JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP INC.

N60258.000369
NSY LONG BEACH
SSIC # 5090.3

PROJECT NOTE NO.	PROJECT NO.
PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002	01-F249/250-YS

CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE	X	DATE HELD	20 November 1992
	TELECOM		DATE ISSUED	04 December 1992
	OTHER		RECORDED BY	K. Brewer/CH2M HILL
			PLACE	Naval Station (NAVSTA)/LB

SUBJECT

Initial Scoping Meeting
Naval Complex Long Beach
Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Work Plans

PARTICIPANTS: (* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)

A. Muckerman/Code 1823.AM
C. Leadon/Code 1852.CL
K. Brewer/CH2M HILL
B. Wong/CH2M HILL
P. Torrey/CH2M HILL
D. Shelton/CH2M HILL
D. Heinle/CH2M HILL
S. Costa/CH2M HILL
J. Friedman/IT Corp.
LCDR J. L. Snyder/NAVSTA Long Beach
Y. Kim/NAVSTA Long Beach
K. Masden/LBNSY
M. Helvey/NOAA
C. O'Rourke/DTSC
A. Rege/DTSC
J. Zarnoch/DTSC
M. Pumford/RWQCB

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM

A scoping meeting was held on 20 November 1992 to identify key issues for the development of RI/FS Work Plans for the Naval Station (NAVSTA) Long Beach and Naval Shipyard Long Beach (LBNSY). This project note summarizes the discussion.

Introductions

The meeting started at 1015 hours.

The DTSC hydrogeologist and toxicologist could not attend; however, Craig O'Rourke presented some of their comments for discussion. He also taped the meeting so they could listen to the discussion later. Joe Zarnoch will be transitioning out of this project as he moves to another position within DTSC; Anand Rege is the new unit chief and will be working with C. O'Rourke on this project.

Chris Leadon is from SOUTHWESTDIV's technical support group and will be a reviewer for the project. Key Jacobs Team technical staff present were Jeff Friedman (hydrogeology), Dennis Shelton (toxicology), Don Heinle (ecological assessment), and Steve Costa (physical oceanography). Mark Helvey was present representing the Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and Mark Pumford attended for the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Work Plan Approach and Outlines

Kathy Brewer presented and discussed the outlines of the RI/FS Work Plans (attached). The separation of site-specific vs. facility-wide discussions was accepted as a good organizational approach.

PROJECT NOTE NO.	PROJECT NO.
PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002	01-F249/250-YS

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
Jacobs Team	J. Zarnoch questioned the rationale for the Operable Unit (OU) designations. This was the first time that DTSC had seen the OU breakdown. Andrea Muckerman explained that the organization of the OUs is part of the work being conducted under the Site Management Plan. The work plans for the OUs are being prepared simultaneously, but they may be implemented separately to respond to schedule and budget constraints. The Jacobs Team will prepare a white paper explaining the OU designations for distribution at the next meeting.
	The main concern with the current OU designations was grouping Sites 5 and 6 together in OU-2. They were grouped together because of similar real estate issues. However, Site 6 has been identified for possibly accelerated action because of the Pier 300 project, which is scheduled for 1994. Requests have been made for interim use of the site for a detour lane and then permanent use for a railroad. The concern is that including Site 5 in that OU may slow action.
A. Muckerman	A Preliminary Assessment (PA) is currently planned for Site 6B, the former scrapyard west of Site 6. This area is not included in the Pier 300 project. DTSC representatives said that they would like to receive the Site 6B PA when they receive the RI/FS Work Plans. A. Muckerman said that the schedule for the PA has not been determined, but will be discussed at the next meeting.
A. Muckerman	The observational approach was briefly discussed as a method of accelerating cleanup of sites. A. Muckerman had recently attended a training session. There are two keys to this approach: the use of data quality objectives (DQOs) and having a phased approach. DTSC and the RWQCB representatives requested more information on the method. Both organizations expressed a desire to assist in accelerating the schedule.
	<u>Conceptual Model</u>
	Jeff Friedman reviewed the conceptual model for groundwater for the facility. The shallow groundwater in the area is saline and is not used for drinking water, so the main pathway of concern is discharge to the harbor or the channel. Direct contact or volatiles inhalation is also a possible pathway if there are industrial uses of the water.
M. Pumford	One unknown in the conceptual model is the cause of the observed north-northeast gradient and the depression of groundwater levels up to 12 feet below sea level in the eastern portion of the facility. A possibility is that the power plant at that end of Terminal Island may pump shallow groundwater for cooling purposes. Mark Pumford said that he assumed that all of any such cooling water would be from surface water intakes, but would investigate pumping in the area.
J. Friedman P. Torrey	Another question in the groundwater conceptual model is what communication exists between the shallow water-bearing zone (where most of the groundwater contamination has been observed) and the Gaspur Aquifer. The information available from past geotechnical work in the area indicates that there is an upward gradient from the Gaspur Aquifer to the shallow water-bearing zone that could inhibit downward contaminant migration. However, dewatering activities in the drydock area could be influencing migration into the Gaspur Aquifer. J. Snyder said that the LBNSY receives a monthly monitoring report from Woodward-Clyde that may provide information on the operation of the drydock wells. The LBNSY Public Works Department would also have

PROJECT NOTE NO.	PROJECT NO.
PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002	01-F249/250-YS

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
K. Masden	information on the drydock hydrostatic relief wells and sand drains and other monitoring wells at NC Long Beach. A meeting was set for J. Friedman and Peter Torrey to meet with K. Masden and LBNSY Public Works Department on 3 December 1992. The Jacobs Team also requested the most recent computer-assisted design (CAD) drawing of NC Long Beach; K. Masden will follow up on this. M. Pumford expressed a concern about the potential for dense nonaqueous-phase liquids (DNAPLs) such as trichloroethylene (TCE) migrating into the Gaspur Aquifer, particularly at Site 9. The Mole is another place where DNAPLs may be an issue. D. Heinle made the point that solvents are not very toxic to marine organisms and they do not bioaccumulate, so there is likely a low risk from solvents for the ecological receptor and human consumption of marine organisms pathways. The stormwater collection and discharge system could also be influencing shallow groundwater transport to the harbor. Also, stormwater discharges could be a source of contamination to the harbor. Joseph Joyce (619/532-3873) handles stormwater discharge issues for the NAVSTA Long Beach. Beth Krinegen (310/547-7868) handles stormwater issues for the LBNSY. Mark Helvey talked briefly about NOAA data that may be available for use in the RI/FS. Current investigations on polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and DDT in the area is confidential, since there is a lawsuit concerning the potentially responsible party (PRP). D. Heinle asked about the monitoring station at the mouth of the harbor, and M. Helvey said that was not confidential; Ed Long/NOAA should be able to provide that information. It includes sediment concentration levels, toxicity testing, and fish and mussel tissue analysis data. Denise Klimas is the coastal resources coordinator and will be the point of contact for NOAA regarding the NC Long Beach. The question was asked as to whether NOAA will be looking to see if the Naval Complex is causing <u>any</u> impacts to ecological receptors in the harbor, or if they will be looking only for effects greater than "background" for the area. M. Hevley said that that would be D. Klimas's decision.
J. Snyder Jacobs Team	Steve Costa briefly reviewed the types of information he needs to develop a conceptual model for transport of sediments in the harbor, such as records for dredging and typical shipping operations. J. Snyder has information from several years back on sediment depths in the harbor. He said that the harbor is dredged infrequently, with the most recent work being at Piers 6 and 7 and at Pier E, which is used as a turning basin for commercial ships. Ed Leukionowitz (at WESTDIV) coordinated the Pier E dredging; J. Snyder will try to contact him to get the records. A meeting was tentatively scheduled with S. Costa, J. Snyder, and port services for 8 December 1992, 1300 hours, to discuss this information. A. Muckerman said that Patrick McKay with SOUTHWESTDIV (619/532-1159) may also have dredging information; the Jacobs Team will contact him.
J. Snyder	J. Snyder also said that he has some geotechnical reports for NAVSTA Long Beach, and will provide them to the Jacobs Team.

PROJECT NOTE NO.	PROJECT NO.
PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002	01-F249/250-YS

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	Potential ARARs Beneficial uses of groundwater in the area of the NC Long Beach were discussed. The antidegradation policy is incorporated into the Basin Plans. This policy has an exclusion for areas with total dissolved solids (TDS) greater than 3000 mg/l and conductivity exceeding 5000 μS/cm (Resolution No. 88-63). Based on this and what is currently known about water quality in the shallow water-bearing zone and the Gasper Aquifer, they would be excluded from the antidegradation standard. Instead it is likely that the Enclosed Bay and Estuary Plan would apply, since these two zones are tidally influenced. Based on the current understanding of the conceptual model, there is a low probability for contaminant migration to the Silverado Aquifer. Water quality information for the Silverado Aquifer will be examined to determine if the exclusion for high TDS and conductivity would apply.
M. Pumford	M. Pumford will clarify the use of the water quality standards for this project at the next meeting. Also, the RWQCB has prepared a memorandum explaining Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) for federal facilities; M. Pumford will provide A. Muckerman with a copy. Two other contacts for ARARs are Julia Bussey/DTSC (310/590-4930) and Ann Saffell/RWQCB (213/266-7551); they have both worked on other projects in the Long Beach area.
Y. Kim	The potential applicability of RCRA requirements for landfill closure were discussed. Yi Hwa Kim said that a representative from the California Integrated Waste Management Board had visited the facility and said that the Subtitle D requirements would not apply. She will call him to request clarification. M. Pumford said that the RWQCB may consider Chapter 15 requirements for closure. The EPA has generated sediment criteria for five compounds: acenaphthene, dieldrin, endrin, fluoranthene, and phenenathrene. These criteria should be considered for use in the ecological assessment. Besides these criteria, the state will use other cleanup criteria for sediments. M. Pumford said that the RWQCB may use the toxicity criteria for off-shore disposal. John Christopher, the toxicologist for DTSC, will have further input on this.
Jacobs Team	Soil cleanup criteria were discussed. For the Defense Fuel Support Point Fuel Wharf investigation in San Pedro, an area similar to the Mole, a soil cleanup standard of 10 times the water quality standard (conversion from mg/l to mg/kg-dry) for a given contaminant was chosen. K. Brewer suggested that, for areas where the groundwater or surface water pathway is of concern, soil cleanup standards be based on partitioning and dilution calculations. M. Pumford said that any approach that was technically defensible would be considered. It was mentioned that the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subpart S standards for soil cleanup may be applicable; the Jacobs Team will look into these. M. Pumford said that the EPA ambient water quality criteria should be a to-be-considered regulation. The enclosed bay and estuary standards would drive cleanup. In cases where there are several applicable standards for a given cleanup criteria, the position of the RWQCB is that the most stringent criteria would apply.

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002

PROJECT NO. 01-F249/250-YS

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM

Risk Assessment

John Christopher (DTSC) had provided comments on the risk assessment approach. He was concerned that the background locations chosen for the SI were not truly background and were inadequate for use in the risk assessment. Establishment of background concentrations needs to be addressed in the RI/FS Work Plans. He is most concerned about exposures to ecological receptors and subsequent uptake by humans.

Bill Fisher with SOUTHWESTDIV Natural Resources has done a study to determine the types of fish captured and killed during drydock operations. Though no tissue sampling was done, this information may be useful for characterizing potential ecological receptors. The Jacobs Team has this report.

D. Heinle suggested that fish taken from commercial fishing operations could be analyzed to assess regional background tissue concentrations. EPA has a standard fish uptake model that could be used for a conservative risk assessment. The uptake model could be modified based on the information obtained during public interviews for the Community Relations Plan (CRP).

A major consideration for the human health risk assessment is the potential future use of the site. J. Snyder said that his understanding is that the highest and most likely future beneficial use of the area will continue to be port-related activities. D. Shelton said that if that was the case, then an industrial-use scenario should be used for both the screening and baseline risk assessments except in specific areas where other scenarios should be considered (such as the ballfields at Sites 1 and 2). Since there is a high likelihood of continued construction in the area, a trenching scenario should be considered for subsurface soils contamination.

The screening risk assessment criteria will be presented at the next meeting. John Christopher will attend and have an opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of this approach.

Community Relations Plan

Jacobs Team — The schedule for the CRP was briefly discussed. DTSC has not conducted the public interviews yet. Kristin Anderson at DTSC will be responsible for this and C. O'Rourke suggested that the Jacobs Team contact her directly to find out the schedule. He did not feel strongly about keeping the CRP and the RI/FS Work Plans on the same schedule. To gain access to the RWQCB files for preparation of the Administrative Record, the Jacobs Team needs to contact Richard Harris. At DTSC, the Jacobs Team needs to make an appointment with Julie Johnson; this can be done by contacting Craig O'Rourke.

Next Meeting

The next project managers' meeting will be in CH2M HILL's Santa Ana office on Thursday, 17 December 1992, from 900 to 1400 hours. The facility-wide and site-specific conceptual models will be presented. Also, the approach to be used for the screening risk assessment and preliminary ARARs will be discussed. An agenda and

PROJECT NOTE NO.	PROJECT NO.
PN-0249/0250-04 CLE-C01-01F249/250-I2-0002	01-F249/250-YS

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	technical memorandum outlining the issues to be discussed will be prepared by the Jacobs Team and distributed to meeting participants on 14 December 1992. The meeting concluded at 1500 hours. **Nonparticipant Distribution** R. Green/ Code 0232.RG — File - CTO Notebook/PMO K. Tomeo/CH2M HILL — File - PMO M. Nuzum/Code 1813.MN — File - CH2M HILL