Notes from 5/23/02 Risk Conference Call

Participants: Dante Rodriguez, Stan Smucker, Gloria Conti, Kimi Klein, Kristin Cothern, Ruth Custance, John Dudley, Eric Weaver.

Comments regarding Box "Commercial >10^4 Risk ..." The flowchart directs any parcel with risk above 10^4, to the Remedy box. Someone asked about such parcels that have high uncertainty (as described in Table 30 of the risk assessment). If we had more data, the risk could decrease to below 10^4. Therefore, we should examine the amount of data available for parcels with risk above 10^4 as well as parcels with risk below 10^4. Delete this box.

Comments regarding Box "Historic Source? Near Historic Source." Edit box to read "Near Del Amo source." Our historic information came from the PRPs study of the plant's process manuals (see the groundwater RI for the most refined version, containing additional information than the Phase 1 RI), diagrams, maps, testimonies, etc.

On the "No" arrow leaving the box, add another box entitled "Historic source not related to Del Amo?"

Comments regarding Box "Are Both Direct/Indirect Accounted For? Adequate certainty?" Stan noted that whether there is adequate certainty and whether the pathways are adequately accounted for is a judgement call by the risk managers. The regulating agencies will look at the data set for each parcel. We agreed that it would be very useful to meet and have Kristin go through an explanation of how she determined each parcel uncertainty, as presented in tables 30 and 31 of the risk assessment. She can explain what she looked at, considered, show us maps, data coverage, etc.

Comments regarding Box "Have Access?" Edit the box's title to read "Have Access for unaccounted path?"

Comments regarding Box "No Additional Sampling Required Now, etc." We discussed what we would do if we found (or an owner found) non site-related chemicals above a health concern level, during any future sampling. We discussed having different levels of required sampling, one level for parcels within historic source areas, and another levels for parcel within non historic source areas. We could define what future development activities would trigger these sampling requirements. For example, activities that exposure or contact native soil or that go beneath buildings would have higher requirements.

General Comments.

- Potential future worker scenarios would likely be what we base risk management decisions on.
- For heavy PAHs, direct contact exposure would be what we base the risk on (for those constituents).
- The risk assessment did not distinguish between site or non site-related chemicals. We would still need to consider what to do about such situations.
• Any required future sampling tiers/levels that we establish could be more rigorous or less rigorous based on whether a parcel lies within a historic source area.

• Dante will send out minutes from this call and revised the flowchart per today's discussion.