Draft Minutes
Del Amo Soil and NAPL OU Risk Assessment
Conference Call, 1/4/01

Follow-up items in italics.

Participants
EPA: Dante, Stan
DTSC: Gloria, Kimi
D&M: Dudley, Ruth, Kristin
Shell/Dow: Chuck, Larry

Dante reviewed the agenda and the group approved it.

1. Ruth & Kristin’s Status Report

   Ruth noted that her December memo, sent to the agencies, compared the soil gas results from the field analysis to the fixed lab analysis. Ruth used this soil gas data review to update the values used in the risk calculations. For each location containing both field and fixed lab results, she had to choose which to use for the risk calculations. When both results had hits, she used the higher value. When one result had a hit and the other didn’t, she used the hit. When both results were ND, she treated the value as below detection and used the lowest DL. Some cases occurred where fixed lab detection limits were much greater than the field lab detection limit. In such cases, she used the field lab results. Kristin noted that the field lab results were usually higher than the fixed lab and were well correlated. Stan noted they didn’t give correlation coefficients, but he can eyeball the numbers to indeed see good correlation. Ruth said that their strategy of using the higher value in the case of two hits is conservative.

   Ruth’s memo also discussed the potential and known effects of composite sampling on the COPC selection. The memo had provided COPC tables, both sitewide and parcel-specific. To deal with the composites, the value was multiplied by the number of samples making up composite. This provided a conservative high end value, which was used to compare to the PRGs. This exercise resulted in adding one chemical to the COPC list ("Bis" something). Now Ruth is ready to calculate all risks except for the trench exposure. She can now use the parcel-specific COPC lists to calculate parcel-specific risks.

   Stan raised the big picture question of how much data do we have and what are the limitations it places on us? What chemicals were analyzed for, what were the sample locations? What don’t we know? We will need to have such issues discussed up front in the report, as well as in the uncertainties section. Ruth said that we need to discuss such things in the risk analysis itself as well. We all also agreed that some kind of communication will be needed as well, that explains to property owners their risk situation. We can’t expect owners to read and fully digest
the entire risk assessment. This would be in addition to the ROD, etc.

Kimi asked why parcel #7351-33-900, just north of southern boundary, had not been included in the COPC tables. It is a narrow strip of land near Hamilton and Del Amo streets. It was explained that this land is the LADWP right of way. **Ruth will check into why it was not included in the parcel-specific COPC tables.**

Ruth asked if the agencies agreed that they can proceed with running the actual risk calculations now. Both Stan and Kimi agreed.

Robbie and Ruth will put together the final parameter values for the trench exposure scenario in a week or two. They will be using the information they gained from researching the frequency of pipeline repairs in the area. Kimi asked Dante to please email the title and citation of Robbie's reference that he used in the trench work. **Dante will email the citation from Robbie's work to Kimi.**

Kimi suggested that a publication called "Estimation of Air Impacts of Excavation of Contaminated Soil, Air-Superfund Technical Information," might be useful. **She will send the citation to Dudley to forward to Robbie. John will see if Robbie wants to use it or talk to Kimi about any approach similarities.** Stan noted that those models in that document are more for specific, known projects where the volume to be excavated, etc. is known.

### 2. Other Issues

John Dudley said that the timing for submitting the draft risk assessment to the agencies is the end of March. EPA and DTSC said they would like it sooner. **John will discuss it internally with his team and get back to Dante later.**

John noted that the MW20 final report, incorporating the agency comments (from a year ago) is now in internal review. John expects to submit it to the agencies later this month.

John Dudley reported on the butadiene and nitrosamines results from the year 2000 annual groundwater sampling. Samples from selected wells were analyzed for butadiene and nitrosamines. There were two labs that conducted the work, and they both had a variety of analytical and QA problems. URS is now working with the labs to incorporate changes in their special methods. There will be some resampling. At this point, results have shown some scattered low level nitrosamine values both upgradient and downgradient from the site. Butadiene had one possible hit. URS is currently in the process of putting a report together for EPA to describe the lab processes and problems, and describe plans for method revisions and resampling. Stan noted that Aerojet had experienced similar issues; it may be beneficial to talk to the EPA RPM about his experiences. **Dante will get John in touch with the EPA RPM for Aerojet, Charles Berry.**
3. Next Steps

The next steps are to proceed with the risk calculations and to complete Robbie’s memo on trench exposure. The trench exposure is a separate scenario and will not hold up the rest of the calculations. We can either discuss the trench scenario after we see the memo, if we have questions and want to discuss it, or we can just wait to see whole draft. Dante will draft minutes for Ruth review.