

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

NASA/JPL CERCLA RPM MEETING

SEPTEMBER 11, 2002

4800 Oak Grove Drive

PASADENA, CA 91109

1 APPEARANCES :

2	NAME	AFFILIATION
3	KEITH FIELDS	BATTELLE
4	KIMBERLY GATES	NFESC
5	DAVID CLEXTON	BATTELLE
6	MARK RIPPERDA	USEPA
7	DAVID YOUNG	LARWACB
8	RICHARD GEBERT	DTSC
9	CHRISTOPHER LEADON	SWDIV, NAVY
10	ROBERT KRATZKE	NFESC
11	PETER ROBLES	NASA
12	LINDA HOLLINGSWORTH	SWDIV
13	JUDY NOVELLY	JPL
14	TONY FORD	GEOFON.
15	SUSAN VAN WINKLE	NAVY SWDIV.
16	KEN MARTINS	CH2MHILL
17	HOOSHANG NEZAFATI	CH2MHILL
18	CHUCK BURIL	JPL
19	RICHARD ZUROMSKI	NAVY

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Pasadena, California, Wednesday, September 11, 2002

2 9:50 a.m.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: I wanted to thank everybody for coming
4 today. And as we normally do, I want to start off the
5 meeting by, if everybody could go around the room and state
6 your name, spell your last name, and where you are from for
7 the record.

8 I am Richard Zuromski. I am the Navy Project
9 Manager, and we'll move down the line.

10 MR. BURIL: Chuck Buril. Last name B-u-r-i-l, Manager
11 at JPL Environmental Affairs.

12 PETER ROBLES: Peter Robles. That's R-o-b-l-e-s. I'm
13 the NASA RPM.

14 DAVID YOUNG: David Young, Y-o-u-n-g, with the Los
15 Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board.

16 MARK RIPPERDA: Mark Ripperda, R-i-p-p-e-r-d-a, from the
17 U.S. EPA.

18 RICHARD GEBERT: Richard Gebert, G-e-b-e-r-t, from the
19 State Department of Toxic Substances Control.

20 LINDA HOLLINGSWORTH: Linda Hollingsworth from the Navy,
21 Southwest Division. Hollingsworth,
22 H-o-l-l-i-n-g-s-w-o-r-t-h.

23 SUSAN VAN WINKLE: Susan Van Winkle. I'm with Southwest
24 Division of the Navy. That's V-a-n-W-i-n-k-l-e.

25 CHRIS LEADON: Chris Leadon, Southwest Div, L-e-a-d-o-n.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Chris, can you make sure you speak up a
2 little bit today, too, for -- if you do state anything so
3 it's on the record. Great.

4 KEN MARTINS: Ken Martins, CH2M HILL, M-a-r-t-i-n-s.

5 MR. NEZAFATI: Hooshang Nezafati, CH2M Hill, N-e-z-, as
6 in Zebra, a-f, as in Frank, -a-t-i.

7 ROBERT KRATZKE: Robert Kratzke with the U.S. Navy,
8 K-r-a-t-z-k-e.

9 KEITH FIELDS: Keith Fields with Battelle, F-i-e-l-d-s.

10 MR. CLEXTON: David Clexton with Battelle,
11 C-l-e-x-t-o-n.

12 JUDY NOVELLY: Judy Novelly with JPL, N-o-v-e-l-l-y.

13 KIMBERLY GATES: Kimberly Gates with the Navy,
14 G-a-t-e-s.

15 TONY FORD: Tony Ford with Geofon, F-o-r-d.

16 MR. ZUROMSKI: Great, okay.

17 So now everybody is here, and what I want to do is
18 just -- we'll just go straight into item No. 1 on the
19 agenda, Project Overview and Updated Schedule.

20 I do have handouts for that as well. Probably the
21 only handouts I'm going to hand out today because a lot of
22 the other things we are working on are drafts, and so we'll
23 project them onto the screen. So if you could take one of
24 these and pass it down, and I will go ahead and start.

25 And, again, if you came with a team of folks, if

1 you would just not mind taking only one of these, that would
2 be great. Here is one more copy of that.

3 Actually, can I get one of those that you just
4 passed down? Yeah. They are all different. Make sure --
5 there should be four sets by the time you are done, so make
6 sure you have one of each. There's a lot of stuff going on,
7 and thank you.

8 You should have Operable Unit 1, 2, and 3 and a
9 support schedule.

10 MR. BURIL: I have 1, 3, and support. Do you have 2
11 there?

12 MR. ROBLES: Do we have a 2 somewhere?

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: We figured we would make this, you know,
14 an exciting, interesting morning. And I am sure this is
15 really helping out.

16 MR. ROBLES: Like shuffling cards.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Does everybody have OU1 right now? Okay.
18 Let's go ahead. We'll just look at OU1.

19 The reason I wanted to hand all these out is
20 because, you know, we have been working on this schedule a
21 lot lately, and things have changed or been modified over
22 time, especially over the summer. And so what I wanted to do
23 is just kind of go through and go through all the different
24 tasks that we're working on and also to get any feedback or
25 any comments on our schedule on how we are moving the program

1 along.

2 And before I start, Mark, you did not -- you didn't
3 bring the ROD signature page, did you?

4 MR. RIPPERDA: No.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So we're going to have to let Dr.
6 Parker know that. There's no signature page.

7 MR. ROBLES: You didn't bring it, Mark?

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: So anyway, let's start with OU1.

9 At the top, you have got the first item is the
10 packed bed pilot study. That's actually, as you can see, the
11 operations have commenced, and I believe they should be done
12 even prior to the 18th of October. And what they're doing
13 there, in case any of you who don't know, is that they are
14 testing the final ex-situ treatment system for perchlorate,
15 the packed bed reactor, and they are running two weeks at the
16 ambient concentrations of perchlorate.

17 And then, as we talked about in the past, then they
18 are going to dilute with tap water and run at lower
19 concentrations of perchlorate to kind of mimic what we would
20 see out in the Arroyo area.

21 MR. MARTINS: They are dechlorinated, I assume? I'd be
22 concerned about the chlorine residual.

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. I would hope that they are, but I
24 couldn't tell you offhand.

25 MR. BURIL: We'll find out in a heartbeat.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's right. We'll find out soon when
2 the bacteria starts to die off. So definitely.

3 I leave that to, you know, the engineers like you.

4 MR. MARTINS: Risk taker, are you?

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: So -- definitely.

6 And, as you can see, right on the heels of this
7 second phase of this pilot study, they are going to
8 demobilize so that we can start doing our well installation
9 for in-situ pilot study, which is the next item on the list,
10 and you can see here we are down on No. 13 right now.

11 I just received yesterday our internal draft
12 workplan, and we'll talk about the workplan itself in a
13 little while. But I am currently taking a look at that, and
14 then we should have that out to you, as you can see, to the
15 regulatory agencies on the 1st of October.

16 So one of the things we'll talk about later as well
17 is the well drilling and also the waste discharge
18 requirements, but I don't want to get into a whole lot of
19 detail on that now.

20 But as far as schedules go, if you guys have any
21 questions on how that is moving along.

22 Okay. Moving on to the next page, OU1 pilot
23 study. This is something you might -- may or may not have
24 seen before. And what this is, is that we found, and we felt
25 that it would be prudent right now, to start a study for --

1 it's kind of like a large-scale pilot study for OU1. And
2 this is basically a contingency in the event that we don't
3 move toward with the EE/CA quick enough or that we need to do
4 something on-site right away.

5 And how we felt that we could do this through a
6 pilot study is if for some reason things in OU3 don't work
7 out we have got this workplan ready to go, and we can start
8 working in OU3 very quickly. And so this is basically to
9 move the schedule along in the event that we need to do that.

10 So right now you can see we are in the development
11 of this internal draft workplan, which is going to be done
12 next month, and we'll probably be getting you a comment or a
13 copy of it. You can see -- you know, it says right now
14 sometime in April of next year. That all depends on how the
15 in-situ study goes, what information we get back from the
16 ex-situ study that is going right now, and at the same time
17 it's kind of evaluating the different approaches that we
18 could take to removing on-site sources.

19 So that day is kind of a -- I don't know -- magic
20 date out in the future that is not really set in stone. It
21 could be earlier than that, but it's really going to depend
22 on what data we have so that before we recommend a certain
23 technology for a pilot study, for example, expanded in-situ
24 remediation of perchlorate, we have some data to back it up
25 on the site. So that could be sooner; it could be later.

1 But that's basically -- that's kind of our
2 contingency plan right now. So you won't see anything on
3 that for a while, but I did want to make you aware of how
4 we're approaching the project.

5 Do you guys have any questions on that?

6 Okay. Moving along, next page is the feasibility
7 study. And so, as you can see again, taking all
8 contingencies into account, we are doing our FS right
9 alongside of the pilot study because we figure, again, in the
10 event that we need to move quickly into OU1 we are not just
11 sitting around waiting for the OU3 actions to take place; we
12 are ready to go on to OU1 in a moment's notice.

13 So we are moving forward with starting a
14 feasibility study, which should mirror a lot with the old
15 feasibility study done by Cal-Tech back in '99, I guess, and
16 then at the same time taking into account the pilot studies
17 that we have done since then and also the pilot study
18 workplan that is being developed at the present time.

19 MR. BURIL: Richard, question for you.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes.

21 MR. BURIL: You don't identify the length of time you
22 anticipate the actual work to take for your pilot study
23 identified in this schedule.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Which pilot? Oh, right. That's only for
25 getting the document out.

1 MR. BURIL: What document?

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: The pilot study workplan.

3 MR. BURIL: Okay.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. Because --

5 MR. BURIL: The question I have --

6 is if you haven't completed that pilot study how are you
7 going to incorporate that information within the FS?

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: They are kind of just moving in parallel,
9 basically. It would be a way to get technologies out in the
10 field quickly rather than waiting for the ROD because it
11 probably would be similar to one of the possible remedies for
12 the facility. But if we waited until the ROD, as you can see
13 through the next few pages, we couldn't get something on the
14 facility through a remedial design and remedial action for
15 another year later, so the whole idea is to speed up the
16 process in the event that we need to do so. So they are
17 moving parallel with each other, basically.

18 MR. BURIL: We should talk off line about this.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Sure. Absolutely.

20 So does anybody else have any other questions on
21 feasibility study, pilot study, and anything like that?

22 Okay.

23 Then, as you can see, moving along, the rest of
24 these are placeholders, the rest of OU1 schedule, proposed
25 plan, ROD, and, you notice, I didn't even put in any RD/RA.

1 But with this schedule and moving along with the FS as is
2 right now, you can see that we would get a ROD sometime in
3 June of '04 at this point in time, if we follow the schedule,
4 and, of course, that's barring any unforeseen circumstances.

5 So that is OU1.

6 Does anybody have any questions, comments, other
7 suggestions?

8 MR. GEBERT: So OU1 is now on a separate track?

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Basically we thought that it would be
10 quicker because, as you can see, and we'll talk about this
11 when we talk about the EE/CA in a while, the EE/CA is
12 dependent, and the OU1, OU3 actions are dependent on a lot of
13 other things aside from CERCLA, and being that we could be
14 delayed by non-CERCLA items, such as negotiating with the
15 City or 97-005, if we needed to do something we basically are
16 ready to go.

17 And, of course, you know that the final remedy for
18 the site is probably going to incorporate something on and
19 off facility so we figured it doesn't make any sense to wait
20 on this right now; we might as well start moving on it.

21 Do you want to talk about any of your other
22 comments there, Chuck?

23 MR. BURIL: No. This is the first one I have had.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So, with that, let's move on to
25 OU2. I think we all should have a copy of that now.

1 OU2, as we all know, is moving along very quickly.

2 Did you not get an OU2?

3 MR. BURIL: Here is an extra here.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: For the sake of OU2, we will talk about
5 our pilot study phase one.

6
7 As you can see, that's basically the pilot study
8 that was going on at VE01, that phase No. 1 at the top there,
9 which was completed back in June, and they're just preparing
10 the final report for that specific well location right now.

11 Pilot study phase 2 is really what we had talked
12 about in the past, how you would -- if it was possible to
13 move through a pilot study to the next well location, started
14 up under the pilot study, and then continue the rest of the
15 actions under the remedial action.

16 So I think that we're going to talk about in a
17 little while. We are going to talk about the comments on a
18 work plan for that second phase. But, of course, we are
19 seeing right now that they may be so close to the RD -- we
20 don't know exactly where we'll go, but we'll talk about that.
21 But those are happening very -- almost concurrently right
22 now. And once we get that workplan finalized, we should be
23 ready to start up our operations at one of the next couple of
24 wells; probably sometime in October is the target date right
25 now.

1 Let's see. The next page has the ROD, which
2 conversations with Mark and his boss should be signed, I
3 think, by Friday.

4 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. You'll get it next week.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So the ROD is just about done,
6 should be signed, and as you can see
7 here, we were going to try to shoot for a signature today
8 from NASA, but basically as soon as we receive it from EPA,
9 we'll sign it, turn around copies to each of you, and that
10 should be final.

11 And one thing I did send to you in the e-mail with
12 the agenda was the ROD notification that's going to go in the
13 newspaper, and we can talk about -- I think we're going to
14 talk about that in the schedule in a couple minutes, but
15 that's something else that, if you have any comments on, if
16 we can get those as soon as possible so basically the day
17 NASA signs the ROD we can get that newspaper notification
18 going, and we'll put that in the paper.

19 Remedial design, again, we will talk about that in
20 the next action -- the next agenda item, but we have
21 completed our initial draft response to your comments on the
22 RD, and we're going to talk about those in a few minutes.

23 So with that, does anybody have any questions on
24 OU2? Great.

25 OU3, this is where the fun starts. As you can

1 see -- yes, Chuck, it is fun. The response to comments, we
2 just received your comments, at least from EPA and DTSC.

3 And, Dave, are you going to give us some comments
4 today on that draft EE/CA?

5 MR. YOUNG: Not today.

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

7 MR. YOUNG: I'll need at least a couple weeks.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

9 MR. YOUNG: But I saw that in Richard's e-mail his
10 supervisor or someone was reviewing the EE/CA still; right?

11 MR. GEBERT: Yeah. I had one of our engineers look at
12 it too.

13 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

14 MR. GEBERT: And she was on vacation so we need a couple
15 more weeks --

16 MR. YOUNG: So let me try and coordinate my schedule with
17 that, and I'll try and provide comments within two to three
18 weeks.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think that should be fine. I think we
20 can talk about, you know, when you want to get it to us, and
21 two to three weeks is probably fine because I think what
22 we'll talk about when we go to OU3 is how we're
23 addressing the comments and some of the other barriers that
24 we are still going to be needing your comments, but there are
25 other things that we are working on that are also kind of

1 delaying some of the process so that should not be a problem.
2 So, anyway, we will talk about your -- at least Richard's and
3 Mark's comments briefly in one of the next couple of action
4 items.

5 And as you can see, a couple of the things that
6 make the beginning of the removal action or contingencies are
7 No. 9, the MOU with the City of Pasadena. And it may not
8 actually be a MOU; it may be some other type of cooperative
9 agreement; it may be a contract.

10 And that's actually something that the Navy is
11 working on for NASA right now is how can we actually get that
12 system in the field and running, either paying the City to do
13 it, or we build it for the City, and the City operates it.

14 Those are different things that we are working on
15 right now, and obviously all of us, being government
16 employees here, we know that obligating money under certain
17 contracts or certain different types of agreements, there's
18 always catches to each way you do it. So we're trying to
19 find out the best way to do it so that it really makes this,
20 you know, go along as smoothly as possible for both parties.

21 So that's something we're working on. So I should
22 have updated that schedule. That schedule -- you know,
23 originally that schedule was set by the City. They had told
24 us back in, I think it was May or -- April, right before I
25 left, that they wanted an agreement together in, like, 60

1 days. And so we said, well, we'll shoot -- we'll push it
2 to 90 or 120. And it still looks like that's not happening
3 at the moment -- but we will talk about that in a bit.

4 And then the other thing, of course, that makes the
5 beginning of the removal action contingent is the No. 23 on
6 the next page, 97-005, which is, as we'll again talk about in
7 a little more detail later, is coming along, and we have
8 actually finished part of the documentation for it. But we
9 will -- that is definitely a long process, as we have
10 learned, and definitely will be something we need to get in
11 place before the actual operations can start up.

12 As you can see, then, No. 25 and 26, the
13 feasibility study for OU3, again, we thought that it would be
14 best to have this in place at least to start it while we're
15 moving along with this removal action in the event that
16 things don't work out with these other contingencies, such as
17 97-005 or negotiations with the City.

18 And so starting in October we're going to start
19 basically taking all of this information that we fed and kind
20 of whittled down in the EE/CA and starting the FS, using the
21 draft FS that was produced a couple years ago, the EE/CA, all
22 the new modeling, and pack it into one document so
23 that, again, we can start the ball rolling on the FS.

24 And the rest of the items after the FS, as you can
25 see here, are all just predecessors of the feasibility study,

1 and they are there just as placeholders. But even if we were
2 to take that into account, of course, best case scenario we
3 could still have a ROD in April of '04.

4 So as you can see, both OU1 and OU3 RODs are
5 sometime in the spring or summer of '04, best case scenario,
6 and so that is kind of something that maybe will help you in
7 your scheduling for milestones and stuff at work.

8 So that is OU3.

9 Does anybody have any questions on the schedule at
10 this point in time?

11 Okay. Good.

12 Finally, and this one, really, just more for your
13 information than anything else, this shows you the support
14 activities that are going on, such as monitoring, the
15 community relations plan, the administrative record, and
16 we'll talk about each of these later, except the monitoring,
17 of course, and it's just, again, for your information to show
18 you what is going on and what is scheduled.

19 So that is all I have on schedule.

20 Do you guys have any comments on maybe the way we
21 are approaching this right now? I mean, do you think that's
22 a good idea? Would you like us to combine documents?

23 This is just the approach that we thought would be
24 the most efficient considering the things that keep us from
25 doing things, you know, off-facility versus on-facility.

1 So no? Okay. Then we'll move right along.

2 We are going to skip No. 2, except for the
3 newspaper notice.

4 I have a copy, which I'll put up on the screen, but
5 I did e-mail that to everybody.

6 And I just want to know if you guys did have any
7 comments on that notice, and, if not, if I can -- if you
8 would just each e-mail me and let me know that it looks good,
9 and then we will go ahead and get that ready for publication
10 in the newspaper after the ROD is signed.

11 MR. RIPPERDA: When did you e-mail it?

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: With the agenda. It was another
13 attachment to the agenda.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: So it was yesterday or --

15 MR. BURIL: Tuesday, Monday timeframe?

16 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah.

17 That's okay. If you've deleted it, I can --

18 I can resend it to you. Sure. Absolutely. So --

19 MS. GATES: Anything from Richard is spam.

20 MR. MARTINS: Spam; right.

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: I can't believe that you would do that to
22 me, Mark, but --

23 MR. RIPPERDA: I got one right here.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So I'll put it up on the screen,
25 but it's basically -- it's all text, and there's not going to

1 be a whole lot to read.

2 But I just want to make sure that -- I know in the
3 past, especially when we put together the documents for the
4 OU2 public meeting, that people had comments on semantics and
5 things like that.

6 And I think what we have done is we have taken all
7 of those comments in the past into account in putting
8 together this ROD notification. And so I don't think it
9 should be anything you haven't seen before, aside from the
10 fact that all it says is NASA's making the ROD available to
11 the public.

12 And what we're going to do is put the notice in the
13 paper and then update the repositories with the ROD, and that
14 will pretty much be it. And so OU2 should be, at least for
15 that extent of the project, should be complete at that time.

16 So I don't know if this helps anybody or not, but I
17 didn't think that handing it out again would really help
18 anything.

19 So did you guys -- I don't know. I know Mark
20 deleted it, but did you guys have
21 any comments on it?

22 Richard?

23 MR. GEBERT: I read it. I don't have any comments.

24 MR. YOUNG: I haven't read it.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: But you didn't delete it? Okay.

1 So if you guys do have any comments, please let me
2 know. But what I'd like to do is if I can get all your
3 comments,
4 before Mark sends
5 out his signature page to me, that would be great because
6 then, basically, once Dr. Parker signs for NASA, we'll go
7 ahead and publish those in the newspaper, and it should be
8 final.

9 Okay. Move on to No. 3, Operable Unit 2
10 Operations. Look at that. We are even ahead of schedule.
11 That is great.

12 Why don't we review the response to comments on
13 the pilot test workplan. And I know that we received
14 comments on the workplan from Mark -- and Richard, did you
15 ever -- you didn't respond?

16 MR. GEBERT: No.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Send us anything? Okay.

18 And Dave, did you send us anything on that either?

19 MR. YOUNG: No, we didn't have any comments.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Great.

21 And what I want to do is just go through Mark's
22 comments really quick.

23 So what we'll do is we'll go through, and these are
24 our draft responses, Mark, and what we are going to do is try
25 to get kind of a little discussion about them today, and then

1 we will go ahead and finalize these and send them out to you
2 over the next couple of weeks.

3 But anyway, the first one -- and I'm going to
4 actually let Keith kind of chime in on these, too, because he
5 and I kind of finished these up, and he is more familiar with
6 them than I am.

7 So do you want to go ahead and address each of
8 these? I know I didn't hand a copy out to you, but I just
9 kind of want to talk about them --

10 MR. FIELDS: Mark, the first question we may have would
11 be -- I think, actually, Richard probably addressed these.

12 These are probably comments from Bill Mabey, not
13 from you.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. Most of these are from Bill
15 Mabey --

16 MR. FIELDS: Because some of the issues I think what we
17 talked about in the past --

18 MR. RIPPERDA: And sometimes comments are more for the
19 record or because the document didn't make it clear --

20 MR. FIELDS: Okay.

21 MR. RIPPERDA: I think if you just read through the
22 document without knowing anything about the site you would
23 reasonably have these questions.

24 MR. FIELDS: It is good to have --

25 MR. RIPPERDA: So even though I know the answer the

1 document doesn't provide that answer to a newcomer. So it's
2 good to either make the text clearer or at least have the
3 comment in response to comments.

4 MR. FIELDS: And that's good because in most cases that
5 is exactly what Geofon did, was just responded, kind of
6 reiterated the approach that we were taking so --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: And Tony might have some -- you know,
8 Tony, you developed these initially as well --

9 MR. FORD: Yes.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- so I just want to make sure that if
11 you have any questions for Mark that we address them today as
12 well.

13 MR. FORD: Yes.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Anyway --

15 MR. FIELDS: Yeah. On the first comment, the location
16 of the wells, is based upon looking at the three VOCs that
17 were above the initial screening levels that are based on the
18 Regional Water Quality Control Board guidance, the leeching of
19 VOC to ground water, kind of overlaying all those maps, and
20 then trying to create the best coverage, assuming a 350 foot
21 radius of influence.

22 And then that would be verified in the field, and
23 also larger considerations, too, are just, you know,
24 accessibility, location within the campus to put a vapor
25 extraction system.

1 Is there anything else you wanted to add on that,
2 Tony?

3 MR. FORD: I know over VEO3 there was a concern that the
4 well could have been placed farther towards the northeast, but
5 because of the logistics of the site with the hillside right
6 in the way, and the facility operation, that wasn't really
7 possible. So we tried to get it as close over there as we
8 could.

9 MR. RIPPERDA: Like I said, I know there's some talk
10 about it at the meeting, but just look at the document. Those
11 kinds of logistical constraints aren't that clear.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: I guess the next one is the method for
13 perchlorate samples in the soils and extraction.

14 Tony, do you want to address that one as well?

15 MR. FORD: Yes. We used the -- really, the only method
16 available for analysis of the perchlorate. We used a
17 laboratory that was -- that is certified by EPA to run that
18 analysis, and we were able to get the detection limit down
19 from twenty to sixteen on the analysis.

20 And as far as extraction goes, what they used was
21 just a water extraction, which is typically used for that
22 analysis. It's right now the best way of doing the analysis
23 for perchlorate.

24 MR. RIPPERDA: This is one I know nothing about.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's fine.

1 MR. RIPPERDA: Bill is the chemical engineer, and he
2 knows more about that than I do.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: And I think this is the last one. The
4 rest is, I think, an attachment.

5 And this one -- this was the one we had a question
6 on, was the use of the Army Corps document for rebound versus
7 what we had proposed that's in the ROD right now and what was
8 in the workplan that we have been working off of the last few
9 months.

10 And we were wondering, I guess, what was missing
11 from our procedure and what we had agreed to in the ROD that
12 Bill was looking for in adding the Army Corps test procedure.

13 I don't know if you know offhand but -

14 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. I kind of do.

15 The stuff we have in the ROD feasibility study, we
16 never came up with a very rigorous evaluation. It's almost
17 run to the best extent of the technology, look at the
18 asymptote, look at the rebound, but it wasn't very detailed or
19 comprehensive.

20 The Army Corps is something that is being developed
21 that probably is going to be some kind of a standard, and so
22 it's just trying to do what everybody else will over time
23 probably start doing.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So should we then supplement what
25 we are proposing to do with the Army Corps standards, or

1 should we reference the Army Corps standards as they are?

2 Because we incorporate -- seems like we have a lot
3 of what the Army Corps has generally, but we don't have maybe
4 the specifics of that document.

5 Is there a way -- is there -- which way would you
6 rather see it, I guess?

7 MR. RIPPERDA: I don't want to mess with the ROD.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Nor do we.

9 MR. RIPPERDA: But because the ROD is so open-ended in
10 how we are going to evaluate shutdown, I would say reference
11 the Army Corps and say that that process will be used to
12 evaluate the shutdown.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: In addition to the --

14 MR. RIPPERDA: Just some kind of reference.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

16 MR. RIPPERDA: Not that it will be the standard because
17 even the Army Corps stuff isn't a standard. It is just a
18 slightly more detailed arm waving exercise than what we have.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Actually, I was wondering -- and maybe
20 Tony or Keith, you guys might be able to tell me -- do you
21 know if the Navy has a similar document that we go by because
22 we do a lot of SVE, but I'm not -- and I know we have a lot
23 of guidance documents.

24 Do you guys -- or Linda, do you guys know -- we
25 don't have a guidance document like that, do we?

1 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't believe so because Michael
2 Pound responded to this, and I would think that Mark Good --
3 Chris, you are not familiar with -- because what Michael said
4 is that he thought that we should review it, and if it was
5 helpful in establishing closure, then it would be a good idea,
6 you know.

7 And I think that that's kind of -- but if instead it
8 ends up causing more confusion, then it would be something we
9 wouldn't want to be tied to.

10 If it's a helpful tool, and if it will help us come
11 with a more resounding close of the door, then that is great,
12 but if it doesn't help, then we probably won't use it, if that
13 makes sense. In other words, if it makes the circle keep on
14 going around and around over and over without any end in sight
15 we wouldn't have to tie ourselves to it.

16 But if we can say this was done in accordance with
17 the Army Corps of Engineers and that makes somebody feel
18 better, then that would be wonderful.

19 MR. RIPPERDA: That's exactly what I feel. If you can
20 just say you use some published national document that sounds
21 better.

22 The Air Force has their start-stop process, which is
23 no different than what we are doing here, but it has got a
24 name, and it's something the Air Force uses.

25 It's easier to go to my management, to the public

1 and say oh, they are using this nationally-accepted process,
2 even though it's no different than what you guys came up with
3 for JPL.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: So if we put a name by what we are doing
5 that might satisfy your management as well?

6 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Like Peter's method of --

8 MR. ROBLES: Ripperda Process.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Well, then we will just do it
10 through a reference right now, and then where it needs to
11 supplement, we will use it, and then hopefully in accordance
12 with what we have agreed to in the ROD and with the use of
13 that document, we should be able to still proceed along with
14 the SVE operations then.

15 MR. FIELDS: Interestingly, we have actually done quite a
16 bit of that through Praxis, and Praxis may be the company who
17 wrote that appendix.

18 Because, I mean, it's verbatim text from the Praxis
19 report versus what is in that appendix -- the Army Corps, so
20 that modeling work that was in that Praxis evaluation either
21 is the same thing as that Appendix F or mimics it very
22 closely.

23 So in fact when you do additional Pnue log we will
24 get a lot of that information and additional modeling that
25 would satisfy any requirements from -- is that your

1 understanding, Tony?

2 MR. FORD: Yes. And right now we have scheduled to do
3 Pneu log testing on each of the logs during startup, and
4 there's a possibility that we may do additional tests in the
5 future during operations, so I think that we will get a lot of
6 this information from their modeling at that point.

7 MR. GEBERT: Can I get a copy?

8 MR. RIPPERDA: It's on the Internet.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. I think the website is --

10 MR. RIPPERDA: The website is on the comment --

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. I can -- you know what? When we
12 send the response to comments to Mark, I'll send you guys a
13 copy -- I'll just courtesy copy both you and Dave so you can
14 have a copy. Okay.

15 And I don't know. So, Richard, you said you
16 guys are not going to comment on that workplan. Are you guys
17 going to comment on this either?

18 MR. GEBERT: No.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So then what we'll do is we'll
20 finalize the response to comments on the SVE pilot test
21 workplan, probably hopefully in the next couple days, because
22 there really isn't anything that we haven't discussed that we
23 have a problem with, and then we'll send it to you for
24 concurrence, Mark; and, you know, if you have any questions
25 or comments, let us know, and, if not, we will finalize those

1 and finalize the workplan, and we should be out in the field
2 then sometime in early October.

3 And I think that -- I'm not sure, and I guess this
4 kind of goes to the SVE pilot test as well, but kind of along
5 the same line. What is our -- our potential start-up date I
6 have that I gave out -- that's not my question.

7 My question is: Which well were we planning on
8 starting on first?

9 MR. FORD: Looks like VEO3 will be the easiest to get
10 the electrical over to.

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: And VEO3 is the one that's out here
12 across from the hazardous waste facility?

13 MR. FORD: Yes.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: So it's going to be -- and, actually,
15 that's the area where we saw the higher levels of VOCs and
16 stuff in there; right?

17 MR. FIELDS: TCE --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think high TCE.

19 So that is where we are going to start. And that's
20 the one -- I don't know if you remember. I don't have the
21 maps with me. But we have some kind of weird hits, kind of
22 up here, that we are trying to target with that SVE system.
23 So that's the one we're going to start at.

24 And I think that what is going to happen is we're
25 going to -- as we have been running, trying to show you and

1 demonstrate through the operations of VEO1, we are going to
2 again try to use that same approach. And we're basically --
3 now that we have that system on a trailer, we're going to move
4 to the first location, operate in accordance with the -- both
5 the Army Corps and our procedure. When we are done at that
6 specific location, we'll move to the next one, and basically
7 we're just going to move around the site with that system.

8 Now, I think what's going to happen is if we find
9 that we are operating for, I guess, an extended period of
10 time, and by that time hopefully we'll have the RD complete,
11 you know, what we'll do is we'll evaluate whether or not we
12 need another system to move around with it.

13 But I think our plan right now is to just stick with
14 the one system. It's on a trailer, move it around, and we
15 don't think we're going to need much more than that.

16 But I don't know -- do you guys -- that was our
17 initial plan, I think, we had talked about a while back.

18 Do you guys have any comments on that at all? Okay.

19 So that's our plan, so we'll be starting hopefully
20 sometime in October, and we'll get rolling on the expansion
21 of the SVE pilot test.

22 Next thing I want to talk about is Review of the
23 Response to Comments on the RD/RA workplan.

24 These are Dave -- or these are Richard's comments
25 on the document. And what I want -- and this basically, your

1 first comment, Richard, is what we had -- what I just really
2 got done talking about is the time limit, and you are talking
3 about -- you know, we had that six-month time limitation
4 versus doing it with actually moving along.

5 And I think you see our comment is basically that
6 the six months is kind of an approximation as to how long we
7 think it is going to take before we hit asymptotic levels, but
8 we are going to only shut down at each location when we hit
9 the levels in accordance with the plan and then, you know,
10 let you know that we have done that, and then we will move to
11 the next one.

12 But we are intending that we will just keep moving
13 every time we hit asymptotic levels, but we will, of course,
14 come back to that location and check again. So just because
15 we finish at one location doesn't mean we are done at that
16 location. We're just going to wait for rebound before we go
17 back there again.

18 MR. GEBERT: Okay. Now, I was confused --

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think the six month --

20 MR. GEBERT: -- moving the trailer from one position to
21 another --

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

23 MR. FIELDS: I'm sorry. It was an appropriate timeframe
24 based on some modeling done by Praxis to assume that you have
25 exchanged an appropriate amount of core volume and that you

1 would get maybe some chemicals at the far end of your radius
2 of influence to reach your well.

3 So the six months was kind of just a good time
4 frame. And then the moving around also gives us the
5 advantage of some rebound of chemical concentrations that,
6 you know, as we move to the next well, by the time we get
7 back around to that well, it may be a more cost effective
8 operation because the chemical concentrations would have
9 rebound --

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: And this is like Keith said, it's -- when
11 we did the Pneu log test of the VE01, that's, again, what we
12 tried to base that on, and what we'll also be doing is Pneu
13 log testing on each of those wells when we start them up so
14 that we can see if our assumptions are valid at each of the
15 wells because it might, for all we could, it could be
16 different and we haven't started extracting (VOCs) yet.

17 So moving on to your second comment, which was just
18 a comment on another section with the same language, the
19 third comment, the sampling analysis after -- for at least
20 one month after the first week. And what I wanted to -- we
21 wanted to talk about here was when you talk about once a
22 month, are you talking about once a month when we start at
23 each location, or are you starting once a month overall?

24 Because what we had talked about was we would do
25 our -- we are going to have -- you're going to have two

1 layers to the program.

2 You have the quarterly overall monitoring program
3 for the soil vapor, monitoring points. So we'll be
4 doing those quarterly no matter what, no matter what the
5 operating -- how we've been doing going along.

6 But what we would be doing in addition to that, the
7 second layer, would be individual sampling at the wells that
8 we are operating to see what we are pulling out of those
9 wells and samples out of those wells.

10 And what we would do is then take the quarterly
11 samples plus what we are finding at each of the wells as we
12 move them around the site, which could be one quarter, it
13 could be two quarters, whatever, combine that to help us make
14 our decision.

15 Because what we thought is that if we, for example,
16 find a hot spot 500 feet away from one of the wells that we
17 are operating, and we find a hot spot on one of our quarters,
18 and then through our operations the next quarter, the hot
19 spot is still there, getting a monthly sample isn't going to
20 make a whole lot of difference because it is telling us the
21 next quarter that this well is not affecting us and that we
22 may have to maybe put another well in.

23 So that's what we are thinking, and I wasn't sure
24 if you were clear on maybe -- maybe that goes back to your
25 first comment on the --

1 MR. GEBERT: Right.

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- operation.

3 MR. GEBERT: The way you described it sounds fine.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So we are going to stick with a
5 quarterly monitoring program overall, but then individual
6 monitoring as we monitor each of the --

7 MR. GEBERT: Each of the individual wells.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Exactly.

9 And how -- and we are monitoring each of those.

10 What is the schedule for monitoring each of the
11 extraction wells --

12 MR. FORD: Actually, for the extraction wells, just for
13 compliance with the permit, we were going to do bi-weekly
14 influent and effluent sampling and I think the question was
15 are we going to get test specific samples from each screen
16 and --

17 MR. GEBERT: Correct.

18 MR. FORD: And --

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Do an overall --

20 MR. FORD: -- we didn't have that planned in the
21 document.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: But you, when you take your compliance
23 sample, then, do you take it from --

24 MR. FORD: From the influent of the system, which is --

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Combination --

1 MR. FORD: -- of all screens that are operating at that
2 point.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

4 So we would -- Now, would we incorporate the samples
5 for the quarterly monitoring program from each of the screens,
6 use that well as, like, a soil vapor monitoring well, or would
7 you do it --

8 MR. FORD: We haven't been doing -

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: We have not been doing that --

10 MR. FORD: No. We have been taking individual screen
11 samples during operation, and it really wouldn't be a problem
12 to take additional samples for individual screens during
13 operation just to see exactly what elevations and
14 contaminants are coming in from --

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: And then we also do the Pneu log, too,
16 which tells us exactly where --

17 MR. FORD: Exactly.

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- we are going to be finding (VOCs).

19 Maybe we might want to reevaluate how we want to do
20 that after we see the Pneu log results because that might show
21 you the best picture of what you are going to find and then
22 leave it -- let it go from there.

23 But we had not planned on doing any samples on a
24 regular basis from the actual screens, from the extraction
25 well, then.

1 MR. FORD: Not after the first week of operation.

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So would you want to see more on
3 that --

4 MR. GEBERT: Not necessarily.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

6 The second one, I think, is just a simple one,
7 modifying the text to make sure we include operating
8 conditions in the reports.

9 MR. GEBERT: The baseline operating conditions; right.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

11 MR. GEBERT: Yes. So we know where we are starting
12 from.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: I don't think we'd have a problem with that
14 at all.

15 And that's both for -- right, not only for the
16 chemicals, but also for the regular vacuum flow rate,
17 everything else, operations.

18 And then the next comment here, the big comment,
19 just to refresh my memory on this one. Okay.

20 So we're actually giving you the baselines on here
21 because what we are going to do is, you know, I think we just
22 took these; right, Tony?

23 MR. FORD: Actually --

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Or is that from the prior --

25 MR. FORD: These are from the RI. These are --

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

2 MR. FORD: -- initial concentrations that --

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

4 MR. FORD: -- they found during the RI. But we are
5 doing a quarterly sampling event right now. We are about
6 halfway through, and that information will give us a good
7 baseline on where we are at this time and what happens in the
8 future when we start up the system in the new location.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: And I think what we are going to use is
10 the baseline that Keith put together for the OU2 public
11 meeting when we talked about the volume, when we calculated
12 the volumes.

13 Remember how there was a difference from, like,
14 200, whatever, pounds or to 5,000 pounds, and then we
15 recalculated that. I think that recalculated number that we
16 presented in the past which --

17 MR. FIELDS: Which is in the ROD.

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: Which is in the ROD. I don't remember --
19 it was like less than a 1000 --

20 MR. GEBERT: It was like 500 --

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: 500 pounds. And we removed, like,
22 225 of that so far. I think that -- like those are the
23 numbers that we are going to use are the numbers we presented
24 in the ROD.

25 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Can I make a statement regarding

1 that?

2 All right. So the baseline, as far as the
3 concentrations, will be on based on the quarterly monitoring
4 from this time. The volume estimations for baseline will be
5 what was presented in the public meeting.

6 Is that what we --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think the overall baseline is from
8 the -- what we presented in the public meeting, and that's
9 what is in the ROD. And that is the overall baseline where we
10 are saying there was 500 pounds of "X" back from whenever we
11 started the remedial investigation; today, there are 250
12 pounds left.

13 MR. FIELDS: The way we presented it was pre soil vapor
14 extraction, including the pilot test over the past couple
15 years, and then current, which was at that point in July of
16 2001 or something.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. So we will definitely provide
18 those baseline concentrations and that's fairly easy to take
19 care of as well.

20 And then you can see in the end of that comment we
21 will also do the results of the Pneu log testing. That will
22 kind of help us show where everything is before we start up
23 in each of these different new wells as well.

24 And on the project schedule we will definitely
25 revise that as well.

1 Yours are pretty easy to take care of, Richard.

2 Do you have any other questions or comments?

3 What we'll do is, then, we will go ahead and
4 finalize our responses, and then in the next couple of days
5 we'll send those out to you as well. We will probably send
6 all of this at the same time. We'll do the workplan for SVE
7 and the RD, and we'll just send it all out to you guys.

8 Now, I think the reason, again, we wanted to do a
9 pilot study workplan is because once the workplan is approved
10 we can start operating the next location. Whereas now we are
11 going to go through a Draft Final RD for formality's
12 purposes, but if you guys don't have any comments on the
13 Draft Final document, and, you know, as soon as you get it,
14 the sooner you send us your response that says you don't have
15 any comments, the sooner we can finalize that so -- but we
16 will send out a Draft Final of this once we update the
17 document.

18 Okay. Let me go into Mark's comments.

19 And this looks like -- you had a similar comment
20 here, Mark. Or are these from Bill Mabey?

21 MR. RIPPERDA: Pretty much similar to Richard's.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: So was our response to --

23 MR. RIPPERDA: Right. And, again, it was because it
24 wasn't exactly clear in the document.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. And I think our response is

1 exactly the same as we did to Richard's. So okay.

2 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: The -- right. And the radius of
4 influence exactly.

5 And I think that what we'll also see, as we were
6 saying, one of the reasons why we didn't want to do the
7 monthly -- necessarily the monthly sampling on the site was
8 because what we'll be able to do is when we do our quarterly
9 sampling, we'll be able to find out what areas were affected
10 and what were not affected so that --

11 MR. FORD: During operation we actually take vacuum
12 response readings weekly and all the vapor monitoring wells,
13 so we'll get a pretty good idea quickly of what the radius
14 of influence is at each well location.

15 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: How often do you do this?

16 MR. FORD: Weekly.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: So does that address your comments?

18 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think this kind of goes back to the SVE
20 wells, and I think we kind of talked about that a little bit
21 earlier as well. I don't know if you want to talk more about
22 this.

23 When we were selecting -- I think it was back when
24 we developed the FS. We gave you a map that size. We are
25 going to put the wells in these general locations. We went

1 out to each of the general site areas, and we looked to see
2 where the best areas were to put -- to actually drill the
3 well. When you look at what that dot was, I think the dot for
4 VEO3 was right on the side of the hill or something like that.

5 When we moved out from there, we had a hazardous
6 waste facility on one side of us and some other lines
7 somewhere else. So we selected each of the locations in
8 accordance with kind of the facility constraints. For
9 example, if these wells don't cover the 300 foot radius of
10 influence and we are not hitting edges of the plume, then
11 that might be a time where we have to look at whether or not
12 we have to put more wells in or not.

13 MR. RIPPERDA: The same as before, to have the comment
14 there.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: And I'll let Tony field this one. This is
16 a FID issue, since Tony is out there doing this on a regular
17 basis.

18 MR. FORD: It is a valid comment. It doesn't pick up on
19 carbon tetrachloride as well as it would fuel hydrocarbon or
20 something like that.

21 The portion of the plan that said that we would
22 request that the FID replace the actual lab analysis was based
23 on the fact that historically our effluent concentrations have
24 been below the requirements for emission. And in the new
25 locations, during the startup, we will be doing influent and

1 effluent samples for laboratory analysis.

2 The only time that we would actually request that we
3 change the permit requirement would be if the levels are
4 consistently below the emission requirements and declining at
5 that location. So we try to make sure that we are well below
6 the requirements before we would make that request.

7 MR. BURIL: Question. Regarding this SCAQMD permit.

8 I don't believe I have seen it.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's your permit.

10 MR. BURIL: Are you talking about the Title 5 permit?

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: Whatever one that SVE system is currently
12 under.

13 MR. BURIL: Okay.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: And you might have converted that to your
15 Title 5 but --

16 MR. BURIL: That's fine.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Whatever --

18 MR. BURIL: It appeared there was something new up
19 there.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: No, no, no.

21 MR. FORD: No. It is actually a facility-wide permit, I
22 believe, for emissions.

23 MR. BURIL: That's fine.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's one of the other reasons why it's
25 not worth modifying right now.

1 MR. BURIL: You would have to have a public hearing to
2 do so.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. And it would be a headache to do
4 that.

5 So Mark, does that answer your question?

6 MR. RIPPERDA: Yes.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

8 The OVA issue, I guess, Tony, did you -- you talked
9 about this --

10 MR. FORD: This is a similar question to No. 4.

11 Again, we do use FID out there for daily monitoring
12 of the system. But we are planning on doing the bi-weekly
13 influent and effluent analysis at least initially to confirm
14 what water concentrations are.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: And this is the fate and transport
16 modeling issue, and I think that -- I think what we're trying
17 to do, and I'm not sure -- Tony, are you -- you are working
18 with Keith on this one on doing the modeling because I know
19 that there was -- we were looking at doing this kind of
20 together.

21 MR. FORD: We haven't discussed it yet. I think that we
22 are kind of waiting until we get to the point where we are
23 looking at shutdown criteria. And if it needs to be done
24 before that, we can do that.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Because we are also trying at the same

1 time. And I think, Keith, in some of your conceptual models,
2 we kind of looked at -- Keith, Battelle is working on the
3 OU1, FS and pilot study and all those documents. And I think
4 Keith has been doing a lot of modeling and seeing how this is
5 going to -- anything that we do do in OU2 is going to affect
6 what we do in OU1, so I think that we can kind of incorporate
7 all this into one combined effort.

8 I think we are planning on doing that to help us do
9 what we're doing in OU1.

10 MR. FIELDS: And that really comes in, I think, in sort
11 of the argument that says we are done--

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

13 MR. FIELDS: -- at this point the wells are going in,
14 and we want to make sure that you can get out as much of the
15 VOCs as you can, and it would be more towards the end when
16 you start evaluating, you know, maybe at each quarterly event
17 as you see fit. We can try to model that and see how it
18 compares to some of the requirements of the guidelines by the
19 Water Board, or we also gave us the opportunity to use
20 v-leach and some other modeling approaches within
21 the ROD.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: And then also looking at the Army Corps
23 guidance to help us in doing that.

24 So does that answer your question for the most part
25 on how we'll approach that?

1 MR. RIPPERDA: Yes. I just wanted to be sure that you
2 are going to do some modeling. You know, I would be
3 interested in seeing what the current baseline, what you
4 calculate to be in place now, if you use those parameters,
5 whatever vadose zone, like V-leach, to see what the best
6 case, worst case, bounds on leachate is now. And as you
7 start hitting asymptote, rotating your system around, at
8 what point do both worst and best case scenario say that your
9 leachate is below MCLs or within some kind of mixing zone
10 allowance, just so you are not chasing asymptotic conditions
11 forever if you don't have to.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think that we are definitely in
13 agreement with that considering that we think that for the
14 most part a lot of this is going to be handled through the
15 ground water anyway right now because there's not really a
16 whole lot left in the soil.

17 The next one -- this is an easy one. This is just
18 updating the plan to make sure we show all the different
19 project roles on how we coordinate and organize with.

20 And we haven't had a meeting for a while anyway, so
21 we'll probably be talking more about all this soon. So I
22 don't know if that -- yes, we will revise that for you.

23 I think that is your last one, Mark. This is the
24 on-site mobile laboratory, and I don't know, Tony. I don't
25 know what we are doing on this. So I'll ask you.

1 MR. FORD: Yeah. The question was about the two
2 different methods that have historically been used out here
3 to analyze VOCs in vapor.

4 The 8021b has been used for the mobile laboratory
5 that we used during the quarterly monitoring events. And
6 then the T014 was then used for the samples collected from
7 the SVE system itself, and since it is basically an
8 off-site laboratory. The reason why there were two different
9 methods used, the mobile laboratories don't perform the T014,
10 so we have used the best method available for the mobile
11 laboratory.

12 We can definitely show the reporting limits in
13 these same units. That's not a problem.

14 And the 8021b, there was a question about how the
15 actual analysis works, and it is very similar to a soil
16 sample other than the preparation of the sample itself. They
17 inject the vapor sample directly into the machine, so there
18 isn't -- there is one less step than you would have with an
19 a soil sample in regards to the extraction.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: And the main reason that we do this is
21 because it saves a lot of cost in the number of samples that
22 we are taking and time, the turnaround time as well --

23 MR. FORD: The turnaround time --

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- when we are doing the field --

25 MR. FORD: And also you have holding time constraints

1 when you take a bad sample in a tedlar bag, we could use
2 canisters, but that becomes very costly.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Considering the number of points that we
4 are looking at.

5 MR. RIPPERDA: And then in all the SVE samples you have
6 taken over the years, have you sent some of them, have you co-
7 collected samples --

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Confirmation samples --

9 MR. RIPPERDA: -- confirmed your on-site with off-site
10 with TO14 versus the 8021?

11 MR. FORD: We haven't since we started the program.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: I don't know. Did you guys do that,
13 Chuck?

14 MR. BURIL: Yes, we did.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: How often did you do that?

16 MR. BURIL: At least once a year.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So maybe -- right now we are in
18 the process of doing an annual event, and we might want to
19 incorporate some confirmations into our annual event.

20 Okay. And that's -- those are all our -- all your
21 comments, Mark. I don't know.

22 Did you have any other questions or anything?

23 MR. RIPPERDA: No.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: And David, you said that you guys were
25 not going to have any comments unless I get that e-mail from

1 you? That was -- the remedial design.

2 MR. YOUNG: I didn't have any comments, but I also
3 submitted it to a staff engineer and didn't hear anything
4 back, but I think I indicated in the e-mail, or you told me
5 that we still have a final draft --

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: Exactly.

7 MR. YOUNG: If there are any comments from the Regional
8 Board, I think they will be minor, and we will provide them
9 as soon as possible.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

11 And if you look at the schedule you still -- I
12 think that we are supposed to finalize all these comments
13 over the next few days. Then you are going to get another
14 30-day review period after that. So if you give us -- if you
15 get us those comments before then, that will be great.

16 Okay. I'm going to move along, then. That is
17 pretty much it for OU2.

18 As you can see, OU2 is really moving along pretty
19 well. And I don't know. Does anybody have any other
20 questions on anything related to OU2?

21 Okay. Well, I have in here a break right now. I
22 don't know. It's up to everybody, kind of take a vote.

23 You can see I have lunch a little bit later because
24 I know that we are probably going -- I mean, this is at least
25 my gut feeling is that we are going to talk a lot about OU3.

1 implemented.

2 So on having not really a Draft Final but kind of an
3 updated draft put together right now that we are going to put
4 out to give to the City and also we are going to send up to, I
5 think, our attorneys at NASA headquarters, that we get
6 everybody's buy-in right now while we are responding to your
7 comments at the same time, so if you still do have any minor
8 comments or anything else that you might have missed, you
9 know, let us know.

10 But one of the things that is making us think that
11 this isn't going to go as fast as it seems like it's going are
12 our discussions with -- I guess with the City of Pasadena.

13 And I kind of wanted to talk about that a little bit
14 because it's important to recognize that the recommended
15 alternative, alternative 2a, involves very, very close
16 coordination with the City of Pasadena.

17 And we have been meeting with them for over what,
18 two, two and a half years now, and we have met with them a lot
19 over the summer when Dave was here, and it seems like things
20 are a little bit stalled at the moment.

21 We have still basically given them the meat of the
22 EE/CA, we have given them the alternatives, and we have given
23 them the technical reasoning behind the alternatives and what
24 we are recommending, but we haven't really gotten a full buy-
25 in on moving forward.

1 So what we are going to ask maybe from the three of you is if
2 you can provide us any support or how you think we should
3 proceed. Because some of the things that are coming up is
4 sure, we can go ahead and finalize the EE/CA, but if we have a
5 final EE/CA document that is just sitting there and then we
6 try to have a public meeting by ourselves without the City or
7 if we try to, you know, start building something on the
8 property, then that is not really going to happen.

9 And so these are kind of some of the things that
10 are keeping us from moving forward, you know, at the pace
11 that we would like to move forward.

12 The other thing, of course, being 97-005, but
13 97-005, for the most part, is moving along very well. I
14 think we have already finished our sampling analysis plan,
15 and I know I talked with Mark about this the other day. We
16 are sending that out to the Department of Health Services to
17 start reviewing so that we can get our next quarterly round
18 of ground water samples to satisfy not only the CERCLA
19 requirements but at the same time get extra samples taken to
20 satisfy the 97-005 requirements.

21 And at that time, that point in time, we will be
22 putting out our first -- I think there's four main sections
23 of this 97-005, and we're going to be putting out the first
24 one in a draft form fairly soon after we get those samples
25 back as well so -- and I think, actually, Hooshang, you guys

1 are almost done with the first draft -- internal draft of
2 that source water assessment report; is that correct?

3 MR. NEZAFATI: Yes.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: So, I mean, so we are
5 almost ready to just push forward on both getting the EE/CA
6 finalized, getting 97-005, the actual document, started to
7 submit to DHS with the City's name on the documents. They
8 are basically by us for the City.

9 MR. NEZAFATI: For the City.

10 MR. BURIL: Who is going to submit them, Richard?

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: We will act -- see, that's -- and there
12 you go.

13 Another question that comes up is we don't have any
14 agreements with the City. The City, though they know exactly
15 what they want to do and their lower level engineers like
16 what we're proposing to do, they want us to do it as soon as
17 possible. We can't get the City to quite agree to move
18 forward with it at the pace that we want to move forward with
19 it.

20 And so, again, I want to let Peter talk, you know,
21 because Peter has been in these meetings with us, you know.
22 Dave knows what is going on -- during the summer, Dave
23 Clextan, and I just want to get maybe any input you guys may
24 have on how you see this moving forward with those obstacles.

25 And I want -- Peter, if you want to put in your

1 comments at this time, too, that will be great.

2 MR. ROBLES: When Richard talks about the City, he's
3 talking about PWP, Pasadena Water and Power. He's not
4 talking about the City Council because Pasadena Water and
5 Power has not officially briefed the City Council on this.
6 This is where my dilemma comes in.

7 We have been working with the Pasadena Water and
8 Power, Brad Boman, Gary Takara, Shan Kwan, and Phyllis
9 Currie, who is the General Manager, but it appears that we
10 have -- that the EE/CA has not been socialized. This EE/CA
11 has not been socialized the city council yet.

12 It appears that they want a done deal with all of
13 the things that they want above and beyond what the EE/CA
14 state. And I'm at struggling right now, and the problem in
15 trying to get an agreement is that they don't want to even
16 present anything to the City until they get all of the
17 whistles and bells that they want, which is above and beyond
18 what's in the EE/CA. So I am struggling.

19 I have talked with NASA headquarters. If we don't
20 get something soon, we are going to have to make a decision
21 within NASA to cut bait, and we are just going to press on
22 with the FS and Record of Decision. And then we have a
23 dilemma because we're not going to have their buy-in, and we
24 are going to come to you and ask what do we do next.

25 Because it looks like OU3 is not going to happen if

1 the City keeps playing around. We have tried to make it
2 clear to them that issues of lost opportunity and past damage
3 is beyond the scope of my authority to discuss, and the fact
4 is that we want to get this in place so that we can address
5 the issues of plume control, but they are looking for much
6 more. And I can't get them to understand that, and we have
7 discussed that with them.

8 MR. BURIL: Would it be helpful for to you enumerate
9 some of those?

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes. Actually -- yes. And some of the
11 things are -- it really depends on how we implement it is one
12 caveat to the whole thing. If we implement it by just giving
13 the City the money to do it, which is one way to do it,
14 that's where the biggest impasse comes in because, for
15 example, our EE/CA says we are going to pay to install the
16 system, which our estimate is like about \$14 million or
17 something like that. And the City says well, we would like
18 that 14 million, but why can't you throw another couple
19 million on top of that for this, that and another.

20 And, you know, I don't think the government can go
21 and just give money for this, that and another through this
22 mechanism -- maybe through other mechanisms, and which I
23 don't want to really discuss, but through the CERCLA process
24 we can really only do what CERCLA requires.

25 I mean, sure, there are things that we can, you

1 know, fudge here and there to make sure that it works because
2 we want to make sure that the system works to achieve the
3 removal action objective. But when you are talking about
4 these huge differences in what they are looking for, it is
5 really hard to justify.

6 I think that, overall, one of the ways that we are
7 finding that maybe is the best way to do it now, and this is
8 something that we are working with NASA to try to develop our
9 next proposal to the City, is maybe if we change the strategy
10 of how we actually implement it such that the Navy and its
11 contractors actually go install the system for the City in
12 conjunction with the City and basically so it meets all the
13 specifications that we need to meet to operate for the
14 removal action and then turn it over to the City, let them
15 operate it, then we have a smaller difference of opinion.

16 I think our difference of opinion there is we're
17 asking for, what, 2.1 million a year for O&M, and they are
18 asking for 2.5 or something like that. So we would avoid a
19 lot of issues, maybe, if we do it that way.

20 But, again, we proposed that to the City at our
21 last meeting which was, I think, in late August, and we still
22 get the same feedback from them, which is even if you do that
23 we still want this other check on the side.

24 And we have told them again and again that we need
25 to separate what we are doing through CERCLA versus claims or

1 any legal things that really have nothing to do with CERCLA.

2 MR. BURIL: Do you fellows understand what he's taking
3 about?

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. There are things that are, you
5 know, lawsuit material versus CERCLA material. That's what
6 we are looking at.

7 And we are trying to work with them in cooperation
8 with the City so that we don't even ever get to those, you
9 know, other issues that we have been trying to avoid. So we
10 have been trying to really take all their comments into
11 account when we put the system together, you know, whether
12 it's through -- you know, maybe we need a new pipe here or
13 maybe we need something else here. You know, we can
14 accommodate certain things to make the system work, but we
15 can't accommodate these huge differences of opinion and
16 that's where they run into the problem.

17 Now, like what Peter was saying is what is
18 happening is that we have the engineers on board with the
19 engineering solutions in the EE/CA alternative 2a. They
20 agreed that that's a good way, at least a good start, towards
21 getting this rolling.

22 But what's happening is the PWP engineers have
23 supposedly been on the City Council's calendar several times
24 over the last six months, but they either keep getting bumped
25 off -- I put in quotes -- or, you know, somehow removed from

1 the calendar, and we can't figure out why.

2 And we wonder, like Peter said, if the reason is
3 because the City Council or -- and/or Pasadena either wants
4 all or nothing, and we really don't have the mechanisms to
5 provide, you know, what they are considering all.

6 We have the mechanisms to provide what we have
7 owned up to in the EE/CA, which we are ready to implement,
8 and that's what we are trying to get them to work with.

9 So we are very far along, but we are at the point
10 where it's kind of like trying to -- at the crest of the
11 hill, and if we can get over that crest of the hill, you
12 know, this is going to start rolling, but we are just
13 having that bit of a problem right now breaching the hill, I
14 guess.

15 So that's where I see us, and that's why the main
16 concern that we have is that it's not the document. I think
17 the document, it seems like from your comments, that the
18 document is in pretty good shape. We all know what we want
19 to do. We are all in agreement. I think that if I had Gary
20 Takara and Brad Boman from the City here, they would probably
21 say -- if their management wasn't watching, they would
22 probably say the same thing: This is a good idea; let's go
23 do it.

24 But it's that next step of finalizing the document,
25 presenting it to the public, and the -- when we do that

1 presentation, I am sure that the City is going to want to be
2 there by our side. And if they are not, then that means that
3 obviously we are trying to do this alone. So that's the
4 point we are trying to get to so we can get agreement
5 and get the City to go along with us.

6 MR. ROBLES: See, if the City doesn't agree, it's their
7 land; we can't build on it without their permission.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

9 MR. RIPPERDA: And you can't sell the water without
10 going through that.

11 MR. BURIL: And you can't get 97-005 addressed --

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's right.

13 MR. GEBERT: So you would have to have them on board
14 before you go too far along on the EE/CA --

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Not necessarily --

16 MR. RIPPERDA: You can finalize the EE/CA document
17 itself --

18 MR. BURIL: I don't think you can go in front of the
19 public, and begin the work without having the City on
20 board.

21 MR. ROBLES: We're going to face the same problem if --
22 you know, we are coming to a point in the process where we
23 can't spend anymore time on this. We are going to have to
24 say okay, look, if we're not going to get an agreement, we
25 are going to press on and do a Record of Decision for OU-3--

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: And that's some of the reasons, like I
2 talked about earlier, for our contingent plan, starting to
3 move OU1 now.

4 Because, you know, we did -- I think I showed you
5 at one of our last couple of meetings, maybe it was even
6 while I was gone during the summer, we did evaluate some
7 strictly on-site containment scenarios which we -- which you
8 saw were very ineffective, or they were effective, maybe, in
9 containing some of the high portions of the plume, but the
10 majority of the plume still goes right by it.

11 But it might be a start, and it might be something
12 to show that we are really doing something, which we really
13 want to do. And that's the reason, again, now you can see
14 the reason why we have these two parallel tracks because we
15 are afraid that one of these tracks is, you know, really
16 going to stop, or it's just going to take a long time to get
17 in place. That's why we're doing the other one.

18 So that's kind of where we are, and before we
19 really get into the actual EE/CA comments, you know, I just
20 want to keep this discussion going.

21 MR. ROBLES: Sooner or later we are going to need your
22 support, whether it's implementing the EE/CA, or to do a
23 Record of Decision in OU-3, if the City doesn't get off the
24 issue of past damages and lost opportunities, we can't do
25 anything on OU3.

1 MR. BURIL: There is one other additional issue of the
2 additional wells as well.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Chuck, could you speak up?

4 MR. BURIL: I'm sorry. There is the additional issue of
5 other wells affected by perchlorate that the City has
6 raised as well.

7 MR. RIPPERDA: Meaning that they want to see wellhead
8 treatment on those other wells?

9 MR. BURIL: There are nine additional wells that they are
10 looking at.

11 MS. GATES: Sunset well.

12 MR. BURIL: Ones that are far south of the 210 freeway.

13 MS. GATES: Have to deal with that eventually.

14 MR. ROBLES: They are basically saying that this is a
15 good start, but they want to see every PWP well, literally.
16 They are looking to get everything and the kitchen sink.

17 MR. GEBERT: Are those other wells affected by
18 perchlorate?

19 MR. ROBLES: Not from us.

20 MR. BURIL: They have perchlorate concentrations in
21 them; however, based on the information that we have
22 available through the RI, we don't believe that perchlorate
23 is sourced from JPL.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Those are the things that we think about,
25 the upgradient injection. Because if you look at the model,

1 you can kind of see how, if there was any perchlorate that
2 kind of flew on the south side of the site, kind of following
3 the same path as the PCE that we are seeing coming from
4 upgradient, so we think that whatever is hitting those really
5 far south wells is probably coming upgradient, and we are
6 trying to confirm that through all our modeling, but from
7 what we have seen so far, that is what it seems like.

8 Those -- at least those wells, that is where we
9 think that's coming from. Because it's just too far down
10 gradient and too far south to really be coming from our site.

11 MR. RIPPERDA: So that becomes a technical argument with
12 the City proving to them with additional upgradient
13 sampling that you are not responsible for that so --

14 MR. ROBLES: They don't care.

15 MR. BURIL: Assuming that they would buy a technical
16 argument as justification for them not pursue.

17 MR. ROBLES: They don't care.

18 MR. BURIL: At this juncture it doesn't appear that they
19 would buy any technical argument that places them in a
20 position of having to expend monies to provide wellhead
21 treatment.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: Because we have brought that up,
23 actually. Maybe we haven't actually done all the exact
24 modeling and shown them that, but we have shown them through
25 maps and through other information that we don't believe that

1 that's coming from our facility so --

2 MR. RIPPERDA: So right now, you presented to them that
3 you wanted to put wellhead treatment on "X" number of wells,
4 "X" dollars, and you are kind of presenting it as a take-it or
5 leave-it, this is what we're doing to do, this is good for you
6 and --

7 MR. ROBLES: No, no, no. We haven't said it as take it
8 or leave it. We said that we want this so that we can
9 control the plume. We know that as this process continues,
10 and CERCLA is a process, that if other issues are raised and
11 it can be shown that we are the cause of your concerns, then
12 we will address those.

13 We are looking at this, if other issues come up,
14 that we may have to expand the EE/CA, in the future addressing
15 of your concerns, we will do that. We made it clear. This is
16 not a final solution. This is about controlling the plume.
17 There is a record of decision in the future that has to
18 include the whole site itself. And we have to bring those in
19 there to look at them. So understand, there is an
20 opportunity.

21 But what they are looking at, they want it now.
22 They want it all to be addressed now. And we are saying we
23 want to deal with plume control right now. We still have to
24 do some more investigation.

25 And understand that from a technical standpoint we

1 don't believe that we are the total source of everything that
2 you have as a problem of perchlorate. We got an upgradient
3 source, we got other issues that have happened, and we can't
4 convince them. They just want their resolution right now.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: And recognizing that we -- I think, Mark,
6 you came to one of our meetings where we tried to show them
7 the CERCLA process. We said this is a removal action. It's
8 not -- like Peter said, it's not the final remedy. This is a
9 part of the final remedy. And the final remedy, once we
10 study it more, and working with them may include more wells.

11 I mean, the whole idea behind the removal action is
12 that from all the modeling that we have done for all the work
13 that we have done over the last -- almost the last year has
14 shown that if we extract "X" amount of gallons per minute
15 from those two wells, it's going to contain 98 percent of the
16 plume that is coming from the facility.

17 So -- and that's the reason we keep presenting it
18 to them, that we want to do it as a removal action. I mean
19 nothing says that -- we can't just take what we have done in
20 this EE/CA and turn it into a draft FS and we'll beef it up a
21 little bit and go through the whole process.

22 But, of course, even somewhere down the line there
23 we are going to have to go through public meetings, but it's
24 not going to be for another, you know, year and a half right
25 now. So we are just trying to show them that this is what we

1 think is going to contain most of the chemicals coming from
2 the facility and is the quickest way to getting a solution.
3 Not necessarily the final solution, but what we think is going
4 to be definitely a large portion of that.

5 So I don't think we have ever said take it or leave
6 it but --

7 MR. BURIL: No.

8 MR. RIPPERDA: So now you are at kind of two basic
9 choices, each branching into many other things. You can
10 continue negotiating --

11 MR. ROBLES: Where, Mark?

12 MR. RIPPERDA: Now. And try to convince the right
13 people in the City that doing this action now is the right
14 thing to do now, and all the other issues get taken care of
15 when they get taken care of. Or you say you don't think
16 that's going to ever resolve until it's time to switch to one
17 of your other options and do injection --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: Even injection involves using their wells.
19 Anything that's off the facility that involves using their
20 wells, they are not going to disengage any of these issues.

21 The only thing that would involve injection that
22 would not involve them is if we moved to our OU1 options,
23 which would involve some probably extraction injection in
24 situ on the facility.

25 MR. BURIL: Remember, everything that is outside of this

1 property line on this map either belongs to the City of
2 Pasadena or a private entity.

3 MR. RIPPERDA: So even for you to drill your own new well
4 involves --

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: City of Pasadena, same issue.

6 MR. BURIL: Exact same issue. Even just getting the
7 water from those locations back to a treatment facility
8 located on-site, if we were to inject, would require the City
9 of Pasadena.

10 MR. RIPPERDA: You see, Mark, if there's a glimmer of
11 chance that there might be a light at the end of this tunnel,
12 I would continue negotiating one way or the other because
13 ultimately we need them on board.

14 But the key is that this issue of lost opportunity
15 and past damages we honestly have told them, guys, I can't
16 talk to you about it, and understand that CERCLA keeps
17 marching on no matter what you do.

18 MR. RIPPERDA: Well, but CERCLA doesn't have to keep
19 marching on. Because if you can't use their wells or their
20 land, you can't do your CERCLA action, your documents then
21 are just documents and don't have --

22 MR. ROBLES: Unless you give us the authority to do
23 something.

24 MR. GEBERT: Peter, when you say you would like our
25 support, what do you mean by that?

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Well, I think there's a variety of things.
2 I mean, of course, the one we would never want to invoke would
3 be taking wells and things like that, and I don't think we
4 want to go that far, --

5 MR. GEBERT: I don't understand --

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: We would have to actually take their
7 property.

8 MR. BURIL: Eminent domain.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. And we would actually just -- it
10 would become the government's for indefinite period of time
11 until we get our actions completed.

12 I mean, that's -- that's the worst case scenario.
13 I think some of the things that we are looking at now would
14 be, you know, maybe one of the next meetings, maybe, we would
15 need the three of you to come in and, you know, talk with
16 them, talk with their management, call them about us there,
17 see what their true perspective is, and I will give you their
18 phone numbers.

19 I mean, I think that there's -- now we need to show
20 the fact that we -- we are doing our best to get them on
21 board. Maybe if they see that you guys have all approved
22 this document, it's ready to go, you just need to start
23 implementing it, maybe that might help them.

24 I mean, we really don't know exactly what's going
25 to get them over that, you know, over that hill, but we think

1 that maybe some type of support so that they don't know --
2 they don't think that this is just our pie-in-the-sky idea to
3 do this.

4 If they also see that, you know, there's three
5 other governmental regulation -- regulatory bodies that are
6 also supporting this decision, then maybe that might be
7 something that PWP's manager might be able to say okay, well
8 maybe now I feel a little more comfortable in talking to my
9 City Council, but, then again, maybe -- maybe not. But
10 that -- but we are thinking that maybe that's the next step.

11 MR. ROBLES: I really need to know if even the City
12 Council will support this. You see, I don't believe that
13 Pasadena Water and Power engineers have even gone to the City
14 Council officially and talked to the City. This is what was
15 presented to us; can you guys support this for now?

16 Because it doesn't appear that they have even
17 got -- socialized the EE/CA to the City Council. That's
18 where I am having a struggle. And I can't even get a letter
19 of support from them. We have been waiting for three weeks
20 from PWP.

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: Because at our last meeting they said
22 they were going to send us a letter saying they support the
23 principle of the EE/CA so that might help us to maybe start
24 getting funding together and start pushing this along.

25 But we don't think, like Peter said, I don't think

1 that PWP has even mentioned this to the City Council, and
2 that's our fear because we think that -- if they have even
3 just mentioned it to the City Council, maybe the City Council
4 would say, well, God, they are giving us 15 million bucks to
5 get this done and solve our problems; why don't we do it?
6 And then we can leave the legal issues for another day. And
7 we don't know if that's happening.

8 MR. BURIL: And the other side of that coin is that the
9 City Council says we are tired of this, and they come
10 whistling back through some other avenue, like through
11 litigation.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: And maybe PWP is afraid of that type of
13 answer because then they know that maybe they won't get
14 anything for a long time, so we don't really know exactly
15 what is happening. And we are making our guesses, and we are
16 meeting with them regularly still.

17 I talked with Gary Takara, and the reason that the
18 letter was somewhat delayed was because he was out sick for
19 like a week and a half, but he was supposed to have it to us
20 before this meeting, and we still haven't seen it. So we are
21 not really sure what is going on over there.

22 So that's -- those are the things that we are
23 talking about now where we see -- we definitely see the
24 progress in the EE/CA, we definitely see the progress in the
25 removal action. I think that on NASA's side we are ready to

1 go. We are just waiting for those other things that we need
2 to, you know, make this happen, happen, and that's maybe why
3 some support from you guys right now might be that thing that
4 helps us get this going.

5 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. If you e-mail us names, phone
6 numbers, addresses, titles, I would certainly be glad to call
7 Phyllis or whoever you think is the appropriate person --

8 MR. ROBLES: Also give him the name of the City Manager.

9 MR. BURIL: Cynthia Kurtz?

10 MR. RIPPERDA: And you guys have talked with the City
11 Manager?

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes.

13 MR. ROBLES: The City Manager is Cynthia Kurtz and
14 Phyllis Currie, is the PWP General Manager.

15 But we did talk to her and told her that if we
16 disengage lost opportunity and past damages -- I'm not saying
17 don't address it; I am saying disengage it from this. You can
18 still address it in other meetings because I don't have the
19 authority to talk about lost opportunity and past damages.
20 You can seek those issues in other venues.

21 But the CERCLA process it is not appropriate for
22 these issues. We don't have the authority to do that.

23 We do not pay past damages and lost opportunity
24 through CERCLA funds. Those are brought through the
25 Department of Justice, through other venues.

1 And we tried to make it clear to them. We are not saying
2 don't do it. We are saying that I can't discuss it but you
3 can still seek it. But don't hang up the EE/CA and the
4 implementation of this removal actions.

5 MR. BURIL: And there are some fundamental issues that
6 they had too. But I don't know how strongly they feel on this
7 one particular issue regarding the two wells versus four.

8 MS. GATES: They are afraid that if we don't hook up all
9 the wells now that we are not going to. You can --

10 MR. BURIL: So in principle you have issue with the
11 EE/CA itself, that we've only identified the use of two wells.
12 They want all four like the VOC plant.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: But what we have talked to them about is
14 how, from what we have seen through our modeling and what,
15 you know, potentially looking at the current -- what might be
16 a PHG coming up early next year, is that we think that
17 treating the two wells and then the continued blending that
18 they have been doing for the last few years, they are going
19 to be way below the PHG. And there is no reason to treat all
20 four of those wells when, after probably a short time, once
21 the plume is contained, especially with Arroyo, kind of pull
22 the plume back away from those other wells, and why would we
23 build a, you know, \$25 million system when we can build a \$15
24 million system and accomplish the same thing in the next few
25 years.

1 So -- and for the most part that's been a -- that's come up a
2 few times, but I think that -- I don't think that that is
3 necessarily the sticking point. Could be.

4 So that's where we are, and I just want to address
5 that with you guys, and I don't know if you have any other
6 questions.

7 I will at least e-mail you the names and phone
8 numbers of Phyllis Currie and some titles and all of that,
9 you know. If you want to get together with a meeting with
10 all of us, if you guys want to meet with them and talk with
11 them separately, we are open either way.

12 MR. YOUNG: When is your next meeting planned?

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: Well, we were waiting for their letter,
14 so we don't have one planned right now. So assuming that we
15 get their letter soon, then we will probably call them. We
16 usually schedule them pretty quickly. I mean, it doesn't
17 take a whole lot. You know, within a couple weeks we can
18 schedule a meeting so --

19 MR. ROBLES: Can we get a commitment that if we schedule
20 a meeting within the next 30 days that we can contact you to
21 be there so at least they can see and you can hear from them
22 directly what we are talking about because then you would get
23 a feel for it, and you may want to meet with them after that
24 on your own to really get a feel for what their concerns are.

25 We have told them that the CERCLA process allows

1 for the City of Pasadena to bring up their concerns to the
2 regulators. My biggest concern is move this along one way or
3 another. If I could find out from the City Council, yes, they
4 will support it or no, they won't support it, I can do
5 something. Right now I am in limbo.

6 MR. RIPPERDA: So I'll call Phyllis. I don't know if it
7 might be better for all of us to call her or just one of us,
8 but I'll call her in the next couple of weeks to chat with
9 her, and then I'll talk to --

10 MR. ROBLES: Kurtz. City Manager.

11 MR. RIPPERDA: Well, I'll probably talk with Phyllis
12 first, and then I'll talk with one of you, just to let you
13 know, and then --

14 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

15 MR. RIPPERDA: Phyllis, you know, based on that, we will
16 discuss whether or not I should be calling the City Manager
17 and then probably have a meeting with all the regulatory
18 agencies and you guys and the City people again.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: So I will hold off on setting up a
20 meeting until after you have done that.

21 MR. RIPPERDA: And then maybe after the meeting, if they
22 are still recalcitrant, some kind of letter from all three of
23 the regulatory agencies, either one letter or probably more
24 likely separate letters to the City Manager saying that they
25 are holding up the remediation process.

1 MR. ROBLES: Greatly appreciate it.

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: And by that time they'll have reviewed
3 the actual document and probably be pretty close to having
4 the final document. And then as soon as we get their
5 agreement, the next step would be to have public comment on
6 the EE/CA and get -- start the public comment period, public
7 meeting. So that would be a big milestone too.

8 I am sure a lot of people in this area are very --
9 I mean, and that is going to be a contentious meeting as
10 well. That's something that we are ready to face.

11 MR. RIPPERDA: If the City stays recalcitrant and
12 doesn't issue an absolute no, but stays recalcitrant, there's
13 all kinds of strategies to pursue? One is to have a public
14 meeting that is just a public information meeting, and you
15 tell the public this is what we would like to do, this is
16 what we think is best, don't paint the City out to be totally
17 bad but say that --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: We are waiting for them.

19 MR. RIPPERDA: That we are waiting for them and, like,
20 what do you think, public, we should do?

21 MR. BURIL: So paint them gray instead of black.

22 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah.

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: Because we did want to -- we thought
24 about doing that too. And that is why we think maybe taking
25 this approach first and waiting a little bit longer because

1 we thought about doing that, just going out there and then
2 saying well, the reason we haven't done it is because of the
3 City and that might not really help our cause so --

4 MR. RIPPERDA: Right. I think one of my comments just
5 on the EE/CA is there are so many uncertainties with 97-005
6 and the City and the public acceptance. And both the City
7 and 97-005 would want public acceptance before going forward
8 with distributing treated water for public consumption that
9 maybe you want to just have a nice, friendly public
10 information meeting anyway during the process, not to paint
11 the City even gray, but we just go to the public and say this
12 is what we are thinking about.

13 Usually when we go to the public with our proposed
14 plans, we have already evaluated all the options, we have
15 made our decision, and we are holding a public meeting
16 because the law says we have to hold a public meeting. It
17 doesn't really involve the public in the decision making
18 process.

19 This is such a big scope, and the public is
20 actually going to be getting the results of what you are
21 going to do that maybe you should hold an openhouse kind of
22 public information meeting early, and you find that they are
23 so against it that you forget about maybe 97-005, and you
24 just pursue reinjection.

25 Or you find out that the people who are willing to

1 come to a meeting think that it's fine and that gives you some
2 good information to go to DHS and say we have held public
3 meetings, the public has some concerns, but they buy into it,
4 so we are confident when 97-005 goes out for its public
5 meeting that things will go smoothly.

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

7 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. I need a moment to
8 change paper.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. We'll take an administrative
10 moment here.

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: So I did want to let you guys know that
12 is what we think is maybe the main barrier to the action right
13 now, because now I want to go through your comments, and I
14 think that for the most part we haven't addressed them. But
15 they are not going to be very difficult to address, so I have
16 Richard's up on the screen, and we can go through Richard's
17 first.

18 The first one is modifying the text to explain a
19 little bit better why we dropped some of the chemicals of
20 concern.

21 MR. GEBERT: Right.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: Weed it down from one document to the
23 next, and now we only have three whereas once we had twelve.

24 MR. GEBERT: And I think that was your main comment.

25 Kind of refers back to Mark's comment, if somebody

1 is familiar with the history of the site, would read the
2 document. The question they would probably have regarding
3 this paragraph or something is that they were screened
4 out or because they are not involved in the off-site
5 migration; they are not involved with this removal action.

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think that, and I will let Hooshang
7 address this a little bit more. I think we kind of generally
8 touched on that, but maybe not so really detail --

9 MR. NEZAFATI: I can explain that --

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Sure.

11 MR. NEZAFATI: -- if you want me to.

12 The No. 12 chemicals and also five chemicals, they
13 go back to RI, the final RI, and they use 1997 to 1998 data,
14 and they had a two-step criteria. And they screened --
15 basically using first step, they screened chemicals to 12, in
16 other words, 12 chemicals. The concentrations were found
17 that they exceed the PRGs or PEAs; and then step two, they
18 checked the concentration of the chemicals against the
19 known MCLs and action levels, and five chemicals basically
20 were found that they exceed these chemicals.

21 These basically MCLs and actual levels, three VOCs,
22 one metal, and one perchlorate. But, again, this was for the
23 period of 1997 to 1998.

24 EE/CA used the later water quality data, October
25 2000 water quality data. And they checked the chemicals

1 against the MCLs and action levels, and only three chemicals
2 were shown that they exceed these.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: But you used the same process that was
4 used?

5 MR. NEZAFATI: The same process.

6 MR. BURIL: The metals dropped out.

7 MR. NEZAFATI: The different period more basically
8 updated water quality data.

9 MR. ROBLES: And that's basically what needs to be
10 stated.

11 MR. NEZAFATI: We need to make that very clear. We
12 thought that was, but apparently it wasn't, because we had
13 other comments.

14 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: One of the things I know how you
15 currently have it -- I think it would be worthwhile to have
16 the list of the chemicals as they were reduced rather than
17 just describing them. I think in the table --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. The second
19 one is the 97-005 process, and it seems like,
20 Richard, you just want a little bit better description of how
21 the process works because we kind of just barely touched on
21 it.

22 MR. GEBERT: The same general comments?

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: We can do that too.

24 MR. GEBERT: Readability. Just a little bit more
25 explanation.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's not a problem. The next one, were
2 the ARARs that were provided back in '93, '94, and let's see.

3 MR. GEBERT: The document says the State never produced
4 ARARs, which really isn't true.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: So you did provide them back in --

6 MR. GEBERT: If you want a new list, we can do that.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think we will not ask you for another
8 list, and we'll look at what you provided.

9 MR. RIPPERDA: Remove that sentence.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Definitely. We will remove that.

11 Next one is the RAO statement, and, you know, you
12 are right, and I think that we tried to get that RAO fairly
13 general and --

14 MR. GEBERT: It's a thought. You know, consider it. I
15 don't know if it might be better to have more objectives than
16 less, but --

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: I don't know. I guess the only reason
18 that we left it as we did because I think we started out
19 maybe too specific at one time, and we said well, maybe this
20 is too specific and then went maybe too general. This has
21 gone back several times with NASA' attorney as well. We'll
22 talk with Tim.

23 MR. GEBERT: I know there's legal issues.

24 MR. NEZAFATI: I have just one comment, that it is
25 really a good comment, but if you include this in the RAO,

1 then since we are basically evaluating our alternatives
2 against whether they meet this RAO or not. We do have some
3 alternatives that they do not involve basically treating the
4 ground water and giving that to the public for, you
5 know, public consumption, so I guess in that regard it may
6 limit the number of the alternatives that we have to
7 basically evaluate --

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think that might have been one of the
9 reasons why, when we were starting this, we were too
10 specific, and then we made it general because when we started
11 this EE/CA, well head treatment was out of the question at
12 that point in time. So I think it didn't matter, but when we
13 started adding well head treatment back in, we made it more
14 general and encompassing.

15 We can look at the statement again. And we can,
16 you know, try to revise it to whatever extent NASA will let
17 us revise it. And if you guys still have a real heartache
18 with that, I am sure we can still talk about this.

19 I think there is still time that we'll be able to
20 talk about this. We will send a response to that and see
21 what you guys think. We only had two days to look at it.

22 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's not our decision to decide when
23 the wells go back online. That's the City of Pasadena. So
24 that's something we don't really control.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. As we see. And maybe that's

1 why we don't say, like, name anybody in there. It's very
2 general because you don't know really exactly what's going to
3 happen.

4 MR. ROBLES: So it would be a fair statement to, say,
5 provide an option of treating drinking water to residents.
6 The option of providing treated water to residents --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think that the main goal of the EE/CA is
8 really to contain the plume -- I think that anything up and
9 above that is really up to where the water goes once it's
10 contained, whether it's injected.

11 Because that would involve then saying the water --
12 the RAO is to reduce the migration and give to the public or
13 inject it. I mean, I don't know if that's --

14 MR. ROBLES: No.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: That would be basically what it would
16 say.

17 MR. ROBLES: The RAOs contain the plume --

18 MR. NEZAFATI: That is the main objective.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: We will comment on your comment and see
20 how you go with that.

21 Did you have something, Mark?

22 MR. RIPPERDA: I don't remember this exact text, but you
23 can have different ARARs for each option, so if one of the
24 options is to distribute water to the public, then the ARAR
25 is to meet MCLs and whatever the health level you have to

1 meet. So you should plug in the number for that option, so
2 it is not the RAOs, it's the ARAR --

3 MR. NEZAFATI: You mean the action specific ARAR.

4 MR. RIPPERDA: Yes.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Are you on number 5 there, is that what
6 you are talking about?

7 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah.

8 MR. BURIL: You moved to Number 5.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Mark's moving faster. I was slow. Okay.
10 Yeah. I think that's true too. I don't think that we
11 mentioned the numbers at all. We mentioned the rules, I think.
12 But we don't say the MCL for carbon tetrachloride is - blank.

13 MR. BURIL: Now is that a commitment to deal with that as
14 a cleanup level then.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: But if we are choosing what the numbers
16 are, then, you know, that means we agree with it too.

17 MR. BURIL: Well, my only point being that action levels
18 are not enforceable

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: True. And I think we had a comment. I
20 think that we actually -- out of the internal draft we took
21 action levels out of the ARAR section because they were not
22 ARARs because action levels are not enforceable standards.
23 We call them other --

24 MR. NEZAFATI: Standards.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Other standards or something like that.

1 Did we call them TBCs? We didn't call them TBCs.

2 MR. ROBLES: This came up because of the fact that we had
3 a DHS person at the meeting on the issue of 97-005 and on
4 the issue of the action level of perchlorate at 4 PPB -- and
5 he stated in a meeting it's unenforceable. It's not an
6 enforceable, it is an administrative issue.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: It's a notification issue.

8 MR. ROBLES: It's a notification issue and that shocked
9 all the purveyors in the Raymond basin. And I had to stand up
10 and say that's that's the reason why, you know, when you come
11 to me and say I got a 4 PPB problem with perchlorate, I say I
12 feel your pain, but I can't do anything about it because it is
13 unenforceable.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Not that we are not saying that all the
15 technologies in here do not treat to nondetectable levels. The
16 whole key there is, you know, can we say that we are going to
17 -- do we really want to put in a document that we are going to
18 put out that is going to become part of the CERCLA process
19 that we are going to treat to an unenforceable number.

20 But a lot of this may change in January of this year
21 if PRG comes out or whatever or the PHG comes out and then the
22 following year an MCL comes out. I think that was the biggest
23 hangup that we had:How can we commit to an unenforceable
24 level.

25 But we know that the technologies treat to that

1 level or less. I don't know. That's how we thought to handle
2 it. And I think that that's probably how we plan to address
3 it unless you have any other comments on how we have addressed
4 it in the EE/CA.

5 MS. GATES: For that comment specifically, we could list
6 the MCLs for carbon tetrachloride.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Absolutely.

8 MR. GEBERT: Perchlorate.

9 MS. GATES: We can put those in there.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: How we address perchlorate, I think, is
11 probably the biggest issue.

12 MR. NEZAFATI: So one option could be that we define
13 action level the same way it's defined by DHS, advisory level
14 and nonenforceable and then use the numbers. That would be
15 an option too.

16 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: We looked at that. I mean, this was
17 one of the things we were discussing when we were going
18 through. We went back and forth on this several times, but I
19 do think that it may be -- I would go along with including
20 the detailed definition of the action level and how the
21 notifications work.

22 And if you are ten times this then they recommend
23 you consider this, because it is a little different than
24 people perceive, but where we didn't want to see it was in the
25 table where you have the list of, you know, MCLs and in the

1 very next column you have the action levels, and you bold the
2 ones that exceed and things like that because it put too much
3 weight in the reader's eye of what they are seeing.

4 You can have all the definitions in the world, but
5 what they are going to see is you have this number that
6 exceeds this when it really -- the understanding I have is
7 that the decision for purveyors to shut down a well that
8 exceeded the action level is really a business decision where
9 they have decided it's not worth the potential risk to operate
10 it that way, but it's not -- the regulators are not telling
11 them that they have to shut down the well.

12 MR. ROBLES: An administrative action and has no
13 enforcement.

14 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: That is kind of the concern. If we
15 have that number in there in a table format people are going
16 to misinterpret it.

17 MR. NEZAFATI: I understand that.

18 But as it is the table you are referring to, you
19 are saying other standards, and that creates a question, what
20 are those other standards.

21 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah. You know --

22 MR. BURIL: Could I offer a suggestion that might
23 postpone this discussion in terms of establishment of a
34 clean-up level. And that is to recognize that standards
25 exist, you can even list them, but to identify that the

1 actual implementation of a standard would be deferred to the
2 remedial design remedial action plans because, really, you are
3 going to have to design that into whatever remedial action you
4 are going to do so that will be a design issue as opposed to
5 something that is an ARAR evaluation.

6 MR. GEBERT: Possible.

7 MR. ROBLES: We'll struggle with it.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: We are definitely going to provide
9 responses. I think they were talking about how we are
10 planning on responding to it, and if you have any other
11 suggestions after we do respond, I'm sure we will all talk
12 about this again, but trying to give you a heads up at this
13 point in time of how we probably will respond to that
14 comment. Okay. Let me move along then.

15 The next one is the -- okay. I think, again, we
16 kind of talked about this. What we are going to do is we
17 will probably to just kind of clear up some of the text in
18 there. You know, and if you want, when we talk about the
19 reasons, I think we stayed fairly vague on the reasons again
20 because it goes back to the action level, what was the reason
21 that the City shut their wells down.

22 Well, I mean, the reasons they shut it down is
23 because they didn't want to have to notify the public. Do we
24 want to put that in the document? I don't know. That's why
25 we stayed kind of general. If we are going to get to the

1 true reason why they shut their wells down, the true reason
2 is they exceeded the action level; they did not want to
3 report to the public.

4 MR. BURIL: That is our assumption.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Nothing says if they exceed an action
6 level they can't still deliver the water to the public and
7 keep their wells on. That's why we didn't get too specific
8 there. We figured we could get through it with a more general
9 statement than getting too specific, and I don't know if the
10 City would like us putting that in there either because I am
11 sure they -- when they review it, I don't think they are going
12 to want that. I don't know.

13 MR. GEBERT: It is good to talk about these because these
14 were questions the public is going to ask.

15 MR. RIPPERDA: I think you should change the document to
16 put some of what Richard wants in. You should never presume
17 to say why the City shut down, if it wasn't a clear-cut
18 regulatory directive. But you should explain what the DHS
19 levels mean, what the enforceability or advisory notification
20 requirements are, and you can say in general that Citys
21 typically shut down when they go past a notification level,
22 even though they are not required to. You don't have to say
23 Pasadena did that in this case, but you can say typically
24 municipal water suppliers do this, and then you can say that
25 Pasadena exceeded that administrative level.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: And the wells were shut down.

2 MR. RIPPERDA: And the wells were shut down.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think we can definitely put something in
4 there. We should explain something about action levels and
5 make it clearer. I think we will definitely put something
6 like that in there.

7 MR. RIPPERDA: That was a good comment.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Move on. Number 7, yeah, I think
9 that is fine. I don't know.

10 Hooshang, you guys can do that; right?

11 MR. NEZAFATI: No problem.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: Add more detail, whatever you want.

13 We were trying to keep it as short as possible to
14 keep it small, but we can add -- we can add as much. We have
15 a lot of data out there and things that we can add.

16 So Number 8, okay. We don't have a problem with
17 that either. These are pretty easy ones, eight, nine, as
18 well.

19 I corrected that, too, on one, on my review of
20 comments on that, and 10, right, you are correct on that.

21 What has happened is we have had so many different
22 pumping scenarios over time that we have kind of -- somewhere
23 along the line some of the numbers got confused, so we will
24 fix those, and we will fix No. 11 as well.

25 All right. Let's -- we can either -- here is our

1 choice. We can break for lunch, or go through Mark's quick
2 comments on the EE/CA.

3 MR. ROBLES: Let's go through Mark's comments.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: And then we will do the modeling stuff
5 after lunch.

6 Here is Mark. Mark was very succinct in his comment on the
7 EE/CA. And see, something like this would be a great thing to
8 copy the City on too.

9 We agree with the objective of the removal action.
10 These are things that I think would help bolster our position
11 with the City. And I think that, yeah, as far as your
12 comments go, again, I think these are pretty easy to address.

13 I didn't see any problems with at least the first
14 one, Hooshang, did you? You didn't have any comments on this
15 one at all, did you?

16 MR. NEZAFATI: I think we can correct that.

17 MR. RIPPERDA: Did I say Lincoln Avenue wells?

18 MR. ROBLES: You said Lincoln.

19 MR. RIPPERDA: I, of course, meant -- I am not thinking
20 of the name.

21 MR. ROBLES: Valley.

22 MR. RIPPERDA: Valley; right.

23 Mr. ZUROMSKI: Since, of course, this is just an e-mail
24 copy. I sure that when you send them, you'll probably send us
25 an official copy sometime. The 97-005, think we are going to

1 end up revising that 97-005 and making it a little bit more
2 succinct along with a discussion on the ARARs. Maybe that
3 will help clear up some of these things.

4 That is what the biggest hangup, I think, with the
5 two of you so far, and to what extent would you want us to
6 talk about what you have said here?

7 I mean, do you want us to say that it is going to
8 delay the process, depending on how it goes, or what? Is
9 that the type of wording you would like us to use?

10 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. I think there's so many open-ended
11 questions.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

13 MR. RIPPERDA: The EE/CA makes it look like you are
14 choosing a course of action and ready to press forward, but
15 even if you got the City to buy in, you might have another
16 year or two with 97-005, so that should be explained.

17 Kind of like explaining what Richard wanted with
18 perchlorate action levels. Should explain possible hangups
19 in timelines.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: And, you know, actually one of the
21 comments I made was -- and I put a question mark by it. I
22 don't know if you read my comments or not. I put a question
23 mark by it. To what extent should we discuss how much
24 involvement and cooperation we need with the City to get this
25 in place as well.

1 What do you guys think? I wrote a comment and put
2 big brackets question mark around it. Because, if you write
3 too much, then the City sees it and says "what the hell is
4 this", but if you don't write anything and the public thinks
5 this is just going to happen like you said. And not knowing
6 these kinds of hangups, I am debating whether or not to put
7 any statement at all in there 1 about the City and/or not,
8 or maybe just say something general in there like we need to
9 cooperate with the City to do such and such.

10 MR. RIPPERDA: I think all -- the nine criteria include
11 an implementability, and if an option is the best option
12 except that you can't implement it; you still can't do it.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: Which is all the options, by the way.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: All of your options have huge problems
15 with implementability, which may just mean you need to forget
16 about it, to go forward to on-site capture what you can at
17 the leading edge on-site and deal with potential litigation
18 from off-site receptors. Who knows? You should in the imple-
19 mentability discussion for the options, discuss 97-005 and
20 discuss that they all require coordination with the City, and
21 then maybe put a few of the specific coordination issues, not
22 say that the City is holding things up, but actually explain
23 why it's a big deal, it involves you doing work on City -- on
24 the property, possibly acquiring City wells, doing work on
25 City-owned wells, you know, providing water for the City to

1 distribute, things that are -- go ahead, Chuck.

2 MR. BURIL: I would caution anyone from thinking that
3 NASA is providing water to the City. It may place them in a
4 position of being a purveyor.

5 MR. RIPPERDA: Word it however it technically and
6 correctly fits, but hit some of these issues so the public
7 reading it can realize there is a lot to be worked out here.

8 MR. ROBLES: In general terms that's the best thing.
9 We need to because when the public reads it, they have to know
10 that we have to coordinate with the City on these issues.
11 Also, we will let the City know, okay, we are on the hook. We
12 have to respond to the public. They are going to ask us how
13 is the City doing on these issues, and we are going to say
14 talk to the City.

15 MR. RIPPERDA: When we all read a document we look for
16 our own names. You say the State of California didn't do
17 something with the ARAR, the State of California is going to
18 notice. If you say the City of Pasadena in there anywhere,
19 that is the one section they are going to read, and it will
20 help them pay attention.

21 MR. BURIL: Help them pay attention. Well said.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. We will definitely -- we are going
23 to beef up the text a bit.

24 And, like I said, this is going to be -- it's not
25 going to be a Draft Final, but it is going to be a revised

1 draft, and I'll send that out, and everybody can take a look
2 at all the things that we revised, and we will provide
3 response to comments as well so you can see how we addressed
4 all these issues.

5 And I don't know, Mark, your last two comments, at
6 least the section 604, will have that taken care of, the last
7 one, absolutely, I think that that is true.

8 And if that just wasn't clear that we had said that
9 because I know we mentioned the toad as part of
10 implementability as far as the pipelines across the Arroyo,
11 but maybe we don't mention it in that section.

12 MR. RIPPERDA: Right, the whole spreading basin issue was
13 thrown in there as a - if we don't have our 97-005, but we are
14 ready to go. We can go and use the spreading basins, and I
15 wanted it to be made clear again with implementability. It's
16 not necessarily that easy.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

18 MR. BURIL: Mark, could you distinguish for me how you
19 anticipate the use of the spreading basin for spreading water
20 that is treated as part of this effort would differ from water
21 that is taken from runoff and spread in terms of how it
22 affects the toad? What are we distinguishing here that we
23 would want to address that?

24 MR. RIPPERDA: I don't know anything about the toad.
25 You are the one who --

1 MR. BURIL: Aren't you fortunate.

2 MR. RIPPERDA: You are the toad's biggest champion in
3 these meetings, or if not champion, at least, the one that is
4 most aware of its ramifications to JPL.

5 And so I just -- I thought that I had heard in
6 previous things that you thought there may be problems with
7 adding more water to the spreading basins and making more 1
8 spreading basins and taking --

9 MR. BURIL: More spreading basins. That is --

10 MR. MARTINS: We're not planning on doing that. I will
11 add one thing. Keep in mind this water will be a little
12 different water quality than you have in runoff, so someone
13 could make an argument along those lines.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: Using the spreading basin would have no
15 impact on the toad, you can say so, and that would be your
16 response to my comment.

17 MR. BURIL: That is fine.

18 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: One thing previously that came up,
19 regardless of what we end up doing when we first start up the
20 system, we will have to have a period of testing where we
21 operate the system to make sure it's running before it starts
22 to be provided. So kind of one of our ideas, or something that
23 we were discussing is the fact that temporary use of the
24 spreading basins will probably be part of just the general
25 startup process so that we can run it, you know, to make sure

1 that it's operating properly, so that's going -- in other
2 words, getting approval to do a temporary, limited thing under
3 certain circumstances, we are hoping will perhaps not require
4 the extensive evaluation for like what you were talking about
5 for permanent use-- or like an expansion or something.

6 MR. ROBLES: Didn't also the City say that if we put the
7 water from the perchlorate treatment system into the spreading
8 basins that that would limit the amount of spreading credits
9 they would get so we have to include that as a major issue--

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. We'll be competing with the City
11 for the use of the spreading basins for that temporary time
12 period.

13 MR. MARTINS: Yeah, that not likely to be a big number
14 though, because how many storm events do we get a year --

15 MR. BURIL: That presumes the City has water to spread
16 that is not from the plant so that's a pretty big assumption.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So we have gone through
18 everybody's comments. We are going to break for lunch. And
19 the things I want to talk about in No. 7 after lunch will
20 probably be the -- some brief comments on the modeling
21 report, and anything else we want to bring up on OU-3 we can
21 talk about right after lunch.

23 But before we go, I want to make sure as far as for
24 the discussion we have been having, does anybody have any
25 other comments or concerns on how things are going on the

1 EE/CA as far as that goes? Or everybody is just hungry?

2 Okay. With that, let's break for lunch, and what
3 we are going to do is walk over to the other cafeteria on the
4 other side of the facility, and so it's going to take --
5 that's why I left an hour and 15 minutes, and then we'll come
6 back after that and start, approximately an hour and fifteen
7 minutes, I think.

8 (A luncheon recess was taken.)

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: We're going to move into No. 7, and, like
10 I said, I want to kind of continue on the OU3 subject. And
11 the next thing we'll be talking about is the modeling report.

12 And I have received comments, I guess, from Richard
13 and Mark, and David informed me at lunch time of his dire
14 situation at the Regional Board, so I am not going to ask --
15 if you have comments, that's okay. If not, that's okay too.

16 MR. YOUNG: I'll try and provide them with the EE/CA.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: That would be great. Okay.

18 I'll tell you right now: This happened over the
19 summer when I was gone, so I haven't read it, and so I
20 couldn't even really address these comments myself. So I'm
21 going to kind of defer to Hooshang to see how we are
22 addressing these because I'm assuming we are going to put
23 together response to comments to these as well along when we
24 send you the EE/CA comments back.

25 So, you know, Hooshang, I'm just going to let you

1 run with these, and if you guys have any clarifications or
2 anything like that, we can go through them. But I haven't --
3 I didn't even read the report so I couldn't tell you.

4 MS. GATES: I did.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Well, Kimberly did, and Kimberly can help
6 you.

7 Yeah. Go ahead. We'll just --

8 MR. NEZAFATI: Well, generally, they are very good
9 comments, you know, and basically what they are saying is
10 that the model is adequate for the purposes that it's being
11 used, but at the same time the model could be further
12 enhanced by collecting some additional data. And if you can
13 go basically comment by comment, I think comment -- this is
14 comment two; right?

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah.

16 MR. NEZAFATI: What they are referring here to is we
17 have this area to the northeast of the site right below the
18 mouth of the Arroyo Seco. We have three monitoring wells,
19 No. 1, 15, and 9, and historically they have been showing that
20 there is a ground water mound in this area, and also --

21 MR. ROBLES: You mean recharge of the basin?

22 MR. NEZAFATI: Basically the underflow that comes from
23 Miller Canyon --

24 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

25 MR. NEZAFATI: -- basically you have water coming from

1 there, but then down-gradient of this location, there seems to
2 be some evidence of either a low permeable unit, or maybe an
3 unmapped fault, so that's why you have up to 120 feet of
4 difference between the water level in this area and in the
5 rest of the, basically, site.

6 Now, when we did the modeling, we basically tried
7 to use a low permeable unit or K value. A low hydraulic
8 conductivity value for this region and tried to basically
9 mimic the ground water, observed ground waters at these two
10 wells, No. 1, 15, and 9.

11 Obviously, based on the information that we had, we
12 tried to match the water levels as much as we can, but they
13 are not as good as a match as compared to the other
14 monitoring wells that we have.

15 Now, the comment here, basically notice -- notes
16 basically some of the data gaps, but also specifically refers
17 to these two wells, and then kind of asks for further
18 physical evidence of this low permeable unit.

19 I think, in response to that, but by just merely
20 looking at the difference of the ground water levels across
21 this area, which is up to 120 feet sometimes, that is really
22 the physical evidence that you need. Obviously, it's not
23 clear that maybe EPA wants more geological investigation to
24 actually map that fault, if the fault is there. It's not
25 clear to us, but really physical evidence is right there, by

1 just looking at the contrast of this water level across this
2 area.

3 On the other -- like doing more pumping tests and
4 to determine, basically, hydraulic conductivity values,
5 particularly the vertical hydraulic conductivity, I mean,
6 yeah, you can always do additional pumping tests, and
7 obviously there are some approximations or some uncertainties
8 with the pumping test, but the question is that how that is
9 going to really improve the results and whether it's going to
10 be significantly impacting the application of that model, in
11 this case, to EE/CA alternatives.

12 I think my general comments are, Richard, that we
13 do have adequate information for the purposes of this model,
14 the application of this model --

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: To the EE/CA?

16 MR. NEZAFATI: To the EE/CA. And even for FS,
17 feasibility study, simulations as well as fate and transport,
18 basically, simulations.

19 Now, we can always add more data, but we don't
20 really believe that it is going to significantly impact the
21 results. That is really the point that we want to make here.
22 Obviously, if we get a little more detail, we can always
23 respond to your comments accordingly, but that is my general
24 take on this.

25 MR. ROBLES: I would like to see that, you know, if

1 modeling is adequate for EE/CA, for FS, I would like to stay
2 with that.

3 It's just whenever we have an opportunity to do
4 more aquifer testing at an appropriate time, like we're
5 going to have to do some investigation there or something
6 else, something requires us, that would be the appropriate
7 time to do it, if you feel there's not a significant change
8 in the modeling that would impact what we are doing with
9 EE/CA or FS.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: I was just going to say is there any
11 reason that is compelling us to finalize this modeling
12 document itself right now? Do we need to finalize that
13 modeling report? Because if we don't, we can kind of leave
14 it open as a draft and kind of a work in progress and add
15 things like the fate and transport and make it more complete
16 over time.

17 I'm just trying to think of, you know, a lot of it
18 supports the EE/CA, but does that document actually have to
19 be complete at the same time as the EE/CA? Because, if it
20 does, I think what I hear Peter and Hooshang saying is that
21 it satisfies maybe what we think we need for the EE/CA, but
22 if it's going to be used over time, and you want to keep,
23 like, one report instead of having another and another and
24 another, then maybe you don't need to finalize it.

25 MS. GATES: I think it was referenced in the EE/CA. So

1 you probably want it finalized.

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: Or, you reference it in draft and
3 then you put the draft in the repositories.

4 MR. RIPPERDA: This is your call. It is not a primary
5 document. You don't even need a separate modeling
6 document, but sometimes it is nice to just have something for
7 the admin record so it -- so you can finalize it now, and
8 it's the state of the art that you have now; and then, as you
9 go toward the FS, you can have more data. You are always
10 going to be doing more modeling.

11 MR. NEZAFATI: Exactly.

12 MR. RIPPERDA: Whether you do a modeling report or you
13 just use the results of the new modeling in fine-tuning and
14 put that into the FS, I don't really care.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

16 MR. RIPPERDA: Since you have got this so close to being
17 the final document now, my suggestion would be, and it's a
18 weak one, that, just go ahead finalize it, stick it in the
19 admin record, and kind of --

20 MR. ROBLES: I don't think we would not address some of
21 the comments. I think the only things that I think that we
22 wouldn't do would be like --

23 MR. RIPPERDA: I'm not saying (inaudible). Of course you
24 would respond to comments. And if there's some easy thing that
25 I --. This was written by some modeling expert from Techlaw.

1 MR. RIPPERDA: -- of course, I don't want you to
2 go out, and I should have actually just deleted this one
3 line, but I let some things go through the -- some physical
4 evidence of a flow barrier needs to be established.
5 I certainly agree that there is a flow barrier there based
6 on the very steep gradients -- of course, there is a flow
7 barrier there, and I don't know what you could do to
8 physically go out and measure it. So, you know, like I
9 always say with comments, sometimes it is just for the
10 record, sometimes it's just to improve the document,
11 sometimes what I want from you is --

12 MR. ROBLES: Is a response.

13 MR. RIPPERDA: -- is a response.

14 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. I think we can handle that one
16 thing.

17 MR. NEZAFATI: Along the same lines, EE/CA is sort of a
18 stand-alone document, has the meat of the ground water
19 modeling incorporated into that document, as you have seen,
20 so really just ground water modeling report is a separate
21 model. It's just that more detailed documentation of the
22 model.

23 So for the EE/CA itself you have everything that
24 you need as far as the ground water modeling is concerned,
25 with assumptions, simulations; it is right there as a part of

1 that document itself. So it doesn't have to just report
2 modeling, doesn't have to basically hold up the other report.
3 That's what I mean, basically.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: What about this next comment with regard
5 to the calibration?

6 MR. NEZAFATI: Yeah. I mean, you know, the figures get
7 crowded when you have the labels for the monitoring wells,
8 you know --

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: No, no. I'm talking about with three.

10 MR. NEZAFATI: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah. That could
11 be done. That could be done.

12 Except that at the last -- the mean is squared,
13 the root mean squared for steady state. You cannot
14 recalculate that because you only have one number. It's only
15 for the transient calibration that you have so many.

16 Basically, you have a four-year calibration period,
17 you have you a monthly stress period. So you have 48,
18 basically, periods that you have measurements for each
19 monitoring well.

20 And given the fact that you have 22 monitoring
21 wells and some of the -- some of them, they are multiple port,
22 up to five, basically, ports, so you have a lot of data when
23 you do a statistical analysis and come up with basically the
24 root means squared, which means that the difference is squared
25 and basically take the average of that.

1 But for the average steady state flow conditions,
2 you have a four-year period. But what we have done, we have
3 averaged all the ground water levels for all the monitoring
4 wells, so you actually have one number so you cannot really
5 scientifically do that root means squared, calculate that for
6 the steady state.

7 But the other comment will basically, more
8 information --

9 MR. ROBLES: Sounds like comment three. The guy is a
10 modeling expert.

11 MR. RIPPERDA: Yeah. So --

12 MR. ROBLES: If John Q. Public got the root means
13 squared, he wouldn't know what to do with it if it bit him.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: Exactly.

15 MR. NEZAFATI: Actually, I wouldn't say that it was a
16 model, but I see that sometimes, when you read the report,
17 for transient you have a format. You show all that
18 information. Then you go to steady state, and the
19 reader maybe is expecting the same computations, but
20 maybe we should have inserted one paragraph saying that for
21 this RMS is not basically applicable for the steady state --

22 MR. ROBLES: And that would clarify that.

23 MR. NEZAFATI: We will do that. Yeah.

24 MR. ROBLES: So that could be our response to that.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Next one down we can --

1 MR. NEZAFATI: Number 4, that is fine. We can try to
2 basically --

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Adjust the figures.

4 What about -- let's see. Specific comment No. 1,
5 you want to expand the discussion on the modeling?

6 MR. NEZAFATI: We can do that --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: That is easy enough.

8 MR. NEZAFATI: I think we have cross sections, but we
9 can expand the discussion on that to make sure it's clear to
10 the reader that -- how the hydrogeological units are basically
11 similar or incorporated information into the model.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: And I think that one thing we have always
13 tried to make clear, at least in more recent times, is that,
14 you know, they are really only model layers, they are not
15 true layers, when we talk about the actual site conditions.

16 MR. ROBLES: That is one thing that I think we need to
17 make clear on that, that has always been a big thing when I
18 talk to people in the lab who looked at some of this stuff.
19 When they see the model, they say "Oh, there are four distinct
20 aquifers".

21 MR. NEZAFATI: They are not geological. They are not
22 based -- we don't have a layer cake geology here. It's a
23 gigantic aquifer, but we have stratification.

24 MR. ROBLES: And we need to explain that.

25 MR. NEZAFATI: We will make that clear, yes.
Absolutely.

1 MR. ROBLES: Because in their minds they think there are
2 four distinct aquifers.

3 MR. NEZAFATI: It will be good to put one of their
4 multiport hydrographs and show that even though you are the
5 same location, but in port one, which is the shallowest,
6 and port five, which is the deepest, you have 150 feet of
7 difference in pressure, which really means that you have a
8 stratification of this aquifer, even though this is one
9 gigantic unit -- but because of the silt-rich layers or
10 because of the pumping, there is basically pressure
11 difference, and that's the -- really the main criteria for
12 delineating these as layers. So we can do that.

13 MR. MARTINS: Is there a better word to use other than
14 layer --

15 MR. NEZAFATI: Model layers, I think it's
16 understood that doesn't mean, necessarily, geological layers.
17 So I think the emphasis should be that it's model layer and
18 not necessarily geological layer.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: It looks like on comment No. 2 you want
20 us to revise some of the figures because they were overlaid
21 too many times; right?

22 MR. RIPPERDA: It's the inverse.

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: Inverse? They are not overlaid enough?
24 You want us to overlay --

25 MR. RIPPERDA: Or just provide an additional figure --

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

2 MR. RIPPERDA: -- where, you know, this suggestion was
3 overlay them, and I don't like overlays too much because it
4 is confusing. But you could overlay the two separate colors
5 or some things so that you can see where in the model it's
6 pretty close, where in the model it is pretty far off.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. And then what about as far as the --
8 Hooshang, why was the -- is there a reason why we did not in-
9 clude a table? I mean, there was a reason why we can't do
10 that?

11 MR. NEZAFATI: I believe we have but, somehow maybe it
12 hasn't been -- it's in the appendix, so we will make sure it
13 is highlighted.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Probably because it's in the appendix --

15 MR. NEZAFATI: Actually, we made sure that all the 23
16 monitoring wells that we have, and all the ports, we have
17 either graphs or the raw data. The way that the water levels
18 are simulated by the model, basically they are documented in
19 this report, but, if not, I believe we have, but we'll make
20 sure that that information is there.

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: When you respond to that, if we do have
22 it in there, we will just reference there. And, if not, we
23 can include that.

24 Next one, the section -- somewhat overstates the
25 success of the modeling calibration.

1 MR. NEZAFATI: I can't really -- I don't want to really
2 come across as we're overstating, basically, the success.
3 But I would like, basically, those people that are modelers,
4 and also they may have had a chance to review the previous
5 modeling effort to really compare and see that -- how much
6 improvement we got by basically, first of all, using FE
7 flow, which is much more comprehensive and state of the art,
8 basically, for the ground water modeling, but also using
9 information in more detail and also in more accurate way,
10 including this pumping test that, as you recall the previous
11 modeling that was done, they used a slug test and then
12 used a K value based on that.

13 Now, in this case what we did was that we
14 actually -- we call it virtual pumping test because we didn't
15 have any extraction wells, and, if we did, it would have been
16 on-site and limited extraction and would have required
17 additional costs.

18 But we said, well, okay, pumping -- we have pumping
19 going on in the -- basically, in the basin, and the
20 monitoring wells on-site show that they are highly being
21 influenced by that.

22 So we said okay, let's take an opportunity, and
23 while the City of Pasadena shuts down their production wells,
24 we monitor the ambient conditions, or the static, basically,
25 water levels, and when they continue to bring these or resume

1 bringing these production wells online, monitoring that
2 continuously -- we have 18 monitoring wells and up to five
3 ports, and we have pressure transducers, and we continuously
4 monitor it, and then reduce that data, using a computer model,
5 which not only takes into consideration the multiple pumping
6 going on in the ground water, but also multi-layered system so
7 we not only came up with a hydraulic conductivity value for
8 each model layer, but also vertical conductivity value, and I
9 think that's one of the greatest factors that helped us to
10 calibrate this highly dynamic, basically, ground water flow
11 system.

12 And that's really -- I don't think that's
13 overstating the success of the calibration model. But we have
14 to compare this with some other basis or some other cases or
15 previous modeling to really get a relative understanding that,
16 well, you know, again, nothing is perfect, but comparing this
17 to this, this may be a better calibration.

18 MR. MARTINS: So you got an unusually good situation to
19 do a calibration because you got to use production wells over
20 a very long period of time and on and on. That's unusual.

21 MR. NEZAFATI: That's unusual.

22 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: I think that's what we need to say
23 in the text, that it's improved. There are certain things --
24 I think that the difficulty, you know, it's short of
25 judgmental statements like a good calibration was achieved,

1 I think, is what --

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: Semantics.

3 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's not that you are saying that it
4 was not good, but just that we don't want --

5 MR. NEZAFATI: That -- I'm sorry. When we say good
6 calibration, it's after we give you all the -- the reader the
7 statistics.

8 RMS, for instance, or the correlation co-efficient,
9 that's 90 percent. That is a great calibration, you know.

10 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, and I understand --

11 MR. ROBLES: What I would state, and not terms as good
12 calibration. I would state it as that the model mimics as
13 close as possible to the reality of what's out there, that we
14 have got a very good -- and that's how we'll put it in, as
15 good, that it's a good approximation of any modeling that we
16 have seen. That way, you tie it back to semantics.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: I think it's a semantical thing that
18 we're talking about.

19 MR. NEZAFATI: Maybe when we basically present the
20 statistics and then we go back and say something --

21 MR. ROBLES: Right.

22 MR. NEZAFATI: -- something is missing; you're right.

23 MR. ROBLES: He wants to quantify the word good.

24 MR. NEZAFATI: Exactly.

25 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Right.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Instead of using the word good we will
2 quantify it a little bit more in the text --

3 MR. NEZAFATI: Well, we can -- we can do that. No
4 problem at all.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: What about the regard -- and I think that
6 the rest of this comment really goes to the data gaps issue,
7 which was one of the first comments that we talked about.
8 And it sounds to me that he is trying -- basically saying
9 that good kind of ties back to the fact that there were no
10 data gaps, or there were data gaps. So that's why he doesn't
11 want to say good.

12 So what we can do is we just quantify what we have,
13 fix the data gaps, and fix the --

14 MR. RIPPERDA: You always need to discuss the
15 uncertainties and the unknown. Every modeling has those.

16 MR. NEZAFATI: And we have a section for that, yes.

17 MR. RIPPERDA: Some areas of the model, the agreement
18 between predicted and observed isn't very good, in some areas
19 it's really good, and so that's -- you know, I agree with the
20 guy from TechLaw that a generic -- a good calibration was
21 achieved is just a little too --

22 MR. ROBLES: Subjective.

23 MR. RIPPERDA: We're weren't saying that you could have
24 done better on the modeling effort. You did a great job on
25 the modeling based on the data you had.

1 But the public, seeing a model called good, and
2 then saying -- and then putting too much faith in the
3 model --

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: We'll -- we'll go ahead and revise that,
5 and we'll talk about that because we will provide a response
6 to comments on that.

7 MR. ROBLES: Public also can come back, why wasn't it
8 great --

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: Sensitivity analysis, I don't know.

10 MR. NEZAFATI: I think I addressed --

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: This is more documentation.

12 MR. NEZAFATI: Yeah. I think we can address this, yeah.
13 And we can provide summary table of additional calibration
14 data and then make sure that, you know, I guess we respond to
15 this comment.

16 We have the information. We have to basically go
17 back and redo things.

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: So if it's not in there, then, already,
19 we will add it in. But if it's in there, we will just
20 reference where it was.

21 Number 5 is --

22 MR. ROBLES: What Mark just said --

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes, exactly. That's -- I think that
24 what we're going to have to do is kind of tie some of these
25 sections back together and quantify the uncertainties and

1 then, you know, judge whether it is good or generally good or
2 whatever, and we'll just kind of -- I think all these kind of
3 go together, and so when we rewrite that --

4 MR. RIPPERDA: Two basic comments --

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

6 MR. RIPPERDA: -- they said several different ways.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Exactly.

8 MR. RIPPERDA: The part that I don't really know much
9 about, such as calibration statistics, that's for you to
10 decide how to handle.

11 And then the other is, you know, the same thing
12 said again several different times on -- as far as data set,
13 complex systems. And some of these you can respond to, which
14 is adding a few sentences here and there. You don't have to
15 go and rewrite the report, add whole new section. It's just
16 a few qualitative sentences to incorporate the --

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Do you have any other --

18 MR. RIPPERDA: No.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

20 Let's go through -- we have a few copies of DTSC
21 handout. I think you can all skip over to page 3. The first
22 two pages are kind of like background information.

23 And these are what we would be addressing, and --

24 MR. NEZAFATI: I have mine --

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: We haven't all read this, so if everybody

1 wants to kind of take a quick look at it.

2 The first couple of paragraphs sound like it's just
3 saying it supports what we have done, for the most part.

4 MR. GEBERT: There's only one comment on modeling, the
5 rest are on the EE/CA --

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Really? Okay.

7 Was that the ground water modeling report, figure
8 1-3?

9 MR. GEBERT: Right.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: The no choice for the last decision
11 diamond?

12 MR. NEZAFATI: I think that was it. Yeah.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: Richard, thank you for your comments.

14 You sure don't want to talk about root mean
15 squared? We should talk about the other comments while we are
16 looking at them.

17 First one, I don't think there's any -- we don't
18 have any problem. I am sure that we are going to do more
19 modeling runs once things start up, before things start up.

20 And, you know, Richard, any time you guys want us
21 to look at a specific run, like Mark wanted us to do in the
22 past, we will be happy to do modeling runs for you guys, if
23 that would help you guys out. That's fine.

24 And I think we are also working on refining our
25 fate and transport model right now too, so that might even

1 try to help fill in some of your concerns -- or I guess these
2 are Richard -- Richard Hoffman's concerns --

3 MR. GEBERT: Coffman.

4 MR. ZUROMSKI: Coffman; right.

5 He was here, like, at one of our last meetings.

6 So, you know, our response to that one would be,
7 you know, absolutely, if you want to us do stuff, special
8 modeling runs, sure.

9 Next one, yeah. A good point. You know, we
10 thought about that, too. I don't know.

11 I mean, Ken, you have kind of talked -- we have
12 actually milled this over several times, the difference
13 between 3500 and 7000. I mean, basically what you do is you
14 could buy these units either in one size or another.

15 MR. MARTINS: They have three sizes.

16 MR. ZUROMSKI: Three sizes.

17 MR. MARTINS: Right.

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: And, you know, right now, you know, we
19 are at the medium size, and it's the medium sized price. But
20 like we were talking about earlier, if we move to the full
21 sized price, and it ends up after two years we contain the
22 plume -- you know, the plume, of course, is not going away,
23 but it's contained, and it's not going to the Ventura and
24 Windsor wells, then we just spent an extra \$10 million for
25 what -- what benefit, I guess.

1 So that's why -- but that's, of course, that's our
2 idea, but then as far as a contingency, I don't -- what --
3 how would we do that, I guess, because we kind of --

4 MR. MARTINS: We would lay out the system so we could
5 expand it in the future, and common facilities like brine for
6 regeneration.

7 And another -- the acid feed and sulfate or
8 phosphate feed could all be common facilities. And we would
9 add a second unit. It could be a second one the same size or
10 a smaller one or a larger one, both, you know. But there is a
11 limit.

12 Now, even when at certain times where you have a
13 range of flow you can use there, and you could probably --
14 you might be able to, you know, goose it a little harder, if
15 you will, and get a little more flow out of it, if you only
16 needed 10 percent extra, can probably do that, can change
17 pumps out and get a little more pressure out of it or
18 something.

19 But if you wanted a 50 percent increase, then you
20 are probably looking at a second unit of some size.

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: I guess we waive the cost and benefits
22 of, you know, looking at just buying the one medium sized
23 unit versus buying the one big sized unit.

24 MR. MARTINS: We -- we thought we designed for a large
25 size at 3800 gpm. That was more than we felt we actually

1 needed to control the plume and more than we needed to blend
2 and give us a blending mix, and it was, you know, oversized by
3 almost 20 percent. So we kind of thought we had this built
4 into the alternative --

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: So that is the largest unit, then?

6 MR. MARTINS: It is actually a large unit --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Oh, okay.

8 MR. MARTINS: It goes up -- up to 600, 1600, and 4000
9 GPM. Those are the three sizes.

10 They are looking at one fourth size, which is like
11 7000 GPM, but that's on the drawing books only right now.

12 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So no matter what, we would have
13 to buy two --

14 MR. MARTINS: We are going currently for the larger
15 size. They refer to it as a three-inch port size, and it's
16 limited to about 4000 GPM.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: So, I guess, that's our contingency, is if
18 we have to buy another one, we will --

19 MR. MARTINS: Yeah.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- but it's not going to matter --

21 MR. MARTINS: We think we have already built it into the
22 size we selected.

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right.

24 MR. MARTINS: You know.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. We think that the 4000 should

1 definitely accommodate what we need to do and, actually,
2 probably could accommodate even some of their water from the
3 other wells, if necessary.

4 MR. MARTINS: Yeah.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: So next one -- four, three, five, one.

6 Yeah, I think that was approval of the general
7 technological approach; right, Keith?

8 MR. MARTINS: Yes.

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: All right. Ken?

10 MR. MARTINS: Yes. Correct.

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: And I -- I can send you guys a copy of
12 that too. I have it on my computer right now, if you want a
13 copy of it.

14 MR. GEBERT: Please.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

16 MR. MARTINS: Then the ISEP has already been approved,
17 so it wasn't part of that --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. But, of course, 97-005 requires
19 site specific testing for -- no matter which technology you
20 use. Is that correct?

21 Ken?

22 MR. MARTINS: I'm not aware of that.

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: No?

24 MR. MARTINS: I'm not aware of that at all.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: So once, it's approved --

1 MR. MARTINS: I thought 97-005 is really more geared
2 toward identifying TICs, technically identified compounds and
3 the hits you gets. I don't -- you know, they have other
4 policies about redundant treatment technologies. Maybe
5 they're referring to that. You know, that was a concern.

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: Now, I thought that -- I have heard
7 discussions about, you know, their issue with using some of
8 the regenerate brine and mixing that with the drinking water
9 stream. DHS --

10 MR. MARTINS: -- 97-005 -- that was a concern they have,
11 and that's one reason they took, like, a year plus to get
12 through this process and -- and the recruit process, by the
13 way, isn't for the brine recovery, by the way. That, you
14 know --

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: So once they have that letter, then, that
16 letter is basically saying in this configuration --

17 MR. MARTINS: Yes.

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: -- you can go for it?

19 MR. MARTINS: That's right.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: And then that -- is that that same letter
21 for the bio, then? Generally, if you can use the bio in this
22 configuration you can use it --

23 MR. MARTINS: No.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: I have -- I have the letter here.

25 MR. MARTINS: No. I think it is separate --

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. We will have to look at that one, I
2 guess.

3 MR. MARTINS: The (inaudible), they're talking about the
4 bio treatment for ISEP-- is that what you meant?

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. Using the U.S. filter system --

6 MR. MARTINS: Right. Two separate subjects.

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

8 MR. NEZAFATI: You said that ISEP+ has been approved by
9 DHS --

10 MR. MARTINS: No, I don't --

11 MR. NEZAFATI: ISEP has been, but not ISEP plus.

12 MR. MARTINS: That's correct. That's my understanding.
13 But they are on the cusp of doing that and --

14 MR. NEZAFATI: Doing the process --

15 MR. MARTINS: Yeah.

16 No, you know what? I take it that back. I think
17 it has been approved, but with the nanofiltration technology
18 built into it. That was the thing went back and forth with
19 Charles on. He wanted to quote it without the nanofiltration,
20 and I clarified for him that the approval was with that and so
21 we really had to have that.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. Okay.

23 So we will definitely clarify that one for you,
24 Richard, and let you know. And I'll send you guys that
25 letter. I am trying to find it. I have it in here somewhere.

1 Appendix D, the figures, yeah, we can.

2 MR. NEZAFATI: We can do this, if you want.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Whatever you want in there. So we just
4 include -- we have those figures, or we can develop them.

5 MR. NEZAFATI: Actually, this is looking at the impact
6 of expanded spreading basins for the City, and we only looked
7 at the impact on the no-action, meaning that the baseline
8 conditions without the EE/CA alternative and I guess what you
9 are requesting is that you want one figure showing the similar
10 impact when alternative two is basically implemented.

11 We can create that; in other words, it is not a
12 very time-consuming or -- yeah. It's taking a few minutes of
13 running the model and reducing the information.

14 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: And I think, for other purposes, it
15 would be useful to have that also.

16 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. The last comment, 3-D, view of the
17 particle tracking.

18 MR. NEZAFATI: Again, we can include these two, I mean,
19 as additional visualizations.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

21 Richard, do you have any more comments or -- that
22 is probably how we'll address your -- wait. Before we
23 finish.

24 One more page. Okay. It's the same.

25 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: You have two copies --

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes. I have two copies of page 4. I was
2 wondering -- I was, like, those are the same.

3 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: I had to make an extra copy. I
4 didn't realize I had --

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: So is that satisfactory? That's probably
6 how we'll address your comments, and we will send you -- we
7 will probably send the response to comments for this along
8 with the EE/CA, you know, the ground water modeling report
9 and the EE/CA at the same time.

10 Of course, you didn't have a lot on the ground
11 water modeling report, and I know Mark did, and we will send
12 it all out in one big batch.

13 MR. GEBERT: Sounds fine.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. That is everything I have for OU3.

15 Does anybody have anything else they want to talk
16 about as far as OU3 goes?

17 Okay. Discussion on OU3 is concluded for the day.
18 Let's move on to OU1, the pilot study.

19 Like I said earlier, the packed bed reactor pilot
20 study, and I am definitely going to have them check on that
21 water issue. I'm sure they must have addressed it. They had
22 to have addressed it. You never know. I'll check on that.

23 And so what's going to happen is they are going to
24 finish that over the next couple of weeks. Then, basically,
25 since we are taking up such a large area of the parking lot

1 where the -- you guys have all seen the pilot study up in the
2 hill. Since you are taking up such a large area right now,
3 the deal is to get them demobed out of there before we start
4 taking up spaces for the in-situ study.

5 So what's happening is, I think on the 18th, these
6 guys are done. They are going to have two weeks of demobe
7 time, and then during that two weeks ARCADIS is going to kind
8 of get ready to mobilize into the field. And then I think on
9 a Saturday or something like that when the last of the stuff
10 is trucked off for Foster Wheeler, like the Sunday, the next
11 day, they are going to mobilize and put up barriers for the
12 other one and take down the fence for the Foster Wheeler
13 study.

14 So that's -- so as far as the Foster Wheeler study
15 goes, from everything that I have heard so far, at least in
16 the first phase where they are just using ambient perchlorate
17 concentrations, things have been going well. So treating the
18 water -- I'm not -- they haven't -- I don't think they have
19 gotten results back yet. So I don't know what they are.
20 They just started last week or so.

21 As far as the in-situ study goes, we are -- I am
22 actually looking at our workplan right now. And we should
23 have that -- I think I told you guys we will have that to you
24 by the 1st of October, and what you are going to get before
25 that, though, and I think that Mark and I -- we kind of

1 talked about this -- I sent you a copy of that letter, and I
2 talked with Dave about this a little bit at lunch, is that
3 the biggest thing we need to get under our belts, as far as
4 the in-situ pilot study, is the waste discharge requirements
5 issue.

6 And so, I guess, as I wasn't here at the last
7 meeting, but I guess we tentatively agreed that we were going
8 to have the workplan for the in-situ study, and part of that
9 workplan addressed the WDR. And then that would satisfy the
10 requirements, the substantive requirements of the waste
11 discharge requirements permit process.

12 And so with that understanding, the copy that I
13 received from the contractor has, as its appendix, the waste
14 discharge requirements and whatever needs to be addressed
15 under there. I am just reading it right now, so I can't tell
16 you exactly what is in there.

17 And so the intent would be that the workplan would
18 satisfy the waste discharge requirements, and that pilot
19 study would move forward like that. And so what I am going
20 to do is send you guys -- send you, David, and a copy to Mark
21 and Richard, a letter saying, you know, this is what we had
22 talked about, and we are going to meet those substantive
23 requirements. You know, whatever the substantive
24 requirements are, they will be met, but we are not going to
25 go through the actual permit process.

1 And that's the approach that I think we are going
2 to take. So I don't know -- that letter should come out
3 probably by the end of this week, if not the beginning of
4 next week, and then you will get the report shortly after
5 that, and you will get 30 days.

6 So you are going to get the letter for a couple of
7 weeks before you get the report so you can maybe start
8 letting your folks know that that's the approach that we
9 would like to take, and like I said, that will probably come
10 out next week.

11 So do you have any comments or ideas on how that's
12 going to happen? I know that you are probably going to have
13 to do a lot of that anyway.

14 MR. YOUNG: As I indicated at lunch, the Board is
15 overwhelmed right now, and especially Huang Lee's unit, the
16 Chapter 15 unit, which reviews and also writes these waste
17 discharge permit applications and approval letters.

18 So I would probably have to write the WDR myself,
19 and that's going to be a lot of time if I have to do it.
20 So by using the CERCLA authority to get this underway, it's
21 probably a much better choice.

22 MR. ZUROMSKI: What do you think --

23 MR. YOUNG: Again, I'll run the letter by management and
24 make sure that we --

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: We will put the statutory citations in

1 there, stuff like that.

2 I think that -- I just -- what do you -- what do
3 you think the likelihood of them getting really upset over
4 this is at this point in time?

5 MR. YOUNG: Well --

6 MR. ROBLES: You don't have your crystal ball with you.

7 MR. YOUNG: Exactly. It doesn't make me upset.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Sounds good to me.

9 MS. GATES: That is what Richard was going for.

10 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. Well --

11 MR. ROBLES: You mentioned that the Board is
12 overwhelmed.

13 MR. YOUNG: Just, you know, with the hiring freeze and
14 also the budget cuts, staff now is responsible for more
15 projects, and it's really limiting our time and availability
16 for addressing site specific issues.

17 And, like I said, even our permit sections are
18 overwhelmed, and so now the site cleanup units are actually
19 having to write their own permits, which typically wasn't
20 done.

21 I have never written a WDR, so it would take a
22 while for me to understand the process involved there.

23 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Well, then, that's how we are going to go
25 ahead and proceed.

1 And I think the biggest thing that hinges on that
2 approval -- actually, from the three of you, I guess, on the
3 overall workplan, is the drilling schedule.

4 Tentatively we want to start drilling our wells --
5 I think we had kind of talked about this again back in May or
6 April, but we want to start drilling our wells in the first
7 part of November.

8 And I guess the drilling of the wells isn't the big
9 issue because I think we all talked about in the past you
10 guys for the most part are okay with wherever we drill the
11 wells. The problem comes in with the fact that while we are
12 drilling these wells we want to start injecting as we are
13 drilling certain areas.

14 So basically as we go down we want to start maybe
15 flooding certain zones with the sugar solution, so we can
16 even get in vadose zone some of this material to see how it
17 may impact any sources in the vadose zone.

18 So that's the only reason why -- and the way around
19 it, of course, is that we will probably end up packing these
20 wells off in several areas so that if we can't do it that we
21 will just pack them and send them the stuff after we complete
22 the well. But it's -- that's really the only thing that
23 affects.

24 But we do want to really start drilling in the
25 first part of November. We are going to use that same guy

1 that we had do the SVE wells. He's hard to come by to get on
2 a schedule, so we definitely want, if we can, to try to keep
3 that schedule to some extent. So that's what we are shooting
4 for right now is November 4th.

5 So I think that we have given -- I think between
6 the notice through the letter and then another 30 days after
7 that when we get you the workplan -- 30 days once you get the
8 workplan -- that all occurs before we start drilling, and so
9 hopefully that should give you guys enough time to raise any
10 issues you may have with what we are planning on doing.

11 But that -- that's the story as far as in-situ
12 pilot study goes right now. And I think that ARCADIS gave
13 you guys a presentation last time. Hopefully that answered
14 any questions you may have had then. You might have more
15 questions when the workplan comes out. And feel free to just
16 e-mail me your questions and concerns as they come up.
17 Because I know you'll be reading that from day one and not
18 day twenty-nine. And because the sooner we can resolve all
19 these things the sooner we can get rolling on doing that
20 study.

21 You guys have any questions or comments?

22 MR. RIPPERDA: ARCADIS's presentation made it look like
23 you guys are going to be done. They are going to fix
24 everything.

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: Well, you know, I -- I -- okay. Sounds

1 good.

2 MR. RIPPERDA: It worked.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: I hope so.

4 MR. RIPPERDA: How close are these in-situ wells to the
5 SVE wells?

6 MR. ZUROMSKI: A good hundred yards or more. You know
7 where the well -- they are right here. Here is your SVE well
8 right up here, right in this parking lot where the -- you
9 know where the fire station is and the SVE well?

10 It's right in here. Actually, this map is a little
11 off. It's kind of like right here.

12 And MW-7 is up here. So it's kind of like off up
13 and off to the north. So is that what you have?

14 MR. RIPPERDA: It's more than --

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: Like 150 feet, 300 feet. So maybe it's a
16 football field in length.

17 MR. ROBLES: Is that a calibrated --

18 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yes. Calibrated it to the scale on
19 there. So yeah, it's probably like a football field away.
20 It's just up over the top of the hill.

21 MR. RIPPERDA: So flooding the vadose zone, the in-situ
22 pilot study wells, won't impact your SVE extraction wells --

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: My biggest concern with that task is how
24 far they are really going to be able to flood.

25 MR. RIPPERDA: Like ten feet out or --

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. They are saying -- that's some of
2 the things that I'm trying to work on right now because the
3 workplan says they are going to get, like, a 40 foot radius.

4 And I said, you know, prove it to me. Forty feet
5 of injecting the sugar water seems a little high. So I am
6 not quite sure that that's going to happen. So no, it
7 shouldn't be anywhere near the vadose zone in the OU2 or
8 where the VE01 is.

9 And that's the biggest problem with, you know,
10 trying to do these types of tests, especially trying to do
11 anything like this with trying to treat soils with this type
12 of treatment, is trying to get that stuff to get out because
13 we would have to punch so many holes in the ground.

14 So that's more of a let's-see-how-it-kind-of-works
15 in the source area, and if it works, then maybe we'll come up
16 with a strategic way to deal with it in the future. But it's
17 more of just to see how it works.

18 We'll be trying to hopefully focus more on the
19 lower vadose zone. I think they talked about creating the
20 reactive zone, and any water that would flow through there
21 would hopefully reduce the perchlorate and all that good
22 stuff. So...

23 MR. ROBLES: Sugar water --

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: Sure. We'll address that if there's one.

25 So that's pretty much it. I didn't have a whole

1 lot on that, and I didn't know how many questions might come
2 up.

3 But does anybody have any other questions on that?

4 Okay. Finally, the No. 9.

5 And Keith is hiding over here. He's trying to keep
6 his head down. But Keith right now, his folks have just put
7 up the admin record website, and they have actually got it
8 running in the two libraries, or they are in the process of
9 getting it running.

10 MR. FIELDS: Yeah. What we are going to do this week,
11 today and tomorrow, is test it and make sure that it's
12 working within the security requirements that we have
13 established.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Right. And so the only thing we are
15 waiting for is the La Canada library hasn't given us their IP
16 addresses, and I need to bug them again to get them up on
17 line.

18 And then, Judy, I sent an e-mail to Chuck, and I
19 don't know if he talked to you, but -- and, actually, I
20 probably copied you on that too. He responded that Chuck's
21 getting JPL's library IP addresses here and also one for his
22 office. So we are going to add those in as well.

23 So depending on -- hopefully, these two will work
24 really well, and we will learn everything we need to learn
25 from the two that we are getting online this week, and then

1 we will transfer them to La Canada when they give us their IP
2 addresses and do JPL's, and I think we will probably outfit
3 several other offices.

4 And then I think the whole plan will also be to
5 outfit the three of you -- Richard, Mark and Dave. Your
6 computers will also have access to them so you could have an
7 online access to the admin record.

8 So you can either give us your -- you can go home
9 and send me your IP addresses, or you can kind of wait and
10 see what the results are and make sure everything worked on
11 these, but eventually we'll need them to get you guys online.

12 And they will probably be just for your -- I would
13 think we would do it for specific computers. Is that how we
14 do it?

15 MR. FIELDS: It's set up two ways right now. One is
16 with a user name and password. And you may have logged on
17 before with a user name and password.

18 And then we have a mirrored site that uses IP
19 addresses for security. So you have to have the IP address
20 within the database to be able to log onto the site, and
21 that IP address approach is what is going to be implemented
22 in the libraries.

23 MR. MARTINS: But it's transparent to the user.

24 MR. FIELDS: You would not know that you went through
25 some security check because it lets you right in.

1 MR. ZUROMSKI: And that might make it easy for you
2 because it is hard to remember 50 passwords. So that's
3 happening. So I am very pleased with that.

4 And I think what we're going to try and do on this
5 is get them up in the libraries, get some documents Keith
6 gave me.

7 I only have three copies over there for you guys.
8 But we'll get more of these out. These are copies of what we
9 are going to put out at the library. There are drafts of
10 what we want to do, and we are going to -- I know we talked
11 with the City of Pasadena about this and Altadena, so what
12 we're going to set these out on a stand and have these for
13 people so they can click through the site and understand how
14 to get through the site.

15 So I'll probably e-mail this to everybody, but I
16 know there's three hardcopies for you guys. Again, this going
17 to be out in the public so we want everybody to take a look at
18 it and comment on it. Have they already commented on this?

19 MR. FIELDS: No. This is the first time we just put this
20 together. This would just try to get people to go to the
21 website. Maybe we put copy -- in the current hard copy admin
22 record or the information repository --

23 MR. ZUROMSKI: And when --

24 MR. FIELDS: We put --

25 MR. ZUROMSKI: We do quarterly updates of the admin

1 records. So when we are out there, one of the things that we
2 can have is just make sure those are stocked all the time and
3 so that people can find their way through the admin record.
4 Kind of make it as user friendly as possible.

5 So I'll e-mail that out to everybody to take a look
6 at so we can kind of get the final go-ahead, and we will
7 print a bunch of those out and send those out to the library.

8 The other things that we are working on would be
9 the community relations plan addendum.

10 I think we are Draft Final right now, and we have input
11 everybody's comments. The only comments we have right now,
12 and you know about this, Peter, to some extent -- the only
13 comments that we are trying to address are NASA's attorney's
14 comments.

15 And you know how the community relations plan, we
16 tried to put those nice little -- those flow charts in there
17 that have, you know, the process, so when you get your ROD
18 these are process steps that you take to go through. I can
19 actually -- let me see if -- I actually have it, I think,
20 right here.

21 But there's a process step that you go through
22 to -- let's see. Well, maybe I don't.

23 MR. FIELDS: Draft final CRP --

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: That's it. So -- and I'll show you what I
25 mean in a second.

1 But we have -- we are kind of trying to decide if
2 these are really necessary, or if it's just kind of fluff and
3 if we should just -- here is one, for example. This one here.

4 And here is community relations during the ROD.
5 And we put these in there because they kind of made it
6 conceptual, it's easy to see in a picture, you know, how the
7 whole community relations process works.

8 And we are trying to decide whether or not these
9 are something you guys definitely want in the CRP that goes
10 out, the addendum, or if this is something that it was nice
11 but you don't care either way.

12 MR. RIPPERDA: Because your attorney doesn't like them.

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: Not necessarily.

14 And so what we were thinking about is we would use
15 these more maybe at meetings; for example, when we have our
16 EE/CA public meeting, we would hand something like this out
17 as a handout rather than actually having it in the CRP
18 document itself.

19 So I don't know -- I don't know if you guys
20 think -- that's where we are, and I know you guys have
21 already approved it as it is. So I don't know.

22 This is something I am just starting to deal with.
23 You know, I did just get back to some extent, and so I am
24 going to try to make this work, however we want.

25 So I just want to see how important you guys think

1 these are to this document or not, so David, Mark, Richard?

2 MR. RIPPERDA: If they hadn't been in there originally,
3 you wouldn't haven't noticed one way or the other. Now that
4 you ask, I look at them, and say those are pretty nice.

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. I will -- before this goes final,
6 I will talk about it again, and I'll e-mail you guys and let
7 you know what the -- you know, what is going on.

8 So anyway, other than that, once that issue is
9 finalized, these will go out as an addendum to the CRP. And
10 that is pretty much done. I really appreciate you guys getting
11 back to me quickly on that one. The fact sheet -- Keith, the
12 fact sheet is draft or -- everybody has seen the fact sheet;
13 right?

14 MR. FIELDS: I believe it's been passed out at maybe the
15 last two RPM meetings. And it's a moving target because every
16 3 months it changed to a certain degree.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. And I really want to get it out
18 some day so --

19 MR. FIELDS: There was an intention at some point to
20 send it out and kind of set the stage for a public meeting
21 associated with EE/CA. But now it may be to a point where we
22 just want to see what happens with the EE/CA, if it's going
23 to go final, and the City is going to agree with everything
24 and then just have a fact sheet that goes out to announce the
25 public meeting for the EE/CA.

1 I think -- and various other things. So I told
2 Richard my feeling is that we may want to wait until we get a
3 decision, have a little more clarity on the EE/CA, whether we
4 want to just have an information meeting -- maybe goes along
5 with what you were saying earlier, Mark, with just having a
6 meeting to, you know, actually try to get public input and a
7 sense of where the public stands with the approach that we
8 are recommending.

9 But yeah, it's been out there long enough that
10 things have sort of changed, and we have modified it to a
11 certain degree, but also it was good that we didn't send it
12 out the first time because we said, well, there's going to be
13 a public meeting at the end of the summer. There wasn't a
14 public meeting at the end of the summer.

15 MR. ZUROMSKI: So I think where I am on this is I
16 actually like Mark's comments earlier that maybe what we want
17 to do is see what happens after you guys talk with the City
18 and we meet with the City again, see where things are going
19 to go, and decide whether or not, at that point, we would
20 have just a public information meeting, or if they are going
21 to agree to the public meeting, but either way, maybe try to
22 set a meeting date and just shoot for it, whether it
23 satisfies one or the other and just do it and then modify
24 this document accordingly and make it for that public meeting
25 and then announce it at that public meeting.

1 And then that way we actually have this -- then we
2 have to send it out because we each put enough notice in for
3 everybody to understand that there is going to be a public
4 meeting, and this would be the actual notice we would mail to
5 everybody, and then we'd put it in the papers and not mail an
6 additional notice other than that.

7 MR. RIPPERDA: How much lead time do you need to set a
8 public meeting?

9 MR. ZUROMSKI: What, about a month?

10 MR. FIELDS: At least.

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: It depends on the facility because if we
12 go back to Elliot Middle School, which I thought was at least
13 one place we should definitely go back to, they were booked
14 for about a month, maybe two, or so. Depends on the day.

15 If we pick a random day and we are very flexible on
16 the day we pick, we would probably have a better chance than
17 if we wanted, you know, this day and it was booked up. So if
18 we are flexible, maybe a month.

19 And then, of course, I think we were talking about
20 at least for the EE/CA this time, for the removal action,
21 we wanted to have -- instead of having three meetings at the
22 same location like we did last time, or the two at the same
23 location, that we would maybe have one in Altadena, one in La
24 Canada, and one in Pasadena or something like that.

25 We had tossed that around, and the only thing I see

1 about that maybe it segregates the three communities because,
2 you know, you talk to some people here and some people here
3 and some people here. But the other parties, of course, when
4 you have it, probably the hassle for people to get on the
5 site and everything like that. So I was trying to find some
6 kind of central location.

7 I like the Elliot Middle School because it's
8 definitely -- they are in the directly affected place. If we
9 were going to choose one of the locations, I don't know --
10 and, maybe, Judy, you might even have input on where do you
11 think would be the best second location for a public meeting.

12 MS. NOVELLY: Some place other than Elliott, if you want
13 people to feel safe coming to the meeting.

14 MR. ZUROMSKI: Where would you say is another location?

15 MS. NOVELLY: Well, La Canada, you feel generally safe,
16 and some areas of Pasadena, but that is not a good area.

17 MR. CLEXTON: Brookside golf course has a conference
18 room. That's where Hahamongna had their last meeting.

19 MR. ZUROMSKI: Was that well attended?

20 MR. CLEXTON: Yes. Very well.

21 MR. ZUROMSKI: That might be a good --

22 MR. ROBLES: The reason we took Elliott is because of the
23 fact that the people in Altadena said --

24 MS. NOVELLY: That's fine for people who can't get there
25 otherwise. But for a lot of the people who don't live in

1 that area, they don't go in that that area. Not voluntarily.

2 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So we'll have at least two
3 locations, and maybe if we get two at that second location --
4 or however we decide to do it.

5 So I will try to look into when we can do it at
6 those two locations and then, you know, if you actually -- if
7 you look at the schedule for OU3, you know, of course, this
8 is if everything worked out okay, I think that I had a public
9 meeting starting in the beginning of November, if the EE/CA
10 was actually finalized, you know, and everybody agreed to it.

11 So nothing says that we still couldn't shoot for
12 that beginning of November timeframe and stick with the
13 schedule, and at least that schedule is for us, and depending
14 on how the City interacts with us, we can make that the
15 formal meeting or not.

16 MR. ROBLES: Make it an informational meeting?

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Yeah. Make it an informational meeting.

18 Does that sound okay?

19 MR. RIPPERDA: Yes. I like that.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So we'll go ahead and shoot for
21 the same timeframe that that was scheduled, No. 11 on OU3,
22 and we'll start working on that now.

23 And that was actually the last action item on the
24 community relations item.

25 MR. RIPPERDA: I would like to, if I am talking with

1 Phyllis Currie, the City Manager, be able to say we have a
2 CERCLA public meeting scheduled for early November --

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

4 MR. RIPPERDA: Do you want to do it with us or not?

5 MR. ZUROMSKI: When do you think you are going to call
6 her?

7 MR. RIPPERDA: Probably mid to late next week.

8 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay.

9 MR. RIPPERDA: I will talk to my management before I
10 start calling City management.

11 MR. ZUROMSKI: I will book those places, then, next week,
12 and, you know, I'll talk with the same lady we talked to for
13 Elliott, and then I'll talk with Dave about where he had the
14 other one, and I'll go talk with them, and we'll get this at
15 least tentatively booked time being -- we have to send in a
16 check or something, maybe we'll hold off a little bit.

17 And I will give you a date. Okay?

18 Okay. That's all I have. I have No. 10, other
19 items.

20 Does anybody have anything else they would like to
21 discuss? We are going to be done about an hour and a half
22 early. Boy, everybody is so excited to get out of here.

23 Good. Well, that's all right.

24 Next meeting. Kimberly has got the calendar.

25 I don't know why we moved to Wednesdays versus

1 Thursdays. Is either day --

2 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Someone wasn't available.

3 MR. ZUROMSKI: Okay. So what would be Thursday of next
4 time? It would be --

5 MS. GATES: This is for next month. October 9th is what
6 somebody has --

7 MR. ZUROMSKI: What is this? This is September,
8 October, November. It would be the beginning of December.

9 So we're looking at -- we don't want to get too
10 late in December. We could either do the 5th or the 12th.

11 I go for the 12th.

12 MR. GEBERT: What day of the week is that?

13 MR. ZUROMSKI: Second Thursday.

14 MR. GEBERT: Second Thursday is when we have our
15 staff meetings.

16 MS. GATES: Oh, that's right.

17 MR. ZUROMSKI: Want to go for the first Thursday, on the
18 5th?

19 MR. ROBLES: The 5th.

20 MR. ZUROMSKI: So December 5th, same time, same place.

21 I'll send out a confirmation, and I think that's
22 it.

23 MR. FIELDS: We do have the teleconference --

24 MR. ZUROMSKI: We don't have the teleconferences set
25 up, do we?

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, ANN BONNETTE-SMITH, C.S.R. No. 6108, do hereby
certify:

That said Transcript of Proceedings was taken before
me at the time and place therein set forth and was taken down
by me in shorthand and thereafter was transcribed into
typewriting under my direction and supervision, and I hereby
certify the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct
transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor
related to any party to said action, nor in any way
interested in the outcome thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name
this _____ day of _____, 2002.

ANN BONNETTE-SMITH