

CCN: CTO-0015/0152
CTO-0016/0155
CTO-0026/0094
CTO-0043/0031

N60258.000788
NSY LONG BEACH
F SSI #5090.3

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: MONTHLY STATUS MEETING CTO-015, 016, 026 (RI/FS) & 043 (SI)	Meeting Date: May 12, 1994 Meeting Time: 0930
Attendees: (*Part Time)	
<u>Navy</u> Alan Lee Chris Leadon Tom Hare, ROICC Duane Rollefson David Pease Randy Holman(BRAC) Joseph Joyce	<u>Bechtel</u> Krish Kapur John Kluesener Aklile Gessesse* Ed Morelan Walter Remsen* Dan McNary* Omer Kadaster (Kleinfelder) Alan Chartrand (Kleinfelder)* Jacqueline Heskett Eric Randall *
<u>Other</u> John Christopher, DTSC Betsy Foley, POLA * Alvaro Gutierrez, DTSC Sheryl Lauth, USEPA Hugh Marley, RWQCB Sophia Serda, USEPA	
Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees) Allen Winans, DTSC	

Description of Discussion/Action Items: (Next Page)

Background:

This was the monthly progress review meeting for CTOs 015, 016, and 026 regarding the RI/FS activities currently being performed at the Naval Station Long Beach (NAVSTA), as well as the Facilitywide Investigation being performed at the Long Beach Naval Complex. The progress review meeting for the Site 6B (CTO 043) Site Investigation (SI) was also held at this time.

MEETING MINUTES

Item No	Description of Discussion/ Actions Items	Responsible Individual	Due Date
CTO-043			
1.	Alan Lee opened the meeting and asked for introductions and reviewed agenda.		
2.	<p>Aklile reviewed schedule of CTO-043. Reviewed field sampling scope. Field investigation is essentially complete (4/4 to 5/3). A total of 34 soil samples were collected (17 surface, 9 shallow, and 8 subsurface samples).</p> <p>10 groundwater samples were collected (6 @ 10' & 4 @ 17' bgs) using hydropunch sampling method.</p> <p>Site geology and hydrogeology was discussed - depth to groundwater at the site is approximately 7' bgs (similar to Site 6A) 3 groundwater monitoring wells were installed - screened 5' to 20' bgs. Tidal influence monitoring was performed for 5 days.</p>		
3.	<p>Hugh Marley: Why were Hydropunch samples collected 4' below the groundwater table?</p> <p>Aklile: DTSC asked for 5' below the water surface; however, because of the lack of flow into the sampler at this depth, samples were successfully obtained at 3 to 4' below the water table.</p>		
4.	<p>Chris Leadon: Did you find much tidal influence?</p> <p>Aklile: No, minimal.</p>		
5.	Aklile: Reviewed planned activities for May. Allen Winans had asked raw data to be submitted when we receive it. Aklile confirmed we will send it to DTSC and RWQCB mid-May when all raw data are in. Complete batch not in until 6/6.		
6.	<p>Alvaro Gutierrez requested that no raw data be submitted until the data package is complete - send in one batch (electronic copy is preferable).</p> <p>Aklile: Agreed.</p>		
CTO-015/016			
7.	<p>Ed Morelan: Summarized field work to date. 18 wells slug tested at Sites 1 through 6A and facility wide.</p> <p>Data evaluation is in process.</p> <p>Contingency sampling planned (to be presented in workshop this afternoon).</p> <p>Initial raw data package sent out to agencies last week.</p> <p>Pointed out there were some inconsistencies in electronic/hard copy data.</p>		
8.	J. Christopher: Stated that picking up minor errors in data is good - shows QA/QC process is up and running.		
9.	<p>Sheryl Lauth: Is it a CLP lab?</p> <p>Ed Morelan: Yes.</p>		

10.	Ed Morelan: Tidal influence is significant on the Mole. On-land groundwater flow is NE to NW (inland - not towards the harbor).		
11.	Ed Morelan: Inquired as to the status of ARARs determination, (especially action specific) by DTSC. Alvaro Gutierrez: ARARs compilation is not complete yet, may be ready by 6/94 progress meeting.		
12.	Ed Morelan: Mentioned that some risk assessment areas have been identified that need to be streamlined. Asked for regulatory contacts for David Liu to discuss these issues.		
13.	John Christopher: Explained that David Liu is the senior contact / overseer for numerous risk assessments. Asked for regularly scheduled Risk Assessment review meetings between D. Liu (Bechtel), J. Christopher (DTSC), Jan Corbett (DON), Sophia Serda (USEPA) and Dan Stralka (USEPA). For Ecological Risk - John is not sure who the point person would be (possibly Clarence Callahan). All participants except Jan Corbett are in Northern California - suggested face-to-face meetings. Looking for roster.		
14.	John Christopher: Compilation of ARARs - should be very similar to El Toro, which is already done (Camp Pendleton also already done).		
15.	Alan Lee: Who is the contact for sediments? Sophia/Sheryl: Try Clarence - his specialization is ecotoxicology (USEPA Region IX in San Francisco).		
16.	Chris Leadon: We are using Camp Pendleton as a guide - they are further along than any other site.		
17.	Ed Morelan: Data evaluation is continuing. Contingency sampling to start on 5/23 if all concur today - he has already talked to Allen Winans and we'll send a package w/ J. Christopher for Allen to review. Ed Morelan: Upcoming very aggressive field schedule. Additional Hydropunch sampling proposed with monitoring wells to be installed for lateral and vertical definition. Additional surface soil samples will also be collected. Ed introduced Dan McNary as a lead contact regarding the field investigation.		
18.	CTO-026 Walter Remsen: Schedule of CTO-015/016 still holds. CTO 26 has been decoupled, and is on its own track, as follows: Reviewed Tech Memo #4: Increased ecological risk review. Revised Tech Memo #4 was issued 4/29, agency comments are due back 5/13.		
19.	Sheryl Lauth: Needs until May 18th for comments on Tech Memo #4. Alvaro Gutierrez: Needs until May 20th for comments on Tech Memo #4.		
20.	Alan Lee: O.K., as long as the final approval date of 6/10 can still be met. All agreed comments by 5/18, final by 6/10.		

21.	<p>Walter Remsen: Stressed that the 6/20 mobilization date must be met, since MEC subcontractor will not be available in July. Their next available date is August (possibly).</p> <p>We will be revising the Fish Sampling Plan to include collection of fish for ecological risk assessment, not just human health.</p> <p>Risk Assessment Work Plan will be revised to accommodate Tech Memo #4 (6/3 to 6/17).</p>		
22.	<p>Aklile Gessesse: What is the date set for issue of Final Tech Memo #4?</p> <p>Walter Remsen: 2 weeks after received (May 18th + 14 days → 6th of June).</p>		
23.	<p>Walter Remsen: Owner of diving company to be issued a subcontract was killed 5/10 - we'll need to give company a week to regroup before awarding contract.</p>		
24.	<p>Sheryl Lauth: How many species to be collected in fish sampling?</p> <p>Walter Remsen: We aren't sure yet.</p>		
25.	<p>John Christopher: Decision on fish species can wait until July.</p> <p>Allen Chartrand: Agreed.</p> <p>Sheryl Lauth: Agencies won't approve Fish SAP until species are selected.</p>		
26.	<p>John Christopher: Wants to watch sediment sampling.</p> <p>Allen Chartrand: O.K., no problem.</p>		
27.	<p>Walter Remsen: Estimates the overall schedule to be delayed by approximately 3 months.</p> <p>Ed Morelan: What is the impact on CTO-015/016 schedule?</p> <p>Walter Remsen: Divers will inspect the rip-rap on the Mole first. Sediment samples will also be collected adjacent to the Mole early in the CTO 26 sampling process.</p>		
28.	<p style="text-align: center;">CTO-015/016 GEOPHYSICAL PRESENTATION</p> <p>Dr. Brian Quinn: Sites 1 & 2 - stressed importance of surface physical features, such as playground equipment, which affect geophysical signals.</p> <p>Indicated there is evidence of metals (perhaps disposal pits or trenches) in the vicinity of the playground area on the eastern portion of the sites.</p> <p>Burn pit area was identified in the area where expected - except that a similar expression was also identified further east under the ball park. Concentrations of metals 6" to 12" deep identified along SE edge - rectangular distribution.</p>		

<p>29.</p>	<p>Hugh Marley: How deep is disposal area? Do we need more than one boring?</p> <p>Brian Quinn: 3 to 4' depth for rectangular area . Playground - unknown, not yet sampled; one boring may suffice.</p> <p>Sophia Serda: Historical records? Disposal logs?</p> <p>Brian Quinn: Aerial photographs have been examined previously, but were not useful for determination of depth.</p> <p>Duane Rollefson: Confirmed Brian's answer. The disposal site is from the 1940s & 50s , no disposal logs exist.</p> <p>Krish Kapur: Pointed out the metals being discussed have not been identified yet - although it is possible there are metals of concern here, we don't know yet, we'll find out from intrusive work to be performed during the second-round of field investigations.</p> <p>Chris Leadon: Can we get 3D picture with geophysical techniques?</p> <p>Brian Quinn: We attempted ground radar (GPR) profiles in limited areas. Based on this information, concentrations appear to be in upper 3' only. Cost also restricts the usage of GPR. High conductivity soils don't lend themselves well to GPR. Good only for selected areas where soil is undisturbed.</p> <p>Brian Quinn: Site 6A - 3 areas of landfilling identified. Proposed railroad spur goes through an area of fairly clean fill - has higher fractions of debris, including metal-containing debris.</p>		
<p>30.</p>	<p>Have you compared this information to Aklile's subsurface information?</p> <p>Ed Morelan: Yes, this confirms sampling was and is correct.</p> <p>Betsy Foley: Where are the Site 6A monitoring wells?</p> <p>Dan McNary: On the exterior of the site only; we can provide information to you this afternoon.</p>		