

MEETING MINUTES

N68311.000538
 NAVSTA LONG BEACH
 SSIC #5090.3

<p>Meeting Subject:</p> <p>Final RSE Report CTO-027 Site 6A Response to Comments</p>	<p>Meeting Date: April 7, 1994 Telephone Conference Call</p> <p>Meeting Time: 3:00 p.m.</p>															
<p>Attendees: (*Part Time)</p> <table> <tr> <td><u>Navy</u></td> <td><u>Bechtel</u></td> <td><u>Other</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alan Lee, RPM</td> <td>Aklile Gessesse, CTO Lead</td> <td>John Christopher Cal/EPA</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>David Liu</td> <td>Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Sheryl Lauth, EPA Region IX</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Sophie Suda, EPA Region IX</td> </tr> </table>		<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Other</u>	Alan Lee, RPM	Aklile Gessesse, CTO Lead	John Christopher Cal/EPA		David Liu	Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC			Sheryl Lauth, EPA Region IX			Sophie Suda, EPA Region IX
<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Other</u>														
Alan Lee, RPM	Aklile Gessesse, CTO Lead	John Christopher Cal/EPA														
	David Liu	Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC														
		Sheryl Lauth, EPA Region IX														
		Sophie Suda, EPA Region IX														
<p>Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees)</p>																

Description of Discussion/Action Items: (Next Page)

Background: The Risk Assessment Report for CTO 0027 was presented on March 7, 1994, and comments were received on March 28, 1994. The purpose of this telephone conference was to present and discuss the response to these comments. Specifically, to discuss the recalculated risk estimates, the results of the expanded hotspot analysis, and the impact of the results of these new risk valves.

MEETING MINUTES			
Item No	Description of Discussion/ Actions Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date
1	Aklile Gessesse stated the purpose of the conference call and David Liu presented the results.		
2	David Liu stated that the new risk estimates were based on directions given by both agencies in their comments on the final Risk Assessment report and in a telephone conference of April 1, 1994 with the same participants (except Aklile Gessesse and Alan Lee). Directions were to base the risk assessment estimates on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upper 95% confidence limit on the mean measured concentration; • dermal absorption factor of 10% for organics and 1% for inorganics; • oral absorption factor of 100% for organics when converting oral toxicity criteria to dermal. 		
3	David Liu stated that these changes were expected to cause an increase in the calculated risk and they did. New cancer risk estimates ranged from 4.3E-6 for the office worker to 1.0E-5 for the resident adult. The original estimates ranged from 1.1E-6 for the office worker to 4.3E-6 for the resident child.		
4	David Liu informed the conference participants that the hotspot locations (sampling locations at which the risk associated with the highest measured concentration of a chemical is equal to or exceeds a cancer risk of 10^{-6} or a hazard quotient of 1.0) were now identified as locations SB07, SB08, and SB19. This is on the basis of the cancer risk of Aroclor 1254, Aroclor 1260 and hexavalent chromium, and benzo(a)pyrene, respectively. The hazard quotients of all of the chemicals were less than 1.0.		
5	As requested by the agencies, David Liu reported that Bechtel calculated the risk presented by all of the chemicals found in the surface soil samples from the three higher risk locations and summed the cancer risks as well as the hazard quotients. the conference participants were informed the hazard quotients were less than 1.0 for each location and the sum of the cancer risk estimates based on EPA cancer slope factors ranged from 3.6E-6 at SB07 to 8.8E-6 at SB19. When based on a combination of EPA and Cal/EPA cancer slope factors, the summed risk estimates ranged from 9.4E-6 at SB07 to 2.5E-5 at SB08.		
6	The representatives of both agencies agreed that on the basis of those results, no remedial action is necessary for Site 6A.		

7	Sophie Suda noticed the revised hazard quotient for the construction worker was 9.27 and asked David Liu to identify the chemicals responsible for the number.	David Liu	April 15, 1994
8	Aklile Gessesse informed the Navy and the agencies that the revised sections of the final report and response to comments would be submitted to the Navy on April 22, 1994.	Aklile Gessesse	April 22, 1994
9	Alan Lee requested DTSC (Alvaro Gutierrez) to send the approval letter for the final RSE report by April 29, 1994. Alvaro said he agreed to the above date.	Alvaro Gutierrez	April 29, 1994