

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Subject: Comment Resolution Meeting for Draft Phase I SA Work Plan (POI 38)	Meeting Date: 9 April 1996 Meeting Time: 13:30 - 15:00 Originator: M'balia Tagoe						
Attendees: (¹Part Time, ²by Phone) <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="164 541 727 577"><u>Navy</u></th> <th data-bbox="727 541 1015 577"><u>CLEAN II Team</u></th> <th data-bbox="1015 541 1401 577"><u>Other</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="164 590 727 730"> Content P. Arnold (RPM) Jackie Coté (NTC Environmental Office) Keith Forman (NTC Interim BEC) Tom Whitman (NTC Safety)¹ </td> <td data-bbox="727 590 1015 661"> Jerald Bailey M'balia Tagoe </td> <td data-bbox="1015 590 1401 695"> Alice Gimeno (DTSC)² Martin Hausladen (USEPA) Corey Walsh (RWQCB)² </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Navy</u>	<u>CLEAN II Team</u>	<u>Other</u>	Content P. Arnold (RPM) Jackie Coté (NTC Environmental Office) Keith Forman (NTC Interim BEC) Tom Whitman (NTC Safety) ¹	Jerald Bailey M'balia Tagoe	Alice Gimeno (DTSC) ² Martin Hausladen (USEPA) Corey Walsh (RWQCB) ²
<u>Navy</u>	<u>CLEAN II Team</u>	<u>Other</u>					
Content P. Arnold (RPM) Jackie Coté (NTC Environmental Office) Keith Forman (NTC Interim BEC) Tom Whitman (NTC Safety) ¹	Jerald Bailey M'balia Tagoe	Alice Gimeno (DTSC) ² Martin Hausladen (USEPA) Corey Walsh (RWQCB) ²					
Additional Distribution (In Addition to Attendees) Jan Corbett (SWDIV RTM) Bob Tait (BNI Technical Integration)							

The meeting was held to resolve comments on the draft work plan for the Phase I steam distribution system site assessment (SA) project. The meeting was held at the NTC Environmental Office and was attended by SWDIV, NTC, BNI, and regulatory agency personnel. The meeting began at 13:30.

These minutes also include the results of subsequent discussions, related to work plan items, held between the RPM, CTOL, and regulatory agency personnel. The results of these discussions are presented in italicized type.

Description of Discussion:

The meeting was conducted by meeting attendees going through the document section by section and voicing comments. Ms. Tagoe then resolved and/or incorporated each comment.

The entire group felt that the vaults needed to be better described as being associated with the direct-buried steam lines rather than with the tunnels. Alice Gimeno requested that additional information on the current status of the MCRD steam tunnel investigation be included in Section 1.3. She also asked for elaboration on what development of an attenuation factor, mentioned in Section 2, would involve. Corey Walsh asked for further discussion of why samples collected would be analyzed for only six metals. He also requested that the pH of the deionized water that will be used as an extraction fluid on sediment samples be specified in the work plan.

Meeting attendees were in agreement that further elaboration on the sample location and collection rationale should be included. There was consensus amongst the group that there would be little benefit in collecting liquid samples from flooded vaults. Content P. Arnold stated that any vaults that are flooded will be pumped by PWC prior to proceeding with the SA work. Disposal of fluid pumped from these flooded vaults will be the responsibility of PWC. M. Hausladen inquired about the source of the liquid that floods the vaults. Are the vaults located below groundwater? It is possible that these vaults are being infiltrated by surrounding water? The group agreed that this was a likely source of the water and a potential source of any debris that may have accumulated on the tunnel floors. Corey Walsh indicated that perhaps sample locations should be

focused in the wet areas since these areas may represent hot spots. After lengthy discussion, the group agreed that the tunnels would be subdivided into 100 foot subsections, with one sediment sample collected within each 100-foot steam tunnel subsection when possible. Also, when possible, one sediment sample will be collected from each of the direct-buried steam line vaults. The focus of sample location and collection will be accumulated sediment in wet areas and/or areas near visible tunnel/vault cracking.

A question was raised about the potential for the presence of asbestos, from damaged/deteriorated pipe lagging, within accumulated sediment in steam tunnels and direct-buried steam line vaults. K. Forman indicated that PWC makes repairs on asbestos in the tunnels when this asbestos is found to be friable. C. Walsh noted that MCRD had planned to sample for asbestos analysis, in addition to metals, during their investigation; however, he has not seen the results of the asbestos analysis. M. Hausladen suggested that NTC might conduct asbestos analyses on a random set of the sediment samples collected. C. P. Arnold responded that asbestos air sampling will be conducted during tunnel and vault investigation for the protection and safety of the field crew; however, identification of the presence or absence of asbestos in the tunnels is a transfer issue and outside the scope of this investigation. She will look into this issue further to confirm this. *(C. P. Arnold did confirm that the asbestos in the steam distribution system does not require immediate attention since the tunnels and vaults are not accessible to the general public. The asbestos issue will be resolved at the time of property transfer. Also, after further research, it was discovered that although originally proposed in their work plan, MCRD did not sample for asbestos in their steam tunnels.)*

C. Walsh indicated that he felt the California Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan standards are too restrictive as action levels for this project and suggested that perhaps an action level of 10 times the Bays and Estuaries standards might be appropriate. The group agreed that the California Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan standards were indeed too restrictive; however, a 10 times factor was purely arbitrary and there was no real justification or rationale for its use. A conference call between A. Gimeno, C. Walsh, and C. Arnold was set for 11 April 1996 at 0930 to discuss the issue of action levels further.

(Based on the results of the 11 April 1996 and subsequent telephone conference calls, data quality objectives, particularly decision rules, and an action level for this project were set. Preliminary action levels were set at 30 times the California Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan standards. These action levels were set to temper the conservative Bays and Estuaries standards by accounting for the tidal mixing that would occur in the sediments near the discharge point of groundwater to the Bay. A more detailed discussion of the tidal mixing factor is included in Section 2 of the Final Work Plan. The decision rules finalized during these conference calls have also been incorporated in the Final Work Plan.)

Finally, Tom Whitman expressed concerns about the inoculations of in-tunnel workers being up to date. His main concern is about ensuring that all personnel that might enter the tunnels get tetanus shots.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 15:00.