

FILE COPY

**CERCLA SCOPING MEETING
January 14-15, 1993
EPA Region Headquarters**

Attendance

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Tizita Bekele | RWQCB | |
| Lynn Berlad | ATSDR | Day 1 only |
| Chuck Buriel | JPL | |
| Richard Freitas | EPA | Day 2 only |
| John Kemerer | EPA | |
| Dan Melchior | Ebasco | |
| Penny Nakashima | DTSC | |
| B.G. Randolph | Ebasco | Day 1 only |
| Bruce Ross | URS (EPA consultant) | |
| Michelle Schutz | EPA | |
| Hank Yacoub | RWQCB | |

January 14, 1993

The meeting was opened by Michelle Schutz. Schutz introduced Lynn Berlad of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).

Berlad distributed information about the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's (ATSDR's) mandate and activities. She informed us that ATSDR is a Federal Public Health Service Agency mandated to conduct health assessments at all sites on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) National Priority List (NPL). ATSDR is an independent agency which has a non-regulatory function to assess site-specific environmental and toxicologic data, and community concerns. The resulting report provides recommendations for follow-up activities to protect human health. Although this health assessment is fundamentally different from an EPA risk assessment, both are essential for comprehensive site evaluation.

In addition to performing health assessments, Berlad stated that ATSDR also has the capability of reviewing and commenting on cleanup levels, Work Plans, etc., throughout all stages of the NPL process.

Berlad stated that there were 3 ATSDR representatives located in EPA Region IX. A technical team from ATSDR Headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia, will be formed with a local representative to perform a health assessment of the NASA JPL site. This assessment would be independent of EPA's assessment. Berlad stated that EPA conducts a risk assessment, not a human health assessment.

The first step in the process is for the Atlanta team and its local ATSDR representative to conduct a scoping site visit. Berlad further stated that a scoping meeting would be requested by the ATSDR team in approximately one year. The ATSDR team would coordinate directly with JPL to set up the meeting. Upon review of the meeting minutes, the EPA clarified that the scoping site visit would be coordinated through the ATSDR representative with the cooperation of EPA and NASA.

Handouts distributed by ATSDR are attached.

Following the information provided by Berlad, JPL and Ebasco began the presentation on the proposed scope of work and project management strategy. Details of the presentation may be referred to in the attached handout provided by JPL.

B.G. Randolph of Ebasco presented background information on the source identification process. Maps and plans of buildings were produced for review by the attendees. A discussion developed regarding the source identification process. It was ultimately agreed that several changes to the existing information presentation would be needed. These were detailed during the January 15th meeting.

Some buildings correlated with seepage pits in previous reports no longer exist. Ebasco made some comparisons during this meeting.

It was further agreed that EPA, DTSC and RWQCB RPM's should meet with JPL and Ebasco to further discuss the details of source identification. A meeting will be set after the schedule announcement dates.

The presentation continued with the approaches to groundwater investigations (both on and off-site), soil vapor investigations, and project operable unit designation and schedules. Details of the presentation may be referred to in the handout provided by JPL.

Questions came up regarding the options for slant borings under buildings and what to do about accessibility due to utilities.

During the discussion on soil vapor surveys and soil boring sampling conducted at JPL, there was a question of whether there was a fluorine scrubber located at Laboratory 77 - boring 12.

JPL indicated that past soil samples did not give the same results as soil vapor sampling results.

JPL proposed an initial soil vapor survey. JPL wants to use soil vapor sampling in areas where there is access - at one sample per location. The samples would be collected in discrete intervals as deep as possible. One part per million vapor (1 ppmv) would be the demarkation point at which point a second vapor test would be performed.

Additional discussion took place regarding the pits identified in the Slade report. Buildings 87 and 88 are now 143 and 98. Concern was expressed by the regulatory agencies that the proposed borings were not in close proximity to these buildings and would therefore not be good indicators for the extent of contamination.

JPL proposed that the site be divided into three Operable Units (OUs) for remediation of contamination. The 3 OUs are as follows: a) a source or soils OU; b) an on-site ground water OU; and c) an off-site ground water OU.

JPL is waiting to evaluate the results of data from sampling well 10 to determine if there are off-site sources.

At the end of the presentation the agency RPM's and consultants requested that they be given time to evaluate the presentation. JPL and Ebasco agreed, and a meeting time for the following morning was agreed upon. Details of the agencies' evaluation of the presentation would be given at that time.

Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA requested that the following item be included:

Background information gathered by Pam Cooley was presented. There were 10 - 12 employees contacted who had knowledge of the facility from the early 1950's to present. A site walk was done with these employees. It was found that some sumps were identified as seepage pits and there was an indication that trenches were used to dump diluted solvents.

January 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order by Michelle Schutz. Schutz introduced Richard Freitas of EPA's Technical Support Section. Freitas presented information regarding EPA's view of groundwater modeling.

Freitas indicated that NASA should view modeling as an estimate of the true conditions. Freitas cautioned NASA that a model cannot take the place of appropriate field evaluation, it can only augment the field efforts. Upon reviewing the meeting minutes, EPA clarified that Freitas had expressed considerable disagreement with the proposed scope of mathematical modeling work which was proposed for the site. Freitas indicated that as the modeling effort was proposed, it would not add to the understanding of the site ground water flow patterns and much of the work was unnecessary.

Freitas also stated that NASA's model selection, ModFlow, should work well for designing extraction systems that may be required. Upon review of the meeting minutes EPA clarified that Freitas feels that contaminant transport modeling, in general, is not very reliable and can be very costly. As far as he is aware, the MODFLOW model is not capable of predicting contaminant transport in ground water.

Yacoub asked about the types of drilling methods that would be used. Ebasco stated that air rotary, dual wall percussion, and mud rotary were the most frequently used in the area. A discussion ensued regarding the number of drilling crews that could be utilized at one time. NASA and Ebasco agreed that the possibility of using multiple crews would be investigated.

The following is a compilation of all agency representative comments on the previous day's presentation. All agency representatives expressed a desire to meet again at JPL to further evaluate source locations. A site walk of all locations may be scheduled at that time. Ebasco and NASA agreed and will set up a future date for the meeting.

All representatives agreed that modifications to the source location tables presented during the previous day were needed. These should include:

- List of which buildings were demolished, or current status of the building
- A cross reference to other reports (PA/SI and ESI) regarding pit designation. Reasoning regarding why certain pits were not addressed must be made available. This information will be presented in the historical information portion of the Work Plan.

Yacoub indicated that a document on QA/QC procedures was available at the Regional Board. Yacoub promised to sent the document to NASA for their use.

Yacoub indicated that multiport wells would be acceptable. Cluster wells will not be needed. Upon reviewing the meeting minutes, RWQCB clarified that the RWQCB stated that cluster wells are recommended over the proposed multiport well because of previous experiences with cross contamination in the multiport well. The RWQCB stated that this type of well can be used for monitoring but at the first sign of cross contamination, the multiport well will have to be abandoned and cluster wells installed. Yacoub cautioned that extreme care must be given to the workmanship on the multiport wells. This will help ensure sample and well integrity. Yacoub requested construction QA/QC documentation and documentation on long term integrity of the sampling system. Ebasco stated that documentation should be available and will be presented as part of the overall QA plan.

Bekele stated she needed to see Building 187 demolition documentation.

All representatives agreed that additional copies of the EPA site map with all wells depicted should be provided. Ebasco agreed to provide these as soon as possible.

Bekele expressed concern regarding possible VOC contamination around JPL's new Optical Instruments Laboratory (OIL) Building. Ebasco suggests that it could be addressed in the preliminary soil vapor assessment.

Yacoub stated that NASA's soil vapor approach looked good.

Regarding on-site monitoring well placement, Yacoub, Bekele and Nakashima all expressed concern regarding contamination upgradient from well MW-7. Yacoub suggested that a well could be placed after soil vapor work was complete. NASA and Ebasco agreed to consider the placement of a well upgradient of MW-7.

Bekele expressed concerns regarding well development procedures. Grout curing was a particular concern. Melchior stated that grout was allowed to cure for a minimum of one day prior to well development. Actually, most zones were cured 2 or more days. Development is accomplished by air lift at 2 depths and pumping from 2 depths. Individual zones are then developed by air lift. Turbidity, pH, conductivity and temperature are used to determine development completion. Bekele requested that turbidity be documented as well as the other parameters.

Schutz stated that NASA's 3 operable units approach and schedule appeared good. Further evaluation would need to be made. Schutz recommended that the due dates for Operable Unit 1 and Operable Unit 2 be staggered by one month. This would

prevent two reviews being due at one time. NASA and Ebasco agreed to modify the schedule.

All representatives agreed that a historical data volume should be generated. The historical data section will include a summary of all previous CERCLA related site work, a summary of the conclusions of all previous CERCLA related site work, and a cross-referencing of old and new building names. This will prevent repeating the information for each report generated. Melchior offered an appendix to this report on the intricacies of source identification and history. This was agreed to by all.

It was suggested by all agency representatives that all procedures be standardized. They should not be repeated in each document. Ebasco agreed to evaluate standardizing sampling, sample handling, and decontamination procedures.

Bruce Ross of URS questioned whether sufficient time had been allowed in the field work to allow for additional wells if needed. Ebasco indicated there was some extra time for unforeseen circumstances. NASA and Ebasco agreed that the field work would be re-evaluated to assure adequate time for additional work.

Buril requested information on EPA's PRP search status. Schutz stated that because NASA is the lead agency, documentation must be provided to EPA by NASA that indicates there are additional potential responsible parties (PRPs) so that EPA can then pursue the issue. Buril requested that Schutz provide the regulation section regarding PRP requirements so NASA could be aware of the requirements.

Bekele expressed concern regarding Building 67 and the possibility of radioactive contaminants. Radioactive materials were once stored in the area. NASA and Ebasco agreed to investigate and to consider radioactive screening on samples from MW-13.

Melchior provided comments on the aerial photos provided by EPA. Several concerns were identified in each photo.

Bekele also provided comments/recommendations that should be addressed in the RI (see attachment).

Schutz suggested that a meeting be held prior to the due date of the work plans to allow the agencies to see NASA's response to the suggestions made on this presentation. NASA agreed that a meeting should be scheduled 30 days or so prior to the due date. Further details would be worked out in the future. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30.

**CERCLA SCOPING MEETING
January 14-15, 1993
EPA Region Headquarters**

Attendance

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Tizita Bekele | RWQCB | |
| Lynn Berlad | ATSDR | Day 1 only |
| Chuck Buriel | JPL | |
| Richard Freitas | EPA | Day 2 only |
| John Kemerer | EPA | |
| Dan Melchior | Ebasco | |
| Penny Nakashima | DTSC | |
| B.G. Randolph | Ebasco | Day 1 only |
| Bruce Ross | URS (EPA consultant) | |
| Michelle Schutz | EPA | |
| Hank Yacoub | RWQCB | |

January 14, 1993

The meeting was opened by Michelle Schutz. Schutz introduced Lynn Berlad of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).

~~Berlad described the ATSDR and its relationship to EPA. Berlad stated that ATSDR is an independent agency which focuses on human health. Berlad distributed information about the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's (ATSDR's) mandate and activities. She informed us that ATSDR is a Federal Public Health Service Agency mandated to conduct health assessments at all sites on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) National Priority List (NPL). ATSDR is an independent agency which has a non-regulatory function to assess site-specific environmental and toxicologic data, and community concerns. The resulting report provides recommendations for follow-up activities to protect human health. Although this health assessment is fundamentally different from an EPA risk assessment, both are essential for comprehensive site evaluation.~~

In addition to performing health assessments, Berlad stated that ATSDR also has the capability of reviewing and commenting on cleanup levels, Work Plans, etc., throughout all stages of the NPL process.

Berlad stated that there were 3 ATSDR representatives located in EPA Region IX ~~for ATSDR~~. A technical team from ATSDR Headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia, ~~Atlanta (ATSDR Headquarters)~~ will ~~would~~ be formed with a local representative to perform a

health assessment of the NASA JPL site. This assessment would be independent of EPA's assessment. Berlad stated that EPA conducts a risk assessment, not a human health assessment.

The first step in the process is for the Atlanta team and its local ATSDR representative to conduct a scoping site visit. Berlad further stated that a scoping meeting would be requested by the ATSDR team in approximately one year. The ATSDR team would coordinate directly with JPL to set up the meeting. Upon review of the meeting minutes, the EPA clarified that the scoping site visit would be coordinated through the ATSDR representative with the cooperation of EPA and NASA.

Handouts distributed by ATSDR are attached.

Following the information provided by Berlad, JPL and Ebasco began the presentation on the proposed scope of work and project management strategy. Details of the presentation may be referred to in the attached handout provided by JPL.

B.G. Randolph of Ebasco presented background information on the source identification process. Maps and plans of buildings were produced for review by the attendees. A discussion developed regarding the source identification process. It was ultimately agreed that several changes to the existing information presentation would be needed. These were detailed during the January 15th meeting.

Some buildings correlated with seepage pits in previous reports no longer exist. Ebasco made some comparisons during this meeting.

It was further agreed that EPA, DTSC and RWQCB RPM's should meet with JPL and Ebasco to further discuss the details of source identification. A meeting will be set after the schedule announcement dates.

The presentation continued with the approaches to groundwater investigations (both on and off-site), soil vapor investigations, and project operable unit designation and schedules. Details of the presentation may be referred to in the handout provided by JPL.

Questions came up regarding the options for slant borings under buildings and what to do about accessibility due to utilities.

During the discussion on soil vapor surveys and soil boring sampling conducted at JPL, there was a question of

whether there was a fluorine scrubber located at Laboratory 77 - boring 12.

JPL indicated that past soil samples did not give the same results as soil vapor sampling results.

JPL proposed an initial soil vapor survey. JPL wants to use soil vapor sampling in areas where there is access - at one sample per location. The samples would be collected in discrete intervals as deep as possible. One part per million vapor (1 ppmv) would be the demarkation point at which point a second vapor test would be performed.

Additional discussion took place regarding the pits identified in the Slade report. Buildings 87 and 88 are now 143 and 98. Concern was expressed by the regulatory agencies that the proposed borings were not in close proximity to these buildings and would therefore not be good indicators for the extent of contamination.

JPL proposed that the site be divided into three Operable Units (OUs) for remediation of contamination. The 3 OUs are as follows: a) a source or soils OU; b) an on-site ground water OU; and c) an off-site ground water OU.

JPL is waiting to evaluate the results of data from sampling well 10 to determine if there are off-site sources.

At the end of the presentation the agency RPM's and consultants requested that they be given time to evaluate the presentation. JPL and Ebasco agreed, and a meeting time for the following morning was agreed upon. Details of the agencies' evaluation of the presentation would be given at that time.

Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA requested that the following item be included:

Background information gathered by Pam Cooley was presented. There were 10 - 12 employees contacted who had knowledge of the facility from the early 1950's to present. A site walk was done with these employees. It was found that some sumps were identified as seepage pits and there was an indication that trenches were used to dump diluted solvents.

January 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order by Michelle Schutz. Schutz introduced Richard Freitas of EPA's Technical Support Section.

Freitas presented information regarding EPA's view of groundwater modeling.

Freitas indicated that NASA should view modeling as an estimate of the true conditions. Freitas cautioned NASA that a model cannot take the place of appropriate field evaluation, it can only augment the field efforts. ~~Information from field work should be used to help shape the interpretation of information from the model.~~ Upon reviewing the meeting minutes, EPA clarified that Freitas had expressed considerable disagreement with the proposed scope of mathematical modeling work which was proposed for the site. Freitas indicated that as the modeling effort was proposed, it would not add to the understanding of the site ground water flow patterns and much of the work was unnecessary.

Freitas also stated that NASA's model selection, ModFlow, should work well for designing extraction systems that may be required. ~~Freitas cautioned NASA regarding the model's ability to track contaminant transport.~~ Upon review of the meeting minutes EPA clarified that Freitas feels that contaminant transport modeling, in general, is not very reliable and can be very costly. As far as he is aware, the MODFLOW model is not capable of predicting contaminant transport in ground water.

Yacoub asked about the types of drilling methods that would be used. Ebasco stated that air rotary, dual wall percussion, and mud rotary were the most frequently used in the area. A discussion ensued regarding the number of drilling crews that could be utilized at one time. NASA and Ebasco agreed that the possibility of using multiple crews would be investigated.

The following is a compilation of all agency representative comments on the previous day's presentation. All agency representatives expressed a desire to meet again at JPL to further evaluate source locations. A site walk of all locations may be scheduled at that time. Ebasco and NASA agreed and will set up a future date for the meeting.

All representatives agreed that modifications to the source location tables presented during the previous day were needed. These should include:

- List of which buildings were demolished, or current status of the building
- A cross reference to other reports (PA/SI and ESI) regarding pit designation. Reasoning regarding why certain pits were not addressed must be made available. This information will be presented in

the historical information portion of the Work Plan.

Yacoub indicated that a document on QA/QC procedures was available at the Regional Board. Yacoub promised to send the document to NASA for their use.

Yacoub indicated that multiport wells would be acceptable. Cluster wells will not be needed. *Upon reviewing the meeting minutes, RWQCB clarified that the RWQCB stated that cluster wells are recommended over the proposed multiport well because of previous experiences with cross contamination in the multiport well. The RWQCB stated that this type of well can be used for monitoring but at the first sign of cross contamination, the multiport well will have to be abandoned and cluster wells installed.* Yacoub cautioned that extreme care must be given to the workmanship on the multiport wells. This will help ensure sample and well integrity. Yacoub requested construction QA/QC documentation and documentation on long term integrity of the sampling system. Ebasco stated that documentation should be available and will be presented as part of the overall QA plan.

Bekele stated she needed to see Building 187 demolition documentation.

All representatives agreed that additional copies of the EPA site map with all wells depicted should be provided. Ebasco agreed to provide these as soon as possible.

Bekele expressed concern regarding possible VOC contamination around JPL's new Optical Instruments Laboratory (OIL) Building. Ebasco suggests that it could be addressed in the preliminary soil vapor assessment.

Yacoub stated that NASA's soil vapor approach looked good.

Regarding on-site monitoring well placement, Yacoub, Bekele and Nakashima all expressed concern regarding contamination upgradient from well MW-7. Yacoub suggested that a well could be placed after soil vapor work was complete. NASA and Ebasco agreed to consider the placement of a well upgradient of MW-7.

Bekele expressed concerns regarding well development procedures. Grout curing was a particular concern. Melchior stated that grout was allowed to cure for a minimum of one day prior to well development. Actually, most zones were cured 2 or more days. Development is accomplished by air lift at 2 depths and pumping from 2 depths. Individual zones are then developed by air lift. Turbidity, pH, conductivity and temperature are used to determine development completion.

Bekele requested that turbidity be documented as well as the other parameters.

Schutz stated that NASA's 3 operable units approach and schedule appeared good. Further evaluation would need to be made. Schutz recommended that the due dates for Operable Unit 1 and Operable Unit 2 be staggered by one month. This would prevent two reviews being due at one time. NASA and Ebasco agreed to modify the schedule.

All representatives agreed that a historical data volume should be generated. *The historical data section will include a summary of all previous CERCLA related site work, a summary of the conclusions of all previous CERCLA related site work, and a cross-referencing of old and new building names.* This will prevent repeating the information for each report generated. Melchior offered an appendix to this report on the intricacies of source identification and history. This was agreed to by all.

It was suggested by all agency representatives that all procedures be standardized. They should not be repeated in each document. Ebasco agreed to evaluate standardizing *sampling, sample handling, and decontamination* procedures.

Bruce Ross of URS questioned whether sufficient time had been allowed in the field work to allow for additional wells if needed. Ebasco indicated there was some extra time for unforeseen circumstances. NASA and Ebasco agreed that the field work would be re-evaluated to assure adequate time for additional work.

Buril requested information on EPA's PRP search status. Schutz stated that because NASA is the lead agency, ~~not EPA and therefore~~ *documentation must be provided to EPA by NASA that indicates there are additional potential responsible parties (PRPs) so that EPA can then pursue the issue, NASA is the responsible agency.* Buril requested that Schutz provide the regulation section regarding PRP requirements so NASA could be aware of the requirements.

Bekele expressed concern regarding Building 67 and the possibility of radioactive contaminants. Radioactive materials were once stored in the area. NASA and Ebasco agreed to investigate and to consider radioactive screening on samples from MW-13.

Melchior provided comments on the aerial photos provided by EPA. Several concerns were identified in each photo.

Bekele also provided comments/recommendations that should be addressed in the RI (*see attachment*).

Schutz suggested that a meeting be held prior to the due date of the work plans to allow the agencies to see NASA's response to the suggestions made on this presentation. NASA agreed that a meeting should be scheduled 30 days or so prior to the due date. Further details would be worked out in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30.