

FILE COPY

**REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS' MEETING MINUTES
NASA/JET PROPULSION LABORATORY CERCLA PROGRAM
4 MAY 1993**

Attendees: Organizations represented at the Remedial Project Managers' (RPMs') meeting included the following:

- U.S. EPA (EPA)/Federal Enforcement Branch, Region 9, San Francisco, CA
- California EPA/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Region 3
- NASA, NASA Resident Office, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
- Los Angeles Area California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- California Institute of Technology (CALTECH), Contractor to NASA
- Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Contractor to NASA
- EBASCO Environmental, Contractor to JPL
- URS Consultants, Contractor to EPA

A list of individuals attending this RPM meeting is attached to these minutes.

OBJECTIVE:

The purpose of the NASA/Jet Propulsion Laboratory meeting held on 4 May 1993 at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California was to discuss status of JPL Superfund Project and the Devils Gate Dam Multiuse Project.

1. TOPIC: Devils Gate Dam Multi Use Project (DGMUP)

The previous day's presentation regarding the DGMUP was discussed. Concern was expressed by JPL regarding well placement, spreading basin construction, and the impact the spreading basins will have on groundwater flows. Additionally, JPL inquired about any agency control that may be possible regarding the DGMUP.

EPA indicated that the project would be a factor in the Superfund Project. RWQCB stated that the only regulatory point of control of the project would be through the EIS process. No other apparent regulatory mechanism exists. JPL requested that the agencies review the requirements of the EIS to determine if Pasadena or JPL would be required to evaluate the DGMUP impact to the Superfund effort.

DTSC noted that once natural habitat is established, additional constraints may be imposed by Fish and Game.

RWQCB stated numerical modeling should be evaluated to determine the impact of the DGDMUP.

DGMUP could have an effect on the final remedy for the JPL project.

JPL offered to approach the City in an attempt to obtain a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the DGDMUP and the JPL CERCLA effort.

ACTION ITEMS:

JPL will contact the City to determine if an MOU regarding the DGDMUP and JPL CERCLA can be reached.

The EPA will investigate the CERCLA requirements regarding projects of this type being constructed next to NPL sites.

The regulatory agencies will determine the EIS requirements regarding the burden of proof for the impact of DGDMUP on the JPL CERCLA effort. Upon review of the meeting minutes, the RWQCB clarified that the EIS is the federal requirement for the federally funded project counterpart to the State's Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The City of Pasadena shall prepare the EIR or the Negative Declaration (ND) for Devils Gate Dam Multi Use Project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Upon receipt of either the Notice of Preparation of the EIR or the ND, the RWQCB will review and determine the appropriate action at that time.

2. TOPIC: Status of Previous Meeting Action Items

Following is a copy of the Action Items from Previous Meetings which was distributed to the attendees. The section "Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting" has been added to reflect comments made at today's meeting, and indicate final status.

December 9, 1992

Action: Please confirm whether JPL has performed a search of the City of Pasadena files for additional history of the site.

Status: All information available from the City of Pasadena has been retrieved.

Action: JPL will investigate to see if they have any historical water rights in the Raymond Basin.

Status: This has not been determined yet.

Action: Per D. Stralka's comment, has JPL determined the signature and components in the propellants? In addition, please advise how you will address his

comment on finding trace metals from propellants in soils.

Status: JPL is currently pulling this information together and this information will be included in the documents forthcoming. JPL advised that all propellant components, except aluminum and silicon, would have volatilized upon contact with air.

Action: Please advise how D. Stralka's comment regarding rationale for eliminating certain components from investigation will be addressed.

Status: This rationale will be presented in the Work Plan.

Action: Please verify that EBASCO is checking the status of vinyl chloride in soil gas samples and this information will be included in the Work Plan.

Status: EBASCO will provide this information in the Work Plan. There was no peak for vinyl chloride. However, the detection limit was 10 ug/L.

Action: Please be advised that we are expecting to see contaminant concentration maps correlating with water level contour maps in the Work Plan.

Status: NASA JPL hesitates to provide any sort of contaminant concentration map based on data which the EPA has noted is not validated. Interpreting the results of previous sampling events in this way could lend an impression of validity to the data. EPA wants X, Y plot hydrographs through time with concentration through time. EPA wants a map/data especially in the event of a major reversal of ground water flow.

Action: Please advise if the State has sent NASA a copy of potential ARARs.

Status: The State is in the process of developing this list.

Action: Please advise if the State has given a copy of their public relations guidance document to JPL and highlighted the differences.

Status: The State defers to EPA requirements.

Action: Please verify that NASA will be addressing the issue of getting Level 4 backup materials to start the initial evaluation of the lab in the QAPP.

Status: EPA advised NASA to get some percentage of Level 4 data packages initially, with a minimum number of

samples, in order to determine the quality of lab data. Once it has been determined that NASA is receiving quality data from the lab, NASA should request Level 3 data with Level 4 data backup.

Action: Please advise if the RWQCB has sent NASA guidance for sampling to determine disposal restrictions.

Status: NASA will follow IDW guidelines.

Action: Please verify that NASA will document rationale for selection of investigation locations.

Status: NASA advised that the rationale will be provided in the Work Plan.

Action: Please be advised that we are anticipating a figure showing all wells, borings and faults in the Work Plan.

Status: The following two maps will be included in the Work Plan: (1) showing wells, seepage pits, faults; and (2) showing seepage pits, proposed locations of wells, faults.

JANUARY 14-15, 1993

Action: Set a meeting to discuss details of source identification, and possibly conduct a site walk.

Status: Complete. Meeting was set for March 9, 1993.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Completed.

Action: Modify the source location tables presented to include the following:

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

Status: Pending. Source location tables will appear in the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: The regulatory agencies found this plan acceptable.

Action: RWQCB to provide QA/QC information to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: Provide RWQCB information on the demolition of Building 187.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: A copy of the information provided to RWQCB was requested and distributed to all attendees. Action complete.

Action: Provide copies of the JPL site map, similar to EPA's, to other RPMs.

Status: Pending completion of site maps.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Randolph reported maps have been completed and sent copy to Schutz. Although she has not seen the maps to date, she will check new mail for receipt.

Action: Modify the project schedule so OU-1 and OU-2 due dates were staggered.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: Develop a historical document giving results of previous work to date.

Status: Pending. Overview will be available in the RI/FS Workplan and specific information in the OU FSAPs.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending.

Action: Evaluate the possibility of standardizing the procedures (sampling and analytical) for the project.

Status: Pending. Standardized procedures will be available either in the QAPP or the FSAPs.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending approval of OU specific FSAPs.

Action: EPA was to provide copies of the regulations regarding PRP determinations.

Status: Pending. JPL is awaiting a response from EPA.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Schutz reported she was unable to find information on PRP determinations in the regulations. Following a discussion, it was concluded that the EPA legal council would write a letter to NASA attorneys stating EPA's position on PRPs determinations.

As it stands, NASA (as the lead agency) is responsible for determining the PRPs. Action pending.

Action: Concern was expressed regarding radioactive material storage in Building 67. JPL agreed to investigate and consider radioactive screening of samples from MW-13.

Status: Pending. The detailed information will be presented in OU-1 FSAP. Radioactive screening is planned for MW-13 groundwater samples.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending approval of OU-1 FSAP.

Action: Set a meeting to discuss NASA's response to suggestions made during this meeting.

Status: Complete. Meeting was set for May 4, 1993.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

MARCH 9, 1993

Action: EBASCO will inform the group of the previous uses of Building 78.

Status: Pending. The information will be provided in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: EBASCO stated the building started out as a hydraulics lab, then made into smaller labs, one was a cryogenics lab, one an oceans lab, a ceramics room, a small laser lab. The last five years, the area was used for cryogenics and glass blowing. A cesspool has been identified with the building. EBASCO noted that we do not have access to the cesspool due to a retaining wall and nitrogen bottles. Schutz said it would have to be addressed eventually. She requested to tour the building. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that accessibility issues for Building 302 had also been discussed under this action item. EPA advised that NASA will either have to collect data to verify there is no lingering contamination or NASA will have to show from past data that there is no longer a concern under this building.

Action: EBASCO will inform the group of the previous uses of Building 183.

Status: Pending. The information will be provided in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: The building was built after sewers were installed. The bermed area identified by DTSC near the building was a landscape feature. It was emphasized that no hazardous materials were used in this area. Action closed.

Action: JPL and EBASCO will provide corrections to the SI and ESI with regard to the pit designation in the Workplan.

Status: Pending. This will be provided with the Workplan.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending. Schutz asked that an indication be made in the Table of Contents to show where this information can be found. Randolph noted that the item can be located in the "Seepage Pit Research" section of the RI Workplan.

Action: JPL will provide a description in narrative form that includes a short discussion of all activities at buildings on-site where a potential for contamination has been identified. This will include a description of how the buildings are plumbed together, and a discussion of which seepage pit the buildings are connected to. If available, specific engineering drawings will be referenced.

Status: Pending. The information will be available in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending completion of the RI Workplan.

Action: Figures 4.1 and 4.3 of the Supplemental Information to the ESI will be provided in the Workplan.

Status: Complete. Copies were provided in today's meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will send the last monitoring report to RWQCB.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will reevaluate sampling around Building 302 and attempt to find a means to sample.

Status: During a site tour with the State RPMs, Building 302 was inspected. The EPA RPM was unable to attend. Both the RWQCB and DTSC staff acknowledged the problem

with obtaining representative soil matrix samples near or under Building 302. However, it was mentioned that installation of a near-field downgradient well is also an alternative to consider assessing the existence of a potential source under the building. The State RPM's stated that if JPL removed all of the contamination beneath Building 302 during excavation and analysis of samples taken from the bottom of the excavation show that the area does not pose a risk to human health or the environment, then JPL may not have to conduct further sampling. After inspecting the building and surrounding area, the State RPMs expressed doubt about the need to sample beneath Building 302. This was due to the excavation required for construction and the likelihood that contamination would have been removed at that time. The State RPMs indicated that EPA should review the site and then meet with the State RPMs to discuss the matter.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Buril not aware of any sampling that was done after excavation. The sampling area is extremely sensitive due to building operation. Schutz requested that sampling information be obtained as EPA will not "write off" due to difficulty in obtaining samples. Buril noted that the building was constructed in mid 1980s and the Lab was very environmentally conscious at the time, thus indicating that sampling would have been conducted if they noted any indication of contamination. An attempt will be made to gather all of the information. Randolph indicated that Slade sampled the pit from the laboratory and found 200ppm lead, but nothing else. The other pit was the sanitary cesspool.

Nakashima stated that she felt that MW-12 is too far away from the building to reveal significant information.

Buril questioned the possibility of doing passive soil gas. Nakashima responded that it is an indicator, but not 100%.

Nakashima noted any construction plans for areas with cesspools should be delayed until the project is over because the fact that a building is on the land does not eliminate the necessity for sampling.

Action pending. Buril will obtain additional information on the excavation of the 302 site and present it to the agencies.

Action: JPL will review the possibility of incorporating a complete historical compendium in the Workplan. The level of effort will be discussed with EBASCO.

Status: In discussions between JPL and EBASCO it was determined that the level of effort to provide the historical compendium in the Workplan was very

significant. JPL has instructed EBASCO to compile this information to the greatest degree possible. A review of the effort to date is planned for the May 4, 1993 meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA noted that they do not consider this action to be complete. They object to the phrase "to the greatest degree possible".

Action: EPA will check to see if an index is required for the Information Repository and get this information to JPL.

Status: EPA has provided information regarding the administrative record and repositories. The Administrative Record has its own index. There are no requirements for an index of the Information Repository.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA, DTSC, and RWQCB will provide comments on the minutes from the previous meeting to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will send JPL the name and phone number of their community relations expert.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will send whatever form of closure report that is available for the storm drain where the carbon tetrachloride was found to the agencies.

Status: Status and the information are provided in the May 4, 1993 meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will send example copies of Table of Contents for FSAP and WP to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will make all changes discussed above and provide the schedule to EPA by Tuesday, March 16, 1993.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will set the schedule to the meeting with Charles Thomas to hear about the Devil's Gate Dam Multiuse Project.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA noted that an action item having to do with NASA responding to the issue of placement of a well upgradient of MW-7 in the Sampling and Analysis Plan. NASA advised that this issue would be addressed prior to submission of the Work Plan. As of July 7, 1993, EPA has not received this response.

Discussion on Previous Meeting Minutes: EPA provided written comments on minutes from previous meetings. These comments will be incorporated in the appropriate minutes or addressed in writing in a separate document.

3. TOPIC: Document Development Status

A discussion was held regarding the Draft RI Workplan. The Table of Contents info was taken directly from the FFA. Comments were made on the following items:

Workplan: The Table of Contents was reviewed by the agencies.

EPA emphasized that they needed a clear summary of all work to date. Analytical results will appear in the Appendix. A summary table of analytical information will appear in the text. It was agreed that less detail would be expected for reports, such as geotechnical studies (which include information such as soil compaction), that do not relate to CERCLA. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that geotechnical information does relate to the CERCLA process. EPA noted that the individual topics under Section 3.2 "JPL Setting" will be as complete as possible. EBASCO clarified that Regional Hydrogeology will cover the Monk Hills sub-basin in the context of the Raymond Basin with emphasis on the site. Each OU will have a general site background. EBASCO noted that the outline was taken directly from the FFA.

Historical Compendium: The following outline was presented to the agencies. It was noted that the following information will be included under each report summary:

1. Why it was done (objectives)
 - who
 - when
 - what were the objectives
2. What was done
 - summary of methodology
 - techniques utilized
 - work completed (wells, samples, samples, etc)
3. What were the results
 - tabulation of information
 - discussion of conclusions (interpretation of author only)
4. How does it relate to CERCLA
 - form basis of additional work

The agencies agreed that this is an acceptable outline. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that they did not specifically agree with the outline.

RWQCB requested that well construction details be included. As-built drawings and chemical analyses information will be incorporated in the appendix. RWQCB noted that we need to address how we dispose of cuttings and investigation generated waste.

4. TOPIC: Community Relations Activities

There was an update of the Community Relations (CR) activities. Over 40 interviews had been conducted with a set list of questions. It was stated that these questions would be included in the CR plan. Groups such as the Fire Department, Police Department, etc, were being focused on versus the individual. EPA expressed concern about this. FOCUS group was doing the CR activities including preparation of the CR plan for JPL.

5. TOPIC: Future Sampling Of Existing Wells

Buril requested feedback from the agencies on the current monitoring program and questioned the need for continuing the monitoring. Following a brief discussion, it was concluded that it may be appropriate to cut back on frequency of sampling and/or number of contaminants analyzed for in certain monitoring wells. EPA recommended that Level 4 data validation be conducted for selected wells. Schutz will follow through and make a recommendation for the level of effort for the data validation.

Yacoub requested a tabulated summary/chart of contaminant concentrations for each well to justify the proposal. He noted that he would need to see quarterly sampling at each well for one year in order to determine if the amount of groundwater monitoring could be cut back to semiannually. EBASCo will prepare a proposal

for a reduction in groundwater monitoring after completion of the documents being submitted in June. Ground water sampling events 8 and 9 will include new wells.

Action: EPA will respond to NASA on the definition of "Quality Assured Data" as used in Section 22.1 of the FFA.

6. TOPIC: Future Underground Tank Removals at JPL

Buril reviewed the Schedule for Underground Tank Removal for FY 1993-94 as distributed to the attendees. The schedule was provided as information only as there has been no indication of leakage or problems with any of the tanks. All tanks will be removed under the requirements of the L.A. County Department of Public Works. Information was well received, and it was requested that tank surveys be provided when available. It was acceptable to the agencies for the County to oversee the tank removals. If something is found, information will be relayed to the agencies for determination of inclusion in CERCLA.

7. TOPIC: Miscellaneous

Ms. Judy Novelly of JPL was identified as the Quality Assurance Officer (QAO) for this project.

8. TOPIC: Action Items

JPL will contact the City of Pasadena to determine if an MOU regarding the DGDMUP and JPL CERCLA can be reached.

The EPA will investigate the CERCLA requirements regarding projects of this type being constructed next to NPL sites.

The regulatory agencies will determine the EIS requirements regarding the burden of proof for the impact of DGDMUP on the JPL CERCLA effort.

ATTENDEE LIST

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Charles L. Buri	JPL	(818) 354-0180
Judy Novelly	JPL	(818) 354-8634
Dora Huff	NASA, Contracting Officer	(818) 354-6315
Dan Melchior	Ebasco - Arlington, VA	(703) 358-8911
Mark Cutler	Ebasco - Santa Ana, CA	(714) 662-4056
Penny Nakashima	Cal/EPA DTSC	(818) 551-2881
Bruce Ross	URS - Sacramento, CA	(916) 929-2346
Michelle Schutz	U.S. EPA	(415) 744-2396
B. G. Randolph	Ebasco - Santa Ana, CA	(714) 662-4141
Hank Yacoub	RWQCB	(213) 266-7522

**REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS' MEETING MINUTES
NASA/JET PROPULSION LABORATORY CERCLA PROGRAM
4 MAY 1993**

Attendees: Organizations represented at the Remedial Project Managers' (RPMs') meeting included the following:

- U.S. EPA (EPA)/Federal Enforcement Branch, Region 9, San Francisco, CA
- California EPA/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Region 3
- NASA, NASA Resident Office, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
- Los Angeles Area California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- California Institute of Technology (CALTECH), Contractor to NASA
- Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Contractor to NASA
- EBASCO Environmental, Contractor to JPL
- URS Consultants, Contractor to EPA

A list of individuals attending this RPM meeting is attached to these minutes.

OBJECTIVE:

The purpose of the NASA/Jet Propulsion Laboratory meeting held on 4 May 1993 at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California was to discuss status of JPL Superfund Project and the Devils Gate Dam Multiuse Project.

1. TOPIC: Devils Gate Dam Multi Use Project (DGDMUP)

The previous day's presentation regarding the DGDMUP was discussed. Concern was expressed by JPL regarding well placement, spreading basin construction, and the impact the spreading basins will have on groundwater flows. Additionally, JPL inquired about any agency control that may be possible regarding the DGDMUP.

EPA indicated that the project would be a factor in the Superfund Project. RWQCB stated that the only regulatory point of control of the project would be through the EIS process. No other apparent regulatory mechanism exists. JPL requested that the agencies review the requirements of the EIS to determine if Pasadena or JPL would be required to evaluate the DGDMUP impact to the Superfund effort.

DTSC noted that once natural habitat is established, additional constraints may be imposed by Fish and Game.

RWQCB stated numerical modeling should be evaluated to determine the impact of the DGDMUP.

DGMUP could have an effect on the final remedy for the JPL project.

JPL offered to approach the City in an attempt to obtain a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the DGDMUP and the JPL CERCLA effort.

ACTION ITEMS:

JPL will contact the City to determine if an MOU regarding the DGDMUP and JPL CERCLA can be reached.

The EPA will investigate the CERCLA requirements regarding projects of this type being constructed next to NPL sites.

The regulatory agencies will determine the EIS requirements regarding the burden of proof for the impact of DGDMUP on the JPL CERCLA effort. Upon review of the meeting minutes, the RWQCB clarified that the EIS is the federal requirement for the federally funded project counterpart to the State's Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The City of Pasadena shall prepare the EIR or the Negative Declaration (ND) for Devils Gate Dam Multi Use Project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Upon receipt of either the Notice of Preparation of the EIR or the ND, the RWQCB will review and determine the appropriate action at that time.

2. TOPIC: Status of Previous Meeting Action Items

Following is a copy of the Action Items from Previous Meetings which was distributed to the attendees. The section "Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting" has been added to reflect comments made at today's meeting, and indicate final status.

December 9, 1992

Action: Please confirm whether JPL has performed a search of the City of Pasadena files for additional history of the site.

Status: All information available from the City of Pasadena has been retrieved.

Action: JPL will investigate to see if they have any historical water rights in the Raymond Basin.

Status: This has not been determined yet.

Action: Per D. Stralka's comment, has JPL determined the signature and components in the propellants? In addition, please advise how you will address his

comment on finding trace metals from propellants in soils.

Status: JPL is currently pulling this information together and this information will be included in the documents forthcoming. JPL advised that all propellant components, except aluminum and silicon, would have volatilized upon contact with air.

Action: Please advise how D. Stralka's comment regarding rationale for eliminating certain components from investigation will be addressed.

Status: This rationale will be presented in the Work Plan.

Action: Please verify that EBASCO is checking the status of vinyl chloride in soil gas samples and this information will be included in the Work Plan.

Status: EBASCO will provide this information in the Work Plan. There was no peak for vinyl chloride. However, the detection limit was 10 ug/L.

Action: Please be advised that we are expecting to see contaminant concentration maps correlating with water level contour maps in the Work Plan.

Status: NASA JPL hesitates to provide any sort of contaminant concentration map based on data which the EPA has noted is not validated. Interpreting the results of previous sampling events in this way could lend an impression of validity to the data. EPA wants X, Y plot hydrographs through time with concentration through time. EPA wants a map/data especially in the event of a major reversal of ground water flow.

Action: Please advise if the State has sent NASA a copy of potential ARARS.

Status: The State is in the process of developing this list.

Action: Please advise if the State has given a copy of their public relations guidance document to JPL and highlighted the differences.

Status: The State defers to EPA requirements.

Action: Please verify that NASA will be addressing the issue of getting Level 4 backup materials to start the initial evaluation of the lab in the QAPP.

Status: EPA advised NASA to get some percentage of Level 4 data packages initially, with a minimum number of

samples, in order to determine the quality of lab data. Once it has been determined that NASA is receiving quality data from the lab, NASA should request Level 3 data with Level 4 data backup.

Action: Please advise if the RWQCB has sent NASA guidance for sampling to determine disposal restrictions.

Status: NASA will follow IDW guidelines.

Action: Please verify that NASA will document rationale for selection of investigation locations.

Status: NASA advised that the rationale will be provided in the Work Plan.

Action: Please be advised that we are anticipating a figure showing all wells, borings and faults in the Work Plan.

Status: The following two maps will be included in the Work Plan: (1) showing wells, seepage pits, faults; and (2) showing seepage pits, proposed locations of wells, faults.

JANUARY 14-15, 1993

Action: Set a meeting to discuss details of source identification, and possibly conduct a site walk.

Status: Complete. Meeting was set for March 9, 1993.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Completed.

Action: Modify the source location tables presented to include the following:

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

Status: Pending. Source location tables will appear in the ~~Completed information should be available in the~~ RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: The regulatory agencies found this plan acceptable.

Action: RWQCB to provide QA/QC information to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: Provide RWQCB information on the demolition of Building 187.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: A copy of the information provided to RWQCB was requested and distributed to all attendees. Action complete.

Action: Provide copies of the JPL site map, similar to EPA's, to other RPMs.

Status: Pending completion of site maps.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Randolph reported maps have been completed and sent copy to Schutz. Although she has not seen the maps to date, she will check new mail for receipt.

Action: Modify the project schedule so OU-1 and OU-2 due dates were staggered.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: Develop a historical document giving results of previous work to date.

Status: Pending. Overview ~~will~~ ~~should~~ be available in the RI/FS Workplan and specific information in the OU FSAPs.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending.

Action: Evaluate the possibility of standardizing the procedures (sampling and analytical) for the project.

Status: Pending. Standardized procedures will be available either in the QAPP or the FSAPs.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending approval of OU specific FSAPs.

Action: EPA was to provide copies of the regulations regarding PRP determinations.

Status: Pending. JPL is awaiting a response from EPA.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Schutz reported she was unable to find information on PRP determinations in the regulations. Following a discussion, it was concluded

that the EPA legal council would write a letter to NASA attorneys stating EPA's position on PRPs determinations. As it stands, NASA (as the lead agency) is responsible for determining the PRPs. Action pending.

Action: Concern was expressed regarding radioactive material storage in Building 67. JPL agreed to investigate and consider radioactive screening of samples from MW-13.

Status: Pending. The detailed information will be presented in OU-1 FSAP. Radioactive screening is planned for MW-13 groundwater samples.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending approval of OU-1 FSAP.

Action: Set a meeting to discuss NASA's response to suggestions made during this meeting.

Status: Complete. Meeting was set for May 4, 1993.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

MARCH 9, 1993

Action: EBASCO will inform the group of the previous uses of Building 78.

Status: Pending. The information will be provided in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: EBASCO stated the building started out as a hydraulics lab, then made into smaller labs, one was a cryogenics lab, one an oceans lab, a ceramics room, a small laser lab. The last five years, the area was used for cryogenics and glass blowing. A cesspool has been identified with the building. EBASCO noted that we do not have access to the cesspool due to a retaining wall and nitrogen bottles. Schutz said it would have to be addressed eventually. She requested to tour the building. *Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that accessibility issues for Building 302 had also been discussed under this action item. EPA advised that NASA will either have to collect data to verify there is no lingering contamination or NASA will have to show from past data that there is no longer a concern under this building.*

Action: EBASCO will inform the group of the previous uses of Building 183.

Status: Pending. The information will be provided in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: The building was built after sewers were installed. The bermed area identified by DTSC near the building was a landscape feature. It was emphasized that no hazardous materials were used in this area. Action closed.

Action: JPL and EBASCO will provide corrections to the SI and ESI with regard to the pit designation in the Workplan.

Status: Pending. This will be provided with the Workplan.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending. Schutz asked that an indication be made in the Table of Contents to show where this information can be found. Randolph noted that the item can be located in the "Seepage Pit Research" section of the RI Workplan.

Action: JPL will provide a description in narrative form that includes a short discussion of all activities at buildings on-site where a potential for contamination has been identified. This will include a description of how the buildings are plumbed together, and a discussion of which seepage pit the buildings are connected to. If available, specific engineering drawings will be referenced.

Status: Pending. The information ~~will~~ *should* be available in either the RI/FS Workplan or the OU-2 FSAP.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Pending completion of the RI Workplan.

Action: Figures 4.1 and 4.3 of the Supplemental Information to the ESI will be provided in the Workplan.

Status: Complete. Copies were provided in today's meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will send the last monitoring report to RWQCB.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will reevaluate sampling around Building 302 and attempt to find a means to sample.

Status: During a site tour with the State RPMs, Building 302 was inspected. The EPA RPM was unable to attend. Both the RWQCB and DTSC staff acknowledged the problem with obtaining representative soil matrix samples near or under Building 302. However, it was mentioned that installation of a near-field downgradient well is also an alternative to consider assessing the existence of a potential source under the building. The State RPM's stated that if JPL removed all of the contamination beneath Building 302 during excavation and analysis of samples taken from the bottom of the excavation show that the area does not pose a risk to human health or the environment, then JPL may not have to conduct further sampling. After inspecting the building and surrounding area, the State RPMs expressed doubt about the need to sample beneath Building 302. This was due to the excavation required for construction and the likelihood that contamination would have been removed at that time. The State RPMs indicated that EPA should review the site and then meet with the State RPMs to discuss the matter.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Buriil not aware of any sampling that was done after excavation. The sampling area is extremely sensitive due to building operation. Schutz requested that sampling information be obtained as EPA will not "write off" due to difficulty in obtaining samples. Buriil noted that the building was constructed in mid 1980s and the Lab was very environmentally conscious at the time, thus indicating that sampling would have been conducted if they noted any indication of contamination. An attempt will be made to gather all of the information. Randolph indicated that Slade sampled the pit from the laboratory and found 200ppm lead, but nothing else. The other pit was the sanitary cesspool.

Nakashima stated that she felt that MW-12 is too far away from the building to reveal significant information.

Buriil questioned the possibility of doing passive soil gas. Nakashima responded that it is an indicator, but not 100%.

Nakashima noted any construction plans for areas with cesspools should be delayed until the project is over because the fact that a building is on the land does not eliminate the necessity for sampling.

Action pending. Buriil will obtain additional information on the excavation of the 302 site and present it to the agencies.

Action: JPL will review the possibility of incorporating a complete historical compendium in the Workplan. The level of effort will be discussed with EBASCO.

Status: In discussions between JPL and EBASCO it was determined that the level of effort to provide the historical compendium in the Workplan was very significant. JPL has instructed EBASCO to compile this information to the greatest degree possible. A review of the effort to date is planned for the May 4, 1993 meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA noted that they do not consider this action to be complete. They object to the phrase "to the greatest degree possible".

Action: EPA will check to see if an index is required for the Information Repository and get this information to JPL.

Status: EPA has provided information regarding the administrative record and repositories. The Administrative Record has its own index. There are no requirements for an index of the Information Repository.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA, DTSC, and RWQCB will provide comments on the minutes from the previous meeting to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will send JPL the name and phone number of their community relations expert.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will send whatever form of closure report that is available for the storm drain where the carbon tetrachloride was found to the agencies.

Status: Status and the information are provided in the May 4, 1993 meeting.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will send example copies of Table of Contents for FSAP and WP to JPL.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: JPL will make all changes discussed above and provide the schedule to EPA by Tuesday, March 16, 1993.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Action: EPA will set the schedule to the meeting with Charles Thomas to hear about the Devil's Gate Dam Multiuse Project.

Status: Complete.

Comments from 05/04/93 Meeting: Complete.

Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA noted that an action item having to do with NASA responding to the issue of placement of a well upgradient of MW-7 in the Sampling and Analysis Plan. NASA advised that this issue would be addressed prior to submission of the Work Plan. As of July 7, 1993, EPA has not received this response.

Discussion on Previous Meeting Minutes: EPA provided written comments on minutes from previous meetings. These comments will be incorporated in the appropriate minutes or addressed in writing in a separate document.

3. TOPIC: Document Development Status

A discussion was held regarding the Draft RI Workplan. The Table of Contents info was taken directly from the FFA. Comments were made on the following items:

Workplan: The Table of Contents was reviewed by the agencies.

EPA emphasized that they needed a clear summary of all work to date. Analytical results will appear in the Appendix. A summary table of analytical information will appear in the text. It was agreed that less detail would be expected for reports, such as geotechnical studies (*which include information such as soil compaction*), that do not relate to CERCLA. *Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that geotechnical information does relate to the CERCLA process.* EPA noted that the individual topics under Section 3.2 "JPL Setting" will be as complete as possible. EBASCO clarified that Regional Hydrogeology will cover the Monk Hills sub-basin in the context of the Raymond Basin with emphasis on the site. Each OU will have a general site background. EBASCO noted that the outline was taken directly from the FFA.

Historical Compendium: The following outline was presented to the agencies. It was noted that the following information will be included under each report summary:

1. Why it was done (objectives)
 - who
 - when
 - what were the objectives
2. What was done
 - summary of methodology
 - techniques utilized
 - work completed (wells, samples, samples, etc)
3. What were the results
 - tabulation of information
 - discussion of conclusions (interpretation of author only)
4. How does it relate to CERCLA
 - form basis of additional work

The agencies agreed that this is an acceptable outline. Upon review of the meeting minutes, EPA stated that they did not specifically agree with the outline.

RWQCB requested that well construction details be included. As-built drawings and chemical analyses information will be incorporated in the appendix. RWQCB noted that we need to address how we dispose of cuttings and investigation generated waste.

4. TOPIC: Community Relations Activities

There was an update of the Community Relations (CR) activities. Over 40 interviews had been conducted with a set list of questions. It was stated that these questions would be included in the CR plan. Groups such as the Fire Department, Police Department, etc, were being focused on versus the individual. EPA expressed concern about this. FOCUS group was doing the CR activities including preparation of the CR plan for JPL.

5. TOPIC: Future Sampling Of Existing Wells

Buril requested feedback from the agencies on the current monitoring program and questioned the need for continuing the monitoring. Following a brief discussion, it was concluded that it may be appropriate to cut back on frequency of sampling and/or number of contaminants analyzed for in certain monitoring wells. EPA recommended that Level 4 data validation be conducted for selected wells. Schutz will follow through and make a recommendation for the level of effort for the data validation.

Yacoub requested a tabulated summary/chart of contaminant concentrations for each well to justify the proposal. He noted that he would need to see quarterly sampling at each well for one year in order to determine if the amount of groundwater monitoring could be cut back to semiannually. EBASCo will prepare a proposal

for a reduction in groundwater monitoring after completion of the documents being submitted in June. Ground water sampling events 8 and 9 will include new wells.

Action: EPA will respond to NASA on the definition of "Quality Assured Data" as used in Section 22.1 of the FFA.

6. TOPIC: Future Underground Tank Removals at JPL

Buril reviewed the Schedule for Underground Tank Removal for FY 1993-94 as distributed to the attendees. The schedule was provided as information only as there has been no indication of leakage or problems with any of the tanks. All tanks will be removed under the requirements of the L.A. County Department of Public Works. Information was well received, and it was requested that tank surveys be provided when available. It was acceptable to the agencies for the County to oversee the tank removals. If something is found, information will be relayed to the agencies for determination of inclusion in CERCLA.

7. TOPIC: Miscellaneous

Ms. Judy Novelly of JPL was identified as the Quality Assurance Officer (QAO) for this project.

8. TOPIC: Action Items

JPL will contact the City of Pasadena to determine if an MOU regarding the DGDMUP and JPL CERCLA can be reached.

The EPA will investigate the CERCLA requirements regarding projects of this type being constructed next to NPL sites.

The regulatory agencies will determine the EIS requirements regarding the burden of proof for the impact of DGDMUP on the JPL CERCLA effort.

ATTENDEE LIST

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Charles L. Buriil	JPL	(818)354-0180
Judy Novelly	JPL	(818)354-8634
Dora Huff	NASA, Contracting Officer	(818)354-6315
Dan Melchior	Ebasco - Arlington, VA	(703)358-8911
Mark Cutler	Ebasco - Santa Ana, CA	(714)662-4056
Penny Nakashima	Cal/EPA DTSC	(818)551-2881
Bruce Ross	URS - Sacramento, CA	(916)929-2346
Michelle Schutz	U.S. EPA	(415)744-2396
B. G. Randolph	Ebasco - Santa Ana, CA	(714)662-4141
Hank Yacoub	RWQCB	(213)266-7522