

5090  
Ser 182/L3161  
17 Feb 1993

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering  
Command

To: Distribution

Subj: MINUTES OF STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING FOR HPA PARCEL E  
OF 11 JANUARY 1993

Encl: (1) Subject Minutes

1. Minutes of subject meeting have been finalized and are forwarded as enclosure (1).
2. Please direct any questions regarding this matter to the undersigned, Code 182, at (415) 244-2571.

Original signed by:

HENRY C. GEE  
By direction

Distribution:

U.S. EPA (Attn: Keith Takata, Julie Anderson, Tony Lewis, Jane Diamond, Roberta Blank)

CDTSC, Emeryville Office (Attn: Chein Kao, Barbara Cook, Bonnie Arthur)

CDTSC, Sacramento Office (Attn: David Wang)

RWQCB (Attn: Steven Richie, Richard McMurtry, Shin-Roel Lee, Barbara Smith)

NAVSTA Treasure Island (Attn: Jim Sullivan)

Copy to:

COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)

Blind copies to:

00, 09B, 09E, 09CMN, 182

18, 181, 1811, 1811WW

ADMIN RECORD *Hunters Point code 181*

*file:*

**Minutes of**  
**Hunters Point Annex Strategic Planning Meeting**  
**with EPA Region IX, DTSC, RWQCB, and the Navy**  
**11 January 1993**

**Attendees:**

<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>ORGANIZATION</u></b>	<b><u>Phone No.</u></b>	<b><u>FAX No.</u></b>
CAPT Bob Moeller	Navy - WESTDIV	(415) 244-2000	(415) 244-2006
Julie Anderson	EPA - FF Branch	(415) 744-2420	(415) 744-1916
Steve Ritchie	RWQCB	(510) 286-0516	(510) 286-1380
Shin-Roei Lee	RWQCB	(510) 286-0699	(510) 286-1380
Richard McMurtry	RWQCB	(510) 286-0432	(510) 286-1380
Barbara Cook	DTSC	(510) 540-3843	(510) 540-3819
Chein Kao	DTSC	(510) 540-3822	(510) 540-3819
David Wang	DTSC	(916) 255-2009	(916) 255-2096
Bonnie Arthur	DTSC	(510) 540-3816	(510) 540-3819
Keith Takata	EPA	(415) 744-2356	(415) 744-1916
Hank Gee	Navy - WESTDIV	(415) 244-2571	(415) 244-3511
Louise Lew	Navy - WESTDIV	(415) 244-2552	(415) 244-2553
Jane Diamond	EPA	(415) 744-2384	(415) 744-1916
Roberta Blank	EPA	(415) 744-2385	(415) 744-1916
Gerald Katz	Navy - WESTDIV	(415) 244-2501	(415) 244-2553
Wing Wong	Navy - WESTDIV	(415) 244-2537	(415) 244-2553
James Sullivan	Navy - NAVSTA TI	(415) 395-5454	(415) 395-5474
Tony Lewis	EPA - Facilitator	(415) 744-1913	(415) 744-1873

**Attachments:**

- (1) Preliminary Agenda
- (2) Status of Hunters Point Remedial Investigation

1. Tony Lewis began the meeting at 9:30 a.m. with attendees introducing themselves. The meeting objectives were stated: (1) Step Back and look at What's Working, What's Not Working, and What can we do to quicken the pace of clean-up?; (2) Refine the Process (Can the way we make decisions today be used by RPMs in the future?); and (3) Discuss and resolve specific clean-up issues.

2. The agenda, Attachment (1), was reviewed to ensure that objectives are being met and that everything was covered. It was reiterated that the basic objective was to try and get clean-up actions going. The issue of how to coordinate with the City in our future deliberations was raised. It was agreed by the group to discuss this issue prior to the 10:30 project briefing and recap/wrap up during the 3:30 discussion on cross-cutting issues.

### 3. Common Goals for Hunters Point Clean-up

- Protect Human Health and the Environment
- Spend \$\$ effectively
- Clean-up sites quickly and efficiently
- Consistent with Re-Use Priority

### 4. Management Statements

- **CAPT Moeller:** As management, empower those in the staff with knowledge of the technical details to go out and get the clean-ups done and spend the monies effectively. There is a bottom to that pot of money and studies will be taking a back seat to actual clean-ups in terms of funding.
- **Steve Ritchie:** Concur with CAPT Moeller. Outcomes are fairly predictable, if you have the right people in the room to make the decisions. Utilize presumptive remedies where possible. We need to make decisions and carry them out.
- **Keith Takata:** Also concur with previous statements. Keith has been involved with Hunters Point since the days of homeporting plans of the Battleship USS Missouri. Many changes have taken place since then...base closure, USS Missouri being mothballed but contamination is still the same. This site is in our "backyard." We need to take the opportunity this example (e.g., Parcel E) gives us in terms of clean-up and determining which way to go. We need to take a look at shared risks. We're doing well with Parcel A and need to do the same (and more) with Parcel E. People need to speak up and identify the barriers to efficient clean-up. We need to support working together as a team to come up with solutions.
- **David Wang:** Empowerment is important. We need to look at the process and ensure it achieves results. How can we get the results faster? Consider: (1) Alternative ways to do it to eliminate unnecessary process; (2) ARARS issues - can we have a process early on to address the ARARS issues?; (3) Balancing the Re-Use with the Clean-ups...what are the priorities?...Will current tenant uses impede cleanup? Are we going to have new interim uses?

### 5. Issue of City Involvement:

a. We need to clarify who the different City entities are that are involved in the re-use of HPA.

b. Bill Lee of the City Dept. of Public Health is not only concerned with what to do with the site today, but what happens 20 years from now. According to him, the City is considering how it could influence clean-up levels to limit liability concerns.

c. The City has appointed Kent Sims, Director, Mayor's Office of Economic Planning and Development, and Ed Hedfeld, Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency, to oversee redevelopment/real estate transactions with respect to Hunters Point. The City is very concerned about indemnification and redevelopment priorities.

d. We as a group can help with determining re-use options. If there are areas that clearly are or are not appropriate for certain uses, we need to identify those. For grey areas, we need to come up with a menu of what can/can't be done. We can work with the City with that information.

e. The Navy has asked the City what it wants, via WESTDIV's Real Estate staff.

f. The City does not appear to have determined its land use priorities yet. We need to have clear-cut decision points where the City can gather information to assist them.

g. Interest has been expressed by the City to be party to the Federal Facilities Agreement. Further discussion with the City is needed to assess their interest in this, prior to our evaluation of this possibility.

6. Navy's Project Briefing, see Attachment (2). Issues/Concerns/Discussions raised:

a. With respect to the flowchart, there needs to be an option for the site investigation (SI) work that leads to removal actions. Removal actions may require less burdensome documentation. It was agreed that some of the 38 PA sites can go to removal, if appropriate.

b. Why did it take so long to handle the pickling plate yards removal action? According to the Navy, there were various internal Navy problems in the past with contracts, personnel, funding, and project management. The Navy now has 5 RPMs to handle Hunters Point, so there should not be problems with directing personnel to address the work there.

7. EPA's Summary of Parcel Schedule Negotiations Issues:

a. Looked at shortening timeframes from the FFA 1996 date and tightening schedules.

b. Want to look at presumptive remedies...see if we can take some leaps now/take some risks.

c. Barring any drastic turns from this meeting, we're still looking at an FFA that takes us to 1996.

d. Issues/Concerns/Discussion Items Raised:

(1) There are some options that can be taken with the FFA schedule amendment for the parcels...amend it with what we agree to at this meeting; leave the parcel schedules as is; or, agree with what we know we can go with now (e.g., SI phase) and agree to amend it later.

(2) Specifics on the EPA presentation...can we go to remedial design in some situations that will help to expedite the schedule? If we can do some things to accelerate the last 3 boxes in the flowchart, i.e., RI, FS and ROD.

8. Discussion on impediments to achieving what we can at Hunters Point

a. Contractual Barriers...how can the regulators help? It was pointed out that while the contractor (PRC) does have the data, the contractor may not feel it can accelerate the clean-up process without taking additional and unnecessary risk.

b. To accelerate the process, the Navy needs the regulators' buy-in on a scope of work, so that they can task the contractor with a program that all agree is the most expeditious. The regulators and the Navy need to agree on base level requirements. There was also a concern about making the work a research project. It was noted that there *is* a commitment by the regulators (state and federal) to agree on what needs to be done. It was also noted that in the past, decision-making occurred in more of a reactive mode, i.e., the Navy makes a proposal, the regulators react and comment on the proposal, the Navy reacts and sometimes it produces results that are not the same as what the regulators *really* wanted. All parties agreed that this reactive mode will change.

c. Question on pickling plate yard...reasons for the delays? Design needs to be finalized based upon experience gained since the design began. The Navy is getting ready to go to construction and is looking at various contracting alternatives, including having the Navy's Public Works Center SF Bay (in Oakland) do the work.

d. Summarizing the barriers: Contractual procedures; personnel changes; Navy and regulators previously working under "reactive" modes. More barriers need to be identified.

9. Brainstorm Approaches to Streamlining Initiatives Considering the Following Decision Criteria: (a) Needed Data; (b) Land-Use Decision; (c) ARARS; (d) Contracting; (e) City Input.

a. A general discussion took place, which led to some possible strategies and remedies for Parcel E Remediation:

- Deal with some hot spots
- Capping/Slurry walls
- Contaminated sediments - on-site disposal
- Storm sewers as a conduit for contaminants
- Areas for on-site disposal or treatment in Parcel E for rest of the facility?
- Land-use options: Open Space, parking lot (dependent on Parcel D)
- ARARS consideration: Chapter 15, Land-ban

b. After the general discussion, a more structured process for looking at remedies for Parcel E was considered, with Keith Takata taking the lead:

**Cap:** Alternatives for types of cap with respect to re-use

**Bayside Protection:** Alternatives: Slurry wall; Sheetpiles

**Hot Spots:** Up to 14 + radiation area...oil reclamation ponds, PCBs, Tank S-505, sandblast grit, etc. Need to evaluate: Disposal; Treat; Leave in Place

**Sediments:** Meeting of 29 January will identify problem and how big. Presumptions are that if dredging is required, there is the possibility of redispersion on Parcel E.

**Storm and Sanitary Sewers:** Removal or seal off; Look at new system for peripheral tenants and occupants in Parcel E.

**Groundwater:** Presume pump under Cap; Treatment; Construction of Treatment Plant to be considered later?

**Leave Open for Re-disposal:** Use for soil treatment area or disposal of treated and untreated materials. Legality? (EPA can check into this). Does it make sense technically/environmentally? Need to cap some/all of it? Community Response?

c. After this process clarified the decision criteria, much discussion ensued on whether this would save time in the process. It was decided that the same discussion needs to take place for the other parcels.

d. **Specific Actions:**

***(1) Series of RPM meetings will be held to discuss practicality of proposed presumptive remedies, scope out how schedule will be affected, FFA amendment and whether full parcel schedules will be developed at this time, or just PA/SI.***

***(2) Top management to meet in the next few months to become familiarized with Parcels B, C and D. The structured process used on Parcel E needs to be applied on these parcels, starting with Parcel B. There will also be a status report on Parcel E as a result of this meeting.***

e. Side Note by Jim Sullivan: the City is looking to get Parcel A by November 93 and they might want some realigning of Parcels B, C and D.

10. Groundwater (GW) Discussion, led by Steve Ritchie

a. Two sets of standards need to be considered; the key is point of compliance (i.e., at edge of base in storm drains, etc.):

(1) For edge of base discharging into the Bay, stricter standards apply (e.g., Basin Water Quality Standards).

(2) For center of base and away from Bay TDS < 3000 MCLs apply.

b. **Specific Action:** *The group needs to begin discussions with the City to determine discharge requirements to the City system.*

c. Issues raised: Does it make sense to look at GW as an entity, instead of breaking it out in terms of parcels? There is a lot of information on the wells and aquifers, but it has not yet been analyzed "big picture-wise" (across the entire site).

d. **Specific Action:** *RPMs need to consider getting a meeting together to consider GW issue in conjunction to ARARS (looking at it as an entity; reviewing data; include the contractor in the meeting; look at ARARS; etc.)*

11. Ecological Considerations:

a. Wetlands Mitigation: Natural Resources - Compensation Issues and Damage Assessment. Need to determine if compensation is required for resource damage for historical activities which may have had an adverse impact on natural resources.

**Specific Action:** *Navy, RWQCB and EPA need to research this and report back to the group.*

b. Offshore Mitigation: RWQCB raised the need to consider the offshore area as another "parcel." The Navy's position is that this is premature and that it must evaluate recently gathered data to determine if there is reason to define another parcel. Per RWQCB, the offshore area will probably get listed as a Toxic Hot Spot with a

requirement to develop a Remedial Action Plan. This is based on State Water Codes.  
**Specific Action: RWQCB will get information to the Navy on this.**

12. Follow-up Discussion regarding the City of San Francisco:

a. Need to meet with the City on how to get them involved in our process. A meeting with Federal and State representatives was discussed. **Specific Action: State (DTSC) has the lead to get with the City on a meeting at the "department" level and have other state agencies also attend. Need to consider timeframes to get the meeting going. Discussion topics with the City:**

- ***Clean-up Levels***
- ***Schedule of what we're doing***
- ***Land-Use Options***
- ***Schedules***

13. ARARS Discussion: Across the board at other sites, this has been leading to disputes. Need to have discussions early on to avoid disputes and delays in clean-ups.  
**Specific Action: RPMs need to meet early (February) to make sure that ARARS are being considered and discussed.**

14. ***EPA to schedule the next meeting.*** Today's meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Hunters Point Annex  
Strategic Planning Meeting  
January 11, 1993

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- 9:30 a.m. Introduction of Participants  
Meeting Objectives
- 9:45 Process and Policy Goals for Hunters Point
- ◆ Common Goals for Hunters Point Clean-Up
  - ◆ Management Statements (Bob Moeller, Steve Ritchie, Keith Takata, David Wang)
- Taking A Step Back - Overall Picture  
Expectations for Clean-Up of the Site  
Increased Risk-Taking/Management Support  
Future Process(es) for Decision-Making
- 10:30 Project Briefing
- ◆ Overview and Schedule Update (Navy)
  - ◆ Summary of Parcel Schedule Negotiations Issues (EPA)
- 11:15 Discussion of What Is And Is Not Working At Hunters Point
- 12:00 p.m. Working Lunch/Brainstorm Approaches to Streamline Initiatives
- Note: See Attachment For Discussion Structure for the Following Issues
- ◆ Parcel E Remediation
  - ◆ Ground Water Clean-up
  - ◆ Ecological Considerations/Decisions Needed  
Wetlands Mitigation, Offshore Clean-Up
- 3:30 Follow-up Discussion on Cross-cutting Issues
- ◆ ARARS  
Process For Determining  
Timing  
Dispute Avoidance
  - ◆ Contracts
- 4:30 Action Items
- ◆ Summary of Decisions/Actions to be Taken
  - ◆ Unaddressed Issues/Issues Needing Further Resolution

Hunters Point Annex  
Strategic Planning Retreat

Topics for Discussion

Parcel E (capping, slurry wall, disposal site, etc.)  
Radiation and FUDS issues need to be considered here.

Groundwater (pump and treat, slurry wall, etc.)

Ecological (wetlands mitigation, etc.)  
Resolution of offshore parcel definition needed here.

Above topics to focus on opportunities and obstacles for presumptive remedies, including issues of:

1. Needed data: do we need to wait until all components of the investigative work are complete to begin remedy selection?
2. Land use decisions: how will land use drive remedy selection, can range of land use options be limited for any parcels?
3. ARARS: how will ARARS drive remedy selection, can we narrow alternatives now based on ARARS?
4. Contracting: how does Navy contracting affect pursuit of presumptive remedies?
5. City input: how and when should we bring them into discussion? Who should be involved?

## STATUS OF HUNTERS POINT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION

- \* Under the FFA of January 92, the IR program at HPA was organized by Operable Units (OUs). OUs I, II, III and IV were defined and schedules were approved. OU V was planned as a catch-all OU and was not fully defined.
- \* July 92- Navy requested extension for submittal of OU IV RI Report.  
August 92- Navy requested extension for submittal of OU III RI Report. Requests were denied by regulatory agencies. Navy and agencies entered formal dispute resolution process.
- \* September 92- Navy proposed re-definition of Group V sites. All parties agreed that remedial investigation for HPA should be conducted by geographic parcels. HPA was divided into five parcels (A, B, C, D and E). Interim remedial actions (IRA) will be considered for OUs I, II, III, IV and V.
- \* Sept - Dec 92, Navy and Agencies participated in OU and Parcel schedules negotiations.
- \* **Current Status**  
Negotiation of IRA schedules for OUs is complete.  
Negotiation of Parcels schedules is near completion with a few minor issues to be resolved.

# HPA SITE LIST

## IR SITES

### OU I

IR 1 - INDUSTRIAL LANDFILL  
IR 2 - BAY FILL AREA  
IR 3 - OIL RECLAMATION PONDS  
IR 21 - BLDG 810

### OU II

IR 6 - TANK FARM  
IR 8 - BLDG 503 PCB SPILL  
IR 9 - PICKLING AND PLATE YARD  
IR 10 - BATTERY AND ELECTROPLATING SHOP (BLDG 123)

### OU III

IR 4 - SCRAP YARD  
IR 5 - OLD TRANSFORMER STORAGE YARD

### OU IV

IR 7 - SUB-BASE AREA

### GROUP 5

IR 11 - BLDG 521, POWER PLANT AREA  
IR 12 - DISPOSAL TRENCH  
IR 13 - OLD COMMISSARY SITE  
IR 14 - OILY LIQUID WASTE DISPOSAL SITE  
IR 15 - OILY WASTE PONDS AND INCINERATION TANK  
IR 17 - DRUM STORAGE AND DISPOSAL SITE

### GROUP 6

IR 18 - WASTE OIL DISPOSAL SITE  
IR 20 - BLDG 156  
IR 22 - BLDGS 368 AND 369

## **PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT (PA) SITES**

**PA 16 - CONTAINER STORAGE SITE (SI COMPLETED)**

**PA 19 - OFFICERS CLUB**

**PA 23 - BLDG 146**

**PA 24 - BLDGS 124, 125, 128, 130**

**PA 25 - BLDG 134**

**PA 26 - AREA XIV, BLDG 157**

**PA 27 - BLDG 205**

**PA 28 - BLDGS 211, 219, 231, 253, 258, 270, 271 AND 281**

**PA 29 - BLDGS 203, 217, 275 AND 282**

**PA 30 - BLDG 241**

**PA 31 - BLDG 114**

**PA 32 - REGUNNING PIER, BLDG 383**

**PA 33 - BLDG 302, 302A, 304, 363, 411 AND 418**

**PA 34 - BLDGS 351 AND 356**

**PA 35 - BLDG 306**

**PA 36 - BLDGS 400, 405, 406, 413, 414, 704, 710, PARTS OF AREA IV**

**PA 37 - BLDGS 401 AND 435**

**PA 38 - BLDG 500**

**PA 39 - BLDGS 505 AND 524**

**PA 40 - PIER 2, BLDG 527**

**PA 41 - BLDG 816**

**PA 42 - BLDGS 109 AND 113**

**PA 43 - BLDG 906**

**PA 44 - AREA NEAR BLDGS 408, 409 AND 410**

**PA 45 - STEAM LINES**

**PA 46 - CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES AT TANK FARM**

**PA 47 - CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES AT TANK S-505**

**PA 48 - CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES AT BLDG 503**

**PA 49 - CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES AT BLDG 205**

**PA 50 - STORM AND SANITARY SEWER**

**PA 51 - FORMER TRANSFORMER SITES**

**PA 52 - RAILROAD RIGHT-OF- WAY FROM PALOU AVE TO ARMSTRONG AVE**

**PA 53 - BLDGS 525 AND 530**

**PA 54 - BLDG 511A**

**PA 55 - BLDG 307**

**PA 56 - AREA VII, RAILROAD TRACKS**

**PA 57 - DRYDOCK 4 AREA**

**PA 58 - SCRAP YARD ACROSS FROM BLDG 258**

# HPA IR PROGRAM

