

PROJECT NOTE NO. PN-0226-04 CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0002	PROJECT NO. 01-F226-NS
--	---------------------------

CONFIRMATION OF:	CONFERENCE TELECOM           X OTHER	DATE HELD   09 September 1992 DATE ISSUED   11 October 1992 RECORDED BY   Peter Torrey/CH2M HILL PLACE           Santa Ana
SUBJECT	Site Management Meeting No. 1 Project Management Meeting Site Management Plan CTO 226, Naval Complex Long Beach	

PARTICIPANTS: (\* DENOTES PART-TIME ATTENDANCE)

B. Wong/CH2M HILL A. Muckerman/Code 1823.AM K. Masden/LBNSY K. Van Houten/NAVSTALB	J. Walsh/CH2M HILL P. Torrey/CH2M HILL Y. Hwa Kim/NAVSTALB
---	--

ACTION REQ'D. BY	ITEM
	<p>This meeting was held between SOUTHWESTDIV, Long Beach Naval Station and Naval Shipyard personnel, and the Jacobs Team to discuss key issues concerning the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) at the Naval Complex (NC) Long Beach. The agenda for the meeting is attached. The meeting commenced at approximately 9:00 am.</p> <p><u>Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Update</u></p> <p>At the Jacobs Team request, A. Muckerman summarized the 4 August 1992 meeting between the Navy and DTSC as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DTSC initially wanted a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Work Plan by 31 December 1992. Because the Navy cannot meet this schedule, DTSC has relaxed the deadline to 30 April 1993. They need the Work Plan then so they can review it by 30 June 1993, which is the end of the State's fiscal year. Once the contract is awarded, the DTSC will meet with the Navy and the contractor and negotiate an aggressive schedule. If the 30 April deadline cannot be met, the DTSC will allow an extension.</li> <li>o DTSC thinks that a full RI/FS is not necessary.</li> <li>o DTSC is committed to meeting with the Navy on a monthly basis during the development of the RI/FS Work Plan.</li> <li>o DTSC plans to meet with the Navy in October 1992 to discuss RI/FS Work Plan schedule.</li> <li>o DTSC is the lead agency; EPA will be a secondary participant in overseeing the remediation process at NC Long Beach.</li> </ul>

PROJECT NOTE NO.

PROJECT NO.

PN-0226-04  
CLE-C01:01F226-I2-0002

01-F226-NS

ACTION  
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

Navy Priorities

The following list of Navy IRP schedule and funding priorities for remediation of NC Long Beach was developed.

- o Threats to human health and the environment
- o RCRA Correction Action requirements listed in permit
- o Funding and costs
- o Real estate transfer of Naval Station Mole
- o Lease of Naval Station Site 5
- o Real estate transfer of Naval Station Site 6
- o Internal land use priorities (currently unknown) at Naval Shipyard
- o Potential effect if facility is listed on National Priorities List (NPL)
- o Naval Station closure under Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
- o Possible Naval Shipyard closure under BRAC 3
- o Underground Storage Tank (UST) issues (hazardous waste) - new Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs)

In addition, the following issues must be considered for their political effect:

- o Interests of the cities and ports
- o Location of the DTSC (close proximity of the Naval Complex draws DTSC's attention)
- o Base closure

The Navy has a screening procedure for receipt of land after base closure. The federal government is first in line; use allocated according to the Homeless Act is second, and the state government is third. Dan Muslin/SOUTHWESTDIV, an environmental planner, knows the screening process.

Base Closure/Land Use Issues

The following base closure/land use issues were identified.

- o Naval Station is closing in fiscal year 1996.

PROJECT NOTE NO.

PROJECT NO.

PN-0226-04  
CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0002

01-F226-NS

ACTION  
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

- o Pilot Expedited Environmental Cleanup Program (PEECP) will draw attention to Naval Station.
- o BRAC funding must be used for Naval Station remediation. (DERA funding is not to be used.)
- o NC Long Beach is high visibility because of PEECP, the cities desire to use the land for port activities; and the facility's location within a large metropolitan area.
- o City of Long Beach has a Land Reuse Commission.
- o DTSC's focal point on base closure issues is David Long in Sacramento.
- o Naval Shipyard will assume some of the Naval Station responsibilities after the Station closes.
- o Naval Shipyard will probably get some of Naval Station property.
- o Real Estate group at SOUTHWESTDIV (Bill Robinson, Lou Misko) handle Long Beach issues.
- o Involvement of the environmental impact statement group and the environmental planning group should be considered.

Operable Units/Corrective Action Management Units

The EPA's definition of an operable unit (OU) according to 40 CFR 300.5 was read by the Jacobs Team. Using this definition and the results of the Site Inspection, the participants developed the following preliminary list of OUs:

Operable Unit	Sites	Criteria
1	1, 2, 3	V,H,C,G,S,B
2	9, 10, 12	C,H
3	7A, 7B	V,H,C
4	11	C,T
5	5, 6A, 6B	C,H,B
Confirmation Study	4, 8, 13	N

The criteria show why sites were group in a particular OU. Criteria:  
V=Vicinity, H=Hydrogeology, C=Contaminants, G=Groundwater,  
S=Soil, B=Base Closure, N=No Further Action,  
T=Threat to Health/Environment

PROJECT NOTE NO.

PROJECT NO.

PN-0226-04  
CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0002

01-F226-NS

ACTION  
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

Phases/Schedule

The primary steps or phases in an RI/FS were discussed next. The following phases were listed:

1. Site Management Plan (SMP)
2. RI/FS Phase 1 Work Plan (includes Work Plan, Community Relations Plan, Administrative Record, Data Management Plan, Health and Safety Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan)
3. RI/FS Phase 1 Implementation
4. RI/FS Phase 2 Work Plan
5. RI/FS Phase 2 Implementation
6. Proposed Plan and Record of Decision (ROD) Work Plan
7. Proposed Plan and ROD Implementation
8. Remedial Design (RD) Work Plan
9. RD Implementation/Pilot Test
10. Remedial Action (RA)
11. Operation and Maintenance/Long Term Monitoring
12. Delisting/Decommissioning

For those sites where no further action (NFA) under CERCLA is recommended, the following steps will be taken:

1. Confirmation Study Work Plan
2. Confirmation Study Implementation
3. Documentation of NFA or Entering of Site into RI/FS at Logical Point

For sites where an interim action is necessary, the following steps were identified:

1. Preparation of Performance Specifications
2. Implementation of Interim Action
3. Documentation of Interim Action

Next, the contracting requirements for a typical work plan were identified. They are as follows:

1. Prepare Request for Proposal (RFP).
2. Issue RFP
3. Prepare Cost Proposal (CP)
4. Fact Finding
5. Revise CP
6. Negotiate CP
7. Prepare Conforming CP
8. Notice-to-Proceed/Work Authorization Form
9. Prepare Work Plan
10. Navy Review
11. Revise Work Plan
12. Agency Review
13. Finalize Work Plan

PROJECT NOTE NO.

PROJECT NO.

PN-0226-04

01-F226-NS

CLE-C01-01F226-I2-0002

ACTION  
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

The contracting requirements for a typical implementation of a work plan were listed:

1. Prepare Request for Proposal (RFP).
2. Issue RFP
3. Prepare Cost Proposal (CP)
4. Fact Finding
5. Revise CP
6. Negotiate CP
7. Prepare Conforming CP
8. Notice-to-Proceed/Work Authorization Form
9. Construction of Decontamination Facility
10. Field Preparation
11. Field Work
12. Laboratory Analysis/Surveying
13. Data Evaluation
14. Draft Report
15. Navy Review
16. Revise Draft Report
17. Agency Review
18. Final Report

Action Items

The following list of action items was developed.

SMP ACTION ITEMS		
WHAT	WHO	WHEN
NC Aerial Photo for Jacobs Team	YiHwa	9/16
Land Use Priorities - NSY	Ken	9/21 Mtg.
Land Use Priorities - NAVSTA	YiHwa	9/21 Mtg.
Funding Priority Letter for Jacobs Team	Andrea	9/16
Agenda for 9/17 Scheduling Meeting	Bryant	9/15
Agenda for 9/21 Land Use Meeting		9/17
Check on CAD Drawings	Peter	9/17
Screening Status of NC Long Beach for Jacobs Team	Andrea	9/17 Mtg.
Background on San Pedro sites	Bryant/Ed Dienzo	9/25
Evaluate and Schedule Facilitator	Andrea	9/17
Example Quarterly Report for CH2M HILL	Ken	9/16

PROJECT NOTE NO.

PROJECT NO.

PN-0226-04

01-F226-NS

CLE-C01-01F226-12-0002

ACTION  
REQ'D. BY

ITEM

SMP ACTION ITEMS		
WHAT	WHO	WHEN
RCRA Corrective Action vs. CERCLA Remedial Action Summary	Bryant	9/15
North Island Interface	Bryant, Andrea	9/15

Schedule for SMP Meetings

Tentative dates and attendees were identified for the remainder of the SMP meetings. See Attachment 2. Please note that the meetings have been postponed until the Notice-to-Proceed is issued by the Navy.

The meeting concluded at approximately 5:00 pm.

Nonattendee Distribution

R. Green/Code 0232.RG  
 M. Nuzum/Code 1813.MN  
 K. Tomeo/CH2M HILL  
 File - CTO Notebook/PMO  
 File - PMO  
 File - CH2M HILL