBS Phase II data - Stuart Cheang (EFA WEST) and Dan Baden (IT Corporation) were to be contacting PRC about data integration into the GIS.

Item # 3:

UST Removal Action Levels

Opening:

Larry Lind, EFA West/PRC

Process:

Discuss ongoing UST removals and explain how selection of cleanup/detection levels affects decisions on conducting additional characterization at selected UST sites. Discuss status of CERCLA/UST integration.

Goal:

Clarify decision-making approach for screening UST sites requiring additional investigation. Clarify how timeliness of UST closure impacts specific parcels targeted for early FOSL. Inform RWQCB and BCT that an alternative cleanup level approach is being reviewed (modeled on UST work conducted at NAS Moffett) for possible submittal to RWQCB.

Closing:

Larry Lind provided an update of tanks pulled. EFA West and PRC provided an update on the petroleum cleanup levels that were established for NAS Moffett, and PRC has a February 3 action item to inform EFA West whether or not the model for NAS Moffett would be appropriate to use at NAS Alameda. Preliminarily, PRC feels confident the model will apply, but the actual task of fitting to the NAS Alameda conditions could take up to 3 months. LCDR Petouhoff then announced that NAS Alameda and EFA West would be meeting on this issue on January 19, 1995.

Tom Lanphar told Larry Lind that DTSC wanted a soil management plan that would include a cost analysis of options for (a) reuse of soil for pavement or other similar reuses, (b) bioremediation, (c) other remedial options, and (d) landfilling. However, DTSC does not consider it acceptable to send the soil to a landfill.

James Nusrala requested the analyses for soil taken from diesel UST pits include EPA 8270.

Tom Lanphar commented on CERCLA/UST integration. He said that he would discuss RCRA closures with DTSC management, but that he thought the implementation of closure monitoring

would happen under the IR program.

Item # 4:

CRP Issues

Opening:

BCT/EFA West

Process:

Discuss CRP update and proposed CRP workshop. Update status of fact sheets/newsletters.

Goal:

Identify issues needing resolution/support; discuss possible solutions.

Closing:

Stacey Lupton (PRC) outlined a timeline/spreadsheet showing documents and which documents required public comment. She also outlined what the workshop would address which included providing the public with an opportunity to tell the Navy what they think is important in a community relations plan. The workshop breakout sessions are to include (1) explanation of documents and help prioritizing those to review, (2) the support needed by the RAB, and (3) how to best implement the public outreach program. The BCT said they would comment on Stacey's graphic presentation prior to the workshop.

Item # 5:

BRAC Cleanup Plan Update - Response to Comments

Opening:

BCT/EFA West/PRC

Process:

Overview of comments received to date. Discussion items will include:

- one time compliance
- concurrence letter
- permitting strategy
- executive summary
- incorporation of BCT and RAB comments

Goal:

Identify and task appropriate team members to prepare responses to comments.

Closing:

Time did not allow discussion of this item.

Item # 6:

All Other Issues

Opening:

Attendees

Process:

Open discussion of other issues to be considered.

Goal:

"To boldly go..."

Closing:

Several meetings were set as follows:

January 20, 1995 - BCT to meet on BCT comments

January 23, 1995 - BCP meeting with BCT/PRC to discuss comments

February 3, 1995 - Groundwater Interface with PRC and RAC

February 14, 1995 - Monthly Progress Review Meeting