



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
SOUTHWEST DIVISION  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND  
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-5190

N00217.003964  
HUNTERS POINT  
SSIC NO. 5090.3

5090  
Ser 06CH.RM/463  
June 16, 2000

Ms. Sheryl Lauth, (SFD 8-1)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

Mr. Chein Kao  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 200  
Berkeley, CA 94710

Mr. Brad Job  
California Regional Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region  
1515 Clay Street, #1400  
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear BCT members:

Enclosures (1) and (2) are provided for your files regarding the May 2, 2000 and January 13, 2000 meetings, Parcel F, Hunters Point Shipyard.

Should you have any further concerns, please contact the undersigned at (619) 532-0913.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. MACH JR., P.E.  
BRAC Environmental Coordinator  
By direction of the Commander

Enclosure: ✓ (1) Parcel F Validation Study Meeting Minutes, May 2, 2000  
✓ (2) Navy/Agency Sediment Work Group (SWG) Meeting Minutes, January 13, 2000

Copy to:

Dr. Clarence Callahan, (SFD-8)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street, Code SFD-8B  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ms. Karla Brasaemle  
Roy F. Weston, Inc.  
Bldg. 229 Walnut Ave. 1st Floor  
Vallejo, CA 94592

Ms. Eileen Hughes  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
700 Heinz Avenue  
Bldg. F, Suite 200  
Berkeley, CA 94710-2737

Dr. Jim Polisini  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
1011 Grandview Dr.  
Glendale, CA 91201

Mr. Charlie Huang  
California Department of Fish and Game  
1700 K Street, Room 250  
PO Box 9444204  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Ms. Amy Brownell  
City of San Francisco Department of Public Health  
1390 Market St., Suite 910  
San Francisco, Ca 94102

Mr. Byron Rhett  
City of San Francisco Redevelopment Agency  
770 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Ms. Rona Sandler  
City of San Francisco Office of City Attorney  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682

Ms. Leslie Lundgren  
City of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
1212 Market Street, Suite 310  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. John Chester  
1155 Market Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Mr. Dale Blount  
710 McDonnell Road, Suite N321  
San Francisco, CA 94128

Mr. Alex Lantsberg  
Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice  
744 Innes Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94124

Mr. Norman T. Shopay  
Envirometrix  
1031 Aldridge, Suite J  
Vacaville, CA 95688

Ms. Christine Shirley  
Arc Ecology  
833 Market St., #1107  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Mr. Robert J. Hocker, Jr.  
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter, Hampton  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Mr. Marcos Getchell  
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter, Hampton  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Ms. Elizabeth McDaniel  
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter, Hampton  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94111

5090  
Ser 06CH.RM/463  
June 16, 2000

Mr. Don Bradshaw  
Levine Fricke Recon  
1900 Powell Street, 12th Floor  
Emeryville, CA 94608-1811

Mr. James Haas  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Division of Ecological Services  
3310 El Camino Ave., Suite 130  
Sacramento, CA 95821-6340

Ms. Laurie Sullivan  
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration  
C/o U.S. EPA Region IX (H-1-2)  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

Mr. Donald MacDonald  
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration  
7600 Sandpoint Way NE  
Seattle, Washington 98115-0070

Mr. Jason Brodersen  
135 Main Street, Suite 1800  
San Francisco, CA 94105

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD  
PARCEL F VALIDATION STUDY  
MEETING MINUTES  
May 2, 2000**

These minutes summarize the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Parcel F Validation Study Meeting attended by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) and the City of San Francisco (City) on May 2, 2000. The meeting was held from 0930 – 1400 at the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) offices in Oakland. These minutes include key points, decisions, and action items agreed upon at the meeting. A list of meeting attendees is included as Attachment A.

**OBJECTIVE**

The objective of the May 2, 2000 meeting was to present a proposal for the Parcel F Validation Study Work Plan to the BCT. The May 2, 2000 meeting was preceded by a Navy and agency technical support team meeting on May 1, 2000 to present sediment screening data collected in April 2000, and discuss the proposed sample design for the Validation Study. Notes from the May 1, 2000 meeting are provided as Attachment B.

**AGENDA**

The agenda for the May 2, 2000 meeting was as follows:

- Introduction, objectives, review of January 13, 2000 meeting minutes
- Validation Study Work Plan overview
- Screening data presentation
- Sample design
- Wrap up and action items

**MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Richard Mach began the discussion by proposing to incorporate Parcel F activities conducted by the Sediment Work Group (SWG) into the BCT process in a manner that is consistent with the other HPS parcels. These meeting minutes are formatted in accordance other BCT meetings. The notes from the May 1, 2000 technical meeting are provided as Attachment B.

The draft minutes from the January 13, 2000 Parcel F meeting were distributed for review on April 24, 2000, but some participants had not yet had the opportunity to review them. Comments were requested by May 10, 2000.

**VALIDATION STUDY WORK PLAN OVERVIEW**

Dr. Jennifer Holder presented an overview of the Parcel F Validation Study Draft Work Plan that will be submitted to the agencies on May 16, 2000 (**follow-up – submitted on schedule**). Topics that were discussed in greater detail during the meeting are summarized below.

Ms. Sheryl Lauth asked for clarification regarding the objective of the Validation Study. Is the Validation Study intended to be a risk assessment? Technical support team members explained that the Validation Study is not a risk assessment, but is a focused data collection effort to answer questions remaining following the original risk assessment. The Validation Study will use risk-based tools to validate the low-volume remedial footprint developed in the draft Parcel F Feasibility Study (FS).

Dr. Clarence Callahan noted that the information collected in the Validation Study would not necessarily be sufficient to complete the Parcel F FS because the vertical extent of contamination might not be adequately defined. Mr. Michael Pound acknowledged that supplemental data may be needed to complete the FS, and proposed that the Navy and agencies work together to develop a process and strategy for completing the FS. Any supplemental data collected after the Validation Study would be included in the FS report.

Dr. Callahan began a discussion regarding the weight of evidence (WOE) process that will be used to evaluate Validation Study data by stating that the details of the WOE evaluation criteria need to be worked out before the data are evaluated. Mr. Brad Job expressed concern about setting the standard for data evaluation in advance and would prefer to see the data before agreeing to how it will be interpreted. Ms. Lauth stated that from a project management perspective, EPA would be reluctant to approve a Work Plan without the evaluation criteria specified in advance. The approach of collecting data first and then discussing data interpretation was previously attempted at Parcel F and was unsuccessful.

Dr. Jim Leather explained that the technical group had attempted to reach consensus on evaluation criteria in the available time frame but had been unsuccessful. Dr. Holder and Dr. Callahan felt that the Navy and regulator technical support group would be able to come to an agreement about a data evaluation process prior to finalization of the Work Plan. Dr. Callahan reminded the group that the Validation Study would not provide a definitive answer about the extent of sediments to be remediated, but that an FS evaluation would follow.

Mr. Pound stated that the Navy was committed to working with the regulator technical support group to finalize the WOE framework and data quality objectives by the end of July (before going out into the field). Mr. Mach stated that the Navy would not proceed with field sampling if the data quality objectives were not finalized and approved. The Navy and regulator technical support group agreed to continue discussions regarding the WOE evaluation and would reach agreement before the Work Plan was approved.

Other technical issues that were briefly discussed included analytical parameters for the Validation Study, selection of appropriate reference sites and use of reference site data, identification of experienced laboratories that could perform the sediment-water interface bioassay, and prioritization of analyses for field-collected tissues if insufficient mass is available for all analyses. Ms. Cynda Maxon reported that A.D. Little will be doing a sediment transport study of San Francisco Bay with the USGS, including validation measurements around HPS during the winter. The City of San Francisco expressed interest in collecting cores for radioisotope analysis from Yosemite Creek at the same time as the Validation Study fieldwork.

Ms. Lauth began a discussion regarding the Parcel F human health risk assessment. Dr. Holder reported that one technical conference call had been held with Dr. Dan Stralka (EPA) and Dr. Jim Polisini (DTSC/HERD) to discuss human health issues and approach. All parties agreed that human health risk from exposure pathways other than fish or shellfish consumption was minimal.

Two issues associated with consumption of fish or shellfish from HPS were identified: 1) risk communication, and 2) identification of data that could be collected to support validation of the remedial footprint. The fish that pose the most significant potential human health risk are not tied strongly enough to the sediment to play a role in validating the footprint; therefore, human health risk would not be addressed in the Validation Study. A technical position paper prepared by the SWG concluded that it would be difficult to discern the contribution of contamination from HPS to the overall body burden of a fish in the Bay.

An action item from the technical call was to determine whether existing fish and shellfish data for HPS were sufficient to address the risk communication issue. The Navy is working on an estimate of the sample size that would be needed to show that fish from HPS are the same as or different than fish from the rest of the Bay. Mr. Pound stated that if the sample size was large, then the Navy may not collect fish for a human health evaluation.

Ms. Lauth noted that the community was continually asking for information about the health risk from consumption of fish from HPS. EPA must be able to explain to the community how sediment clean up will result in human health protection, and the Navy agreed to assess the human health risk.

The Navy agreed to develop a schedule and approach for addressing human health risk. Another conference call would be scheduled with the technical support group responsible for human health assessment to discuss the path forward. The Navy will have a human health risk assessment proposal and schedule to the remedial project managers (RPMs) one week after the conference call.

Mr. Mach and Ms. Lauth agreed that if the Validation Study only addresses ecological risk, then it cannot be the only primary document that provides input for the FS. Another document that addresses human health will be required.

#### **SEDIMENT SCREENING DATA**

Dr. Leather presented the results of a sediment screening survey that was carried out in April 2000 to provide information on contaminant concentration gradients to support the Validation Study sample design. Dr. Leather noted that it was difficult or impossible to collect samples in some of the intertidal and shoreline areas in the low-volume footprint that were armored with large pieces of construction debris, metal debris and rip rap. Dr. Leather explained that the debris may be the source of elevated contaminant concentrations measured in previous samples from the same area, particularly in areas containing metal debris. The objective of the Validation Study is to assess soft, subtidal sediments; heterogeneous, debris-covered areas along the shoreline will not be assessed because collection of sediment for the three lines of evidence is not practical or relevant.

Ms. Lauth noted that the debris-covered shoreline areas have little habitat value, and could be handled as part of the onshore parcels. Mr. Mach asked for clarification about whether metal waste along the shoreline would be addressed under CERCLA. Mr. Job and Ms. Lauth responded that it would have to be addressed if it were shown to be acting as a source of contaminants to sediments. Dr. Leather noted that movement of particles from the Parcel E landfill to Area X in Parcel F via an erosion channel discharging on the beach was another issue that needs to be addressed in conjunction with Parcel E activities.

## SAMPLE DESIGN

Mr. Dan Michael presented the proposed sample design for the Validation Study. The proposed sample design is based on definition of strata based on expected level of contamination using screening results and historical data, and allocation of sample numbers within each strata based on statistical considerations.

Ms. Lauth asked about evaluation of mercury in the area between Areas VIII and IX, which is outside of the low-volume footprint. Ms. Lauth clarified that if the original FS flow diagram for the low-volume footprint had been followed, this mercury hit would have been included in the low volume scenario. Mr. Pound responded that sampling in this area was an unresolved issue that required further discussion between the Navy and the regulators.

## WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

The following action items were identified at the end of the meeting:

<b>Action Items from this Meeting</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Complete</b>
Submit plan for resolution of human health risk communication issue	M. Pound (Navy)	One week after technical conf. call to be scheduled for week of May 22, 2000	
Complete development of WOE framework for Validation Study	Navy and regulator technical support group	July 20, 2000	
Complete DQOs and obtain BCT concurrence before sampling begins	M. Pound (Navy)	August 3, 2000	
Re-evaluate the need to analyze TPH and both PCB Aroclors and congeners in Validation Study	M. Pound (Navy)	May 5, 2000	
Provide comments on January 13 meeting minutes to Navy	EPA, RWQCB, DTSC	May 10, 2000	May 10, 2000
Specify priorities for field-collected tissue analysis in the Work Plan	M. Pound (Navy)	May 16, 2000	
Send Work Plan for City of San Francisco sampling at HPS to Richard Mach	C. Maxon (A.D. Little)	May 5, 2000	
Provide Work Plan for North Island to assist with WOE development	C. Maxon (A.D. Little)	May 5, 2000	
Schedule tentative meeting for July 20, 2000 to discuss Validation Study Draft Work Plan comments	R. Mach (Navy)	June 20, 2000	

**ATTACHMENT A  
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Richard Mach	Navy
Michael Pound	Navy
Jim Leather	Navy
Martin Offenhauer	Navy
Sheryl Lauth	EPA
Clarence Callahan	EPA
Brad Job	RWQCB
Chein Kao	DTSC
Leslie Lundgren	SFPUC
Cynda Maxon	A.D. Little
Ron Goloubow	LFR
Patty White	Battelle
Jennifer Holder	Entrix
Dan Michael	Neptune & Co.
Deb Carlson	Neptune & Co.

**ATTACHMENT B  
MEETING NOTES  
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PARCEL F  
VALIDATION STUDY SAMPLE DESIGN MEETING  
MAY 1, 2000**

These notes summarize the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Parcel F Validation Study sample design meeting held on May 1, 2000 at the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Offices in Oakland. The objective of the meeting was to present sediment screening data collected in April 2000 and discuss and finalize sample design for the Validation Study Work Plan. The meeting attendees were as follows:

Jim Leather, SPAWAR Systems Center San Diego (Navy)  
Marty Offenhauer, SWDIV NAVFAC (Navy)  
Clarence Callahan, EPA Region IX  
Jim Polisini, DTSC/HERD  
Brad Job, RWQCB  
Fred Hetzel, RWQCB  
Charlie Huang, CDFG  
Laurie Sullivan, NOAA  
Leslie Lundgren, SFPUC  
Cynda Maxon, A.D. Little  
Ron Goloubow, LFR  
Patty White, Battelle  
Jennifer Holder, Entrix  
Dan Michael, Neptune & Co.  
Deb Carlson, Neptune & Co.

The agenda for the meeting was as follows:

- Objectives and agenda
- Screening data presentation
- Sample design development
- Sample design discussion

Dr. Jim Leather convened the meeting at 0930 by stating meeting objectives. The original intent of the Parcel F Validation Study was to fill data gaps for both the remedial investigation (RI) and feasibility study (FS); however, it has become apparent that the Navy may not be able to fully characterize the site for FS purposes. Supplemental sampling may be needed at a later date to delineate sediment volumes for the FS. Dr. Polisini asked if the Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM) was amenable to this plan; Dr. Leather confirmed and said that the topic would be discussed by the RPMs on May 2, 2000.

#### **SCREENING DATA PRESENTATION**

Dr. Leather presented the April 2000 screening data. Main points raised during the discussion of screening results were as follows:

- The assessment target for the Validation Study should be the soft sediments offshore of riprap and debris-lined shoreline and intertidal areas. It is not appropriate to collect data for three lines of evidence in debris-covered areas. Disposition of debris along the shoreline is a management issue; it could be handled as part of upland Parcels. Michael Pound has been briefed about the possibility of and need for greater linkages between Parcels E and F.
- The City of San Francisco sampled in South Basin two weeks ago, with 60 sites sampled for sediment chemistry and amphipod toxicity. Five locations in South Basin (previous TtEMI sample sites) were included.

### **SAMPLE DESIGN PRESENTATION**

Mr. Dan Michael presented the process used to develop a statistically-based sample design for the Validation Study. He stressed that the definition of strata using ER-M quotients (ERM-Qs) was a design tool for allocation of Validation Study sample stations, and not a decision tool. Site decisions would not be made on the basis of the strata defined for this purpose. The following topics were discussed during the presentation:

- Ms. Laurie Sullivan suggested that bathymetry be taken into account when defining strata, particularly in Area X.
- The process used to generate ERM-Qs was questioned, including lumping of PCBs with metals. Jim Leather emphasized that the goal of the exercise was to identify areas of high, medium and low levels of chemistry for summer sample design, and not to draw conclusions about the areas.
- The group agreed that it would not reach agreement on the end use of the data before the draft Work Plan was completed. Nevertheless, the Navy could move forward with a sample design that would allow various interpretations to be made.
- The Navy will not propose a large number of samples in debris-covered shoreline areas, which are very heterogeneous and not a valid offshore assessment target. Mr. Job stated that the Navy needs to be explicit in the Work Plan and Validation Study report that shoreline source areas will be addressed elsewhere in a FS.

### **SAMPLE DESIGN DISCUSSION**

Fred Hetzel from the RWQCB introduced himself and explained that he was interested in PCBs at HPS, particularly sediment hot spots, contamination at depth and PCB bioaccumulation. He will be doing some work at HPS in conjunction with TMDL development.

Dr. Callahan asked the Navy to restate the objectives of the Validation Study before discussing sample locations in each area of the low-volume footprint. He asked whether the samples are placed in the best locations to meet the objective of spanning the gradient of contamination. He would prefer that the Navy move the sample stations shoreward to focus on sampling the steepest part of the gradient. Jim Leather explained that the Navy directed the contractor not to put too few stations farther away from shore so that the decision to pass an area into or out of the FS would not be based on too few samples.

Dr. Polisini and Ms. Sullivan agreed with Dr. Callahan and suggested that if the Navy focuses on the steepest part of the gradient, then it may be able to develop effects-based levels. Screening analyses could then be conducted to better delineate the footprint boundary (horizontal and vertical) for FS purposes.

Discussion followed regarding what would happen if sediments come up clean after a weight of evidence (WOE) evaluation. Mr. Job stated that he thinks that action would still be required in some areas of the intertidal zone (source areas) regardless of the results for offshore sediments based on chemistry alone. Further delineation would be required of the source areas based on chemistry alone, preferably using screening methods.

Jim Leather agreed that if sediment concentrations in the intertidal zone are above our site-specific effects-based levels, then it's a problem. However, if no relationships between chemistry and biology can be derived, then the fall back position is empirical. Each sample station will represent some area around it, and a decision will be made on a station-by-station basis.

Several regulators reiterated that they would prefer to see sample stations moved shoreward to focus on the steepest part of the concentration gradient. Ms. Maxon noted that the disadvantage to this approach is that the proposed tests are not suitable for nearshore areas. They are intended to assess risk to the marine environment.

Each agency representative was asked to summarize his or her opinion about the proposed sample design. Responses were as follows:

- Dr. Callahan wanted reassurance that the proposal will give the Navy enough information to develop exposure-response relationships.
- Mr. Job is in general agreement with the approach, but is concerned about the focus on the subtidal areas. Mr. Leather reiterated that the RPMs need to agree with respect to management of shoreline disposal areas as part of onshore parcels.
- Mr. Huang stated that he hasn't visited HPS, but that Susan Ellis of CDFG was concerned about Area X from an ecological perspective. The north side is less significant from an ecological perspective because it is deeper. Mr. Huang also asked for verification that Parcel E data had been taken into consideration in characterizing shoreline areas (Mr. Leather confirmed that it had).
- Ms. Maxon spoke on behalf of the City and expressed concern about the lack of well-defined decision criteria. Mr. Michael stated that from a data quality objective standpoint, the sample design will be adequate for the most stringent type of comparison.
- Ms. Lundgren stated that the City is glad to see that the Navy is going to collect higher quality data to support decisions for the site.
- Dr. Polisini is in general concurrence with the adopted approach. However, he has an issue with the area between Areas VIII and IX at the base of the TU and TV transects, where elevated levels of mercury were previously detected. The USFWS has requested a minimum of three stations in this area for analysis of total and methyl mercury. Mr. Leather said that he would pass the request on to his management because this area is outside of the low-volume footprint.
- Ms. Sullivan concurs with the proposed sample design for Area X. However, she is concerned that there is only one sample in the high stratum in Area VIII. This is the first time that she has heard about the debris-lined shoreline, and would like to see supporting

information (bathymetry, photos, and description of shoreline) to back up the definition of the strata.

A discussion followed regarding various approaches that could be taken to characterize subsurface sediment chemistry. Mr. Leather noted that without information on levels of concern in sediment, that it is difficult to target subsurface sample locations or devise a meaningful coring scheme. Therefore, the current goal is not to map 3-dimensional plumes across the site, but to obtain an initial delineation of the vertical extent of contamination. Mr. Leather will recommend to Mr. Pound that the Navy consider supplemental sampling after the Validation Study to better delineate volumes of sediment for consideration in the FS.

The meeting was adjourned at 1630.

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Navy/Agency Sediment Work Group (SWG) Meeting**  
**January 13, 2000**

These minutes summarize the meeting held to discuss the agency position regarding Parcel F at the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS). The meeting was held at the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board offices in Oakland. The meeting agenda was as follows:

0930-0945	Introductions
0945-1015	Agency position
1015-1045	Navy caucus
1045-1200	Question and answer
1200-1230	Recap/Action Items

Meeting attendees were as follows:

Michael Pound, SWDIV  
Susan Gladstone, RWQCB  
Chris Maxwell, RWQCB  
Brad Job, RWQCB  
Sheryl Lauth, USEPA  
Eileen Hughes, DTSC  
Jim Polisini, DTSC/HERD  
Chein Kao, DTSC  
Charlie Huang, CDFG  
Dennis Mishek, RWQCB  
Curtis Scott, RWQCB

Jim Leather, SSC SD  
Leslie Lundgren, SF PUC  
Amy Brownell, SF DPH  
Laurie Sullivan, NOAA  
Jack Word, Battelle  
Patty White, Battelle  
Jennifer Holder, Entrix  
Stacey Curtis, SSC SD (by phone)  
Donald Gunster, Battelle (by phone)  
Dean Neptune, Neptune & Co. (by phone)  
Dan Michael, Neptune & Co. (by phone)

**Agency Position**

Ms. Lauth acted as the spokesperson for the agencies. The agencies met the previous week and formulated a unified position and recommended options for the Navy regarding Parcel F at HPS. The agency group included USEPA, RWQCB, DTSC, USFWS, CDFG and NOAA. The recommended options address ecological risk only; human health risk is a separate issue. The recommended options are a compromise developed in the spirit of moving forward. The agencies presented two alternatives:

**Option A:**

1. Use the areas of concern identified in the low volume scenario in the Parcel F draft FS report as a starting point.
2. Carry out sediment sampling to better define the horizontal and vertical extent of contamination.
3. Complete the FS.

The cleanup decision would be based on sediment chemistry and contaminant mass reduction. This option is preferred by the agencies.

**Option B:**

1. Use the areas of concern identified in the low volume scenario in the Parcel F draft FS report as a starting point.
2. Conduct a focused study based on sediment chemistry, bioassays and bioaccumulation.

3. Use data to confirm areas of concern and better define the extent of contamination.

The second option is considered a validation study, and is less preferred by the agencies.

The agencies do not agree that confounding factors were the sole source of toxicity in previous HPS studies, or that subtidal sediments are known not to pose an unacceptable risk. The agencies are willing to accept the low volume areas of concern identified in the draft FS report. The Navy asked for clarification that the low volume areas of concern would be considered a starting point for further assessment; USEPA confirmed this statement.

Mr. Pound asked for clarification regarding the agencies' position on pre-test results addressing confounding factors in toxicity tests. Dr. Polisini identified two problematic aspects of the pre-test results:

1. Amphipod acclimation rates/holding times: the pre-test did not examine results for intermediate time frames, it only looked at the extreme ends of the spectrum - long or short holding times and acclimation rates.
2. Ammonia in larval tests: the mechanism responsible for the production of ammonia is unclear. The paper provided by the Navy to explain the mechanism does not appear to be applicable to HPS. While ammonia may play a role in the larval test, the magnitude of the effect (and absence of other effects) has not been established.

Ms. Lauth reported that the USEPA laboratory analyst that performed toxicity tests on split samples from HPS did not observe an acclimation problem with the amphipod test. The analyst felt that ammonia may have contributed to toxicity observed in the larval test; however, the relative contribution of ammonia and influence of other possible confounding factors were not known.

The Navy clarified that in the previous meeting on 12/7/99, they did not intend to definitively state that subtidal sediments do not pose an unacceptable risk. The intent was to provide a preliminary conclusion for further discussion.

The Navy asked for clarification regarding development of sediment cleanup levels under Option A. Mr. Job described a sediment volume vs. contaminant mass three dimensional analysis, possibly using GIS. The cleanup would be based on a mass removal strategy.

Ms. Curtis asked for clarification regarding the expectations for dose assessment. Upper trophic level transfer was identified as an issue that needs to be addressed in follow-up discussions.

The Navy caucused to discuss the two options. After the meeting reconvened at 1115, Mr. Pound identified two problems with Option A:

1. Option A gives the appearance of negotiating on the basis of what the Navy is willing to pay for remediation.
2. Option A is not clearly tied to risk, and Navy policy requires that the cleanup decision be risk-based.

Consequently, the Navy prefers Option B. Mr. Pound needs to confirm this approach with the Navy's HPS team, but does not foresee any problems.

A discussion followed regarding the title and nature of the document produced by the Validation Study conducted under Option B. The agencies do not consider the study to be an ERA; they

consider it to be a pre-FS investigation. The Navy would prefer that the results be reported in a primary document so that if any disputes arise, resolution would be forced at an earlier date.

The agencies noted that fish and shellfish ingestion still needs to be addressed. Bioaccumulation studies carried out to help delineate the extent of contamination would not fulfill the human health risk assessment requirements. Human health risk needs to be part of the decision-making process, although it can be reported separately.

Mr. Pound proposed adoption of Option B subject to confirmation by the Navy's HPS team. The Navy will complete a Validation Study based on the low volume areas of concern presented in the Parcel F FS report. The validation study will address sediment chemistry, bioassays, bioaccumulation and sedimentation rates. Mr. Pound proposed the following follow-up activities:

1. The Navy will develop a strawman approach for the validation study to present to the agencies in one month.
2. A briefing meeting will be held to discuss the approach.
3. Small subgroups will be formed to participate in technical discussions on outstanding issues.

Mr. Pound anticipates that data interpretation will be discussed in the technical subgroups and spelled out in the Work Plan. A decision matrix will be provided in the Work Plan, and sediment cleanup levels will be discussed in the Validation Study report.

Ms. Lauth noted that the request for an FFA schedule extension must provide the dates for all primary documents: the Validation Study Work Plan, Validation Study Report, FS report, and Fish Tissue report (human health risk assessment). Assumptions underlying the schedule must be spelled out (ie. reliance on technical meetings with agencies during Work Plan development) so that justification can be provided if any problems arise.

Mr. Kao stressed that the Navy must meet the schedule dates for primary documents. In the past, disagreements over secondary documents have resulted in delays on primary documents.

#### **Action Items**

1. Mr. Pound will submit a draft revised FFA schedule to the agencies on January 24, 2000. If the schedule is acceptable, then an official letter will follow.
2. The Navy and agencies agreed to participate in weekly one hour conference calls to discuss technical issues. The first call will take place at 0830 on Tuesday, January 18, 2000.
3. A technical meeting will be held at 0930 on Thursday, March 2 at the RWQCB offices to discuss the strawman approach to the Validation Study Work Plan and the draft decision matrix. Technical staff and BCT members should attend.

Michael Pound expressed his appreciation for the agency consensus and recommendation, which has paved the way for forward movement in an expeditious way. The meeting concluded at 1200.