

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

Region 4
245 West Broadway, Suite 350
Long Beach, CA 90802-4444

M60050.001030
MCAS EL TORO
SSIC # 5090.3



02/03/94
JZ
Version 1

MCAS El Toro
RPM Meeting
February 8-10, 1994

Note: To be considered as an addition to the agenda pending team consensus.

Field Screening at RI/FS Strata - Potential Changes to Strategies Proposed in the Draft Phase II RI Work Plan

Please note that sites/strata identified by DTSC as potential removals and areas identified by DTSC as potential RI/FS site expansion areas (see DTSC's comments on the Draft Phase II RI Work Plan dated December 17, 1993) are not necessarily included in the following comments. If removals are not conducted at the sites/strata proposed by DTSC, then those areas should also be reviewed and evaluated for possible changes in the use of the field screening approach.

Furthermore, the application of immunoassay techniques, as recommended by DTSC for numerous strata, is not necessarily included in the following comments.

1. Site 2 (Magazine Road Landfill)

Stratum 2 (Stained Area)

Use field screening (with CLP confirmation) as a primary approach instead of basing field screening on CLP sample results.

2. Site 3/4 (Original Landfill and Ferrocene Spill Area)

SWMU/AOC 194 (Former Incinerator)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at three locations. Concern: is it possible to obtain herbicide and petroleum hydrocarbon data, that may be necessary, using the field screening method?



3. **Site 6 (Drop Tank Drainage Area No.1)**

Stratum 2 (Drainage)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at three locations (please note that DTSC has requested an expansion of this stratum or creation of a new stratum to address concerns about drainage from SWMU/AOC 204 and a persistent stained area that was not sampled in Phase I).

Stratum 3 (Storage Area)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at four locations (please note that DTSC has requested an expansion of this stratum or creation of a new stratum to address concerns about sites 125 and 183 from the **SAIC Report** and the triangular-shaped impoundment-like area).

4. **Site 7 (Drop Tank Drainage Area No. 2)**

Stratum 5 (Open Dirt Area)

Apparently field screening was not proposed due to original cost estimates based on the number of necessary analyte chemical classes (SVOCs, pesticides/PCBs and metals). Reconsider this stratum for field screening based on revised cost estimates.

5. **Site 8 (DRMO Storage Yard)**

Stratum 2 (West Storage Yard)

No further investigation was recommended. However, anomalous areas identified by USEPA were not sampled in Phase I. Field screening (or immunoassays and field screening) could be used for the anomalous areas.

Stratum 5 (Old Salvage Yard)

No further investigation was recommended. However, it is unclear which borings were located in anomalous areas and furthermore, surface soil samples were not collected in Phase I (please note that contamination at other strata at Site 8 appears to be limited to the upper soil layers). Field screening (or immunoassays and field screening) could be used to characterize surficial soils.

6. **Site 9 (Crash Crew Pit No. 1)**

Stratum 1 (Pit Areas)

No further investigation was recommended. However, the recommendation was based on three surface only samples that may have been located in fill material. Furthermore, none of the Phase I samples were located in the areas where liquids were reportedly flowing, i.e., near the northern edge of the pits. Field screening could be used to further characterize this site; please note that DTSC has requested dioxin/furan analysis for surficial soils.

7. **Site 10 (Petroleum Disposal Area)**

Stratum 1 (Aircraft Matting Area)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at three locations.

8. **Site 12 (Sludge Drying Beds)**

Strata 1 and 2 (West and East Sludge Drying Beds, respectively)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of an all CLP sample approach.

SWMU/AOC 90 (Former WWTP) and Former IWTP

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of an all CLP sample approach.

9. **Site 13 (Oil Change Area)**

Strata 1 and 2 (Area Southeast of Tank Farm and Area Southwest of Tank Farm, respectively)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of an all CLP sample approach.

10. **Site 19 (ACER Site)**

Stratum 1 (Northeast Stained Area)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at three locations.

11. **Site 20 (Hobby Shop)**

Stratum 4 (Courtyard and Front Slope)

Use field screening (for SVOCs) with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at seven locations. Please note that DTSC also requested that samples be analyzed for metals (lead was detected up to 900 ppm).

12. **Site 22 (Tactical Air Fuel Dispensing System)**

Strata 1 and 2 (Western and Eastern Areas, respectively)

Use field screening with CLP confirmation instead of a CLP sample approach at Stratum 1 and apply field screening at Stratum 2 even though no further investigation was recommended.