

MEETING MINUTES

N60258.000685
 NSY LONG BEACH
 SSIC # 5090.3

FILE: 0208

Meeting Subject: RSE & RI/FS Monthly Progress Meeting	Meeting Date: January 6, 1994 Meeting Time: 9:30 AM - 12:30 PM	
Attendees: (*Part Time)		
<u>Navy</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Other</u>
Duane Rollefson C. Anna Ulaszewski Alan Lee Al Hurt LCDR Kevin Barre LT Alex Miclat	Krish Kapur Aklile Gessesse Ed Morelan David Liu Susan Livenick Walter Remsen	John P. Christopher, DTSC Sheryl Lauth, U.S.EPA Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC Clair Best, DTSC Hugh Marley, LARWQCB Allen Winans, DTSC Richard Davidson*, Port of L.A. Betsy M. Foley*, Port of L.A. Phil Tondreault*, Port of L.A.
Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees)		

Description of Discussion/Action Items: (Next Page)

Background:

This meeting served as the monthly progress meeting for CTOs 015,016,026,027 and 028 regarding the RI/FS, RSE and SI activities to be performed at the Naval Station Long Beach (NAVSTA), as well as for the Facilitywide Investigation to be performed at the Long Beach Naval Complex.

Discussion Items to note included:

- Introductions by Alan Lee
- Aklile reviewed the Site 6A Schedule, which was issued today. On January 24 at 1:00 PM a workshop is scheduled to discuss the draft RSE Report and on February 7, final RSE report for submittal.

- David Liu presented background metal findings for 6A:
 - discussed establishment of background metal levels (in soils).
 - Objective: to derive "upper tolerance limit" (UTL) for metals: UTL 95, 95.
 - 95% confidence that 95% of background metals are below the determined levels.
- John Christopher requested that for each sample collected/analyzed for metals, a comparison to UTL should be made. If sample concentration is ">", then "contaminated"; if sample concentration is "<", then "Not Contaminated".
- John Christopher suggested looking at the distribution of data used to establish UTL.
- David Liu presented Risk Assessment Findings:
 - Performed for both potential site residents and workers.
 - Assumed that both potential site residents and workers were exposed to surface and subsurface soil within the excavation areas.

Three pathways were evaluated: ingestion, dermal contact, inhalation; 49 chemicals were found in surface soils and 37 in subsurface soils and evaluated.

Six chemicals were contributing factors to increased cancer: As, Be, Cranium, DB(AH) Anthracene, Arochlor 1260, Benzo(a)pyrene. The assumptions were overly conservative because measurements were made as total chromium and assumed it was all Cr⁺⁶.

- John Christopher stated that oxidized soils typically contain Cr⁺³; he suggested speciation of already-sampled samples, and re-analyze for Cr⁺⁶ (if holding times have not been exceeded).
- Alan Lee on the 24th workshop: Compare (potentially) the results of Cr speciation (at Norwalk).
- Results: Hazard Index for cancer risk for children, and excavation workers are > 1. No "Toxic" type risks were found.
- Alan Lee reviewed Cmdr. Snyder's proposed revised Site 6A schedule and requested comments on schedule by the next project review meeting.

- Aklile presented the draft schedule for Site 6B. Schedule will be finalized following contract award.
 - Coordination needed with POLA to gain access to site, which is currently under lease (contains containers).
- Walter Remsen presented statused schedules for CTOs 015, 016, and 026. Discussed the detailed schedule for each CTO and additional concurrence issues.
- Walter Remsen mentioned that draft plans were submitted on Dec. 17 and are due Jan. 16, 1994 with comments from Agencies and Navy. In addition, CTO-026 schedule on subcontract procurement award date is two weeks behind due to complex analysis required to specific samples and finding the appropriate laboratory. This delay will be caught up by the beginning of the report preparation task.
- Walter requested that sediment sampling concurrence is needed from DTSC, RWQCB and EPA.
- John Christopher and Sheryl Lauth stated that sediment sampling issue can be discussed in next CTO progress review meeting after DTSC and EPA had some time to go over the sampling procedure.
- Walter suggested that the sediment sampling and other related issues should be worked out in workshops (to be scheduled) prior to February 20 meeting.
- David Liu suggested that the subcontracted laboratory might not be able to analyze the volume of samples in the time allowed to do so.
- John Christopher requested that DTSC visit the selected laboratory in order to address the limitations and inspect the laboratory.
- Al Hurt asked who is addressing data validation issues?
- Krish Kapur responded that Bechtel has audited the laboratory currently under contract.
- Kevin Barre asked if the location of sediment sampling points in the harbor could be impacted by the port of Los Angeles Pier 300 project. In addition, the World Port will present the expansion project during the next project review meeting.
- Kevin Barre presented a summary of the Port expansion project and discussed that a review by the reuse commission is required prior to starting a construction activity in any site owned by the Navy.

- Al Hurt asked if there is an impact on the sediment sampling points by the port expansion project. Why do sampling at these points? We need to coordinate with the L.A. and Long Beach Ports in regard to schedule and sampling location issue.
- Ed Morelan discussed upcoming field activity and other related issues. Ed presented the status on Aerial Photograph Review and requested input from DTSC on contingency sampling implementation. In addition, Ed discussed the preliminary schedule for RI/FS field activities prior to startup.
- Walter Remsen suggested that the drilling activity underneath the pier is a subject of a technical memo.
- Ed said contingency sampling locations and other related issues will be discussed in an upcoming workshop or progress meeting.

MEETING MINUTES			
Item No	Description of Discussion/ Actions Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date
1	The workshop for Site 6A is scheduled on January 24 at 1300 at the Bechtel office in Norwalk.	All Attendees	
2	DTSC to determine if permit modification is required after reviewing the RSE report.	Alvaro Gutierrez	