

The Boeing Company
Santa Susana Field Laboratory
5800 Woolsey Canyon Road
Canoga Park, CA 91304-1148

Via Hand Delivery and Federal Express

April 30, 2010
In reply refer to SHEA-109895

Regional Water Quality Control Board
Los Angeles Region
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Attention: Mr. Peter Raftery

Subject: 2010 Addendum to the Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA)
Work Plan Submitted in Response to California Water Code Section
13304 Order (NPDES NO. CA0001309, CI NO. 6027, SCP NO. 1111,
SITE ID NO. 2040109)

Dear Mr. Raftery:

Per the above-referenced order dated December 3, 2008, The Boeing Company (Boeing), on behalf of Boeing and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), hereby submits the attached 2010 Addendum to the Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan submitted on May 1, 2009. The attached addendum summarizes the results of the ISRA evaluation process and presents recommended ISRA remedial actions for the Outfall 009 watershed. The attached work plan will be posted within the next 10 days on the Boeing website at the following address:

http://www.boeing.com/aboutus/environment/santa_susana/isra.html

If you have any questions or require anything further, please contact Lori Blair at 818-466-8741.

Very truly yours,



Thomas D. Gallacher
Director, Santa Susana Field Laboratory
Environment, Health, and Safety

LB:bjc

Attachment: 2010 Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA)
Work Plan Addendum



Mr. P. Raftery, RWQCB (SHEA-109895)
April 30, 2010
Page 2

cc: Ms. Cassandra Owens, RWQCB
Mr. Allen Elliott, NASA
Mr. Steve Slaten, NASA
Mr. Rick Brausch, DTSC
Mr. Buck King, DTSC




**2010 INTERIM SOURCE REMOVAL ACTION (ISRA)
WORK PLAN ADDENDUM
SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY
VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

April 2010


**Prepared For:
The Boeing Company
The National Aeronautics and Space Administration**

**Prepared By:
MWH
618 Michillinda Avenue
Suite 200
Arcadia, California 91007**



Margaret S. Milman Barris for

**Dixie Hambrick, P.G. 5487
Program Director**



Handwritten signature of Alex Fischl.

**Alex Fischl, P.M.P.
Project Manager**

Handwritten signature of Shelby Valenzuela.

**Shelby Valenzuela, P.G 7852
Senior Geologist**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION NO.</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Project Background.....	1-2
1.1.1 Outfall 008 and 009 NPDES Monitoring and Exceedance History.....	1-2
1.1.2 ISRA CAO.....	1-3
1.1.3 ISRA Project Approach.....	1-4
1.1.4 Phase I Implementation.....	1-5
1.2 Northern Drainage and Stormwater Maintenance Activities.....	1-6
1.2.1 Northern Drainage Cleanup.....	1-6
1.2.2 Stormwater Maintenance Activities.....	1-7
1.3 ISRA Work Plan ADDENDUM Scope.....	1-7
2.0 OUTFALL 009 ISRA AREA IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIAL PLANNING.....	2-1
2.1 Source Delineation and Data Gap Sampling.....	2-1
2.1.1 Sampling Approach and Plan.....	2-2
2.1.2 Sampling Results.....	2-3
2.2 ISRA Area Identification.....	2-15
2.2.1 ISRA Criteria Evaluation.....	2-15
2.2.2 RUSLE Results.....	2-16
2.2.3 ISRA Area Identification Summary.....	2-17
2.3 Remedial Alternatives Evaluation and Plan.....	2-18
3.0 REMEDIAL ACTION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	3-1
3.1 Supplemental Plans.....	3-1
3.2 Permitting and Site Surveys.....	3-2
3.3 Remedial Action Implementation.....	3-2
4.0 ISRA SCHEDULE AND REPORTING.....	4-1
4.1 ISRA SCHEDULE.....	4-1
4.2 ISRA REPORTING.....	4-2
5.0 REFERENCES.....	5-1

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

- 1-1 Summary of NPDES Benchmark Exceedances – Outfalls 008 and 009
- 2-1 Outfall 009 ISRA PEA Chemical and Physical Characteristics
- 2-2 Outfall 009 ISRA PEA Criteria Evaluation Matrix
- 2-3 Outfall 009 ISRA PEA Criteria Evaluation – Physical and Geochemical Parameters
- 2-4 Outfall 009 ISRA Area Remedial Action Summary
- 3-1 Confirmation Sample Analytical Reporting Limits

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures

- 1-1 Regional Map, Santa Susana Field Laboratory
- 1-2 Outfall 008 and 009 Location Map
- 1-3 Eastern Outfall 009 Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas
- 1-4 Western Outfall 009 Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas
- 2-1 Outfall 009, Sample Locations for PEA B1-1 and B1-2
- 2-2 Outfall 009, Sample Locations for PEA IEL-1, IEL-2, IEL-3, IEL-4, IEL-5, IEL-6, IEL-7, and IEL-8
- 2-3 Outfall 009, Sample Locations for PEA A1LF-1, A1LF-2, and A1LF-3
- 2-4 Outfall 009, Sample Locations for PEA CTLI-1, CTLI-2, CTLI-3, and CTLI-4
- 2-5 Outfall 009, Sample Locations for PEA LOX-2
- 2-6 Sample Locations, Western Outfall009, Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas
- 2-7 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - B1-1
- 2-8 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - B1-2
- 2-9 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - IEL-1, IEL-3, and IEL-6
- 2-10 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - IEL-2, IEL-4, and IEL-5
- 2-11 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - A1LF-1
- 2-12 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - A1LF-2
- 2-13 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - CTLI-1 & CTLI-2
- 2-14 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - LOX-1
- 2-15 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - A2LF-2
- 2-16 Refined Preliminary ISRA Evaluation Areas Outfall 009 - AP/STP-1

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

Appendix A Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results

- Table A-1 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - B1-1
- Table A-2 Outfall 009 Data Gap Source Delineation Sample Results - B1-2
- Table A-3 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - IEL-1, IEL-3, and IEL-6.
- Table A-4 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - IEL-2, IEL-4, and IEL-5
- Table A-5 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - IEL-7, and IEL-8.
- Table A-6 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - A1LF-1
- Table A-7 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - A1LF-2
- Table A-8 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - A1LF-3
- Table A-9 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - CTLI-1 and CTLI-2
- Table A-10 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - CTLI-3
- Table A-11 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - CTLI-4
- Table A-12 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - LOX-2
- Table A-13 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - LOX-1
- Table A-14 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - A2LF-2
- Table A-15 Outfall 009 Data Gap and Source Delineation Sample Results - AP/STP-1

Appendix B Memorandum, SSFL Outfall 009 Sediment Yield Analysis for Remaining ISRA PEAs (Geosyntec, 2010)

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AL1F	Area 1 Landfill
ASTM	American Society for Test and Materials
bgs	below ground surface
Boeing	The Boeing Company
CAO	Cleanup and Abatement Order
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CM	culvert maintenance
COC	constituents of concern
CWA	Clean Water Act
cy	cubic yards
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
ELV	Expendable Launch Vehicle
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
Geosyntec	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.
HSP	health and safety plan
ISRA	Interim Source Removal Action
LOX	liquid oxygen
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWP	Nationwide Permit
MRCA	Mountains Recreation Conservancy Authority
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PEA	preliminary evaluation area
pg/g	picograms per gram
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RFI	RCRA Facility Investigation
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation, Version 2
RWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS (continued)

SAA	Streambed Alteration Agreement
SAP	Sampling and Analysis Plan
SIM	selective ion monitoring
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SRGs	Soil Remediation Goals
SSFL	Santa Susana Field Laboratory
SVOCs	semi-volatile organic compounds
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TCDD TEQ	tetrachlorobenzo-p-dioxin toxic equivalent (normalized to 2,3,7,8-TCDD)
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USACE	United States Army Corp of Engineers
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirement

This page intentionally left blank

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This 2010 Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan Addendum summarizes the results of the ISRA evaluation process and presents recommended remedial actions to control releases of constituents of concern (COCs) to surface water for the remaining areas within the Outfall 009 watershed at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL). This work plan supplements the Preliminary ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009a), the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b) along with other work plan addenda (MWH 2009c, MWH 2009d, MWH 2009e, and NASA, 2009). The Preliminary ISRA Work Plan and the Final ISRA Work Plan present the approach used to identify and control the release of COCs to surface water within the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds. The Final ISRA Work Plan, along with other work plan addenda, summarizes the results of ISRA evaluations performed prior to this work plan.

As described in the Final ISRA Work Plan, the ISRA project is being conducted in annual phases to allow completion of ongoing work within the Outfall 009 watershed (Northern Drainage cleanup and storm water maintenance activities), and to accommodate federal funding schedules for work to be performed on property owned by the federal government and administered by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). ISRA activities performed in 2009 are summarized in the ISRA Phase I Implementation Report (MWH, 2010b). Subsequent implementation reports will be prepared to document future ISRA activities completed. Final completion of the ISRA project is anticipated prior to the Fall 2012 rainy season.

All ISRA documents to date, including work plans, work plan addenda, and progress reports, were prepared by MWH and CH2M HILL on behalf of The Boeing Company (Boeing) and NASA pursuant to a California Water Code Section 13304 Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) dated December 3, 2008 (RWQCB, 2008). The CAO was issued by the RWQCB to achieve compliance with the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) for Outfalls 008 and 009 established in its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, NPDES No. CA0001309 (NPDES Permit). The CAO was issued to Boeing, and included provisions for Boeing to communicate and work cooperatively with NASA for ISRAs necessary on NASA

property (Item 6 of the CAO). This communication and coordination is ongoing and represented in this work plan, as well as in previous ISRA work plans and progress reports.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The SSFL is located approximately 29 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles, California, in the southeast corner of Ventura County. Figure 1-1 shows the geographic location and property boundaries of the site, as well as surrounding communities. Storm water discharges at the SSFL are monitored according to the NPDES Permit. A figure showing the 16 outfall locations is included in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b), and a detailed view of the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds is shown in Figure 1-2. Currently, surface water discharges at the site are exclusively the result of intermittent storm water runoff after rain events.

The SSFL is also currently undergoing a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Program under oversight by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). This action is currently in the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Phase.

1.1.1 Outfall 008 and 009 NPDES Monitoring and Exceedance History

Outfall 008 was established in August 2004 as the NPDES Permit monitoring location for Happy Valley (Figure 1-2). Between 2004 and December 2009, a total of 21 samples were collected from Outfall 008 and the results from these samples were compared to the 2009 NPDES benchmark limits. The constituents that were detected at concentrations that exceeded these limits are considered the surface water COCs in the Outfall 008 watershed, and include: copper, lead, and dioxins¹. Details of these sampling results are presented in Table 1-1.

Outfall 009 was established in August 2004 as the NPDES Permit monitoring location in the Northern Drainage (Figure 1-2). Between 2004 and December 2009, a total of 38 samples were collected from Outfall 009 and the results from these samples were compared to the

¹ The term 'dioxins' as used in this work plan represents the sum of 17 dioxin/furan congener results adjusted for toxicity by normalizing to the toxicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD TEQ). See *Notes* to Table 1-1.

2009 NPDES benchmark limits. The constituents that were detected at concentrations that exceeded these limits are considered the surface water COCs in the Outfall 009 watershed, and include cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, dioxins, oil and grease, and pH. Details of these sampling results are presented in Table 1-1. Since the exceedances of oil and grease and pH each occurred only once and are attributable to natural causes (Boeing, 2005 and 2006), they are not considered ISRA COCs, as described in the ISRA work plans (MWH, 2009a and 2009b).

1.1.2 ISRA CAO

In response to exceedances of 2009 NPDES benchmark limits at Outfall 008 and Outfall 009, the RWQCB issued a CAO to Boeing on December 3, 2008 (RWQCB, 2008). The CAO requires that the sources which are discharging constituents that exceeded NPDES benchmark limits within the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds be addressed. Constituents for which there have been NPDES benchmark limit exceedances at Outfall 008 and Outfall 009 between 2004 and March 2008 include lead at Outfall 008; and copper, lead, dioxins, pH, and oil and grease at Outfall 009 (Boeing, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009).

The objective of the ISRA RWQCB CAO is to improve surface water quality within the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds by identifying, evaluating, and remediating areas of contaminated soil in order to remove the COCs that have resulted in exceedances of NPDES benchmark limits in storm water. The CAO also requires that methods be used that minimize impacts to the streambed adjacent to habitat during cleanup activities, protect the water quality during and after cleanup activities, and restore the streambed and surrounding habitat following cleanup activities.

To accomplish this objective, two work plans were required as stipulated by the RWQCB CAO, a Preliminary ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009a) and a Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH 2009b). Both work plans, along with other work plan addenda (MWH 2009c, MWH 2009d, MWH 2009e, and NASA, 2009), were submitted to the RWQCB for review and approval in 2009. The activities described in the work plans and work plan addenda were implemented following the receipt of RWQCB approval, with activities summarized in the Phase I Implementation Report (MWH, 2010b). This addendum to the Final ISRA Work Plan

summarizes the results of the ISRA evaluation of the remaining ISRA Preliminary Evaluation Areas (PEAs).

1.1.3 ISRA Project Approach

The CAO directs ISRA activities to remove the COCs that have resulted in exceedances of NPDES benchmark limits (RWQCB, 2008). The ISRA project approach to meet the objectives of the CAO was presented in detail in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b) and approved by the RWQCB. The approach included:

- (1) Compiling the previously existing data set of soil and sediment samples for the Outfall 008 and Outfall 009 watersheds;
- (2) Identifying potential source areas of ISRA COCs and designating them as ISRA PEAs. ISRA PEAs represent areas in which samples from the previously existing data set contain concentrations of the ISRA COCs exceeding DTSC-approved background comparison concentrations (MWH, 2005);
- (3) Performing additional soil sampling to fill data gaps and delineate the lateral and vertical extents of the source areas, producing refined ISRA PEAs;
- (4) Evaluating each refined ISRA PEA, based on criteria including sampling results, soil type, site geomorphology, and type of vegetation, to highlight which areas were likely to be contributing ISRA COCs to surface water and should be identified as an ISRA area requiring remediation; and
- (5) Performing a remedial alternatives analysis and developing soil remediation goals (SRGs) for each proposed ISRA area.

As described above, the ISRA COCs for surface water at Outfalls 008 and 009 were determined by surface water samples collected for monitoring or compliance under the NPDES Permit at those outfalls. Based on the evaluation of all surface water samples collected at Outfalls 008 and 009 since August 2004, the ISRA COCs for surface water are copper, lead, and dioxins at Outfall 008, and cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, and dioxins at Outfall 009. The ISRA approach presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan also specifies that where RCRA risk drivers are collocated with ISRA areas, the RCRA risk drivers will be considered in ISRA activities (MWH, 2009b). RCRA risk drivers are those chemicals that significantly contribute to elevated human risks and ecological risks within the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds, as presented in the RFI Group reports.

The SRGs established for the ISRA project are consistent with or near background concentrations (MWH, 2005), as described in the ISRA Final Work Plan (MWH, 2009b). However, since the 2005 soil background data are being re-evaluated by DTSC and a final background dataset is not defined at this time, ISRA SRGs will be adjusted, as necessary, once a final background dataset is approved by DTSC. The SRG for dioxins is slightly higher than current background levels (approximately 3 times the background concentration) since there is more uncertainty in the 2005 data set for dioxins than for other ISRA COCs, and because the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds were extensively burned during the 2005 Topanga Fire, resulting in dioxin-containing ash and burned debris being deposited throughout the area.

1.1.4 Phase I Implementation

ISRA remedial activities performed in 2009 are considered to be Phase I implementation activities, and included all ISRA activities recommended in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b), as well as subsequent Work Plan Addenda (MWH, 2009c; MWH, 2009d; MWH, 2009e; NASA, 2009), with the exception of the two ISRA areas, ELV-1C and ELV-1D, identified within the Expendable Launch Vehicle (ELV) ISRA PEA, which are planned to be completed this year. ISRA remedial activities during 2009 consisted of excavation and site restoration at ten ISRA areas in the Outfall 008 watershed on Boeing property and two ISRA areas in the Outfall 009 watershed on NASA property. A total of approximately 5,200 cubic yards (cy) (*ex situ*) of soil was removed from Outfall 008 ISRA area excavations, and approximately 180 cy (*ex situ*) of soil was removed from Outfall 009 ISRA area excavations. Areas of removal were then regraded to natural contours, hydroseeded, and, in appropriate areas, revegetated with plants specifically grown for use along drainages and to stabilize channel banks.

Pursuant to Item 4 of the RWQCB CAO, a Phase I Implementation Report was prepared and submitted to the RWQCB on April 1, 2010 (MWH, 2010b). The Phase I Implementation Report summarizes the ISRA activities completed in 2009 and includes all pertinent ISRA project related documentation for Phase I implementation. It also describes the Performance Monitoring Plan that was developed for monitoring surface water at Phase I ISRA areas after remediation and site restoration are complete, and at selected culverts within the Outfall 009 watershed (MWH, 2010a). Performance monitoring of storm water runoff upgradient and downgradient of

the Phase I ISRA areas and selected Outfall 009 culverts is currently ongoing for the 2009/2010 rainy season, and will be reported in the second ISRA Quarterly Progress Report. Performance monitoring at Phase I ISRA areas and selected Outfall 009 culverts is planned to continue through the end of the 2010/2011 rainy season. Although the overall effectiveness of the ISRA remedial actions in meeting the requirements of the CAO will be evaluated by the results of surface water samples collected at Outfalls 008 and Outfall 009 compared to NPDES benchmark limits, performance monitoring sampling results will be considered when assessing the need for additional ISRA actions, if any.

1.2 NORTHERN DRAINAGE AND STORMWATER MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES

ISRA work in the Outfall 009 watershed is being conducted in annual phases due to the ongoing Northern Drainage cleanup under the oversight of DTSC, completion of stormwater maintenance activities, and federal funding schedules. A brief description of the ongoing work in the Outfall 009 watershed as part of the Northern Drainage and storm water maintenance programs, including work performed, in progress, and planned is provided in the following sections.

1.2.1 Northern Drainage Cleanup

As described in the Preliminary and Final ISRA Work Plans (MWH, 2009a, and MWH, 2009b), ongoing cleanup activities are being performed in the Northern Drainage under DTSC direction. The Northern Drainage cleanup is being performed pursuant to an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order (DTSC, 2007) and a CAO (RWQCB, 2007). Both orders applied to property encompassed within the "Northern Drainage," including the former Liquid Oxygen (LOX) Plant debris area and the former Rocketdyne-Atomics International Rifle and Pistol Club (Shooting Range), located on Mountains Recreation Conservancy Authority (MRCA) property. Cleanup activities that addressed debris in the Northern Drainage near the former LOX Plant were completed in 2007 (MWH, 2008). Cleanup activities to address clay pigeon debris near the former Shooting Range and within the Northern Drainage began in 2008 and are scheduled to be completed by the end of May 2010. These cleanup activities removed the soil samples with exceedances of ISRA COCs above SRGs within PEA-LOX-3, located east of the LOX RFI site in the Northern Drainage. A figure showing the location of PEA-LOX-3 is included in the Final

ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b). A report summarizing those activities will be submitted to DTSC. Cleanup activities to address residual lead shot present near the former shooting range and within the Northern Drainage will be conducted following completion of the 2009/2010 rainy season.

1.2.2 Stormwater Maintenance Activities

As part of the SSFL surface water maintenance program, culvert upgrades were performed in early 2009 at 13 culverts within the Outfall 009 watershed and in January 2010 at the culvert located within ISRA area A2LF-3 after ISRA remedial and site restoration activities. These culvert maintenance actions included installation of culvert headwalls and filtration media to reduce sediment loads and COCs that may be within or associated with suspended solids in storm water discharging into the primary Outfall 009 drainage. The design of the culvert upgrades was completed by Geosyntec Consultants, Inc (Geosyntec), under direction of the SSFL Surface Water Expert Panel. Culvert design diagrams were provided in the ISRA Phase I Implementation Report (MWH, 2010b). Although these culvert maintenance actions were not specifically installed to address potential ISRA areas, eight of them were performed within ISRA PEAs or ISRA areas (CM-8 and CM-9 within PEA-A1LF-1; CM-11 within PEA-CTLI-1; CM-2, CM-3, CM-4, and CM-10 within PEA-LOX-2; and CM-1 within ISRA area A2LF-3).

These Northern Drainage cleanup and stormwater maintenance activities have been considered during the ISRA identification process and in development of the remedial activities recommended in this work plan addendum.

1.3 ISRA WORK PLAN ADDENDUM SCOPE

This ISRA Work Plan addendum supplements the previously submitted ISRA Work Plans and addenda (MWH 2009a, MWH 2009b, MWH 2009c, MWH 2009d, MWH 2009e, and NASA, 2009), by performing the ISRA area identification and remedial planning process for the remaining ISRA PEAs. The remaining ISRA PEAs are located in the Outfall 009 watershed and are shown on Figures 1-3 and 1-4. In previous ISRA work plans, the ISRA PEA located south of Service Area Road and culvert maintenance areas CM-7 and CM-11 was identified as PEA-A1LF-2 (MWH, 2009a, and MWH, 2009b). As shown on Figure 1-3, this work plan

identifies this PEA as PEA-CTLI-1 due to its proximity to the Component Test Laboratory I (CTLI-I).

This Work Plan addendum follows the ISRA approach presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan and summarized in Section 1.1.3 for the remaining ISRA PEAs, resulting in the identification of ISRA areas and recommended remedial actions. As described in the Final ISRA Work Plan and further in Section 2, finalization of ISRA areas and remedial planning in Outfall 009 are pending completion of ongoing Northern Drainage cleanup actions, culvert maintenance activities, SSFL building demolition plans, and federal funding schedules.

This work plan includes four sections and two appendices:

- Section 1 summarizes the project background information and describes the scope and objectives of this ISRA Work Plan Addendum.
- Section 2 presents the results of the ISRA area identification and remedial alternatives evaluation for the remaining ISRA PEAs.
- Section 3 summarizes the remedial action planning process, including activities associated with supporting plans, permits, and site surveys, and the remedial action implementation.
- Section 4 presents the ISRA implementation schedule and ISRA reporting requirements.
- Appendix A presents the results of data gap and source delineation soil samples within the remaining ISRA PEAs.
- Appendix B presents modeling results considered in the ISRA area identification process.

2.0 OUTFALL 009 ISRA AREA IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIAL PLANNING

There are eight ISRA PEAs that were identified in the Preliminary ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009a) based on available soil data, but have not been evaluated in previous work plans and work plan addenda. Four of the ISRA PEAs are located in the eastern portion of the Outfall 009 watershed and four are located in the western portion of the Outfall 009 watershed, shown in Figures 1-3 and 1-4. Although these figures display only surface soil data, subsurface soil data were also considered in the identification of ISRA PEAs in the Preliminary ISRA Work Plan; all subsurface soil COC detections above SRGs were collocated with surficial COC impacts.

As described in previous work plans, the ISRA PEAs identified in the Preliminary ISRA Work Plan were highly generalized and approximate due to data limitations. Additional soil samples have been collected at and near these ISRA PEAs to further delineate areas exceeding SRGs for the ISRA COCs, and assess concentrations of ISRA COCs near and/or down-gradient of former operational areas previously not investigated (see Section 2.1). This section summarizes the sampling activities and results, the ISRA area identification results, the remedial alternatives evaluation results, and the recommended remedial action for each ISRA area identified within the remaining ISRA PEAs within the Outfall 009 watershed. Descriptions in the following sections use the term “COC” to include both ISRA COCs and collocated non-ISRA COCs, including RCRA risk drivers.

2.1 SOURCE DELINEATION AND DATA GAP SAMPLING

An evaluation of previous soil sample locations and analytical results was performed to identify locations for source delineation and data gap sampling. Source delineation soil sampling was performed to further refine the extent and magnitude of soil COCs within ISRA PEAs. Data gap sampling was performed near and/or down-gradient of former operational areas where the absence of a COC had not been verified by previous sampling. The sampling approach, plan, methods, and results of the source delineation and data gap sampling performed within the eight remaining ISRA PEAs located within the Outfall 009 watershed are described below.

2.1.1 Sampling Approach and Plan

Source delineation and data gap soil sampling in the vicinity of the eight remaining ISRA PEAs was performed to further refine the extent and magnitude of COCs within the Outfall 009 watershed. Source delineation and step out sampling locations performed between June 2009 and March 2010 are shown on Figures 2-1 to 2-6.

In general, the sampling approach and methods followed those presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b). Source delineation and step out samples were collected approximately 25 to 50 feet from previous sample location(s) with COCs exceeding SRGs and approximately 25 to 50 feet from other source delineation sample locations. The sample spacing considered the surface area of the impact and the likely depositional method, with greater spacing for larger areas and those possibly impacted by air dispersion. Source delineation samples were also collected proximate to existing sample locations for which the vertical extent required assessment. Data gap samples were collected near and/or down-gradient of former operational areas where the absence of a COC had not been verified by previous sampling. Generally within drainages, source delineation and data gap assessment was performed by collecting 3 to 5 samples along transects aligned perpendicular to the surface water flow pathway, with a 5- to 10-foot spacing within each transect. This sampling approach was designed to characterize soil from the middle of the drainage, the banks of the drainage, and the overbanks area.

At each source delineation and data gap sample location, a surface soil sample and a subsurface soil sample were collected, if soil depth allowed. The analytical suite for source delineation samples was chosen based on constituents known from previous sampling to be associated with a potential source area, and included both ISRA COCs and RCRA risk drivers. The analytical suite for data gap samples was chosen based on the analytes for which the data gap existed. Soil samples from step out locations and subsurface soil samples were placed on hold at the laboratory and only analyzed if needed for source delineation. Source delineation and data gap sample analysis included one or more of the following:

- Metals by United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 6010B/6020/7471A;

- Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) by EPA 8015B, modified;
- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by EPA 8260B;
- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) by EPA 8082;
- Semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) by EPA 8270C with selective ion monitoring (SIM);
- Dioxins by EPA 1613B;
- pH by EPA 9045C;
- Percent moisture by American Society for Test and Materials (ASTM) Method D2216.

The field sampling, laboratory analysis, and quality control samples were collected according to DTSC-approved RFI Field Standard Operating Procedures and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) requirements (Ogden, 2000 and MECx, 2009). A summary of the sample collection and handling procedures, along with sample analytical methods, is presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b).

2.1.2 Sampling Results

Source delineation and data gap soil sampling were performed at and near the eight ISRA PEAs remaining within the Outfall 009 watershed, including PEA-B1-1, PEA-IEL-1, PEA-A1LF-1, PEA-CTLI-1, PEA-LOX-1, PEA-LOX-2, PEA-A2LF-2, and PEA-AP/STP-1. Sample locations are shown on Figures 2-1 through 2-6. A summary of the sample results of ISRA COCs is provided below. Data is summarized by PEA moving from east to west through the Outfall 009 watershed, starting with PEA-B1-1 in the east and ending with PEA AP/STP-1 in the west. Results are presented in Tables included in Appendix A. As described above, select samples were also analyzed to test for collocated RCRA risk drivers. Although the following text does not include a summary of the results for collocated RCRA risk drivers, the results are included in the tables in Appendix A. In addition, RCRA risk drivers were considered in ISRA area identification and remedial action evaluation process (Sections 2.2 and 2.3).

PEA-B1-1

Prior to performing source delineation sampling, PEA-B1-1 was subdivided into two PEAs, PEA-B1-1 and PEA-B1-2, based on a review of previous sample results. The source delineation

samples collected to further refine these two PEAs are shown on Figure 2-1. A summary of the sample results within each PEA is provided below.

PEA-B1-1

Fifty-three borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-B1-1. A total of 49 soil samples (45 surface samples, 2 subsurface samples, and 2 duplicate samples) were collected from 45 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Eight of the sampling locations (B1BS0083, B1BS0094, B1BS0096, B1BS0107, B1BS0116, B1BS0120, B1BS0128, and B1BS0130) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at a depth of approximately 1.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) on the B1-1 hillside and former dirt road. Soils are thicker, up to 13 feet bgs, located near the former B-1 test stand area.

Seventeen soil samples collected from 16 locations were analyzed for cadmium and 39 soil samples from 36 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-7. Below is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 17 soil samples (16 surface samples and 1 subsurface sample) analyzed for cadmium, 2 samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). Cadmium was detected at concentrations up to 3.74 mg/kg at B1BS0110.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 39 soil samples (38 surface samples and 1 subsurface sample) analyzed for dioxins, 14 soil samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 picograms per gram (pg/g). Dioxins were detected at concentrations up to 820 pg/g at B1BS0175.

Concurrently to the collection of the ISRA soil samples described above, soil samples were collected within PEA-B1-1 for the SSFL demolition program to assess a localized mercury leak near the former water tank area located at the top of the B1-1 hillside. Sixteen surface soil samples were collected and analyzed for mercury. Of the 16 samples collected, 8 contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Mercury was detected at concentrations up to 75 mg/kg in B1BS0136. These samples delineated the exceedances of mercury to relatively small, isolated

areas in the southeastern portion of PEA-B1-1, as shown on Figure 2-7. These results will be considered during the ISRA area identification process (Section 2.2).

PEA-B1-2

Thirty-one borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-B1-1. A total of 34 soil samples (29 surface samples, and 5 subsurface samples) were collected from 30 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. One of the sampling locations (B1BS0099) did not have a sample analyzed because analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at a depth of approximately 3 feet bgs within the drainage and drainage banks, and up to 4 feet bgs near B-1 fence line.

Thirty four soil samples collected from 30 locations were analyzed for metals and 7 soil samples collected from seven locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, and lead) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-8. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 34 soil samples (29 surface samples, 5 subsurface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 8 soil samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 mg/kg, 7 soil samples contained copper above the SRG of 29 mg/kg, and 10 soil samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg. Cadmium was detected at concentrations up to 7.73 mg/kg at B1BS0104, copper at concentrations up to 70 mg/kg at B1BS0104, and lead at concentrations up to 460 mg/kg at B1BS0101.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 7 soil samples (surface samples) analyzed for dioxins, 5 samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 100 pg/g at B1BS0164.

PEA-IEL-1

Prior to performing source delineation sampling, PEA-IEL-1 was subdivided into eight PEAs, PEA-IEL-1 through PEA-IEL-8, based on a review of previous sample results. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-2. Samples were not collected at PEA-IEL-6 because the exceedance is located under a building. The following is a summary of the sample results within the PEAs, which are grouped based on proximity to each other.

PEA-IEL-1 and PEA-IEL-3

Twenty-four borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-IEL-1 and PEA-IEL-3. A total of 18 soil samples (13 surface samples, 2 subsurface, 1 duplicate sample, and 2 split samples) were collected from 14 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Ten of the sampling locations (ILBS0118A, ILBS0139A, ILBS0310, ILBS0311, ILBS0312, ILBS0314, ILBS0315, ILBS0317, ILBS0322, and ILBS0325) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 2 feet bgs east of the former Building 1324 and near the west corner of Building 1300, and up to 5.5 feet bgs east of the former Building 1324.

Eighteen soil samples collected from 14 locations were analyzed for metals. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury) are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-9. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 18 soil samples (16 surface samples and 2 subsurface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, no samples contained metals above the SRGs.

PEA-IEL-2, PEA-IEL-4, and PEA-IEL-5

Sixteen borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-IEL-2, PEA-IEL-4, and PEA-IEL-5. A total of 15 soil samples (12 surface samples, 2 subsurface samples, and 1 duplicate sample) were collected from 12 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Four of the sampling locations (ILBS0291, ILBS0293, ILBS0299, and ILBS0305) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. Bedrock was not encountered in these sampling locations, but is known to be present in the vicinity at depths up to 25 feet bgs based on previous sampling.

Fifteen soil samples collected from 12 locations were analyzed for metals. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, and lead) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-10. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 15 soil samples (13 surface samples, 2 subsurface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 2 samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 mg/kg, 2 samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg, and 5 samples contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Cadmium was detected up to 2.78 mg/kg at ILBS0328, lead was detected up to 45.1 mg/kg at ILBS0326, and mercury was detected at concentrations up to 4.49 mg/kg.

PEA-IEL-7 and PEA-IEL-8

Seven borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-IEL-7 and the data gap sampling at PEA-IEL-8. A total of 5 soil samples (5 surface samples) were collected from 5 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Two of the sampling locations (ILBS0301 and ILBS0303) did not have a sample analyzed because analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. Bedrock was encountered at a depth of 1.5 feet bgs in PEA-IEL-8.

Five soil samples collected from five locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for dioxins are presented in Appendix A. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Dioxins.** Of the 5 soil samples (surface samples) analyzed for dioxins, no samples contained dioxins above the SRG.

PEA-A1LF-1

Prior to performing source delineation sampling, PEA-A1LF-1 was subdivided into three PEAs, PEA-A1LF-1 through PEA-A1LF-3, based on a review of previous sample results. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-3. A summary of the sample results within each PEA is provided below.

PEA-A1LF-1

Six borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-A1LF-1. A total of 6 soil samples (surface samples) were collected from 6 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Bedrock was not encountered in these sampling locations, but is known to be present in the vicinity at depths up to 25 feet bgs based on previous sampling.

Five soil samples collected from 5 locations were analyzed for metals, and 1 soil sample collected from 1 location was analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-11. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 5 soil samples (5 surface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 2 samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 mg/kg, and 3 samples contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Cadmium was detected up to 2.95 mg/kg, and mercury was detected up to 0.519 mg/kg, both at A1BS0061.
- **Dioxins.** In the one soil samples (1 surface sample) analyzed for dioxins, dioxins were not detected above the SRG.

PEA-A1LF-2

Fifty-two borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-A1LF-2. A total of 45 soil samples (43 surface samples, 1 subsurface sample and 1 duplicate sample) were collected from 44 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Eight of the sampling locations (A1BS0056, A1BS0057, A1BS0081, A1BS0084, A1BS0105, A1BS0107, A1BS0110, and A1BS0112) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 2 feet bgs, and at depths up to 5 feet bgs.

Twenty six soil samples collected from 24 locations were analyzed for metals, and 30 soil samples collected from 29 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-12. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 26 soil samples (25 surface samples and 1 subsurface sample) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 6 soil samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 mg/kg, 1 soil sample contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg, and 3 samples contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Cadmium was detected up to 2.13 mg/kg at A1BS0099, lead was detected up to 42.4 mg/kg at A1BS0113, and mercury was detected up to 0.563 mg/kg at A1BS0085.

- **Dioxins.** Of the 30 soil samples (surface samples) analyzed for dioxins, 4 samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 11 pg/g at A1BS0085.

PEA-A1LF-3

Thirteen borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-A1LF-3. A total of six soil samples (surface samples) were collected from six sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Seven of the sampling locations (ENBS0107, ENBS0108, ENBS0110, ENBS0111, ENBS0112, ENBS0115, and ENBS0116) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 2.5 feet bgs, and at depths up to 5 feet bgs.

Seven soil samples collected from 7 locations were analyzed for lead, and 3 soil samples from 3 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for lead and dioxins are presented in Appendix A. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 7 soil samples (surface samples) analyzed for lead, 4 soil samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg. Lead was detected up to 79.8 mg/kg at ENBS0105.
- **Dioxins.** Of the three soil samples (2 surface samples and 1 subsurface sample) analyzed for dioxins, no samples detected dioxins above the SRG.

PEA-CTLI-1

Prior to performing source delineation sampling, PEA-CTLI-1 was subdivided into four PEAs, PEA-CTLI-1 through PEA-CTLI-4, based on a review of previous sample results. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-4. A summary of the sample results within the PEAs, which are grouped based on proximity to each other, is provided below.

PEA-CTLI-1 and PEA-CTLI-2

Ninety-five borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-CTLI-1 and CTLI-2. A total of 83 soil samples (70 surface samples, 11 subsurface samples, 1 duplicate samples, and 1 split sample) were collected from 67 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA

COCs. Twenty-eight (28) of the sampling locations (ENBS0145, ENBS0147, ENBS0149, ENBS0151, ENBS0152, ENBS0154, LFBS0245, LFBS0257 to LFBS0262, LFBS0265, LFBS0269, LFBS0271, LFBS0289, LFBS0291, LFBS0297 to LFBS0304, LFBS0314 to LFBS0315) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 2.0 feet bgs, and up to 6 feet bgs within the drainage north of PEA-CTLI-1.

Eighty soil samples collected from 65 locations were analyzed for metals, and 48 soil samples collected from 38 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-13. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 80 soil samples (67 surface samples, 11 subsurface samples, 1 duplicate sample, and 1 split sample) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 16 soil samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg and 3 soil samples contained copper above the SRG of 29 mg/kg. Lead was detected up to 450 mg/kg at LFBS0276, and copper was detected up to 1,900 mg/kg at LFBS0276.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 48 soil samples (41 surface samples, 7 subsurface samples) analyzed for dioxins, 3 soil samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 94 pg/g at LFBS0316.

PEA-CTLI-3 and PEA-CTLI-4

Thirty borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-CTLI-3 and PEA-CTLI-4. A total of 20 soil samples (19 surface samples and 1 duplicate sample) were collected from nineteen sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Eleven of the sampling locations (ENBS0086, ENBS0088, ENBS0136 to ENBS0142, ENBS0145 and ENBS0147) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 1.0 feet bgs, and up to 3 feet bgs within the drainage south of the CM-7.

Ten soil samples collected from 9 locations were analyzed for metals, and 17 soil samples collected from 16 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals

(cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 10 soil samples (19 surface samples and 1 duplicate sample) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 4 samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg. Lead was detected up to 79.9 mg/kg at ENBS0133.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 17 soil samples (16 surface samples and 1 duplicate sample) analyzed for dioxins, 3 samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 7.2 pg/g at ENBS0121.

PEA-LOX-1

Forty-two borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-LOX-1. A total of 44 soil samples (41 surface samples, 2 subsurface samples, and 1 split sample) were collected from 42 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-6. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 0.5 feet bgs.

Thirty four soil samples collected from 41 locations were analyzed for metals and 36 soil samples collected from 34 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, copper, and lead) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-14. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 34 soil samples (32 surface samples, 2 subsurface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 8 soil samples contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg and 8 soil samples contained copper above the SRG of 29 mg/kg. Lead was detected up to 203 mg/kg at LXBS1051 and copper was detected up to 121 mg/kg at LXBS1066.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 36 soil samples (34 surface samples, 2 subsurface) analyzed for dioxins, 29 soil samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 340 pg/g at LXBS1046.

PEA-LOX-2

Thirty-seven borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-LOX-2. A total of 12 soil samples (11 surface samples and 1 duplicate sample) were collected from 11 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. Twenty-five of the sampling locations (ENBS0081,

ENBS0162 to ENBS0165, ENBS0167 to ENBS0170, ENBS0172 to ENBS0174, ENBS0176 to ENBS0179, ENBS0181 and ENBS0184, ENBS0186 to ENBS0189, and ENBS0194) did not have a sample analyzed either because samples were not collected due to refusal prior to reaching the desired sample depth, or analysis of collected samples was not needed for source delineation. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-4. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 2 feet bgs.

Two soil samples collected from 2 locations were analyzed for lead and 11 soil samples collected from 10 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for lead and dioxins are presented in Appendix A. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 2 soil samples (surface samples) analyzed for lead, 1 soil sample contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg. Lead was detected up to 124 mg/kg at ENBS0195.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 11 soil samples (10 surface samples and 1 duplicate sample) analyzed for dioxins, no samples contained dioxins above the SRG.

PEA-A2LF-2

Eleven borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-A2LF-2. A total of 11 soil samples (10 surface samples, and 1 subsurface samples) were collected from 11 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-6. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 1 foot bgs.

Eleven soil samples collected from 11 locations were analyzed for metals. Results of chemical testing for metals (lead and mercury) are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-15. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 11 soil samples (10 surface samples, 1 subsurface sample) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 4 soil samples contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Mercury was detected up to 0.174 mg/kg in A2BS1081.

PEA-AP/STP-1

Sixty-nine borings were advanced during source delineation sampling at PEA-AP/STP-1. A total of 87 soil samples (66 surface samples, and 21 subsurface samples) were collected from

69 sampling locations and analyzed for ISRA COCs. The source delineation sampling locations are shown on Figure 2-6. On average, bedrock was encountered at approximately 1.5 feet bgs.

Ten soil samples collected from 8 locations were analyzed for metals and 82 soil samples collected from 66 locations were analyzed for dioxins. Results of chemical testing for metals (cadmium, lead, and mercury) and dioxins are presented in Appendix A, and shown on Figure 2-16. The following is a summary of the results:

- **Metals.** Of the 10 soil samples (8 surface samples and 2 subsurface samples) analyzed for one or more of the metals listed above, 2 samples contained cadmium above the SRG of 1.0 mg/kg, 1 sample contained lead above the SRG of 34 mg/kg, and 3 samples contained mercury above the SRG of 0.09 mg/kg. Cadmium was detected up to 3.42 mg/kg at APBS1029. Lead was detected up to 115 mg/kg at APBS1029, and mercury was detected up to 0.399 mg/kg at APBS1029.
- **Dioxins.** Of the 82 soil samples (66 surface samples and 16 subsurface samples) analyzed for dioxins, 53 soil samples contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. Dioxins were detected up to 610 pg/g at APBS1042.

The objective of the sampling was to refine the estimated extent and magnitude of soil COC areas within each ISRA PEA, and identify new ISRA PEAs if data gap samples collected outside the identified ISRA PEAs exceeded SRGs. As described in the results summary above, select ISRA PEAs were subdivided into two or more PEAs based on previous sample results prior to performing source delineation sampling. Based on source delineation sample results, ISRA PEAs were subdivided further and boundaries refined. The boundaries of the refined ISRA PEAs that are evaluated in the ISRA area identification process (Section 2.2) are shown on Figures 2-7 through 2-16, and are listed below.

- PEA-A1LF-1 was subdivided into PEA-A1LF-1 and -2;
- PEA-B1-1 was subdivided into PEA-B1-1 and -2;
- PEA-CTLI-1 was subdivided into PEA-CTLI-1, -2;
- PEA-IEL-1 was subdivided into PEA-IEL-1, -2, -3, -4, -5; and -6;
- PEA-AP/STP-1 was subdivided into PEA-AP/STP-1A, -1B, -1C, -1D, -1E, and -1F;
- PEA-A2LF-2; and
- PEA-LOX-1 was subdivided into PEA-LOX-1A, -1B, -1C, -1D.

Of the 23 ISRA PEAs listed above, additional source delineation sampling is ongoing at six, including PEA-B1-2, PEA-CTLI-1, PEA-A1LF-2, PEA-LOX-1, PEA-A2LF-2, and PEA-AP/STP-1. Although the final excavation boundaries of these six PEAs are still pending, an expected boundary for each PEA is shown on the figures. Following completion of the ongoing delineation sampling, appropriate tables and figures in this report will be revised and submitted to the RWQCB for review and approval.

The six ISRA PEAs that are not in the list above include PEA-A1LF-3, PEA-CTLI-3, PEA-CTLI-4, PEA-IEL-7, PEA-IEL-8, and PEA-LOX-2. Four of these ISRA PEAs is located upgradient of a culvert: PEA-A2LF-3 is upgradient of CM-8, PEA-CTLI-3 is upgradient of CM-7, PEA-CTLI-4 is upgradient of CM-11, and PEA-LOX-2 is upgradient of CM-3. The location of CM-3 is shown on Figure 2-5, the locations of CM-7 and CM-11 are shown on Figure 2-4, and the location of CM-8 is shown Figure 2-3. This summer, accumulated sediment upgradient of each of these culverts is planned to be removed as part of the surface water maintenance program. Because of this planned removal action, these ISRA PEAs will not undergo further evaluation in this work plan addendum. Following completion of the culvert maintenance (CM) activities, the effectiveness of the CM will be evaluated by the results of performance monitoring samples, similar to the process for completed ISRA areas. CM-3, CM-8, and CM-11 have been part of the performance monitoring program since the 2009/2010 rainy season. CM-7 will be added to the performance monitoring program in the 2010/2011 rainy season. PEA-IEL-7 was identified to delineate a surface soil sample at ILBS0280 that contained dioxins above the SRG of 3.0 pg/g. The sample was collected as part of the demolition program to characterize base foundation material from Building 1989. The foundation base material was removed during 2009 demolition activities. Since ISRA delineation sample results at PEA-IEL-7 did not detect dioxins above the SRG, this PEA is not recommended for further evaluation. PEA-IEL-8 was identified as a data gap for dioxins. Since ISRA data gap sample results did not detect dioxins above the SRG, this PEA is not recommended for further evaluation.

2.2 ISRA AREA IDENTIFICATION

An evaluation of the 23 refined ISRA PEAs was performed to further assess the potential for each PEA to contribute COCs to surface water following the methods presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b). The methods included evaluating each refined ISRA PEA using criteria developed with the goal of highlighting the areas with the greatest chance of contributing contaminants to the drainages, and the use of the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation, Version 2 (RUSLE) to estimate COC loss from each refined ISRA PEA. The evaluation and results for each of these methods is described below, along with a summary of the ISRA areas identified. For the six ISRA PEAs where additional source delineation sampling is ongoing, this evaluation was performed using the data available and estimated boundaries. If results of the additional delineation sampling significantly change the chemical and/or physical characteristics of an ISRA PEA, this section will be revised and submitted to the RWQCB for review and approval.

2.2.1 ISRA Criteria Evaluation

The chemical and physical characteristics of the 23 refined ISRA PEAs that are used for the contaminant migration criteria evaluation are presented in Table 2-1. The physical and geochemical parameter evaluation totals for the 23 refined ISRA PEAs are presented in Table 2-2, along with total rank of each of the refined ISRA PEAs. The results of the contaminant migration criteria evaluation are presented in Table 2-3.

The ranking of the 23 refined ISRA PEAs from most to least likely to contribute COCs in soil to surface water based on results of the criteria evaluation are:

<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Total Rank</u>
1. CTLI-1	34.0
2. A1LF-1	32.1
3. LOX-1B	30.7
4. A1LF-2	29.8
5. B1-2	28.5
6. AP/STP-1E	28.1
7. AP/STP-1B & AP/STP-1C	27.9

9. A2LF-2	25.5
10. B1-1	24.9
11. LOX-1C	23.9
12. AP/STP-1D	23.7
13. AP/STP-1F	22.3
14. LOX-1A	22.1
15. IEL-2	21.8
16. IEL-1	21.1
17. AP/STP-1A & LOX-1D	20.1
19. IEL-3	18.9
20. CTLI-2	18.7
21. IEL-4	14.8
22. IEL-5	14.4
23. IEL-6	13.7

Three PEAs have a total rank above a value of 30, 15 PEAs have a total rank between a value of 20 and 30, and 5 PEAs have a total rank below a value of 20. The distinguishing factors of the four PEAs ranked above a value of 30 include ISRA COCs at least 10 times greater than SRGs, non-ISRA COCs at least 2 times greater than RCRA risk based screening levels, estimated clean up volumes greater than 1,000 cubic yards, and drainages located less than 200 feet from the PEA. The distinguishing factors of the five PEAs ranked below a value of 20 include ISRA COCs less than 2 times SRGs and no collocated RCRA risk drivers, in addition, two of the PEAs are covered completely by an impermeable surface.

2.2.2 RUSLE Results

As described in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b), results of the RUSLE were also considered to prioritize recommendations for ISRA areas based on the average annual ISRA COC yield from the 23 refined ISRA PEAs compared to the average annual ISRA COC yield for the entire watershed. Appendix B presents the results of the average annual sediment yield from these refined PEAs, the average annual ISRA COC yield from the 23 refined ISRA PEAs, and a comparison of the average annual ISRA COC yield of 23 refined ISRA PEAs to that of the entire watershed (Geosyntec, 2010). To be conservative, the sediments within each refined ISRA PEA

were assumed to have concentrations of ISRA COCs equal to the greatest concentration detected within that particular PEA. The analysis also assumed background concentrations for sediments within the watershed.

Based on the analysis, all but 5 of the 23 ISRA PEAs are believed to contribute less than 6% of the annual pollutant yield within the watershed for the ISRA COCs (Geosyntec, 2010). The model indicates PEA-A1LF-1 and PEA-B1-1 contribute the most to the annual COC yield of the watershed, including 1.5% for cadmium and 46% for lead from PEA-A1LF-1, and more than 100% for mercury and dioxins from PEA-B1-1. Other PEAs that contribute more than 6% of the annual pollutant yield with the watershed for the ISRA COCs include PEA-AP/STP-1C (14% for dioxins), PEA-AP/STP-1E (32% for dioxins), and PEA-LOX-1B (24% for dioxins). These results are conservative and likely biased high because, as mentioned above, the sediments within each PEA were assumed to have concentrations of ISRA COCs equal to the greatest concentration detected within that particular PEA.

2.2.3 ISRA Area Identification Summary

The contaminant migration criteria evaluation resulted in 18 of the 23 refined ISRA PEAs with a total rank above a value of 20. Based on the contaminant migration ranking and RUSLE model results, these 18 refined ISRA PEAs are the highest priority areas for ISRA implementation. The five refined ISRA PEAs with a total rank below a value of 20 are the lowest priority areas for ISRA implementation and, at this time, remedial action is not recommended. Two of these five refined ISRA PEAs are covered completely with an impermeable layer, including IEL-3 and IEL-6. If the impermeable layer was removed from each of these PEAs, the total rank of IEL-6 would remain below a value of 20, but IEL-3 would increase to above a value of 20. To remove the potential COCs sources that may be affecting the water quality at the Outfall 009 NPDES monitoring point, the 18 refined ISRA PEAs with a total rank above a value of 20 are considered ISRA areas and are carried forward for the remedial alternatives evaluation. In addition, since PEA-IEL-3 would have a total rank above a value of 20 if the impermeable surface were removed, it is also considered an ISRA area and is carried forward for the remedial alternatives evaluation. The remaining four ISRA PEAs that had a total rank below a value of 20, including

PEA-CTLI-2, PEA-IEL-4, PEA-IEL-5, and PEA-IEL-6, are not considered ISRA areas and will not be carried forward for the remedial alternatives evaluation.

2.3 REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION AND PLAN

In the Final ISRA Work Plan, a remedial action alternatives analysis was performed for the ISRA project to identify potential source removal alternatives that achieve the remedial objectives and requirements of the CAO. The potential alternatives identified by the analysis were excavation with offsite disposal, capping with a clay cap, and construction of diversion and collections structures. Excavation was ranked highest in meeting the CAO objectives and is considered the default approach to source removal unless circumstances at specific ISRA areas render another alternative more feasible or cost-effective. With the exception of the ISRA areas associated with the Area I Landfill (A2LF-1 and A1LF-2), the ISRA areas identified in Section 2.2 for remedial action are similar in physical, chemical, and geochemical characteristics. In addition, there are relatively small volumes of material to be removed from each area, and there are no known site constraints that render excavation less feasible. Therefore, excavation and offsite disposal is the recommended remedial alternative for these ISRA areas. Although excavation and offsite disposal is the recommended remedial alternative for ISRA Area IEL-3, it is currently covered by asphalt and implementation of the remedial action at this location will be postponed until the asphalt is removed. A summary of the ISRA area remedial plans, including COCs and SRGs, is presented in Table 2-4. Remedial action planning and implementation activities are summarized in Section 3.

The remedial alternatives analysis for the Area I Landfill (A1LF-1) and Area I Landfill drainage (A1LF-2) is more complex than the other ISRA areas due to the relatively large volume of material (~40,000 cy), the permitting requirements, and the involvement of multiple regulatory agencies. Therefore, a separate work plan addendum will be prepared that summarizes the remedial alternatives analysis and identifies the recommended remedial action for the Area I Landfill and the Area I Landfill drainage.

3.0 REMEDIAL ACTION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section summarizes the activities that will be conducted prior to and during ISRA remedial action implementation. Prior to implementation, the planning documents prepared for the Phase I ISRA Implementation will be revised to support the proposed ISRA activities, including the site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HSP), the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), the Soil Management Plan (SMP), and the Transportation Plan. In addition, permitting packages and site surveys will be prepared and submitted to appropriate agencies. Remedial action implementation activities consist of site preparation, excavation, confirmation sampling, site restoration, and performance monitoring sampling. Brief descriptions of these planning and implementation activities are provided below. Additional information can be found in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b).

3.1 SUPPLEMENTAL PLANS

Several planning documents were prepared for the Phase I ISRA Implementation, including a site-specific HSP, a SWPPP, a SMP, and a Transportation Plan. These supplemental plans will be revised to supplement the proposed ISRA activities and submitted to the RWQCB prior to implementation. A summary of each plan is provided below.

- An addendum to the existing site-specific HSP shall be prepared by the contractor selected to perform the ISRA work that describes overall health and safety requirements for the proposed ISRA activities.
- A modification to the existing ISRA SWPPP shall be prepared that describes erosion control and storm water pollution prevention measures for the proposed ISRA activities.
- An addendum to the existing ISRA SMP shall be prepared that describes procedures for waste soils characterization, soil handling, and stockpile and container management for the proposed ISRA activities;
- An addendum to the existing ISRA Transportation Plan shall be prepared that identifies procedures for loading, SSFL entry and egress, and transportation of soil waste on public roads for the proposed ISRA activities, and provides a plan for minimizing potential health, safety, and environmental risks that may result during these activities.

A detailed description of contents of each plan is presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b).

3.2 PERMITTING AND SITE SURVEYS

Appropriate regulatory permits will be obtained and a biological survey will be conducted prior to implementation of the proposed ISRA activities. The Archeological assessment performed in 2009 prior to the Phase I ISRA Implementation covered these proposed ISRA areas. A summary of the expected regulatory permitting submittals/agencies and the scope of the biological survey for the proposed ISRA activities are provided below.

- An application package for a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404, Nationwide Permit (NWP) 38 (Cleanup of Hazardous and Toxic Waste) for proposed ISRA activities located in potentially jurisdictional waters (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)).
- A CWA Section 401 Pre-Certification Notification (RWQCB).
- An application package for a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) (California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG]); it is anticipated that the proposed ISRA activities will be covered under an existing Amendment to SAA No. 1600-2003-5052-R5.
- A Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the General Construction Storm Water Permit (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ) and Modifications (State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)).
- An application package for a Grading Permit for proposed ISRA activities located on non-Federal property (Ventura County).
- An application package for a Tree Permit to remove *Quercus agrifolia* (Coast Live Oak) during proposed ISRA activities located on non-Federal property (Ventura County).
- A pre-field work biological survey to identify the presence of sensitive species, to help prepare potential relocation and/or mitigation options, and to ensure compliance with the CDFG SAA; a preliminary biological survey of the proposed ISRA areas has been completed.

Additional details of these permits and site surveys are presented in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b).

3.3 REMEDIAL ACTION IMPLEMENTATION

As discussed in previous sections, a remedial alternatives analysis has been performed for each ISRA area to identify the most appropriate remedial action, except for ISRA areas associated with the Area I Landfill, for which a separate work plan addendum will be prepared. The remedial alternatives analysis identified excavation as the most appropriate remedial action for

the 19 ISRA areas identified in Section 2.2. A general description of the implementation process for the remedial alternative of excavation and offsite disposal is provided in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b), in addition to a general description of site preparation, confirmation sampling, performance monitoring sampling, and site restoration. Updated analytical reporting limits for confirmation samples in the ISRA areas proposed in this work plan are provided in Table 3-1.

This page intentionally left blank

4.0 ISRA SCHEDULE AND REPORTING

The following sections present the implementation schedule and reporting requirements through the completion of the ISRA project, and provide information regarding the posting of ISRA documents for public access.

4.1 ISRA SCHEDULE

An implementation schedule for the remaining work to be performed to complete the ISRA effort is presented below. Included in this schedule are delineation and data gap sampling, permitting submittal requirements, biological surveying, and supporting plan preparation, as well as performance monitoring requirements following work plan implementation. The ISRA schedule is contingent on several factors including obtaining agency work plan or work plan addenda approvals, obtaining permit authorizations, data gap and delineation sampling results, and performance monitoring sampling results. However, as shown below, the target ISRA project completion date is prior to the Fall 2012 rainy season.

As described in the Final ISRA Work Plan (MWH, 2009b) and in Section 1 of this work plan addendum, the proposed ISRA schedule accounts for phasing of implementation to allow completion of ongoing work within the Northern Drainage, culvert maintenance activities, SSFL building demolition plans, and to accommodate federal funding schedules for work to be performed on NASA property.

Phase II Implementation:

June 2009 – May 2010	Completion of delineation and data gap sampling
April 2010	Submit ISRA Work Plan Addendum to RWQCB
May - June 2010	Complete biological surveys for proposed work areas
	Submit permitting packages or permitting amendments for potential implementation areas
	Revise existing supporting plans for ISRA implementation, including HSP, SWPPP, SMP, and Transportation Plan

October 2010	Submit Area 1 Landfill Work Plan Addendum to RWQCB
Summer/Fall 2010	Implement Phase II field work and restoration activities following approval by RWQCB, issuance of necessary permits, and completion of required studies/surveys
Spring 2011	Submit Phase II ISRA Implementation Report

Phase III Implementation:

Summer/Fall 2011	Implement Phase III field work and restoration activities following approval by RWQCB, issuance of necessary permits, and completion of required studies/surveys
TBD	Submit Final ISRA Summary Report

As described in Final ISRA Work Plan, following ISRA implementation, effectiveness of the soil source removal in meeting NPDES benchmark limits will be evaluated by the results of surface water samples collected at Outfalls 008 and Outfall 009. In addition, storm water runoff samples will be collected at locations upgradient and downgradient of completed ISRA areas and at selected culverts within the Outfall 009 watershed, per the Performance Monitoring Plan (MWH, 2010a). Following completion of the Phase II ISRA Implementation, the Performance Monitoring Plan will be updated to incorporate sampling upgradient and downgradient of the completed areas. Performance monitoring sample results will be considered when assessing the need for additional ISRA actions, if any.

4.2 ISRA REPORTING

The submittal dates of the Phase II ISRA Implementation Report and Final ISRA Summary Reports have not been identified at this time since the CAO provides that these dates will be determined by the RWQCB following review and approval of this work plan. Because of the phasing of the ISRA work to be performed, Boeing and NASA propose to continue providing the RWQCB quarterly progress reports until construction field work is complete (targeted Fall 2011). Boeing will continue to post all project deliverables, including this Work Plan Addendum, supporting plans (H&S Plan, SWPPP, SMP, Transportation Plan, and permits),

Quarterly Progress Reports, and Implementation and Summary Reports on their NPDES web site at: http://www.boeing.com/aboutus/environment/santa_susana/isra.html.

This page intentionally left blank

5.0 REFERENCES

- Boeing, 2005. 2004 Annual NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report, The Boeing Company, SSFL, Ventura County, California. Compliance File CI-6027, NPDES No. CA0001309, March 1.
- Boeing, 2006. 2005 Annual NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report, The Boeing Company, SSFL, Ventura County, California. Compliance File CI-6027, NPDES No. CA0001309, March 1.
- Boeing, 2007. 2006 Annual NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report, The Boeing Company, SSFL, Ventura County, California. Compliance File CI-6027, NPDES No. CA0001309, March 1.
- Boeing, 2008. 2007 Annual NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report, The Boeing Company, SSFL, Ventura County, California. Compliance File CI-6027, NPDES No. CA0001309, March 1.
- Boeing, 2009. 2008 Annual NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report, The Boeing Company, SSFL, Ventura County, California. Compliance File CI-6027, NPDES No. CA0001309, March 1.
- DTSC, 2007. Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order. November 1.
- Geosyntec, 2010. Memorandum, SSFL Outfall 009 Sediment Yield Analysis for Remaining ISRA PEAs, SSFL, Ventura County, California. April 30.
- MWH, 2005. Standardized Risk Assessment Methodology (SRAM) Work Plan, Revision 2. SSFL, Ventura County. September.
- MWH, 2008. Northern Drainage Former LOX Plant Debris/Asbestos Removal Action Report, SSFL, Ventura County, California. February.
- MWH, 2009a. Preliminary Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Ventura County, California. February.
- MWH, 2009b. Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Ventura County, California. May.
- MWH, 2009c. Addendum to the Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan Submitted in Response to California Water Code Section 13304 Order (NPDES NO. CA0001309, CI NO. 6027, SCP NO. 1111, Site ID NO. 2040109); Response to RWQCB and DTSC Comments on the Final ISRA Work Plan, Letter to RWQCB. June 19.

- MWH, 2009d. HVS-2A Soil Collapse Feature and Pipeline Removal Summary and Plan, Letter Amendment to the Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan, California Water Code Section 13304 Order (NPDES NO. CA0001309, CI NO. 6027, SCP NO. 1111, Site ID NO. 2040109). September 18.
- MWH, 2009e. Happy Valley South Underground Septic Tank Removal Plan, California Water Code Section 13304 Order (NPDES No. CA0001309, CI No. 6027, SCP NO. 1111, Site ID NO. 2040109), Letter to RWQCB. October 9.
- MWH, 2010a. Performance Monitoring Sampling and Analysis Plan, Final Interim Source Removal Action (ISRA) Work Plan submitted in Response to California Water Code Section 13304 Order (NPDES No. CA0001309, CI No. 6027, SCP No. 1111, Site ID No. 2040109). January 7.
- MWH, 2010b. 2009 Phase I Implementation Report – 2009 Activities, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Ventura County, California. April.
- MECx, 2009. Quality Assurance Project Plan, Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL), RCRA Facility Investigation, Surficial Media Operable Unit, Revision 4. March.
- NASA, 2009. Additional Removals [Areas in the Outfall 009 Watershed], Email to RWQCB. September 18.
- Ogden 2000b. RCRA Facility Investigation Work Plan Addendum Amendment, Appendix A, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Ventura County, California. June.
- RWQCB, 2007. Letter from T. Egoscue, DTSC, to T. Gallacher, Boeing, Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R4-2007-0054 Requiring the Boeing Company, Santa Susana Field Laboratory to Cleanup and Abate the Effects of Contaminants Discharged to Surface Waters, the Northern Drainage, An Ephemeral Stream that Discharges to the Arroyo Simi, A Tributary to Calleguas Creek. November 6.
- RWQCB, 2008. California Water Code Section 13304 Order to Perform Interim/Source Removal Action of Soil in the Areas of Outfalls 008 and 009 Drainage Areas, The Boeing Company Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Unincorporated Ventura County, California (SCP No. 1111, Site ID No. 2040109). December 3.