

5090
Ser 1832.4/L6339
14 Aug 1996

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity, West, Naval Facilities Engineering
Command
To: Distribution

Subj: MINUTES FOR MEETING OF 11 JULY 1996 DISCUSSING RADIOLOGICAL
ISSUES, ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST, NAVAL FACILITIES
ENGINEERING COMMAND, HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO,
CALIFORNIA

Encl: (1) Minutes, 11 July 1996

1. Enclosure (1) provides the minutes for the meeting of 11 July 1996 discussing various radiological issues for Engineering Field Activity, West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Hunters Point Shipyard.

2. If you have any questions regarding this enclosure, please contact Ms. Luann Tetirick, Code 1832.4, at (415) 244-2561, FAX (415) 244-2654.

Original signed by:
RICHARD E. POWELL
By direction of
the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Ms. Anna Marie Cook)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Mr. Steve M. Dean)
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Mr. Cyrus Shabahari)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Mr. Richard Hiatt)
California Department of Health Services (Attn: Ms. Deirdre Dement)

Copies to:

PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Mr. James Sickles)
Roy F. Weston, Inc. (Attn: Ms. Karla Brasaemle)

Blind copies to:

62.3, 1822, 1832, 1832.4, 1852.4,
09CMN, HPS CSO (Eddie Sarmiento)
Information Repository (3 copies, w/encl)
Chron, Green
Activity File: HPS (aka HPA)

MINUTES

MEETING:

07/11/96

9:30 AM to 11:55 AM

Building 208, Conference Room

EFA West, 900 Commodore Way

San Bruno

Meeting called by: Luann Tetirick EFA WEST

Attendees: Steve M. Dean, (US EPA), Deirdre Dement (DHS), PRC, LCDR Lino Fragoso by telephone conference call (NAVSEASYS COM DET RASO), Michael McClelland (EFA West), Richard Powell (EFA West), Luann Tetirick (EFA West), Neil Morgan-Butcher (PRC), David Preston (PRC), Jim Sickles (PRC)

Agenda

Documentation for Cleared Buildings All 9:30-10:40 AM

Discussion: Discussed agency comments to Phase III Radiation Investigation Draft Field Work Plan dated February 15, 1996. The focus of the discussion was the comments from DHS requesting additional documentation for the release of cleared buildings from previous surveys. The Navy stated that all of the back up data available for these surveys was already supplied and looked at by previous Department of Health Services staff to see if release criteria was met. The Navy doesn't have any additional data beyond what was already provided (per Lino Fragoso). Sites that were licensed and released by NRC were reviewed and found to comply with latest release criteria per letter by NRC. Where the Navy felt the data was inadequate, further investigation was recommended.

Conclusions:

1. The volume of back up data for the previous surveys which was already supplied would be too much to provide as part of report. The Navy will add into the report a statement concerning the sites that were licensed and released by NRC and why they believe decontamination efforts were adequate.
2. The Navy will clarify what documents were used for the work plan as references only, and not simply list all documents.
3. The data for building 113A is adequate, per Dierdre Dement after reviewing the minutes for the July 26, 1993 radiation meeting.

Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
The Navy to provide a response to agency comments clarifying the issues discussed.	Navy/PRC	

Tidal Area Work Plan Comments All 10:40-10:45 AM

Discussion: This has not been reviewed yet by the DHS staff so there was no discussion on this topic.

Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
None		

Radiation Risk Model

All

10:45-11:45 AM

Discussion: The focus of the discussion was a request from the Navy as to the agencies' preferences regarding the use of the two spreadsheets RESRAD or RISKCALC to calculate radiation risk. EPA stated it prefers RISKCALC which it considers to be more health conscious than RESRAD and is under no obligation to accept RESRAD or RISKCALC as long as whatever method used meets the EPA RAGs Part B criteria. Dierdre Demente with DHS was only familiar with RESRAD and has no objections to its use, but suggested that the Navy should check with E. Bailey and G. Wong of the Radiation Health Branch. Per LCDR Lino Fragoso: There is no Navy policy on radiation risk models which must be used. If the Navy chose to use RISKCALC the model may need to be "tweaked" for Hunters Point Shipyard parameters. Whichever approach the Navy uses would need to be justified to the agencies as to the parameters used. It appears that neither agency has a designated model but that the EPA prefers RISKCALC and the DHS prefers RESRAD.

Conclusions: The Navy will need to do a technical memorandum to propose a radiation risk model for approval. The agencies will review criteria presented and then decide if model proposed acceptable.

Action items:

PRC to do radiation risk model technical memorandum.

Person responsible:

David Preston, PRC.

Deadline:

Chem Nuclear Update

Luann Tetirick

11:45-11:55 AM

Discussion: The discussion focused on the upcoming screening of the IDW from IR 1, and 2 for radiological contamination. Rock Island needs additional funding to complete this job. This project may be delayed six months if the Navy needs to do a Determination and Findings for additional funding. The Navy is pursuing other options for this task, since funding for this job expires by the end of September..

Conclusions: Need to update status.

Action items:

Check on additional funding

Person responsible:

Navy/Luann Tetirick

Deadline:

Additional Information

Chem Nuclear Additional Information: Chem Nuclear is scheduled for a site visit at Hunters Point Shipyard September 9, 1996. Funding issues have been resolved. An additional Determination and Findings was not needed for this job.