

MEETING MINUTES

CTO-0026/0078

File: 0208

Meeting Subject: Site 7/CTO26 Technical Memo #4 Workshop	Meeting Date: April 13, 1994 Meeting Time: 8:30 am 03.6	
Attendees: (*Part Time)		
<u>Navy</u> Alan Lee Chris Leadon Bill Fisher C. Anna Ulaszewski Duane Rollefson David Pease Joseph Joyce	<u>Bechtel</u> Krish Kapur Walter Remsen Allan Chartrand Kathy Stevens Patricia Saucedo David Liu Noriko Kawamoto	<u>Other</u> John Christopher, DTSC (SAC) Jim Policini, DTSC (SAC) Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC Michael Lyons, LARWQCB Sheryl Lauth, EPA Region IX Clarence Callahan, EPA Region IX Denise Klimas, NOAA SF Herb Curl, NOAA PMEL Bob Dexter, EVS/NOAA
Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees)		

Description of Discussion/Action Items: (Next Page)

Background:

The purpose of this meeting was to present technical issues contained in Draft Technical Memorandum #4 (Implementation of Final RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan) and discuss comments from reviewing agencies and proposed responses in a workshop forum.

CTO 026 Status, Background, and Procedure for Achieving Consensus

Walter Remsen reviewed the status of CTO 26 and provided a backdrop for the technical discussion. He stressed that the scope of work still attempts to follow the CLEAN I Sampling and Analysis Plan to the extent possible, but that changes recommended by Agencies were substantive and would have cost and schedule impacts. He estimated that the process would be slowed down by about two months. The intent of the forthcoming Technical Memorandum No. 4 and the meeting is to address Agency concerns and refine the Work Plan in order to generate the best possible data for the purpose of risk assessment and evaluation of remedial alternatives.

In addition, Walter Remsen discussed the process whereby consensus could be achieved. This consisted of: (1) orally presenting Bechtel's responses to Agency comments; (2) preparing written responses to individual comments; (3) receiving approval from the Agencies concerning all outstanding issues; and (4) reissuing the Technical Memorandum No. 4, which would then serve as the basis for proceeding with the CTO 26 Scope of Work.

CTO 026 Technical Presentation

Allan Chartrand made a technical presentation designed to cover most or all of the issues raised by the regulators in their comments. This presentation was accompanied by a series of overheads designed to illustrate key technical elements of the program. These included:

- Selection of reference stations and sample replication at reference stations. We discussed the possibility of adopting some of the State's BPTCP stations and following their protocols to obtain valuable reference data.
- How the present program stresses bioavailability of contaminants in sediments and as such constitutes a risk-based approach. This is important because simple bulk sediment chemistry will not necessarily be the driving force for determining site sediment toxicity.
- The overall decision process for the entire project, including how each type of data would be triggered and incorporated into the risk assessment. This included how chemistry, bioaccumulation, and bioassay data "triggered" potential subsequent action with mussels (water column evaluation) and/or benthic community analysis. It also included the issue of how the fish sampling and analysis would fit into the overall RI/FS and risk assessment.
- How the sampling and analysis of fish tissue could most effectively be conducted and used to make risk management decisions relating to both human health and ecological risk. We discussed the possibility that human consumption of fish, as reported in the risk assessment, would potentially determine whether additional species of fish need to be analyzed.
- Decision/performance criteria used in chemical and biological testing used to make decisions in the risk assessment. Because bioassays in sediment are so important in determining bioavailability and toxicity, this issue will determine to a large extent what constitutes a "hit" (evidence of toxicity), which in turn could influence areas to be considered for remedial alternatives.
- "Triggers" from specific analyses which could generate subsequent data gathering and characterization. This discussion attempted to resolve the significance of conflicting results from chemistry, bioaccumulation, and bioassay data.
- Selection of species and toxicological endpoints to be used in bioassay testing. Both chronic and acute toxicology will be performed using both lethal and sublethal endpoints (e.g., growth and/or abnormality).
- How the results of the risk assessment could feed into the evaluation of remedial alternatives. If specific areas are found to be highly toxic, there is a possibility that expedited remedial action (e.g., hot spot removal) could be pursued as an alternative approach to remediation of the site.
- Sampling and analysis methods for chemistry, and performance criteria for chemical data. This is important because it will help identify compounds and locations of potential concern, detailed in the risk assessment, of importance to CTO 26 sediments.

The presentation was designed to cover the key points and elicit discussion on key issues.

MEETING MINUTES			
Item No	Description of Discussion/ Actions Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date
1	The next meeting is scheduled for May 12, 1994 to discuss implementation of the proposed changes in scope.	All	5/12
2	Create comment and response table, modify appropriate portions of text, and send to participants for review.	Remsen/ Chartrand	4/22
3	Respond to resolution of comments.	All	5/6
4	Modify Technical Memorandum No. 4.	Remsen/ Chartrand	-
5	Review workshop minutes by 5/9. No comment within this period will be taken as approval.	All	5/9