



BECHTEL NATIONAL INC.

M60050.001283
MCAS EL TORO
SSIC # 5090.3

CLEAN II TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N-68711-92-D-4670

Document Control No. CTO-0059/000014-117

File Code: 0208

TO: Jason Ashman, RPM (4 copies)
Code 1831.JA
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1220 Pacific Highway, Building 128
San Diego, CA. 92132-5187

DATE: 08 May 1995

CTO#: 0059

FROM: J.W. Kluesener
J.W. Kluesener, Operations Manager

D.K. Cowser
D.K./Cowser, Project Manager

DESCRIPTION: 02 May 1995 Meeting Minutes for CTO-0059, MCAS El Toro, California

TYPE: Contract Deliverable CTO Deliverable Request for Change/Project Note

CATEGORY: Preliminary Final Preliminary Final Draft Final

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: 05/12/95 ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 05/10/95

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED: Five (5)

COPIES TO :

*Distribution done by Bechtel.

SWDIV:

J. Rogers, Code 1845.JR (1)
P. Kennedy, Code 0233.PK (copy
w/o att.)

BECHTEL:

D. Tedaldi (1)*
D. Cowser (1)
A. Schwartz BNI-SF(1)*
T. Latas (1)*
J. Scholfield (1)*
P. Wiegand (1)*
J. Kluesener (1)*

OTHER

B. Arthur, US EPA (1)*
S. Beard, Cal EPA (1)*
J. Jimenez, Cal EPA (1)*
J. Joyce, El Toro (1)*
V. Parpiani, El Toro (1)*
L. Vitale, CRWOCB (1)*

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: MCAS El Toro Visit to OU-3 Sites Proposed for Reclassification to No Further Action At This Time or Removal Action		Meeting Date May 2, 1995 Meeting Time 0900 hrs Meeting Place MCAS El Toro, Bldg. T2009 Meeting Notes Prepared By Pat Wiegand	
Attendees: (*Part Time)			
<u>Navy/Marine Corps</u>		<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Regulatory Agencies</u>
Ginny Garelick - DON SWDIV		David Cowser	Bonnie Arthur - U.S. EPA
Joseph Joyce - MCAS El Toro		Tim Latas	Sherrill Beard - Cal EPA
Vish Parpriani - MCAS El Toro		John Scholfield	Juan Jimenez - Cal EPA
		Dante Tedaldi	Larry Vitale - CRWQCB
		Pat Wiegand	
Fax Distribution:		Fax	Phone
Bonnie Arthur		415-744-1916	415-744-2389
Sherrill Beard		310-590-5511	310-590-5528
Ginny Garelick		619-532-2469	619-532-2967
Juan Jimenez		310-590-4932	310-590-4919
Joseph Joyce		619-532-1656	714-726-3470
Vish Parpriani		714-726-6586	714-726-3386
Larry Vitale		909-781-6288	909-782-4988
Copies to:			
David Cowser			
Tim Latas			
John Scholfield			
Dante Tedaldi			
Pat Wiegand			

Summary of Meeting Discussion Topic(s)/Action Items : The meeting convened at 9:00 AM in the conference room of Bldg T2009 with a brief statement by Pat Wiegand reiterating the purpose of the meeting/site visit. Copies of an informal summary document "Recommended No Further Action and Removal Action OU-3 Sites" were distributed to all participants. The document summarizes the existing data for each of the four No Further Action units and the six Removal Action units. Pat Wiegand again indicated that regulatory concurrence with these ten recommendations represented an interim rather than final approval. All of these units were still subject to evaluation as part of the baseline risk assessments that will be performed for each of the OU-3 sites upon completion of the planned Phase II RI/FS field activities.

The content of the document was reviewed briefly and the draft letters with sign off blocks for each unit were identified. Pat Wiegand then described the planned sequence for visiting the various sites. Sites 7 and 8 would include visits to several units. As the group prepared to leave for the first site, Joseph Joyce requested that everyone reconvene at the Trailer T2009 conference room after visiting the final site.

The first site visited was No. 15, the Suspended Fuel Tanks. While standing at the approximate location of the two former fuel tanks (Unit 1), Pat Wiegand briefly summarized the unit history and the Phase I RI data. Pat Wiegand pointed out that Site 15 is located across the street from Sites 13 and 14, the Oil Change Area and Battery Acid Site respectively, which are already designated as removal actions. The contaminated soil at Unit 1, Site 15, are similar to fuel contaminated soils present at Site 13. For this reason, it would be feasible to use the same treatment technology (thermal desorption). As a result, this unit may be designated as a time-critical rather than non-time critical removal action, using the information presented in the Site 13 EE/CA to expedite approval and allow a removal action here to proceed concurrent with that site.

At the request of several participants, Unit 2 at Site 15 was also visited and the basis for its designation was explained. After a review of the proposed sampling approach, the number and depths for the Unit 2 samples were described. Bonnie Arthur and Sherrill Beard then suggested that this unit might be a candidate for a limited soil gas survey (for VOCs) following the collection and analysis of soil samples.

The next stop was Site 20, the Hobby Shop. Unit 1, the East Drainage Ditch which was recommended for No Further Action at this time. John Scholfield presented a brief summary of the site history and the Phase I RI data. Pat Wiegand pointed out that this unit was also proposed for No Further Investigation at an April 28, 1994, BCT meeting.

John Scholfield also identified the remaining units at Site 20 and indicated that Units 2 and 3 are already designated as removal action sites. In response to a question on delivery schedules from Juan Jimenez, Tim Latas indicated that the draft EE/CAs would be transmitted to the regulators over the next two weeks. In the course of viewing Units 2 through 4 at Site 20, it was observed that three original oil/water separators had been replaced by a single new unit and a new courtyard runoff collection channel had been constructed between the courtyard fence and the South Drainage Ditch (Unit 2). Ginny Garelick noted that this work had been completed the previous week. Further, at Unit 3, an out of service sign had been installed at the location of the waste oil UST.

The third stop was Unit 1 (Northeast Stained Area) at Site 19, the Aircraft Expeditionary Refueling (ACER) site. Pat Wiegand presented a brief history of the unit and summarized the Phase I RI data. Because the primary contaminants are PAHs, one treatment alternative would be thermal desorption, which has been proposed as the primary treatment method for the existing removal action sites with PAHs, fuels, or waste oil in soil. Bonnie Arthur inquired about any plans to evaluate Aqua Chinon Wash

owing to its close proximity to this unit. Pat Wiegand indicated that the wash area was not part of the current plan for Site 19. When asked about the proposed field activities for Site 25 (Major Drainages) presented in the Revised Draft Work Plan for the Phase II RI/FS, Tim Latas indicated that sampling and analysis of the drainages is to occur at the station boundaries, not on exposed drainage segments within the station. The issue of refining the extent (horizontally and vertically) was also discussed briefly. One option was to have the Remedial Action Contractor (RAC) conduct any additional soil sampling during excavation.

The group briefly reviewed Units 2 through 4. Pat Wiegand again presented a brief history of each unit and summarized the existing analytical data. Joseph Joyce suggested combining Unit 2 (Excavated Area), which is already designated as a removal action with the surrounding Unit 3 (Stained Area Around Excavation). The RAC would then do sampling of Unit 3 during the removal action at Unit 2 to determine whether a removal action or no further action was the appropriate designation for Unit 3. The idea was considered, but questions arose about who would be responsible for developing the necessary performance specifications for such sampling - the Bechtel team or the RAC. Also mentioned were oversight during the work and transmittal of sampling data to Bechtel for use in subsequent risk assessment. These questions were not resolved.

The Group then broke for lunch from 11:45 AM to 12:30 PM.

The first site visited in the afternoon was Unit 3 (Drainage Ditch) at Site 12, the Sludge Drying Beds. Unit 3 is recommended for removal action. After reviewing the site history and the Phase I RI data, the question of remedial alternatives was raised by Ginny Garelick. Tim Latas indicated that thermal desorption was an option, and Pat Wiegand agreed with Ginny Garelick that bioremediation was a viable alternative and one of several included in the recommendations for this unit. Bonnie Arthur and Ginny Garelick also raised the issue of additional sampling to better define extent prior to implementing any kind of treatment. One option put forth was to have the RAC do the sampling as preparatory work for a removal action. This idea then brought up the issue of who would be responsible for preparing the performance specifications.

The group then moved on to Site 8, the DRMO Yard. Units 1 (East Storage Yard) and 4 (PCB Spill Area) are recommended for removal action and Unit 2 (West Storage Yard) is recommended for No Further Action at this time. As the group walked across through Unit 2, Pat Wiegand described the site history, the Phase I RI results and the soil gas survey results. Pat Wiegand noted that while several TRPH concentrations exceed LUFT guidelines, they are surficial samples (0-6 inches) and the TRPH is due to the overlying asphalt. Pat Wiegand also noted that most VOCs and no fuel compounds/constituent were identified in soil gas samples taken at this unit. The location of Unit 3 (Refuse Pile) was also identified and Pat Wiegand indicated that this unit would have been recommended for removal action if the upper 2 feet of soil containing PCBs had not been removed in late 1993. The unit is presently considered unknown and more sampling is necessary to estimate the residual risk.

Units 1 and 4, the unpaved section of the DRMO Yard, were then visited. The location of Unit 4 within the Unit 1 perimeter was pointed out, and the Phase I RI data were summarized. Pat Wiegand pointed out that because the primary contaminant is PCBs, treatment alternatives already identified for the existing removal actions at Site 11 could be utilized here. These units also represented another possibility for a time-critical removal action because much of the information compiled for treatment of PCBs at Site 11 would be applicable here.

The next stop was Site 7, the Drop Tank Drainage Area No. 2, which included units recommended for No Further Action at this time and for removal action. No Further Action is recommended for Unit 2 (Old

East Pavement Edge). A No Further Investigation recommendation for this unit was also agreed upon at the April 28, 1994, BCT meeting. Pat Wiegand pointed out the location of the old pavement edge, described the site history, and summarized the Phase I RI data and soil gas survey results. Besides the very low fuel concentrations identified in the shallow soil, the unit is covered by a reported 12-14 inches of concrete. Sherrill Beard noted that the concrete thickness could be much less, as little as six inches based upon what she observed when holes were cut last year for the soil gas sampling.

Pat Wiegand then described Unit 3 (New East Pavement Edge) at Site 7, which is recommended for removal action. The primary contaminants here are PAHs in the shallow soil, a situation essentially identical to that at Unit 1 (North Pavement Edge), already designated for removal action. This was another case where it would make sense for the RAC to implement the selected treatment alternative at Units 1 and 3 simultaneously. Contamination at this unit is limited to a narrow strip adjacent to the pavement based upon the absence of similar constituents in soil samples from Unit 4 (Drainage Ditch).

The final stop was Unit 2 (Eastern Area) at Site 22, the Tactical Air Fuel Dispensing System (TAFDS). John Scholfield pointed out the approximate unit limits, then noted that although some TFH-diesel and TRPH concentrations at one sample location exceed LUFT guidelines, that sample is located under the concrete apron. Further, while some low VOC soil gas concentrations were reported, these can be tied into the VOC plumes originating at nearby buildings 296 and 297. Based on the site conditions, human and ecological exposure to the underlying soil is essentially non-existent at this time and the reported soil and soil gas concentrations would only become a concern if reuse followed a residential scenario that resulted in demolition of the aircraft parking apron. Joseph Joyce noted that resolving the issue of reuse would greatly simplify many aspects of the RI/FS work at El Toro and indicated he was pursuing a timely decision from Orange County.

The group then returned to Trailer T2009 for a meeting to solicit comments and address any additional questions concerning the sites visited. Bonnie Arthur, Juan Jimenez, and Larry Vitale will review the recommendations and submit their responses with the Revised Draft Work Plan comments on May 22, 1995. A list of action items (summarized on the following page) was then developed. Everyone agreed that visiting individual sites to discuss site specific issues was an effective approach and should be continued in the future. The meeting then adjourned at about 3:30 PM.

Item No.	Action Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date/ Status
1.	Send revised letter covering recommended "Removal Action" units to BCT members.	John Scholfield Pat Wiegand	May 4 (Sent out May 4th)
2.	Correct identified errors in unit narratives.	John Scholfield Pat Wiegand	May 4 Corrected and sent w/Item 1
3.	Prepare site visit and meeting minutes	Pat Wiegand	May 7
4.	Regulators to return completed and signed "No Further Action" and "Removal Action" recommendation forms when the Revised Draft Work Plan comments are submitted	Bonnie Arthur Juan Jimenez Larry Vitale	May 22
5.	<p>Memorialize omitting the RI/FS sampling and analysis descriptions for currently designated removal action units from the Final Work Plan, Phase II RI/FS.</p> <p>Note: Joseph Joyce has indicated that this action cannot be completed until the regulatory review comments on the Revised Draft Work Plan have been received.</p>	Joseph Joyce	?

Issue No.	Issue Bin
1.	Who will be responsible for the preparation of performance specifications that will be used at Removal Action sites.