

JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP INC.

M60050.000882
MCAS EL TORO
SSIC # 5090.3

CLEAN TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

CONTRACT N68711-89-D-9296

DOCUMENT CONTROL No.: CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009

TO: Southwest Division
Robin Green, Code 0232
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Contracts Department, Room 131
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, California 92132-5187

DATE: 4 January 1995
CTO#: 0284
LOCATION: MCAS El Toro
TASK/WORK ELEMENT:

FROM: *M. N. Arends*
Mike Arends/Project Manager

Miriam Tebrache for...
Ken Tomeo/ Resource Center Manager

DESCRIPTION: Project Note No. 0284-15, Redline Meetings for Base Closure, MCAS El Toro

TYPE: Contract Deliverable CTO Deliverable Change Notice/Project Note Other

VERSION: _____

REVISION #: _____

ADMIN RECORD Yes No Category _____ Confidential
(PJM to identify)

NEGOTIATED DELIVERY DATE: _____

ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: _____

Number of Copies Submitted: _____

Copies To:	J. Rogers - Code 18C1 w/attach	K. Tomeo - CH2M HILL w/attach
	A. Piszkin - Code 1831.AP w/attach	M. Huddleston - CH2M HILL w/ attach
	D. Crawley - Code 1831.DC w/attach	File - PMO w/attach
	L. Tedeski - JEG/Pas w/o attach	File - CH2M HILL w/attach
	M. Pan - IT w/ attach	D. Hernandez - CH2M HILL w/attach

Delivered To: Contracting Officer RPM/EIC

Name: _____

TITLE: REDLINE MEETINGS FOR BASE CLOSURE

AUTHOR: MIKE ARENDS/CH2M HILL

DATE: 01/04/95

CATEGORY: 11.5

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009		PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6	
CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE X TELECOM OTHER	DATE HELD DATE ISSUED RECORDED BY PLACE	05, 06 December 1994 04 January 1995 Mike Arends/CH2M HILL <i>MAA</i> Santa Ana, California
SUBJECT	Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 284 Redline Meetings for Base Closure Marine Corps Air Station El Toro		
PARTICIPANTS: (* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)			
N/A			
ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM		
	<p>Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Plan (BCP) Redline Meetings were held on 05 and 06 December 1994 at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro (or Station). A copy of the agenda and a list of attendees are provided as attachments to this project note.</p> <p>Meeting Objectives. Some of the objectives of the meeting were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To receive "final" review comments from the primary points of contact (POCs) assigned to various sections of the BCP in the Kickoff Meeting held on 10 November o To provide a forum for the members of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) and the BRAC Project Team (BPT) to discuss "final" review comments o To finalize the current status of Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and compliance programs for the updated BCP o To discuss strategies for future work in IRP and compliance programs (the schedule for future work in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study [RI/FS] Program at the Station was planned for discussion, with emphasis on the relationship of planned work to new funding constraints.) <p>Introduction and General Issues. J. Joyce/Code 1832.JJ, the BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC), welcomed everyone to the meeting. Because there were some new people attending the meeting, he requested that everyone introduce themselves for the benefit of the new attendees.</p> <p>M. Arends/CH2M HILL briefly reviewed the status of work to date for the attendees. He listed each of the meetings and deliverables submitted to date, and presented a</p>		

	PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009	PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6
--	--	---------------------------

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
------------------	------

schedule for future meetings and deliverables. Of special importance are the following meeting dates and deliverables:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| <u>Meetings:</u> | 1. Second Redline Meetings, 10 and 11 January 1995 |
| <u>Deliverables:</u> | 1. Final SAP - submitted 01 December 1994 |
| | 2. Draft Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) and Draft Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) Report - in 90-day review period; comments are due from BCT on or before 10 February 1995 |
| | 3. Updated BCP - must be submitted to Headquarters on or before 01 March 1995 |
| | 4. Final EBS and CERFA Reports - must be submitted to Headquarters on or before 01 April 1995 |

The agenda was then discussed, and the group decided to alter the schedule in the following manner:

- o Monday afternoon (05 December) would be reserved for discussion of the operable units (OUs) in the IRP and the planned schedule of activities for the OUs.
- o Compliance programs would be discussed in the section-by-section review on Tuesday, 06 December.
- o Discussion of reuse issues would be held on Monday morning, 05 December, as planned.
- o Discussion of Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) would be placed on hold pending the possible appearance of James Hendron/Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) at some later point in the meetings. (J. Hendron could only be reached via voicemail the previous week, and his attendance could not be confirmed.)

Reuse Issues. LtCol Comstock provided a brief presentation on reuse. Some of the highlights included the following:

- o The Department of Justice (DOJ) filed a screening application for 155 acres of land for use as a minimum security prison.
- o The Air National Guard filed a screening application for 25 acres around Building 368.
- o The Department of the Interior (DOI) filed a screening application for over 1,000 acres located in the undeveloped areas in the far northeast portion of the base.
- o The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) expressed interest in about 8.5 acres at the pistol range.

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009	PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6
--	---------------------------

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o DOI expressed an interest in an unspecified number of acres for a potential land swap with The Irvine Company. o A 4-month extension was requested to 01 April 1995 for a decision on the various screening applications. o By law, the Station must close by 02 July 1999. o Measure A passed during the November 1994 elections. This measure reserves about 2,000 acres of Station land for a commercial airport. <p>Schedule and Other Issues - IRP. On Monday afternoon, December 05, the IRP was the focal point of discussion. A. Piszkin/Code 1831.AP provided an update on the status of OU-1, the volatile organic compound (VOC) plume in groundwater emanating from the southwest portion of the Station. He said that negotiations with Orange County Water District (OCWD) on the Irvine Desalter have temporarily stopped and the Navy is moving forward with evaluating some additional alternatives for the OU-1 FS. He said the revised schedule for OU-1 was still in the process of being evaluated by the Navy, but it appears that the schedule will be pushed back at least 4 months.</p> <p>J. Jiminez/California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) expressed his concern that groundwater pumping for the desalter will spread some of the other halogenated hydrocarbon and petroleum hydrocarbon plumes on-Station. He suggested that the Navy consider some interim pumping at the separate small plumes to prevent these from being enlarged by the desalter project.</p> <p>B. Arthur/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), J. Jiminez, and L. Vitale/Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) each agreed that they would like to see the Navy provide funding for groundwater monitoring. They said that this issue was expected to be resolved in October 1994, but remains unresolved even at the time of the Redline Meetings.</p> <p>A. Piszkin said that funding constraints will delay work on OU-3 sites. He said that Phase II work on these sites may not be started until 1998.</p> <p>Because of the Navy's funding constraints, B. Arthur said it was extremely important to prioritize sites and planned activities. She suggested that the BCT review the current sites in each of the OUs and develop lists of restructured OUs. She suggested that the team provide lists of pros and cons for the various options and write them on poster paper. The following posters were developed by the team relative to OU designation and potential restructuring.</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p>POSTER 1</p> <p>Pros/Cons for staying with OU-2 as is:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Pros</td> <td style="width: 5%;">1.</td> <td>Easy to stay</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2.</td> <td>OU is fully funded</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cons</td> <td>1.</td> <td>New information is available</td> </tr> </table>	Pros	1.	Easy to stay		2.	OU is fully funded	Cons	1.	New information is available
Pros	1.	Easy to stay								
	2.	OU is fully funded								
Cons	1.	New information is available								

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009	PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6
--	---------------------------

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM				
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. OU-2 is too large 3. OU-2 is now composed of unrelated sites 4. Current OU-2 sites are geographically separated 				
	<hr/> <p>POSTER 2</p> <p>Current Sites in OU-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Four Landfills (Sites 2, 3/4, 5, and 17) o VOC Source Area (Site 24) o Washes (Site 25) <p>Each OU-2 site is funded for development and implementation of a Work Plan</p>				
	<hr/> <p>POSTER 3</p> <p>Options for OU-2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status Quo 2. Have a separate OU for the landfills (Sites 2, 3/4, 5, 17) 3. Divide landfills into two separate OUs? Sites 2 and 17 as one OU, Sites 3/4 and 5 as another. 4. Site 2 and Associated Groundwater Plume as an OU? 5. Site 24 as OU-4? 6. Site 25 as OU-5? 7. Sites 24 and 25 as OU-4? 				
	<hr/> <p>POSTER 4</p> <p>Priorities for OU-3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Assess value of Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) sites handled separately from other OU-3 sites o Reuse potential 				
	<hr/> <p>POSTER 5</p> <p>Pros/Cons for staying with OU-3 as is:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Pros</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More "flexible" 2. Fewer hypothetical schedules to deal with 3. Should wait for reuse plan before changing </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cons</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No funding until 1998 - affects reuse 2. No intermediate progress to track </td> </tr> </table>	Pros	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More "flexible" 2. Fewer hypothetical schedules to deal with 3. Should wait for reuse plan before changing 	Cons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No funding until 1998 - affects reuse 2. No intermediate progress to track
Pros	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More "flexible" 2. Fewer hypothetical schedules to deal with 3. Should wait for reuse plan before changing 				
Cons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No funding until 1998 - affects reuse 2. No intermediate progress to track 				

	PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009	PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6
--	--	---------------------------

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>POSTER 6</p> <p>Pros/Cons for Splitting OU-3 into an OU-3A (Two EE/CA Sites - Sites 13 and 20) and OU-3B (All other OU-3 sites)</p> <p>Pros 1. "Bean counting" advantages for completion of work</p> <p>Cons 1. Why do this now when OU-3 will likely need to be restructured again after the Reuse Plan is developed?</p> <hr/> <p>POSTER 7</p> <p>OU-3 Site Priorities</p> <p>1. Complete two EE/CA sites (Sites 13 and 20) first</p> <p>2. Then complete six other EE/CA sites (Sites 4, 7, 11, 14, 19, and 25)</p> <p>3. The priority of other OU-3 sites will be determined at a later date based on reuse</p> <hr/> <p>POSTER 8</p> <p>Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sites contributing to groundwater contamination o Sites that are adjacent to or nearby other sites o "Get rid of" sites as soon as possible at minimum (or reasonable) cost <hr/> <p>POSTER 9</p> <p>Potential Realignment of OUs</p> <p>OU-1 Site 18</p> <p>OU-2A Sites 24, 25</p> <p>OU-2B Sites 2, 17</p> <p>OU-2C Sites 3/4, 5</p> <p>OU-3 All other Sites</p> <hr/> <p>POSTER 10</p> <p>Miscellaneous CLEAN II CTOs for El Toro</p> <p>CTO 59 Work Plan (VOC Source Area, Landfill Sites, Miscellaneous OU-3 Sites) and Develop EE/CAs</p> <p>CTO 65 RFA Followup Accumulation Area Evaluation</p>

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0284-15 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009	PROJECT NO. 01-F284-H6
--	---------------------------

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
------------------	------

- CTO 73 Implementation of Work Plan (VOC Source Area - Site 24 and Site 25)
- CTO 76 Implementation of Work Plan at Landfill Sites

Section-by-Section Review of BCP.

For the section-by-section review on Tuesday, 06 December CH2M HILL provided a brief presentation for each section highlighting the key issues and assumptions contained in that section in the first version of the BCP. A copy of the handouts is attached to these meeting minutes.

A list of action items was generated throughout the day for various members of the project team. A table summarizing these action items is attached. This table was also faxed to appropriate team members after the meeting as a reminder for completing the required action.

A partial list of items discussed in the 06 December morning session included the following:

- o The term SAA (satellite accumulation area) is desired to be changed in the BCP. Possible alternative terms were "temporary accumulation area" or "less than 90-day accumulation area." J. Jiminez said that he would check within the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) for what would be an appropriate term. (Note: Satellite accumulation area was used in the first BCP because this term was used in the guidance document for preparing BCPs.)
- o P. Sherwood/MCAS El Toro provided a copy of his comments on the oil/water separator sections of the BCP.
- o A question arose as to what extent work can be done on removal or repair of USTs and oil/water separators that are located within the boundaries of RI/FS sites, especially if some contamination is encountered. Currently, the Station has put this work on hold.
- o The team requested that a draft version of revised BCP sections relating to the IRP and the designation and schedule for OUs be prepared early and distributed prior to the next Redline Meetings. It was agreed that the draft versions of the rewritten sections on the IRP will be prepared by CH2M HILL and faxed to the BCT on or before 25 December 1994.

Tuesday Afternoon Session (with smaller group). A smaller group continued the meeting for this session. Those included in this portion of the meeting were J. Joyce, B. Arthur, L. Nuzum/Code 1831, E. Rumsey/MCAS El Toro, V. Parpiani/MCAS El Toro, D. Hernandez/CH2M HILL, T. Smith/CH2M HILL, and M. Arends.

Some of the topics discussed in the afternoon session included asbestos, lead-based paint, and radon. B. Arthur suggested that the geologic contribution to the presence (or lack) of radon at sites be discussed in the updated BCP.

PROJECT NOTE NO. PROJECT NO.
 PN-0284-15 01-F284-H6
 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009

ACTION
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

Although not every section was discussed by the end of the meeting, the presentation material for each is attached to this project note for reference. A list of all of the Action Items generated from the Redline Meetings is also attached.

**ACTION ITEMS FROM REDLINE MEETING #1
 (05 AND 06 DECEMBER 1994)
 MCAS EL TORO BCP**

No.	Team Member	Action Item	Due Date
1	Juan Jimenez/DTSC	Clarify terminology for less than 90-day storage areas (SAA vs TAA)	13 December
2	Bonnie Arthur/EPA Juan Jimenez/DTSC	Identify deactivation requirements (in regard to property transfer) for less than 90-day storage areas.	13 December
3	Leta Suarez/EI Toro	Provide closure schedule for the former RCRA facility at Bldg. 673-T3, including notification dates to DTSC.	13 December
4	CH2M HILL	Provide Cal-EPA (DTSC and RWQCB) with the number of less than 90-day storage areas by BCP Area Type.	09 December
5	Ann Dotson/EI Toro	Determine if outlease agreements address management of hazardous substances.	13 December
6	Vish Parpiani/EI Toro	Determine policy for removal/repair of oil/water separators and underground storage tanks located within IRP site boundaries.	13 December
7	CH2M HILL	Contact EI Toro Environmental Office to determine regulatory status of oil/water separators.	13 December
8	Bonnie Arthur/EPA Juan Jimenez/DTSC	Provide evaluation/differentiation of definitions for BCP Area Types 6 and 7 (in regard to application to IRP and other sites).	13 December
9	Jason Ashman/SWDIV	Provide latest IRP site boundaries.	13 December
10	CH2M HILL	Provide draft versions of BCP Sections 3.1.1 and 4.1 to BCT before 25 December 1994.	23 December
11	Jason Ashman/SWDIV Vish Parpiani/EI Toro	Update status of IRP early actions listed in BCP Table 4-2.	13 December

PROJECT NOTE NO.
 PN-0284-15
 CLE-C01-01F284-I2-0009

PROJECT NO.
 01-F284-H6

ACTION
 REQ'D. BY

ITEM

**ACTION ITEMS FROM REDLINE MEETING #1
 (05 AND 06 DECEMBER 1994)
 MCAS EL TORO BCP**

No.	Team Member	Action Item	Due Date
12	Larry Nuzum/SWDIV	Provide evaluation of funding issues relative to designation of IRP sites as Area Types 6 and 7.	14 December
13	Bill Sedlak/OHM Remediation	Provide schedule for remediation of Tank 398.	13 December
14	Joseph Joyce/EI Toro	Update status of Tank Management Plan.	13 December
15	Jason Ashman/SWDIV	Provide followup information for Site 5 boundary extension per results of SAIC aerial photograph review and interviews with former Station employees.	13 December
16	CH2M HILL	Contact Eddie Benevente/MCAS El Toro regarding former drum storage area (waste from Desert Storm) identified near Station golf course.	13 December
17	Ann Dotson/EI Toro	Determine if Marine Corps policy exists for lead-based paint at non-residential buildings.	13 December
18	CH2M HILL	Contact Eddie Benevente/MCAS El Toro regarding status of PCB Management Plan.	13 December

Attachments