

Raykowski, Carol

From: Raykowski, Carol
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2002 11:30 AM
To: 'Ana Veloz-Townsend (E-mail)'; 'Christine Houston (E-mail)'; Dienzo, Ed (SWDIV); Valenzia, Jennifer (SWDIV); 'John Hill (E-mail)'; 'Kim Foreman (E-mail)'; 'Martin Hausladen (E-mail)'; 'Michelle Gallice Sondrup (E-mail)'; 'Sue Hakim (E-mail)'; 'Tom Johnson (E-mail)'
Cc: Macchiarella, Thomas (SWDIV); Raykowski, Carol
Subject: LBNC BCT Meeting, January 23, 2002

Attached is the agenda for the January 23, 2002 meeting and draft minutes from the November 28, 2001 meeting for your approval. Approved final minutes from the October meeting is also attached for your convenience. See you there.

Jan23 Agenda_.doc

Draft Min - 01Nov.doc

Final Min - 01Oct.doc

Carol Raykowski

Community Relations Specialist
Navy CLEAN Program
Bechtel National, Inc.
✉ cjraykow@bechtel.com
☎ 619/744-3031

**Long Beach Naval Complex
BRAC Cleanup Team Meeting**

**Port of Long Beach
925 Harbor Plaza
Sixth Floor Staff Conference Room
562-590-4160
Wednesday, 23 January 2002
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM**

- I. Introductory Remarks**
- II. Reuse and Disposal**
 - A. Property Conveyance
 - B. POLB Projects Update
- III. Installation Restoration Program**
 - A. Site Management Plan
 - B. Sites 1 and 2 RA/O&M
 - C. Site 14
 - D. Sites 9, 12, and 13 PP
 - E. Sites 8, 10, and 11 PP
 - F. Site 7 Draft FS, ARARs, Tech Memo #1
 - G. Site 16 ESI Preparations
- IV. Compliance Program**
 - A. Building 101 MTBE Plume
 - B. TSDFs
- V. Community Relations**
 - A. Upcoming Meetings
- VI. Finalize Meeting Minutes from 28 November 2001 Meeting**
- VII. Next Meeting**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) Meeting

MEETING DATE: 28 November 2001

ACTIVITY: Long Beach Naval Complex (LBNC) and Associated Housing

ATTENDEES: Thomas Macchiarella (SWDIV) Sue Hakim (DTSC)
Jennifer Valenzia (SWDIV) Ana Veloz-Townsend (RWQCB)
Christine Houston (POLB) Carol Raykowski (BNI)
Martin Hausladen (EPA) Kimberly Merriman (BNI)

LOCATION: Port of Long Beach (POLB) Conference Room, Long Beach, CA

PURPOSE: To discuss the current status of the ongoing Compliance Program, Installation Restoration Program, and other issues related to the cleanup and reuse of LBNC

DISCUSSION:

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Macchiarella welcomed everyone and introduced the BCT members.

II. Reuse and Disposal

A. Property Conveyance

Mr. Macchiarella reported on the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) which will complete 100 percent of property transfer.

- The Navy prepared the point paper and request for approval to send to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (DASN) for authorization to proceed with the early property transfer.
- The Draft Site-Specific Environmental Baseline Survey (SSEBS) will be sent to the agencies by the end of December 2001. The Final Draft SSEBS will be prepared by March 2002.
- Ms. Wendy Thornton will have a list of major milestones for BCT members soon.
- The Draft FOSET will be completed and sent mid-February 2002 with the signing of the FOSET by mid-May 2002.
- The Draft Land Use Covenant (LUC) will be ready by mid-April 2002, and once signed by the Navy, the Final LUC will be sent to DTSC (at the time of property transfer) by the end of August 2002. The property will transfer after the Draft Final LUC around September 2002.
- The DASN will send the CDR package to the governor in mid-July 2002.

Ms Houston asked if there would be a difference in this deed because of the early transfer. Mr. Hausladen suggested that the only difference would be the covenant deferral and any outstanding cleanup actions. Mr. Macchiarella suggested that there may be more complexities than are obvious and will check with Mr. John Hill at the RAB meeting later that night.

Mr. Macchiarella said that LBNC is known as a "red star" among Captains and Admirals which means that in fiscal year 2002, the base is getting a lot of attention to make sure nothing stands in the way of 100 percent transfer. Mr. Hausladen asked if funding would still continue once the transfer is completed. Mr. Macchiarella stated that monitoring at LBNC would continue after the transfers were complete and the environmental budget is still on the radar through 2004.

B. POLB Projects Update

Ms. Houston commented on the Mole construction progress.

- The track was laid on the north-south portion of the Mole, and the west basin area is progressing well. The Alameda Corridor Rail Project is expected to be up and running in 2003.
- A majority of the gate complex on Pier E is constructed.

She suggested arranging a tour of the Mole after the next BCT meeting (January 2002).

III. Installation Restoration (IR) Program

A. Site Management Plan (SMP)

Ms. Valenzia stated that the second quarter closes on December 15, 2001, and the quarterly progress report would be submitted to BCT members the second week of January 2002.

B. Sites 1 and 2 Remedial Action

Mr. Macchiarella stated that the air sparging/soil vapor extraction system at Sites 1 and 2 is in operation, although no data have been received. Quarterly monitoring will begin in January 2002. The debris removal report that was scheduled for the end of December 2001 is in the draft phase and ready for Navy review (only minor changes have been incorporated).

The pickup of the radioactive waste containers was scheduled for December 15, however the Army Corps of Engineers informed Mr. Ed Dienzo that the targeted disposal location has gone bankrupt and a new disposal location is being sought.

Ms. Houston said that she would like to see all of the asphalt in that area removed prior to the rainy season, as it could create a mosquito breeding ground. She suggested taking the debris to the crusher pile. Mr. Macchiarella hopes to have the debris removal done in mid-January 2002.

C. Site 14 Field Work

Mr. Macchiarella reported that the monitoring wells at Site 14 are to be constructed in May 2002. This was pushed back from April 2002. The hydrogen release compound (HRC) injection will begin once the wells are installed. HydroPunch™ was suggested prior the well installation; however, BCT members agreed that it would be more practical to inject the HRC when the wells are installed. Mr. Macchiarella stated that Foster Wheeler will gather additional data at Site 14 after the initiation of the HRC injections. Foster Wheeler will place glass wool into the monitoring wells to gather microbes for bacteria studies. The Navy will monitor for bacteria during the first phase.

D. Sites 9, 12, and 13 Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS) and

E. Sites 8, 10, and 11 Draft Final FS

Ms. Valenzia reported that the Preliminary Draft Proposed Plan (PP) for Sites 9, 12, and 13 is being held back while the Navy further investigates the following:

1. The Navy recently found that a few of the parcels were in the reversionary area, and a portion of the remedy proposed for all of the Sites 9, 12, 13, and 8, 10, and 11, includes institutional controls. Sites 12 and 13 and part of Site 11, are included in the reversionary parcels and are technically not owned by the Navy. Institutional controls can be implemented, but cannot be called deed restrictions. The Navy has discussed this issue with the POLB, who is willing to enter into a land use covenant (LUC) with the state of California, provided it is the same LUC used on the other sites.
2. At Site 12, the proposed remedy for the soil at area of concern 1 is a cap. Some of the cut-and-fill plans have been changed by the POLB, so the Navy is reinvestigating whether a cap is the best alternative for Site 12. The Navy is not proposing another alternative, and as long as no other alternative is suggested, the Final FS will remain as written and the PP will commence as scheduled. Ms. Valenzia hopes to have the Preliminary Draft PP issued in mid-December 2001.

Ms. Valenzia stated that the Draft Final PP for Sites 8, 10, and 11 is complete and was sent to the BCT members (both by regular mail and e-mail) for review. She is waiting for their comments and said that, as far as the deed restrictions for Site 11, the Navy's mapping department is in the process of superimposing the reversionary parcel on the IR site map so that the boundaries will be accurate. She said Site 11 will all be a LUC, but it's unsure whether or not it can be called a deed restriction because the Navy owns a portion and the POLB owns a portion of the site. The POLB and the Navy need to add land use restrictions to their deed. Consequently, a separate LUC will be recorded between POLB and DTSC. This will be worked out between the attorneys, and the DTSC will have the opportunity to review the language before it goes into the PP.

To clarify, Mr. Macchiarella stated when the Navy wants to restrict property that is transferred to another owner (in this case, the POLB), institutional controls (LUCs or restrictions) are written in the deed prior to the transfer. However, if the restricted item is

already a part of the property, the new owner (POLB) has the option to work with DTSC on a LUC. Ms. Houston said that this is not a technical issue; the only difference is that there will be a separate LUC with the Navy for Sites 9 and part of Site 11 and a LUC with the POLB on Site 12 and 13 part of Site 11.

F. Site 7 Draft FS, Technical Memo #1

Mr. Macchiarella said all the agencies have responded and he has responses to comments for the Draft Final Technical Memo (Tech Memo). A second letter from DTSC and RWQCB stated acceptance, provided that California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) approves the Navy's response to the comments made by CDFG. The Navy is currently working on those responses, but Mr. Macchiarella doesn't feel they will create any changes to the Tech Memo. The most significant request from CDFG is for the Navy to run effects-range median quotients (ERMQs), which is a literature-based value of aquatic sedimentation. CDFG requested that the Navy compare the ERMQs to the sediment objective values, since other Naval complexes have used the same method. However, Mr. Macchiarella said the problem with LBNC using ERMQs is that those other complexes use ERMQs at a screening level. LBNC is past the screening level, so it is not appropriate to use the ERMQ method.

Ms Hakim stated that the CDFG would like to see the ERMQ comparison at LBNC. Ms. Houston reiterated that the ERMQ method is not feasible or applicable to LBNC. Mr. Macchiarella stated that Site 7 may not have the funding to do the full ERMQ calculation and comparison, but the Navy will provide information and data on this topic to the CDFG.

Mr. Macchiarella said the revised applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) information for the FS is not moving along as quickly as first thought. He said that in the past year, the Navy has generated a new ARARs model; therefore the ARARs information had to fit the new model. He said that the original comments have been addressed and thoroughly reviewed and conforms to the new model. The ARARs and the Tech Memo will be in the upcoming Draft Final FS for Site 7.

Ms. Veloz-Townsend wanted to know if there was going to be a new set of responses to comments. Mr. Macchiarella plans to respond to the most recent letters from each of the agencies. According to the SMP schedule, the Draft Final FS will be out January 29, 2002, the Final FS in April 2002, and the PP scheduled for Summer 2002 (then the ROD).

G. Site 16 Extended Site Investigation (ESI) Preparations

Ms. Valenzia reported that the Scope of Work was prepared and sent to the contractors. The contractors are currently preparing their bids; however, work at Site 16 is halted until funding is received. Mr. Macchiarella confirmed that although new fiscal year funding usually arrives in November, it has not yet been received.

Ms. Houston asked if HydroPunch™ sampling is expected at Site 16 because paving has already begun. Ms. Valenzia said that they were hoping to collect HydroPunch™ samples

before terminals and groundwater monitoring wells were installed, but there is currently no funding.

IV. Compliance Program

A. Building 101 Methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) Plume

Ms. Valenzia reported that as with Site 16, the Scope of Work for Building 101 has been prepared and delivered to the contractor, the contractor has prepared the bid, but the funding has not been approved. Mr. Macchiarella said that the MTBE plume area has been excavated all the way up to the edge of Building 101 and much of the source material has been removed.

B. Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs)

Mr. Macchiarella stated that Mr. Romero at DTSC informed Mr. Dienzo that he will send a letter to the Navy stating that the closure certification for Building 118 cannot be issued due to elevated levels of hexavalent chromium in groundwater. Ms. Hakim confirmed Mr. Romero's statement. Mr. Macchiarella said he felt that this issue had previously been raised several times, agreed upon, and was closed. He also felt the criteria were clear, and said there hasn't been any new groundwater data since. Ms. Veloz-Townsend will check on the highest allowable concentration levels for hexavalent chromium for Ocean Plan background criteria. There is a possibility that the hexavalent chromium came from another source, but the Navy will have to show proof to DTSC. Ms. Hakim said that Building 314 also needs attention due to the elevated levels of arsenic in the soil despite the removal of the hotspots.

V. Community Relations

A RAB meeting will be held later in the evening (November 28, 2001). Election of the new Community Co-Chair is scheduled. The Long Beach Gas Company will be undergoing renovation next year, and will not be available for RAB meetings. The January 2002 RAB and public meetings will be important and should be held at a familiar location, so Mr. Tom Johnson has offered the POLB Administration Building. An alternate meeting location will be announced at that time. This evening's RAB meeting will discuss and vote on the issue of moving the RAB meetings from bi-monthly to quarterly. The Technical Assistance for Public Participation process which allows RABs to receive funding from the Navy for technical consultants will also be discussed. Updates and upcoming milestones will also be presented.

VI. Finalize Meeting Minutes from 25 October 2001 BCT Meeting

Ms. Hakim identified minor changes in the draft minutes from the October 25, 2001 meeting that were corrected in the final minutes.

VII. Next Meeting

The next LBNC BCT meeting will be January 23, 2002, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The meeting place was not determined.

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) Meeting

MEETING DATE: 25 October 2001

ACTIVITY: Long Beach Naval Complex (LBNC) and Associated Housing

ATTENDEES: Thomas Macchiarella (SWDIV) Christine Houston (POLB)
Jennifer Valenzia (SWDIV) Tom Johnson (POLB)
John Hill (SWDIV) via conference call Ana Veloz-Townsend (RWQCB)
Martin Hausladen (EPA) Carol Raykowski (BNI)
Sue Hakim (DTSC) Steve Glynn (BNI)

LOCATION: Port of Long Beach (POLB) Conference Room, Long Beach, CA

PURPOSE: To discuss the current status of the ongoing Compliance Program, Installation Restoration Program, and other issues related to the cleanup and reuse of LBNC

DISCUSSION:

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Macchiarella welcomed everyone, tied in Mr. Hill by conference call, and introduced the BCT members.

II. Reuse and Disposal

A. *Property Conveyance*

Mr. Hill reported that Ms. Wendy Thornton will be the project lead for the early transfer and is developing the schedule. He explained that SWDIV has prepared the point paper and request for approval to send to the Secretary of the Navy for authority to proceed with the early transfer. He said that another Site-Specific Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) will be produced covering Sites 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 16, in addition to the submerged land in the harbor that extends about 100 feet out, as well as land under any piers that have not yet been demolished. The EBS does not need to cover the fuel depot or associated Pier 12 because they are not BRAC property.

Mr. Hill hopes to have the early transfer documents in working draft form in approximately two months and will see that Ms. Thornton provides a schedule to the BCT members. He will have the schedule to the BCT as soon as possible, and expects that transfer will occur no later than 30 September 2002. Another land use covenant (LUC) may be prepared and there will be more definite, specific interim restrictions as a result of the ongoing remedial and removal actions during the deferral period.

Ms. Hakim said that if there are any sites that have not reached the Record of Decision (ROD) stage, they cannot be approved for early transfer and should, therefore, be taken out of the early transfer parcel. She explained that Mr. John Scandura told her that this is State policy. She further explained that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is not able to approve transfer of any property without having an approved remedy. Mr. Hill recommended a conference call with the DTSC team, Navy counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), and POLB members as soon as possible to discuss this matter further, as this would undercut the reason for early transfers. Mr. Hill will research the early transfer guidance put together by the State as well as Navy policies in order to facilitate agreement on what this early transfer should and should not cover. Ms. Hakim will call Mr. Hill to set up the meeting. Mr. Hill stated that this transfer covers property not yet addressed in a ROD and would be the final BRAC property transfer for all of Long Beach. He then thanked everyone on the success of the last conveyance.

Mr. Hill stated that he believes the deed for the Port of Los Angeles as well as the latest deed for POLB have both been executed. Ms. Houston clarified the process by stating that the POLB deed went to the board for the first reading (resolution) last Monday and will go for the next reading this coming Monday. There is a 30-day cooling off period required by the City charter and the POLB deed should be executed in about five weeks. The POLB will sign and give the deed to a title company who will record it. At the end of the five weeks, the State will have their copy.

Ms. Hakim asked Mr. Johnson to elaborate on ordnance at Site 7 as mentioned in the July meeting minutes. She wanted to know if the POLB actually surveyed for unexploded ordnance (UXO) and found nothing. Ms. Houston clarified that it was Site 3 that was mentioned where a geophysical survey was performed and a few anomalies were found. The anomalies turned out to be a small amount of concrete, but no ordnance. Ms. Hakim then asked about UXO surveying during the POLB's dredging projects. Mr. Macchiarella stated that, from the Navy's prospective, they have followed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process and that during that process it was determined that there is no reason to perform a UXO study at Site 7. He said that this determination comes from reviewing records, practices, and information from previous dredging events. The remedial investigation (RI) discussed this in detail and concluded that there was no need to do further investigation. Ms. Houston added that for all the millions of cubic yards that were dredged up, only one munitions shell was found. This supports the conclusions of the RI. Mr. Johnson stated that specific studies for ordnance would not be performed based on the Navy's analysis and, based on experience, he doesn't see any reason to perform such studies.

B. POLB Projects Update

Mr. Johnson stated that Site 14 is being backfilled and is getting close to grade. There were no other POLB projects for discussion.

III. Installation Restoration (IR) Program

A. Site Management Plan (SMP)

Ms. Valenzia stated that the quarterly progress report for document activities between June 16 and September 15 was mailed to everyone on October 10, 2001. This report shows that the SMP will include a schedule showing what has been accomplished and what is expected to happen. She said the next quarterly progress report would be available in January 2002.

B. Sites 1 and 2 Remedial Action

Mr. Macchiarella stated that the Debris Removal Report for Sites 1 and 2 would be sent out within a few days and that pickup of the radioactive waste containers would take place in mid-November. The reason this is taking so long is that there is a state agency on the east coast who is involved at the receiving end of the waste and the Navy had to contract with Army Corps of Engineers who had to contact with their subcontractor who had to contract with this end receiver, then obtain the regulatory buy off. The air sparging (AS)/soil vapor extraction (SVE) system at Sites 1 and 2 is in the operation and maintenance phase and going well. He hopes to have the first results back within the next few months.

It was noticed by those who took the site tour that the AS/SVE system was very loud. Mr. Macchiarella will have noise level measurements conducted to make sure the birds are not being disturbed. It was noted that the trees are looking better than in the past and a sprinkler system is being put in place.

C. Site 14 Field Work

Mr. Macchiarella reported that the Draft Soil Removal Report was sent to the BCT on September 28 and the Navy is expecting the (California) Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) comments around November 9. DTSC has already sent their comments. The work plan for injection of hydrogen release compound (HRC) was submitted to the RWQCB in August and comments have been received. Mr. Macchiarella is currently waiting for the response to comments to be developed.

Ms. Veloz-Townsend stated that RWQCB is drafting a general permit which will be out for a 45-day public review period. At that point, approval of the permit will be placed on the RWQCB board meeting agenda. She believes the permit approval has been placed on the November-December board meeting agenda and if the permit is approved at this meeting, it will be issued by the end of 2001. The general permit will cover injecting different types of materials. The other alternative is for her to write site-specific permit which would take an additional 45 days. If she feels it's going to take longer than December to issue the general permit, then she will begin writing her own permit.

Ms. Veloz-Townsend elaborated that the permit doesn't specify anything about the well placement, rather it states a timeframe and provides monitoring requirements, but nothing major. It is mainly just a step to prevent people from injecting unsuitable materials. Ms. Houston added that POLB is waiting to issue the paving contract. Ms. Veloz-Townsend stated that not much will be happening at Site 14 for at least a few months.

Ms. Hakim asked whether, in the meantime, bacteria studies should take place. Ms. Veloz-Townsend answered that studies would be performed once injection begins. The Navy would monitor for bacteria at the same time but not before because they have to raise the grade.

D. Sites 9, 12 and 13 Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS) and

E. Sites 8, 10, and 11 Draft Final FS

Ms. Valenzia congratulated everyone for completing the Draft Final FS for Sites 9, 12, and 13. She stated that the FS has been approved and that the Proposed Plan (PP) for Sites 9, 12, and 13 is currently being prepared. She expects to have a draft copy of the PP to BCT members by mid-November.

Ms. Valenzia stated that the FS for Sites 8, 10, and 11 is complete and the Draft PP has been reviewed by the BCT members and she has received most of their comments. Mr. Hausladen asked if she would use DTSC's suggestions from the Sites 8, 10, and 11 PP for Sites 9, 12, and 13 as well. Ms. Valenzia responded that there would not be enough time to have the Draft Final PP to use as an example. However, she said those who are working on the PP for Sites 9, 12, and 13 are aware of the general comments.

Ms. Hakim asked if the Navy would be making a decision on the preferred remedy because there are four options. She said they have already evaluated all the options and that the PP would propose one preferred remedy. She suggested that before they issue a draft, the members meet to discuss Sites 9, 12, and 13 to come to an agreement. Mr. Macchiarella stated that it would better to meet after the agencies receive the draft PP. Ms. Valenzia added that there are no human health risks with which to contend at Sites 9, 12, and 13. Risk assessment results were performed for an industrial scenario based on the proposed reuse as a container terminal. With Sites 9, 12 and 13 the Navy wants to make sure that certain contaminants don't reach the SVE wells or discharge to the bay at concentrations above Ocean Plan criteria. These three sites are therefore relatively straight forward. There is one small area at Site 12 where there is a soil issue and capping is an alternative. The POLB is planning to pave over this portion of Site 12.

Mr. Hausladen asked if this area would be brought up to the same grade as the rest of the sites. Ms. Houston interjected that this is on Pier E and is already a pretty high grade. The POLB has gotten rid of most of the potential contamination at Site 12 already because they ended up reducing the grade by three feet in a lot of places. The site will mostly be a parking lot for the longshore workers.

Ms. Hakim stated she is working with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) people in Sacramento to obtain a Notice of Exemption for Sites 8, 10 and 11. This is supposed to be done as the same time as the PP. LBNC is not qualified for a CEQA exemption, but because the remedy consists only of institutional controls and groundwater monitoring and has been accepted, the exemption might go through. DTSC will check with California Department of Fish and Game to see if representatives toured the site and can validate that no endangered species are present.

There may also be a Negative Declaration for Sites 9, 12, and 13. Mr. Macchiarella asked if DTSC does not determine a Negative Declaration following CEQA, would this cause any problems for the IR program? Ms. Hakim stated that there is a long list of preparations and calculations to go through and that the schedule might be impacted. DTSC doesn't have a schedule from the CEQA people but there could possibly be delays. DTSC won't proceed to the next stage until public comments are received.

Ms. Valenzia stated that the Final PP for Sites 8, 10 and 11 should be mailed around January 15. The draft final will go out November 15 with a Public Meeting being held during late January or early February.

Because monitored natural attenuation will be performed at Site 9, Ms. Veloz-Townsend wanted to know if the remedy would be evaluated after five years. At that time, a decision will be made. Mr. Macchiarella stated that a site cannot be closed prior to five years. He said that his research shows that site closeout is not well defined in the CERCLA process. Mr. Hausladen added that if we still see concentrations after five years at levels similar to current concentrations, then action would need to be taken because the current remedy (in this case, attenuation) is not working. In this case, the ROD would have to be amended. Ms. Hakim asked if we want to wait that long. Ms. Houston responded that if we have a remedy in place it will be protective of human health. Mr. Hausladen stated that natural attenuation means that concentrations should go down. If the concentrations stay the same or go up, then natural attenuation isn't working and another risk assessment could be done.

Ms. Hakim stated she would rather put the money in enhancement and closure than five-year quarterly reviews. Mr. Macchiarella said that once the remedy is selected, then the monitoring plan will be designed. Ms. Houston suggested DTSC wait to see what happens with Site 14 first because there is some very tough stratigraphy at that site. Ms. Veloz-Townsend agreed that there are similar compounds at Site 9 as at Site 14 and if HRC is working for Site 14, then it will work for Site 9. Mr. Hausladen stated that U.S. EPA already has five-year reviews coming in and is taking a very hard look at them. Ms. Hakim said DTSC has a new guidance document on five-year reviews. Mr. Macchiarella said they are going to get all the sites on the same five-year schedule, so by the year 2004, all sites will be included in the five-year review document even if the remedy at the sites has only been up and running for two years.

F. Site 7 Draft FS, Technical Memo #1

Mr. Macchiarella said he has comments on the Draft FS for Site 7 from U.S. EPA, DTSC, and California Department of Fish and Game, and expects to receive comments from RWQCB. It was agreed by everyone present that mail is too slow so they will begin sending comments via e-mail. Mr. Macchiarella stated that e-mailing also saves a step in re-entering the text into a response to comments format.

Ms. Hakim stated that a meeting is being planned with California Department of Fish and Game to get them to come on board with the regulatory agencies. California Department of Fish and Game would like to arrange a site visit and has been given Mr. Johnson's

phone number at POLB. Mr. Macchiarella volunteered to help put together information packets for Site 7 to aid with the meeting.

Mr. Macchiarella said the revised ARARs information for the FS will be sent out within the next couple of weeks. He noted that the FS responds to everyone's comments/changes. Because it has been so long since the draft version, Ms. Veloz-Townsend suggested there be a draft final, perhaps insert pages only. Mr. Macchiarella said he will check the schedule and budget to see if that is feasible. He said he would like to get Site 7 rolling in the IR program because it has been in the FS process for four years. Mr. Hausladen cautioned that U.S. EPA may not sign off if there are new developments or if they are not satisfied with the FS.

Ms. Hakim informed everyone that Gary Brown, the attorney at DTSC, has been replaced by Bob Elliott in Sacramento.

G. Site 16

Ms. Valenzia reported that the Scope of Work has been defined and that the Navy hopes to receive the funding for the new Site 16 within the next few weeks. The proposed Scope of Work is to perform an expanded site inspection; collect soil and groundwater samples; doing a risk assessment; perform a removal action if necessary; and close the site. Site 16 is approximately a half acre in size and soil removal has already taken place at the site. The immediate scope stops at the risk assessment, so samples will have to be collected, and a report will need to be written to initiate the next phase.

Mr. Macchiarella stated that there are no groundwater data available yet on Site 16. Ms. Houston stated that the only groundwater samples taken to date were grab samples from an excavation. It is estimated that the area of the site is outside of the immediate footprint of the Plating Shop.

IV. Compliance Program

A. Building 816

Building 816 is closed and can be removed from the agenda.

B. Building 101 MTBE Plume

Ms. Valenzia stated that she would be taking over this project from Ms. Michelle Gallice-Sondrup. The Navy is planning to collect additional samples in the MTBE plume area and is still waiting to obtain funding in order to begin the work. HydroPunch™ sampling is planned as well as reassessing the risk before installing monitoring wells. This cannot be done until after the POLB has finished their terminal construction, in the area of Building 101.

Funding is based on the current terminal construction schedule and if the funding is received within the next few weeks, work will begin on the work plans. Everyone can then expect to receive a draft work plan in mid-December, but this could possibly be postponed until January 2002. The terminal is scheduled to open in July 2002.

C. Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs)

Mr. Macchiarella stated that Mr. Dienzo reported that the Closure Certification for Building 314 was sent to the agencies on September 26 and responses are expected October 26.

He noted that Mr. Dienzo sent the Groundwater Investigation Report for Building 118 to Mr. Romero in May but no response has been received. Ms. Hakim said she will talk to Mr. Romero regarding hot spots and background concentrations of arsenic before he submits his comments in order to receive comments that include agreements made in previous discussions. Mr. Macchiarella stated that he felt it was clear that both Building 314 and Building 118, RCRA-type site closures, were finished and that only the paperwork needed to be completed.

V. Community Relations

A RAB meeting was held the previous evening, October 24. Election of the new Community Co-Chair was postponed until the next meeting which will be held November 28, 2001, in order to get back on the bi-monthly schedule. If a need can be identified, another fact sheet could be developed. This is considered unlikely.

Ms. Hakim asked what happened to the archeological artifacts and why were historical buildings mentioned in the Environmental Impact Report torn down? Ms. Houston stated that these buildings were eligible but were not listed on the National Registry of Historical Places. She reported that there were no historical buildings or structures on the site, and since the land was not built until the 1930s, there were probably no artifacts.

VI. Finalize Meeting Minutes from 26 July 2001 Meeting

Ms. Hakim identified two minor changes in the draft minutes from the July 26, 2001 meeting which were corrected in the final version of the minutes.

VII. Next Meeting

The next LBNC BCT meeting will be November 28, 2001, 2:00 p.m. at the POLB.



BECHTEL NATIONAL INC.

CLEAN II TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

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

Document Control No. CTO-0177/0214

File Code: 0208

TO: Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
Mr. Richard Selby, Code 02R1
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132-5190

DATE: January 14, 2002
CTO #: 0177
LOCATION: Long Beach Naval Complex

FROM: Thurman L. Heironimus, Project Manager

DESCRIPTION: Draft Long Beach BCT Meeting Minutes for November 28, 2001 and
Agenda for January 23, 2002, and Final Minutes for October 25, 2001 Meeting.
Meeting Sent Via E-mail on January 07, 2002 to LBNC BCT Members

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

VERSION: Draft REVISION #: 0
(e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final, etc.)

ADMIN RECORD: Yes X No Category Confidential
(PM to Identify)

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: N/A ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 1/14/02

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED: 0/7C/3E

COPIES TO (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and No. of Copies):

Table with 3 columns: SWDIV, BECHTEL, OTHER (Distribution done by Bechtel). Lists names and copy counts for various personnel.

- O - Original Transmittal Sheet
C - Copy Transmittal Sheet
E - Enclosure

Date/Time Received