

5090
Ser 18312GK/L5200
3 Aug 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 for February 14, 1995
(2) Progress Review Meeting Minutes for March 14, 1995
(3) Progress Review Meeting Minutes for April 19, 1995

1. Enclosures (1), (2), and (3) are Progress Review Meeting Minutes for meetings held in February, March and April 1995 for the Installation Restoration Program being conducted at NAS Alameda.
2. If you have any questions regarding this matter, the point of contact is Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 1831.2GK, (415) 244-2549; FAX (415) 244-2654.

Original signed by:

CAMILLE GARIBALDI
By direction of
the Commanding Officer

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

Copies 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 copies to: (w/enclosure):
1831; 1831.1, 1831.2, 1831.3, 1831.4
Admin. Record (3 copies, w/enclosure)
WRITER: G. KIKUKAWA/1831.2GK
Chron, Pink, Green
Activity File: NAS ALAMEDA (File: L5200GK.DOC) ab

PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
NAS ALAMEDA

Date: February 14, 1995, Tuesday
Time: 8:30 am - 5:30 PM
Place: Building 1, NAS Alameda, Alameda, California

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
John Hunt	A-N West Engineers	(510) 451-2133
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA (Dept. Toxic Substances Control [DTSC])	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	(510) 286-0301
Tim Ault	IT Corporation	(510) 372-9100
Dan Baden	IT Corporation	(510) 372-9100
Ken Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda Environmental Office	(510) 263-3726
Teresa Bernhard	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3723
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3729
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP) Alameda	(510) 263-6241
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (EMI)	(916) 853-4529
Susan Willoughby	PRC EMI	(916) 853-4507
Jeriann Alexander	Subsurface Consultants Inc.	(510) 268-0461
R. William Rudolph	Subsurface Consultants Inc.	(510) 268-0461
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
Stewart Cheang	U.S. Navy, Engineering Field Activity West (EFAW)	(415) 244-2528
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2549
Larry Lind	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2527
Dennis Wong	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2526

Agenda:

Item: #1 Interim Remedial Action - Site 7A and Site 14 and 18 Removals
Opening: EFAW/PRC/NAS Alameda
Process: Discuss status of EE/CA for Site 7A (action levels, tank removal data, schedule).
Site 14 update from EFAW.
Site 18 - Discuss strategy. Could NAS prepare a "streamlined" EE/CA? Could the agencies work out a strategy for reviewing/approving a streamlined EE/CA?
Goal: Update project team, reprioritize actions as needed, and identify key process deadlines.
Closing: Site 7A: PRC indicated that action levels need to be selected for the chemicals of concern, principally benzene in soil. Scope of Navy's EE/CA to address soil only. The facility recently removed the waste oil and solvent underground storage tanks (USTs) at Building 457. An oil sheen was reportedly observed on the water in the tank pit. Tom Lanphar (DTSC) requested that the Navy provide him with a written report on the UST pulls. The two abandoned gasoline USTs

are slated for extraction by April. The group briefly discussed the logistics of working at an active gas station, which precludes pulling one of the inactive gasoline tanks nested with three other active USTs, essentially preventing implementation of the EE/CA recommendations. Based on current operations the implementation of the EE/CA would occur after November 1995. Tom Lanphar mentioned that he expected that excavated UST soils would go into his proposed "soil management unit" to be located somewhere on base (a potential candidate site might be inside Building 410, an empty paint-stripping hangar building).

DTSC's Tom Lanphar passed out copies of Senate Bill (SB) 1706 and made a presentation concerning this new state law on removal actions which became effective January 1, 1995. SB 1706 removal action requirements are essentially similar to those provided for the preparation of EE/CAs under CERCLA, but with a different reporting emphasis and specified monetary limits on cleanups that effect the level of required documentation. Navy legal counsel will be reviewing SB 1706 as it relates to Navy stance to continue doing removal actions following federal guidelines. Tom Lanphar indicates that he will investigate DTSC's requirements for interim RAPs.

Further discussion of Site 7A centered on using an approach for only doing soil removal associated with the UST excavations, and performing a treatability study for impacted groundwater; as several questions were raised by the group concerning the appropriateness of doing an EE/CA at what is essentially a typical "gasoline station" UST release site. The Navy stated that proposed alternative petroleum action levels were being developed for NAS Alameda. This is being modeled on a RWQCB-accepted approach used for petroleum at Moffett Field.

Site 14: The Navy stated that it continues to pursue contractual activities with IT Corporation to conduct an EE/CA and soil removal at the former Fire Training Area (Site 14). Award is expected by April 24, with implementation in 170 days.

Site 18: The group discussed a removal action that would include clean out of the storm drain system and stockpiling of impacted sediments for treatment. PRC updated the group on its efforts to consider establishment of a corrective action management unit (CAMU) at NAS Alameda for storage and treatment of impacted soil and sediments that are generated during removal actions (and UST pulls). Tom suggested that the new state law (SB 1706) would allow stockpiling of soil as part of the "removal action plan" without instituting a CAMU. Essentially, the removal action work plan (= EE/CA) would be required before the state would allow stockpiling. State law would require that the action meets the substantive permit requirements of a RCRA permit.

Tom Lanphar's perspective on the Site 18 removal action included the following steps: 1) prepare removal action work plan (does it include a public notice and comment period?), 2) Acquire permit? (Tom Lanphar to get update) either under the new state health and safety code or as part of the CAMU, 3) remove sediment/sludge and stockpile, 4) conduct treatability studies as appropriate, 5) prepare interim RAP, 6) public notice, 7) treat sediment/sludge, and 8) carry site through the feasibility study and on to RAP (or ROD).

Currently IT Corp. is sampling selected lengths of the storm drain system. Any future removal action to be taken can be considered "time critical" (since very elevated levels of metals and hydrocarbons have been found at catch basins and man-holes near Site 5 and at other IRP sites) in order to take action prior to heavy rains next winter. Treatment of the removed sediment, sludge and water would not be "time critical" but rather be conducted as part of a treatability study.

Action Items: Tom Lanphar to provide additional clarification on SB 1706 requirements (including permits); Navy legal counsel will review same; PRC to develop proposed petroleum

cleanup level position paper, and will provide input on possible removal scenarios for Site 18 to EFAW; and the project team as a whole will give consideration to developing a modified removal action process that is streamlined and meets both federal guidance and state law.

Item: #2 RI/FS Status
Opening: PRC/EFAW/NAS Alameda
Process: Discussion items included:

- Data Transmittal Memoranda
- Aquifer Testing Work Plan
- Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment Work Plan
- radiological field survey at Sites 1 & 2
- ARARs response from DTSC
- West Beach Landfill Wetland wells
- Total Dissolved Solids basewide maps
- filtered/unfiltered water analyses
- EBS Phase II data integration (Ann Klimek)

Goal: Update attendees on RI/FS progress.
Closing: Initial discussion covered status of EBS phase IIA field activity by IT Corp. Essentially only soil sampling occurring at parcels under current EBS investigation. IT Corp has budgeted for up to 21 groundwater wells. Team discusses need for PRC and IT to meet in near future to identify appropriate location for selected wells at non-IRP sites. PRC and IT agree to meet April 19 and May 24 to target potential sites as EBS data are received.

Ann Klimek indicates that IT's focus is on reuse, and not necessarily chasing groundwater plumes, though in some areas this may be appropriate (e.g. parcels within/around IRP sites 3 and 5). RWQCB would like to see IT install wells at the edge of plumes; Navy objects to using IT's services in that manner. Ann Klimek goes on to state that IT's priorities should be focused on the ten to 20 parcels already identified for high priority reuse. The RWQCB states that it wants the plumes characterized before the feasibility studies are done, and does not care who installs the wells. Navy indicates that the wells would be installed as part of phase IIB after the phase IIA EBS data are collected and analyzed.

PRC states that the aquifer test work plan and the human health risk assessment work plan are both at the Navy undergoing Navy review. The data transmittal memorandum for recent work at IRP sites 4, 5, 8, 10A, 12, and 14 was distributed for Navy review on January 31. PRC reminds the team that it still needs to negotiate chemicals of concern and human health/ecological risk assessment issues with the regulatory agencies.

The DTSC says it's still working on responding to Navy requests for the state's ARARs. DTSC stated at the January 18, 1995, review meeting they would provide ARARs by January 31, pending receipt of ARARs from other state agencies. Navy reminds DTSC that ARARs are critical for assisting in the timely completion of the Site 14 removal action. If Navy and DTSC agree on ARARs, an appropriate cleanup action level for the Site 14 removal action can be selected and the Navy can then estimate how much soil will need to be excavated/treated. This issue has Davis-Bacon Act implications as the Navy has requested IT Corp to do both the EE/CA and removal action implementation. The Navy would be doing the "design," because the Navy would tell IT Corp the volume of soils to excavate and treat.

With respect to beneficial use of groundwater issues, PRC indicated it was generating base-wide TDS maps for discussion with the Navy and regulators. After Navy review draft copies of maps would be forwarded to the BCT and RWQCB.

Wetland wells at the wetland/landfill boundary within IRP site 2 were briefly discussed. Concerns were brought up about exact locations along the edge of the wetland/landfill interface and about installing wells within the wetland area itself. The group decided that for preparation of a wetland/landfill wells work plan addendum, only wells along the interface would be considered, and that pending future chemical analyses of the soil and groundwater from these new interface wells, subsequent discussions would entertain the need of additional wells within the landfill. PRC and EFAW indicated they would look into permit issues related to putting wells at the edge of, and within, the wetland, and would inquire about similar activities that have occurred at NWS Concord.

James Nusrala stated RWQCB's desire to get unfiltered water samples during quarterly monitoring at NAS Alameda. EFAW indicated that the Navy would be inclined to consider RWQCB's request but wished to discuss the number of wells actually sampled, and for what purpose the RWQCB would apply the new data. RWQCB also said they would like the data collected during the Spring quarter of sampling. EFAW said they would provide a letter response to the RWQCB.

The radiological survey at Sites 1 and 2 did not begin on February 6 as planned due to DTSC concerns about starting the field work before DTSC comments from Sacramento had been received and addressed by the Navy. DTSC (Sacramento) comments were received by Navy on February 6, and Navy/PRC are preparing responses to these comments.

Item: #3 Community Relations Issues

Opening: BCT/EFAW/PRC

Process: Discuss proposed presentations for RAB

Goal: Clarify scope of proposed presentations

Closing: Mike Petouhoff gives a summary of his plans for providing restoration advisory board (RAB) presentations on subjects that the RAB desires clarification. Mike indicates that both Navy guidance (Section IV.F.(2)(c), dated October 18, 1994) and DOD/EPA guidance (page 9, "Training for RAB Community Members," dated September 27, 1994) specify RAB support along the lines of informative or educational workshops or presentations. Mike subsequently gives tentative dates and subject matter information for monthly RAB training/workshops during the next six months.

March 18 Documents/Process to ROD

April 8 Early Actions

April 29 Risk Assessments

Subsequent training would cover site characterization, cleanup technologies, and geological overviews.

Item: #4 BRAC Cleanup Plan Update-Response to Comments

Opening: BCT/EFAW/PRC

Process: Overview of comments not currently addressed.

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

Closing: The BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) had just received their draft BCP revision on February 13, and was not ready to discuss details or changes made to the draft BCP. The Navy and the BCT agreed

to meet next week on February 22, 1995, to discuss changes and assign responsible staff for editing sections within the draft BCP revision.

Item #5 Fuel Line Removal

Opening: Larry Lind/EFAW

Process: Provide BCT with some details of the A-E proposal for fuel line removal.

Goal: BCT to evaluate review time needed and provide ideas/criteria for the proposal format and content.

Closing: Larry Lind began by introducing personnel from A-N West and Subsurface Consultants who had been tasked to begin investigations of abandoned fuel lines at NAS Alameda. A presentation was made showing lines investigated and preliminary chemical analyses. Subsurface Consultants will be preparing work plans and plans and specifications for further sampling and excavation of the abandoned lines.

Concerns about controlling groundwater during line removal, handling and reuse of excavated materials, soil/water disposal issues, and proposed sample analytes were discussed. DTSC and EPA voiced strong concern about not knowing that the work presented today had occurred and wanted to be better informed so as to have had some input into the work already performed, and any future work. Larry Lind stated that the fuel line issues had been discussed previously with the RWQCB (lead agency with respect to USTs). Larry Lind also indicated that he would like to consider sending impacted soils to an off-site thermal treatment facility, to which DTSC's Tom Lanphar objected since he felt that the Navy was open to creating an on-base "soil management unit." PRC mentioned that an alternative to a "soil management unit" might be a corrective action management unit or "CAMU" which could be used to handle all impacted soils regardless of which program they were generated under.

Larry said that the soil management unit issue would be partially controlled by the amount of affected soil that has to be handled, and that he could not know that volume until the analytical results come in after excavation. Conversely, the contractors need to know what the disposal options are so that they can develop their plans and specifications accordingly.

Key issues: better communication between regulators (RWQCB and the BCT), between Navy facility and Navy UST/fuel line groups (NAS Alameda and the EFAW UST group), and resolution as to where and how impacted soils are going to be handled regardless of whether or not it's an activity for a removal action, UST pull or fuel line excavation (BCT/EFAW/PRC).

Item: #6 All Other Issues

Opening: Attendees

Process: Open discussion of other issues to be considered.

Goal: To summarize previously discussed action items and group tasks.

Closing: Additional meetings, other than the RAB workshops listed above, were tentatively scheduled as follows:

February 22, 1995	BCP update
March 7, 1995	March 18 RAB training dry-run; RAB meeting
March 14, 1995	Monthly review meeting
April 19, 1995	Groundwater meeting with IT Corp.
May 24, 1995	Monthly review meeting

PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
NAS ALAMEDA

Date: March 14, 1995, Tuesday
Time: 10:00 am - 4:30 pm
Place: Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Berkeley, CA.

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Karen Hack	ARC Ecology	(415) 495-1786
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	(510) 286-0301
Teresa Bernhard	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda Environmental Office	(510) 263-3723
Ann Klimek	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3729
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP) Alameda	(510) 263-6241
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (EMI)	(916) 853-4529
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, Engineering Field Activity West (EFAW)	(415) 244-2549
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2569
Dennis Wong	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2526

Agenda:

Item #1 Latest on UST and Fuel Line Removal

Opening: RWQCB

Process: Provide team with update of status & result of 3/10/95 meeting.

Goal: Continue to inform team to aid integration of programs.

Closing: James Nusrala stated that a proposed plan for fuel line removal actions is due from the Navy in late March and that the RWQCB will review within 45 days. He states that Navy's Larry Lind gave him a copy of the UST listing showing which USTs have been removed so far, and showing the results of UST soil and groundwater sample analyses. This list shows which USTs are to be or are currently being investigated under the IR program rather than by the UST contractor (ERM-West). For impacted UST sites not associated with IR sites, ERM-West is drawing up sampling plans, and is doing geoprobe investigations at six UST sites (including collection of grab water samples). Tom Lanphar inquires as to the status of a "soil management plan" for addressing excavated soils. There is discussion about modeling the plan on a similar plan from the Shell Oil Martinez Manufacturing Complex. Larry Lind says he thinks it would take five to six months to get a soil management plan together; Teresa Bernhard says it would need to be done sooner to meet other removal action needs. She further states that she is inquiring into suitable areas for CAMU development.

Action Items: Fuel line removal work plan due to RWQCB from Navy by late March. Tentative meeting set between Larry Lind, RWQCB, and project team on April 11, 1995. PRC requests copies of ERM-West's UST sampling and analysis plans as soon as they are available.

Item: #2 Restoration Advisory Board Presentations
Opening: BCT/EFAW/PRC
Process: Discuss proposed presentations for RAB.
Goal: Clarify scope of proposed presentations (especially 4/8/95).
Closing: Teresa Bernhard states that last night's (March 13) dry-run presentation to restoration advisory board (RAB) member Corinne Stefanick went well. PRC's Susan Willoughby will be making a workshop presentation on March 18, 1995, discussing the IR program process and the documents generated during that process. Teresa continues discussion with mention that future workshop dates and subjects may vary from that discussed at the February 14 review meeting, depending on availability of presenters and the RAB. The April 8 workshop is tentatively planned to cover early action processes, including removal actions and treatability studies, followed by a field tour of those sites where such actions may be implemented.

Action Items: PRC and Teresa Bernhard will meet before April 8, to discuss RAB workshop content and to do a dry-run of the April 8 presentation.

Item: #3 BRAC Cleanup Plan Update - Cost-To-Complete and Ongoing Updates
Opening: BCT/EFAW/PRC
Process: Overview of cleanup cost estimates.
Goal: Identify and task appropriate team members to prepare necessary updates.
Closing: Gary Munekawa and Duane Balch state that they are working with NAVFAC and awaiting the latest revisions from US Cost on estimates submitted last January. Revisions are expected by late April or May. Discussions also covered the likelihood of doing real-time updates of the BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP) with a working draft generated every six months. Karen Hack inquired as to getting responses to ARC's written comments on the draft BCP. James Ricks stated that ARC comments were considered and selectively incorporated within the context of the purpose of the document, but that no formal written response to ARC's comments would be generated. Teresa Bernhard said she would be available as a point of contact should Karen have questions as to the inclusion or exclusion of specific ARC comments in the BCP.

Action Items: DTSC requested a copy of the BCP for Tony Landis (DTSC in Sacramento). Navy or PRC will forward a copy to DTSC for distribution.

Item: #4 Early Actions - Site 5, 7A, 7C, 14, 15, and 18
Opening: EFAW/PRC/NAS Alameda
Process: Discuss early action "action levels" and removal action "summit;" discuss status of EE/CA for Site 14; removal of tanks at Site 7C; Site 15 status; status of treatability studies proposed by UC Berkeley; and Lockheed/ERG proposal for Sites 5 and 18.
Goal: Update project team; Set date for "summit," reprioritize actions as needed; and identify key process deadlines.
Closing: Site 5: US EPA Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) program personnel requested the opportunity to visit Site 5 with representatives of Lockheed/ERG to visually inspect possible sites for demonstrating an innovative electrokinetic metals treatment process. On March 8, PRC and NADEP personnel attended a visit of sites 1, 2, 4, 5, 13, and 15. Based on logistical needs, Site 5 (in situ) and Site 18 (ex situ) appeared to be the best candidate sites for the Lockheed/ERG technology. Further evaluation of the Lockheed/ERG proposal by US EPA SITE personnel will be communicated to the BCT as soon as available.

Site 7A: Tom Lanphar provided further perspective on the new State law (Senate Bill [SB] 1706) and gave the group his thoughts on getting together to have what he calls a "removal

action summit" meeting to hammer out an acceptable hybrid plan for conducting/documenting early action activities that honor SB 1706, the CERCLA process, and DTSC's requirements under CEQA. A tentative date for this "summit" meeting was set for March 29 at NAS Alameda. Action levels for Site 7A (and for other removal actions) await receiving State responses to Navy's request for ARARs; meanwhile PRC continues generating a petroleum cleanup level model based on action levels agreed to by the RWQCB for UST removals at Moffett Field. Tom Lanphar said that he would block off March 23-24 to complete DTSC's ARARs responses (pending receipt of other State agencies' responses).

Sites 7C and 16: Removal action contracting continued for actions by Moju to perform EE/CAs at both sites. Moju's proposal is due to Navy by March 23. IT Corp will do the actual removal following Moju's EE/CA recommendations.

Site 14: The Navy stated that it had completed negotiations with IT Corporation to conduct an EE/CA and soil removal at the former Fire Training Area (Site 14). Award is expected by or before April 24, with implementation in 170 days.

Site 15: Teresa Bernhard indicated that no actions had been taken this month due to the ponding of rain water at the site from the recent storms. A series of berms and bales of hay were set around the perimeter of the site to prevent impacted sediments from migrating beyond the site boundary. Tom Lanphar asked the Navy for a letter summarizing their containment efforts. Teresa Bernhard stated that the rain delay impacts Army Corp of Engineer work on the sewer line crossing the site; that the work may not be done until after December 1995.

Site 18: The group discussed a removal action that would include clean out of the storm drain system and stockpiling of impacted sediments for treatment. IT Corp has been collecting data around and within selected storm drain lines and their data will be available in preliminary form within three weeks. The project team sets up a tentative date for meeting with IT Corp on April 18 to discuss their findings and to decide on the appropriate removal action for Site 18. Further discussions centered on focusing activities for the removal of impacted soils before the next rainy season (Fall 1995), pursuing this action separately from treating the soils once they are removed (part of a treatability study).

UCB: Additionally there were brief discussions concerning updates on UC Berkeley's proposals for treatability studies at sites 13 and 17. Navy stated that delivery order #3 had been recently awarded to UCB for installing 3 wells at Site 13 for part of a steam injection-vapor extraction (SIVE) system treatability study. This Phase I work was expected to start in early May, and a work plan for installation of the wells is due to the Navy next week. A cost estimate and proposal for Site 17 is due from UCB by March 20. Both Tom Lanphar and James Ricks expressed surprise and concern as to when they would be involved in review of the UCB work plans and proposals, as well as their regulatory input for "Go/No Go" decisions on the application of UCB innovative technologies as part of the treatability studies. Navy indicated that they planned on using UCB as per their contract with the university for implementation of treatability studies, and that DTSC and EPA regulatory input would be solicited. There was concern that the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) and the Navy get together soon to discuss this issue and the role of the BCT (particularly DTSC and EPA) in the decision-making process with respect to UCB and treatability studies. Gary indicated to Tom and James that UCB proposal abstracts were due to Navy by March 23, and that they should visit this important BCT issue with LCDR Petouhoff when he returns. Tom Lanphar suggested having a BCT/Navy meeting on March 21, to discuss the above concerns, followed by a meeting with UCB. A tentative date for discussing UCB's treatability study proposals with UCB was set for March 28 at NAS Alameda.

Item: #5 RI/FS Status
Opening: PRC/EFAW/NAS Alameda
Process: Discussion items included:

- Background values for soil and groundwater - discuss approach, plan meeting
- Data integration from other non RI/FS actions
- OU boundary redefinition to coincide with EBS zone boundaries
- ARARs response from DTSC
- West Beach landfill wetland wells (work plan addendum)
- Total Dissolved Solids basewide maps (delivered to Navy 3/14)
- Filtered/unfiltered water analyses
- EBS Phase II data integration (Ann Klimek)

Goal: Update attendees on RI/FS progress.

Closing: Due to time constraints not all topics proposed were covered. Ann Klimek gives a brief update as to EBS Phase IIA activities by IT Corp, and states that all parcel evaluation plans (PEPs) should be submitted and approved by the BCT by end of May. PRC has been working with IT Corp to try a test-download of IT's EBS Phase IIA data into PRC's RI/FS database; PRC was told that IT may be ready for this test by next week.

With respect to collection of unfiltered/filtered groundwater sampling, the Navy agreed to meet with the BCT at the RWQCB office in Oakland on March 30 to discuss the number of wells for unfiltered sampling, to review recently generated total dissolved solids (TDS) groundwater isoconcentrations maps, and to discuss Navy's approach for the installation of groundwater monitoring wells along the Site 2 wetland/landfill boundary. Draft copies of the TDS were presented to the group today, and PRC will forward Navy-reviewed copies to the BCT and RWQCB prior to the March 30 meeting. A work plan addendum for the installation of up to 12 wells along the Site 2 wetland/landfill boundary is near completion for Navy review, and regulator copies will be ready for the March 30 meeting.

PRC provided a brief status of various RI/FS documents and actions. A brief document summary for the draft data transmittal memorandum or DTM (CTO 0260) for sites 4, 5, 8, 10A, 12, and 14 has been reviewed by Navy with only minor comments. A draft version for regulatory review will be distributed prior to distribution at the upcoming RAB meeting on April 4. Tentatively, the draft DTM (CTO 0280) for the remaining IRP sites will be submitted for Navy review in late May or June.

The draft aquifer test work plan and the draft ecological assessment work plan for operable units 1, 2, and 3, (and their respective document summaries) are currently under Navy review. The draft human health assessment work plan is ready for agency review, and subsequent distribution of the document summaries is scheduled for the next RAB meeting on April 4.

Item: #6 All Other Issues

Opening: Attendees

Process: Open discussion of other issues to be considered.

Goal: To clarify individual and task group action items and responsibilities.

Closing: Additional meetings were scheduled as follows:

March 18, 1995 RAB Presentation at NAS Alameda; IRP process/documents
March 21, 1995 Navy/BCT UCB meeting at DTSC

March 28, 1995	UCB meeting at NAS Alameda to discuss treatability studies
March 29, 1995	Removal Action Summit at NAS Alameda
March 30, 1995	Wetland wells/Unfiltered sampling issues meeting at RWQCB
April 4, 1995	Dry-run with UCB and PRC for RAB presentation of April 8
April 8, 1995	RAB Presentation at NAS Alameda; Early Actions
April 11, 1995	UST action level meeting at RWQCB
April 18, 1995	Site 18 meeting with Navy/PRC/IT Corp at NAS Alameda
April 19, 1995	Groundwater issues at parcels; NAS Alameda with BCT/RWQCB

PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
NAS ALAMEDA

Date: April 19, 1995, Wednesday
Time: 1:00 pm - 4:00 pm
Place: NAS Alameda, Building 1, Alameda, CA.

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Cal-EPA (Dept. Toxic Substances Control [DTSC])	(510) 540-3809
Ron Gervason	Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	(510) 286-0688
James Nusrala	RWQCB	(510) 286-0301
Dan Baden	IT Corporation	(510) 372-9100
Ann Klimek	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda, Environmental Office	(510) 263-3729
Mike Petouhoff	NAS Alameda Environmental Office	(510) 263-3726
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Alameda	(510) 263-6241
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (EMI)	(916) 853-4529
Susan Willoughby	PRC EMI	(916) 853-4507
James Ricks, Jr.	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	(415) 744-2402
Camille Garibaldi	U.S. Navy, Engineering Field Activity West (EFAW)	(415) 244-2516
George Kikugawa	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2549
Bill Van Peeters	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-3017
Dennis Wong	U.S. Navy, EFAW	(415) 244-2526

AGENDA:

Item #1	West Beach Wetland Wells
Opening:	EFAW/PRC
Process:	Updated team members on constraints on well installation due to Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and discussed ramifications.
Goal:	Develop plan of action for well installation and discuss the timing and amount of data to be collected.
Closing:	After lengthy discussion as to Navy's position on initiating well drilling activities adjacent to the wetlands at Site 2, Navy and regulatory representatives agreed that it would be better to wait until after the bird nesting season (approximately May to August) before putting in the wetland boundary wells. Tom Lanphar of the DTSC duly noted this delay in well installation would delay completion of the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) reports for operable units (OU) 3 and 4, and acknowledged that the delay was necessary so as to be protective of the birds, and to allow for two quarters of hydrogeologic and chemical data from these new wells and the existing, adjacent landfill wells. Mr. Lanphar agreed

that revisions to the OU3 and OU4 schedules should be clarified by July or August pending better information on the actual start date of the wetland/landfill boundary wells.

Item #2 **Groundwater - Site Specific Contaminant & Updated Quarterly TDS Data**
Opening: EFAW/PRC
Process: PRC provided the team with draft versions of quarterly TDS and water level maps (January-February 1995) and updated groundwater results, and discussed potential data gaps. PRC provided site specific, compound specific contaminant contour maps showing the extent of select VOC's at OU's 1 and 2. The purpose was to discuss data gaps, objectives of additional wells (if needed), and criteria for deciding whether additional wells are needed. Depending on availability of data from IT Corporation's EBS Phase IIA field work, the team was also meeting to discuss the potential for EBS Phase IIB well installations at select IR sites, or wells outside of those IR sites.
Goal: Develop approach to address any potential groundwater data gaps, and define objectives and decision making criteria for addressing data gaps in groundwater data.
Closing: Draft TDS and water level maps based on data collected in January-February 1995 were reviewed, as were selected maps showing VOC hits at Sites 4 and 5. IT Corporation did not have available, as yet, any visual or tabulated data for their current investigation of parcels near or beyond existing IR program sites. Essentially, **the RWQCB acknowledged that the primary data gaps are at the wetland/landfill boundary.** As additional data become available (third and fourth quarter groundwater data), additional data gaps will be identified and compared to the IT Corp. parcel data as they become available.

Item: #3 **All Other Issues**
Opening: Attendees
Process: Open discussion of other issues to be considered.
Goal: "To keep boldly going..."
Closing: Pending placement of the wetlands/landfill boundary wells in late Summer, **schedules for getting to record of decision (ROD) for OU3 and OU4 will be revisited and revised by August 1995.** Final versions of TDS and water level maps will be generated for quarterly data currently validated and available. These maps will be distributed to the BCT and the RWQCB for future discussions, and will be included in the appropriate OU RI/FS report.