

**KICK-OFF MEETING MINUTES
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA**

Meeting Date: February 12, 2004

Attendees: Scott Gromko, Navy RPM
Rick Weissenborn, Navy Lead RPM
Andrea Espinoza, Navy BEC
Ernst Buijten, Navy Contract Specialist
Diana Visser, SulTech PM
Angela Patterson, SulTech HHRA Lead

Matters Discussed:

All items on the Navy's meeting agenda (attached) were discussed, including clarifications/emphasis on items noted below:

- Purpose of meeting: Contractual changes procedure: The Navy Contract Specialist (CS) is the only person who can authorize any cost or scope changes to the contract. The Contractor must contact the CS for authorization prior to proceeding with change in scope. No scope changes are to be made in the field without the knowledge of the CS.
- Item 1. Delivery Order Value and Dates:
 - o Award amount remains at \$436,527
 - o 18-month performance period will be from 2/9/04 to 8/8/05
- Item 4. Matters Concerning Job Site Conditions:
 - o Item 4.a Passes: A badge or pass will be required for each SulTech person visiting the site. A list of visitors is to be submitted to Rick Weissenborn prior to each site visit so that temporary badges/passes can be arranged on a visit-to-visit basis. There may be provisions for a non-US citizen to obtain a pass; however, additional lead time will be needed, and a pass is not guaranteed.
- Item 5. Required from the Contractor:
 - o Item 5.c.(2) Progress Schedule, Critical Work items: Critical path items that may delay the start or completion of the project are to be identified on the master project schedule. SulTech will submit a schedule identifying these items to the Navy.
 - o Item 5.d Safety Plan/Activity Hazard Analysis: It was acknowledged that these requirements will pertain only if fieldwork is conducted at the site. The scope of work included in this project does not currently contain fieldwork.
 - o Item 5.h Vouchering Procedures: Several methods for determining the 'percent complete' each month for the project were discussed. It was agreed that prior to entering the 'percent complete' on monthly invoicing documents, the SulTech PM will discuss the amount with the Navy RPM for concurrence on the completion estimate for each

**KICK-OFF MEETING MINUTES
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA**

individual task. Billing for each task will then be based on the respective 'percent completion'.

- Item 6. Additional Items Discussed:

- The Navy emphasized the importance of SulTech personnel being aware of any suspicious activity which could potentially be a security threat to the facility. SulTech personnel are to immediately inform site security personnel upon any observations of suspicious activity or persons.
- The Navy emphasized that SulTech personnel are not allowed to talk with anyone beyond the immediate Navy/SulTech team (i.e., members of the media and/or the public) without prior written authorization from the Navy. If an inquiry is made to a SulTech team member, the person making the inquiry should be directed to the Navy RPM, Scott Gromko.
- SulTech presented the cost basis for developing their fixed price cost to conduct the scope of work included for this project. The cost basis is attached to this document, and includes clarifications to the scope of work and level-of-effort limits on specific tasks that involve third-party interaction.
- The site BCT meeting the week of 2/16/04 will not require the presence of SulTech personnel.
- The RAB meeting in March 2004 may or may not require the presence of SulTech personnel. TTFWI is making a presentation on the status of work at Site 25 during this meeting.
- The process for getting started on developing a receptor list for the ERA and HHRA was discussed. The Navy will initiate contact with the Department of Fish & Wildlife and will furnish contact information to SulTech.
- The subject of exposure scenarios for the HHRA was discussed. The Navy RPM will try to obtain the latest site map showing potential walkways/paths through the tidal marsh area. It was agreed that SulTech and the Navy should discuss this issue further, as well as exposure scenarios for the ERA, as soon as the existing information is reviewed. The estimated timeframe for discussion was within the next week or two.

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1
MEETING AGENDA

SULTECH
1230 Columbia Street Ste 1000
San Diego, CA 92101

Subj: CONTRACT N68711-03-D-5401; DELIVERY ORDER # 0016; FSA REVISION ADDENDUM
AT SITE 25, MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA.

The Post Award Conference will be held in the conference room of SULTECH on 12 February 2004 at 1000 hours.

The purpose of this meeting is as follows:

- (a) Achieve a clear and mutual understanding of all delivery order requirements.
- (b) Identify and resolve potential problems.
- (c) Emphasize the contractual changes procedure.

1. **Delivery Order Value and Dates:**

Award amount (FFP): \$436,527

Performance Period: 18 months from to

2. **Points of Contact:**

See contract Delivery Order 0016 pages 7 and 8

3. **Correspondence:**

See Delivery Order 0016 award document page 1 blocks 6 and 14

For questions or POC please use Ernst H. Buijten Contract Specialist

4. **Matters Concerning Job Site Conditions:**

- a. **Passes:** Are required for entry to Moffett Federal Field.
- b. **Job Site Security:** Job site security is the contractor's responsibility. This contract contains no provision, which would allow the Government to reimburse the contractor for any loss incurred from theft or vandalism of material or equipment at the job site.
- c. **Fire:** Sultech and subcontractors will coordinate all work efforts to ensure that no fire access is restricted. The Contractor will provide fire extinguishers at all times and must post the emergency number of 911 at all job sites.
- d. **Burning and Welding Permits:** Burning and welding permits are required at all times. Request burning and welding permits from MFF and Mountain View Fire Departments
- e. **Utilities:** Power and water requirements will be coordinated by the contractor with the Moffett Field with base and if required, with Mountain View authorities. Contractor will need to obtain applicable digging permits. The Contractor will also need to obtain utilities clearance from the Underground Services Alert prior to any digging and excavation.
- f. **Outages:** Obtain outage permits prior to performing any work that will interrupt roads or base utilities. Some permit requests may require written advance notification of base and/or City officials.
- g. **Medical Emergencies at the Job Site:** The Base Fire Department and Or the City Fire Department will respond to an emergency at the job site.

Include in your safety plan the name of the ambulance company and hospital to be used for all emergencies. A map showing how to reach the designated hospital should be posted at the job site.

5. **Items required from the Contractor:**
 - a. **Insurance Certification:** Sultech will maintain current sub-contractor proof of insurance at the home office.
 - b. **Quality Control:** The QC organization will be responsible for the three (3) phases of control. The Government considers the QC program to be the key to a successful project and expects the contractor to make it the highest priority.
 - c. **Progress Schedule:** Submit a realistic schedule to the Government for approval.
 - (1) Work Item Descriptions (include admin. items required under the contract such as: submission, review and approval of submittals, testing and inspection) and their start dates, duration, dependencies and completion dates.
 - (2) Critical Work Items, which if not done as scheduled, will delay the start or completion of the project (i.e. critical path items).
 - d. **Safety Plan/ Activity Hazard Analysis:** A job specific safety plan IAW Army Corps of Engineers Construction and Safety Standards EM 385 1-1 (03 September 1966 Edition), is required. The Government considers this plan to be essential in preventing serious accidents. All contractor and sub-contractor personnel must have the proper training.
Activity Hazard Analysis must be prepared prior to each major phase of work. Safety meetings will be conducted by the on-site Safety Manager to review activity hazard analysis with all workers. A roll call must be taken and minutes of each safety meeting shall be submitted to the RPM within two (2) working days. All contractor/Sub-contractor personnel entering exclusion zones must have completed the mandatory 40 hours of training required by OSHA.
 - e. **Certification of Mandatory OSHA Training:** Contractor will have proof that their employees and sub-contractors employees have completed the mandatory 40 hours of training required by OSHA on file at the Contractor's home office.
 - f. **Safety Issues:** Safety gear (hardhats, boots, etc.) must be worn at all times on the job site. The prime superintendent is held accountable for the prime and sub-contractor personnel. Only one warning (compliance notice) will be given when violations occur and then the superintendent will be asked to leave the job site. The contractor will require all violators to report to the site office, get an initial orientation and review tailgate form prior to entry on the job site.
 - g. **Production and QC Meetings:** See scope.
 - h. **Vouchering Procedures:** As outlined in the basic contract. Indicate % of project completion on each invoice. Agreement to % of completion must be attained with RPM and CS prior to each invoice submittal.
 - i. **Standards of Conduct:** The Navy strictly adheres to a "Zero Tolerance" Policy on all bases for the use of drugs. Your personnel must abide by this same policy. Maintain a work environment free of sexual harassment and discrimination.

6. **Additional Items Discussed:**

7. **Questions:** Please contact the CS, Ernst H. Buijten or the RPM David Gromko

8. Agreement and Understanding:

Contractor

Date

ATTACHMENT 2
SULTECH COST BASIS AND SCOPE CLARIFICATIONS

**TASK CLARIFICATIONS AND COST BASIS
FOR SULTECH PROPOSAL TO NAVY DATED JANUARY 28, 2004
N68711-03-D-5104, PLANNED OBLIGATION X026, REVISION 02
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
NAS MOFFETT AIRFIELD, MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA**

CLARIFICATIONS TO SCOPE OF WORK

The following clarifications are made regarding the scope of work (SOW) contained in SulTech's "Proposal for Planned Obligation X026, Revision 02, Site 25 Feasibility Study Addendum, NAS Moffett Airfield, California, Contract Number N68711-03-D-5104", submitted to the Navy on January 28, 2004, and represent SulTech's understanding of the level of effort required to complete each task. These clarifications form the cost basis for SulTech's fixed-price proposal.

GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS

General SOW clarifications include:

- Costs are included for a maximum duration of work (Period of Performance, POP) of 18 months.
- This scope of work does not include evaluating the adequacy or validity of past work at the site, including prior risk assessment assumptions and calculations; or making any changes or alterations to past work.
- The Western Diked Marsh will not be addressed during this scope of work.
- Sediment and surface water are the only two media of concern at Site 25 to be addressed by the risk assessments and FS. If the RI Report Addendum indicates that additional media require evaluation, inclusion of those media into the risk assessment or FS will be considered out of scope.
- The SOW does not include the design of a fresh water marsh, separation berms, flood control measures, stormwater handling equipment, or any other device or equipment that may be needed for remedial measure implementation.
- The Feasibility Study Addendum will not evaluate the feasibility of constructing a tidal marsh at Site 25; rather, it will evaluate remediation alternatives that are applicable to remediating the chemical contamination at Site 25 to standards protective of a tidal marsh.
- Dr. Jennifer Holder of Blasland, Bouck & Lee, Inc. (BBL) has been added to SulTech's team at the request of the Navy as a senior-level ecological risk strategist

TASK CLARIFICATIONS AND COST BASIS
FOR SULTECH PROPOSAL TO NAVY DATED JANUARY 28, 2004
N68711-03-D-5104, PLANNED OBLIGATION X026, REVISION 02
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
NAS MOFFETT AIRFIELD, MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA
(CONTINUED)

and reviewer, and has provided SulTech with a fixed price proposal (attached) to perform an agreed-upon scope of work for the project. If the Navy requests more involvement or additional tasks from Dr. Holder, this will be considered out of scope.

- No reports or documents generated during this project will contain figures larger than 11" x 17".

SPECIFIC CLARIFICATIONS

2.5 EVALUATE NASA STORM DRAIN SYSTEM

One trip to one agency location is included. NASA will forward pertinent information to SulTech's office location.

2.6 EVALUATE PREVIOUS SWRP RISK LEVELS BASED ON NEW SEDIMENT RESULTS

ERA

This task includes evaluation of up to 20 chemicals.

2.7 CALCULATE NEW SWRP RISK LEVELS, IF NECESSARY

ERA

This SOW includes the evaluation of up to 10 non-risk drivers for potential risk, and calculation of risk-based cleanup levels for up to 5 non-risk drivers.

HHRA

This SOW includes calculation of risk, hazard, and risk-based cleanup levels for a maximum of 5 compounds.

TASK CLARIFICATIONS AND COST BASIS
FOR SULTECH PROPOSAL TO NAVY DATED JANUARY 28, 2004
N68711-03-D-5104, PLANNED OBLIGATION X026, REVISION 02
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
NAS MOFFETT AIRFIELD, MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA
(CONTINUED)

2.8 DETERMINE RECEPTOR/EXPOSURE ASSUMPTIONS FOR TIDAL MARSH

All discussions and interaction with the groups discussed in this section, as well as with NASA, MROSD, and regulatory agencies regarding the potential receptors, will be during the scheduled Team Meetings identified in Task 1.2 of the proposal; no additional costs are included in this task for this interaction.

2.9 CONDUCT ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR TIDAL MARSH

A maximum of five (5) ecological tidal marsh receptors will be evaluated in this task.

Revisions or modifications to the ERA based on changes in methodology, receptors, or exposure variables after the assessment has been initiated, and inclusion of new data after the data tables have been created for the assessment, are not included.

2.10 CONDUCT HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT FOR TIDAL MARSH

Up to three exposure areas and up to four receptor scenarios will be evaluated. Costs do not include revisions or modifications to the risk assessment based on changes in methodology, receptors, exposure variables, or data after the assessment has been started.

2.13 INCORPORATE NAVY COMMENTS ON PRE-DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

Because SulTech will submit an annotated outline (describing each section and the way that data will be presented within the report) to the Navy for approval prior to starting the report, and because the Navy will be able to review the report text prior to submittal of the Pre-Draft report, the Navy's comments should not be substantive. If the Navy's comments change the scope or direction of the document, or if additional work is requested beyond that described within the proposal, it will be considered out of scope.

2.15 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

Because the Navy intends to discuss ERA and HHRA protocols, assumptions, and results with the regulatory community as the project progresses, comments should be non-substantive, should not change the scope or direction of the document, and should not require additional research, calculations, or work to be conducted in addition to that already completed. However, because regulatory agency comments may not focus entirely on the technical merit of the data presented

TASK CLARIFICATIONS AND COST BASIS
FOR SULTECH PROPOSAL TO NAVY DATED JANUARY 28, 2004
N68711-03-D-5104, PLANNED OBLIGATION X026, REVISION 02
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
NAS MOFFETT AIRFIELD, MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA
(CONTINUED)

within the report, SulTech is limiting the labor effort of this task to include 74 hours for responding to comments, participating in conference calls, discussing response strategies with the Navy, and preparing the RTC document. Additional effort beyond this will be considered out of scope.

2.16 PREPARE DRAFT FINAL RI ADDENDUM

Costs are not included to modify figures or add new sections to the report. No additional research, calculations, or work in addition to that already completed is included.

2.17 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT FINAL RI ADDENDUM

Because the Navy intends to discuss ERA and HHRA protocols, assumptions, and results with the regulatory community as the project progresses, comments should be non-substantive, should not change the scope or direction of the document, and should not require additional research, calculations, or work to be conducted in addition to that already completed. However, because regulatory agency comments may not focus entirely on the technical merit of the data presented within the report, SulTech is limiting the labor effort of this task to include 52 hours for responding to comments, participating in conference calls, discussing response strategies with the Navy, and preparing the RTC document. Additional effort beyond this will be considered out of scope.

2.18 PREPARE FINAL RI ADDENDUM

Costs include up to 20 replacement pages per report. Costs are not included to modify figures or add new sections to the report. No additional research, calculations, or work in addition to that already completed is included.

3.6 IDENTIFY SITE LAND USE CONFIGURATIONS FOR FS

The FS will consider a maximum of three land use configurations.

3.10 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON PRE-DRAFT FS ADDENDUM

Because SulTech will submit an annotated outline (describing each section and the way that data will be presented within the report) to the Navy for approval prior to starting the report, and

TASK CLARIFICATIONS AND COST BASIS
FOR SULTECH PROPOSAL TO NAVY DATED JANUARY 28, 2004
N68711-03-D-5104, PLANNED OBLIGATION X026, REVISION 02
SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY ADDENDUM
NAS MOFFETT AIRFIELD, MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA
(CONTINUED)

because the Navy will be able to review the report text prior to submittal of the Pre-Draft report, the Navy's comments should not be substantive. If the Navy's comments change the scope or direction of the document, or if additional work is requested beyond that described within the proposal, it will be considered out of scope.

3.12 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT FS ADDENDUM

Same as Task 2.15. SulTech is limiting the labor effort of this task to include 60 hours for responding to comments, participating in conference calls, discussing response strategies with the Navy, and preparing the RTC document. Additional effort beyond this will be considered out of scope.

3.13 PREPARE DRAFT FINAL FS ADDENDUM

Same as Task 2.16.

3.14 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT FINAL FS ADDENDUM

Same as Task 2.17. SulTech is limiting the labor effort of this task to include 42 hours for responding to comments, participating in conference calls, discussing response strategies with the Navy, and preparing the RTC document. Additional effort beyond this will be considered out of scope.

3.15 PREPARE FINAL FS ADDENDUM

Same as Task 2.18.

4.1 PREPARE DRAFT NAVY/NASA MOA

Costs are based on a maximum 5-page MOA document and one 11 x 17" figure.

4.3 PREPARE DRAFT NASA/MROSD MOA

Costs are based on a maximum 5-page MOA document and one 11 x 17" figure.

Transmitted Via email

December 20, 2003

Diana Visser
Tetra Tech, Inc.
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Revised Site 25 Feasibility Study Addendum SOW

Dear Ms. Visser:

This proposal responds to the Statement of Work received by Blasland, Bouck & Lee, Inc., (BBL) November 18, 2003, for performing work elements related to a remedial investigation (RI) addendum, and feasibility study (FS) addendum for Site 25 at the former NAS Moffett Airfield, Mountain View, California. This proposal also incorporates comments received from the Navy and Tetra Tech via conference call on December 15, 2003.

This proposal contains the following elements:

- Statement of qualification to perform requested tasks;
- Labor cost for each staff category;
- Detailed description of the proposed scope of work and total cost for each work element (labor and other direct costs).

It is assumed that the role of BBL, specifically, Dr. Jennifer Holder, is to provide strategic support, technical guidance and review to the Tetra Tech ecological risk assessment team. In that role, BBL assumes that all work products will be developed by Tetra Tech.

1.0 STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

BBL is a multidisciplinary environmental consulting and engineering firm that specializes in providing our clients with cost-effective solutions to environmental problems. Our business is focused on the environmental, life sciences, and engineering needs of our clients. BBL team members have extensive experience in conducting ecological risk assessments in the San Francisco Bay Area. Dr. Jennifer Holder, Vice President/Principal Toxicologist for BBL Sciences has provided ecological risk assessment support to the Navy's Sediment Work Group since its inception (see attached resume). As a member of this group, Dr. Holder has been the Ecological Risk Assessment Task Lead and has played a key role in developing strong relationships with the regulatory and community teams at a number of former Navy bases.

Our staff mix and experience working as an integrated team allow us to leverage the skills and capabilities of all of our staff to provide our clients with high-quality, technically excellent, and cost-efficient work products. Based on our strong experience, BBL is highly qualified to perform the tasks outlined in this SOW.

2.0 SCOPE OF WORK BY WORK ELEMENT

The following sections describe the SOW and estimated labor and other direct costs (ODCs) and associated assumptions for each work element. Table 1 provides an overview of proposed rates for BBL staff based on labor categories, and Table 2 provides a summary of the estimated costs per work element.

2.1 WORK ELEMENT 1 – MEETINGS

This task includes all meetings anticipated for the completion of this project, except where noted. Costs for this work element assume 2004 US *per diem* rates for Santa Clara, California, and a 15% markup on other direct costs (ODCs):

TEAM MEETINGS:

BBL assumes that Dr. Holder will attend a total of 6 meetings in the SF Bay Area in support of Tetra Tech and the Navy. It is assumed that participation at the following meetings is required:

- Four Team Meetings with Navy, NASA, and MROSD in the Bay Area
- One Base Closure Team (BCT) Meeting in the Bay Area – also includes 1, 1 hr pre-meeting conference call
- One Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting in the Bay Area – also includes 1, 1 hr pre-meeting conference call and 1 dry-run meeting in San Diego

Costs estimated for each meeting in the Bay Area assumes:

- 10 hrs of travel and meeting time
- 2 hrs of meeting preparation
- 1 roundtrip flight from Santa Barbara to San Francisco International Airport
- one and a half day car rental
- one night hotel in Santa Clara
- one day per diem
- mileage to airport
- airport parking

Costs estimated for the San Diego pre-meeting include time for travel and meeting attendance, one and half day car rental, one night hotel, and one day per diem for San Diego. It is assumed that one Tetra Tech staff person will assist Dr. Holder in preparing for these meeting and that Tetra Tech will prepare all handouts and graphics necessary for the meetings.

Total labor cost for team meetings (meetings in the Bay Area and dry run in San Diego) is \$16,929 and the ODCs are \$6,428.

2.2 WORK ELEMENT 2 – REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION (RI) ADDENDUM

BBL understand that the objectives of revising the Remedial Investigation (RI) at Site 25 are to present new sampling data collected at the site since the completion of the Site-wide Feasibility Study in March 2001; to evaluate if these data would change the risk calculations previously presented for the Stormwater Retention Pond (SWRP) land usage; and to evaluate risks and calculate cleanup levels required for a “tidal marsh” land use. Historical data will not be presented in the addendum; rather, the appropriate reference document(s) will be noted.

Because of the large volume of work in this work element, this proposal has divided the RI Addendum into subtasks focusing on those work elements that will be performed by BBL. In order to provide an overview of BBL’s understanding of these tasks, a summary of the overall scope is included where appropriate (Tetra Tech and BBL); however, as described above, BBL’s proposed scope of work is limited to providing strategic support to Tetra Tech .

2.2.1 REVIEW AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS (2.2.1)

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will review all previous documents relating to the site investigation, feasibility study, and storm drain management system of Site 25. Documents will include the existing FS, Response to Comments on the existing FS, Draft Proposed Plan, Pre-Construction Sampling Report, and the MROSD Property Plan. BBL assumes that Tetra Tech assumes will make at least one copy of each pertinent document readily available for review and that Tetra Tech will forward to BBL all documents that pertain to the Site 25 ecological risk assessment (ERA) or the development of ecologically protective media concentrations for BBL review. BBL estimates that the labor costs for this work element is approximately \$2,900.00.

2.2.2 EVALUATE PREVIOUS SWRP RISK LEVELS BASED ON NEW SOIL/SEDIMENT RESULTS

The new soil/sediment data may have an effect on previous ecological and health risk calculations conducted for Site 25. Tetra Tech will compare all new data to previous SWRP cleanup levels for the four main ecological risk drivers identified in the FS (PCBs, DDT, lead and zinc). It is assumed that the new soil/sediment data do not change the soil/sediment to tissue bioaccumulation factors developed in the RI ERA and new risk cleanup levels will not need to be calculated for risk drivers in the RI ERA. If the new data identify additional areas as requiring cleanup, then these areas will be mapped by Tetra Tech in Task 2.2.3.

For non risk drivers, Tetra Tech will compare the new soil/sediment data to exposure point concentrations used to evaluate risks in the previous risk assessments to determine if the inclusion of the new data would result in a higher calculated risk. If the new EPCs are higher than those used in the RI, then the new data will be evaluated to determine whether potential risks are unacceptable (as described in Task 2.2.3).

BBL assumes that for this subtask, Tetra Tech staff will develop exposure point concentrations based on the new soil and sediment data and complete the following:

1. Compare the new EPCs for risk drivers (PCBs, DDT, Pb and Zn) to the SWRP cleanup levels;
2. Compare EPCs for non-risk drivers (all other detected compounds) to EPCs developed in the RI.

BBL assumes that Dr. Holder will be available as a senior resource to Tetra Tech staff, will coordinate the EPC screen, be updated on a regular basis by Tetra Tech staff on the progress of the EPC screen and

will review the work products for this task. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$1,260.

2.2.3 CALCULATE NEW SWRP RISK LEVELS, IF NECESSARY

Depending on the output of Task 2.2.2, this task could include the following subtasks which Tetra Tech will complete:

1. Mapping of additional polygons into the FS footprint based on EPCs from the new data for risk drivers exceeding SWRP cleanup levels;
2. Calculating potential risk to ecological receptors where the new EPCs from non-risk drivers exceed the old EPCs;
3. Developing cleanup levels for non-risk drivers that demonstrate unacceptable risk.

For these subtasks it is assumed the SWRP cleanup levels for risk drivers are appropriate and do not need additional revision and that the methodology used to assess ecological risk and develop cleanup levels as conducted in the RI (e.g., ecological risk assessment exposure assumptions, dose models and toxicity data) will be used and that no new inputs will be required except for the new EPCs. In this task, Tetra Tech will develop a map using the Thiessen polygons used in the RI to identify any new polygons that have concentrations of constituents of potential ecological concern (COPECs) greater than cleanup levels (both existing risk drivers [PCBs, DDT, Pb and Zn] and new ones).

BBL assumes that for this subtask, Tetra Tech staff will use EPCs based on the new soil and sediment data developed in Task 2.2.2 and complete the following:

3. If an EPC with the new data exceeds the old EPC, Tetra Tech staff will calculate potential risks following the methodology outlined in the RI. It is assumed that up to 10 non-risk drivers will be evaluated for potential risk.
4. If unacceptable risk is identified for these non-risk drivers, SWRP cleanup levels will be developed for those COPECs. It is assumed that up to 5 non-risk drivers will be evaluated for potential risk.
5. Map polygons where risk drivers (PCBs, DDT, Pb and Zn) or new COPECs exceed the SWRP cleanup levels;

It is assumed that Dr. Holder will be available as a senior resource to Tetra Tech staff, will coordinate the SWRP risk screen, be updated on a regular basis by Tetra Tech staff on the progress of the EPC screen and will review the work products for this task. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$3,900.

2.2.4 DETERMINE RECEPTOR/EXPOSURE ASSUMPTIONS FOR TIDAL MARSH

As discussed with the Navy and regulatory agencies, there are several approaches to determining appropriate receptor and exposure assumptions for a tidal marsh at Site 25. Because no tidal marsh environment currently exists at the site, Tetra Tech will present a list of potential receptors to the Navy and the regulatory agencies for discussion and determination of which receptors to include in the ecological risk assessment. It is assumed that Tetra Tech will complete these following tasks:

- Generating a conceptual site exposure model for both ecological and human receptors based on a tidal marsh environment;

- Conducting a paper search for typical tidal marsh receptors, including uptake and exposure assumptions;
- Contacting San Francisco Bay experts (such as the San Francisco Estuary Institute and the Point Reyes Bird Observatory) for input and information about local marsh environments and organisms;
- Conducting preliminary screening of similar sites in the San Francisco Bay Area that have been successfully converted into a tidal marsh, with detailed evaluation of the two best sites, for applicability of receptors/exposure routes to Site 25; and
- Determining exposure scenarios for human receptors at both the MROSD and NASA sites.

This task does not include the design of a tidal marsh beyond the conceptual site model. Additionally it is assumed that all information gathered will be based on existing literature, through discussions with experts and through evaluation of existing sites. It does not include conducting studies regarding the receptors or uptake/exposure assumptions, either in the literature or in the field, or traveling to other sites.

It is assumed that Dr. Holder will work with Tetra Tech in their review of available ecological information regarding tidal marsh receptors in San Francisco Bay, will be updated on a regular basis by Tetra Tech staff on the progress of the review, and will review the work products for this task. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$2,400.

2.2.5 CONDUCT ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR TIDAL MARSH

Following agreement by both the Navy and the regulatory agencies on the receptors and conceptual site exposure model to be used at the site, an ecological risk assessment for a "tidal marsh" land use scenario will be conducted for Site 25 using all available soil/sediment data. Tetra Tech will evaluate risks for both NASA and MROSD property within Site 25, assuming that all land converted to tidal marsh (regardless of owner) will have the same receptors and exposure assumptions. Therefore, if the calculated risk exceeds acceptable levels for a specific compound, one cleanup level will be calculated for the compound that will apply to all areas converted to tidal marsh, whether on MROSD or NASA property.

Additionally, if surface water is identified as a media of concern, potential risk to exposure to COPECs in surface water will also be evaluated by Tetra Tech. For the purposes of this cost estimate it is assumed that surface water will be evaluated. Methodologies to be used in the ERA for the tidal marsh will be consistent with the standards and methodologies in common use in 2003 and may be different than those used in the RI for the SWRP. It is assumed that Tetra Tech will evaluate up to a maximum of 5 ecological tidal marsh receptors in this task. If calculated risks are below acceptable levels, cleanup levels will not be calculated. However, if potential risk is considered unacceptable, then Tetra Tech will calculate a cleanup level for that compound that will be applied to all the tidal marsh area.

For the purposes of this cost estimate it is assumed that no additional data are required to conduct the tidal marsh ERA. However, based on the conceptual site model and receptors evaluated it may be in the Navy's best interest to collect some focused additional data in which to refine the risk analysis. Any additional data needs will be discussed with the Navy at a later date once the preliminary tasks are completed.

This proposal assumes that the risk assessment methodology, as well as the receptor list and exposure assumptions for the tidal marsh land use, are agreed upon by the Navy, NASA, MROSD, and the regulatory agencies prior to commencement of the ecological risk assessment. Costs do not include

revisions or modifications to the risk assessment based on changes in methodology or receptor or exposure assumptions after the assessment has been started.

It is assumed that Dr. Holder will work closely with the Navy, Tetra Tech and other regulators/stakeholders to develop an ERA approach that best addresses potential risk to tidal marsh receptors at Site 25. It is assumed that Tetra Tech will implement the ERA once the methodology is finalized. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will act as technical advisor to Tetra Tech staff, will be updated on a regular basis by Tetra Tech staff on the progress of the assessment and will review the work products for this task. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$10,000. This cost estimate is based on the assumption that 32 hrs of Dr. Holder's time and 20 hrs of BBL staff time will be required.

2.2.6 GENERATE RAOS FOR TIDAL MARSH (2.2.4)

Following completion of both the ecological and human health risk assessments, Tetra Tech will generate preliminary RAOs applicable to the tidal marsh land use scenario. These RAOs will consider protection of ecological and human receptors, and will be further refined in the Feasibility Study (Task 3) to account for additional regulatory requirements, following a comprehensive evaluation of applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs).

It is assumed that Tetra Tech will develop the preliminary RAOs and that Dr. Holder will review them. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$600.

2.2.7 PREPARE PRE-DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will produce the Pre-Draft RI Addendum. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will provide senior-level support to Tetra Tech staff during the development of the Pre-Draft RI Addendum, will be updated on a regular basis by Tetra Tech staff on the progress of the report and will review the draft work product. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$4,100.

2.2.8 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON PRE-DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will generate all responses to the Pre-Draft RI Addendum. BBL assumes that Dr. Holder will provide senior-level support to Tetra Tech staff during the development of responses and will review the draft work product. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$800.

2.2.9 PREPARE DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will incorporate all revisions described in the response to comments on the Pre-Draft RI Addendum into the Draft RI Addendum. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will review the work product. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$800.

2.2.10 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will generate all responses to comments to the Draft RI Addendum. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will participate in one conference call and will provide senior-level support to Tetra Tech staff during the development of responses and will review the draft work

product. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$4,100 and is based on an assumption of 20 hrs of Dr. Holder's time.

2.2.11 PREPARE DRAFT FINAL RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will incorporate all revisions described in the response to comments on the Draft RI Addendum into the Draft Final RI Addendum. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will review the work product. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$800.

2.2.12 PREPARE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT FINAL RI ADDENDUM

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will generate all responses to comments to the Draft Final RI Addendum. It is assumed that Dr. Holder will participate in one, 4 hr conference call. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$860.

2.3 WORK ELEMENT 3 – Feasibility Study Addendum

BBL understands that the objective of revising the Feasibility Study (FS) is to address information that has become available since the 2001 FS that is critical to the evaluation of potential remedial actions at Site 25. This information includes a potential change in land use for a portion or all of Site 25 (to a tidal marsh), and information related to the effectiveness of the stormwater settling basin and the potential for ongoing contaminant contribution to Site 25. The FS Addendum will serve as the mechanism to update the development, screening, and detailed evaluation of alternative remedial actions, but will not re-evaluate or address the adequacy of remedial actions or conclusions presented in the original FS for the SWRP land use scenario. It will address conceptual mitigative measures that may be required for NASA's storm drain system to reduce future potential contamination of Site 25 (for both the SWRP and tidal marsh scenarios), and will evaluate remedial actions for the conversion of part or all of Site 25 to a tidal marsh.

BBL understands that for this proposal, the FS Addendum has been broken out into the following subtasks, which Tetra Tech will have primary responsibility to develop, implement and finalize:

- 3.1 Summarize Effect of New Data on SWRP Remediation Areas/Costs
- 3.2 Summarize Tidal Marsh ERA
- 3.3 Summarize Tidal Marsh HHRA
- 3.4 Identify ARARs (Navy RFP Task No. 2.3.2)
- 3.5 Identify RAOS/GRAs
- 3.6 Identify Site Land Use Configurations for FS
- 3.7 Conduct Remedial Alternatives Evaluation
- 3.8 Generate ROM Cost Estimates
- 3.9 Prepare Pre-Draft FS Addendum
- 3.10 Prepare Response to Comments on Pre-Draft FS Addendum
- 3.11 Prepare Draft FS Addendum
- 3.12 Prepare Response to Comments on Draft FS Addendum
- 3.13 Prepare Draft Final FS Addendum
- 3.14 Prepare Response to Comments on Draft Final FS Addendum
- 3.15 Prepare Final FS Addendum

BBL assumes that Dr. Holder will provide input in the form of technical and strategic comments and direction into subtasks 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.9, 3.11, 3.13, and 3.15. These subtasks are described in the following sections.

2.3.1 SUMMARIZE EFFECT OF NEW DATA ON SWRP REMEDIATION AREAS/COSTS

Tetra Tech will develop a summary of the effects of the new soil/sediment data on previous health and ecological risk calculations for the SWRP land usage and the new SWRP cleanup levels (if applicable) will be presented. This information will then be used to identify the total area requiring remediation under the SWRP land use scenario, if different from the original FS, as well as the corresponding ROM costs.

BBL assumes that Tetra Tech will develop this section and that Dr. Holder will be available for discussion and to review it. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$400.

2.3.2 SUMMARIZE TIDAL MARSH ERA

Tetra Tech will summarize the findings and methodology of the ERA conducted as part of the RI Addendum in the FS Addendum, and compound-specific cleanup levels will be presented. One set of cleanup values will be presented for use of all property within Site 25 that is converted to tidal marsh. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$400.

2.3.3 IDENTIFY ARARS (NAVY RFP TASK NO. 2.3.2)

Tetra Tech will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of state and federal ARARs to identify ARARs for the site. The preliminary list will be submitted to the Navy for review prior to finalizing RAOs. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$400.

2.3.4 IDENTIFY RAOs/GRAs

After ARARs have been identified, Tetra Tech will append or modify the RAOs developed in the RI Addendum as appropriate. RAOs may differ slightly between the NASA and MROSD property for the tidal marsh scenario due to the difference in human receptors. General response actions (GRAs) will then be developed. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$800.

2.3.5 PREPARE PRE-DRAFT FS ADDENDUM

Tetra Tech will prepare the pre-draft FS Addendum. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$800.

2.3.5 PREPARE DRAFT FS ADDENDUM

Tetra Tech will prepare the draft FS Addendum. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$600.

2.3.7 PREPARE DRAFT FINAL FS ADDENDUM

Tetra Tech will prepare the draft final FS Addendum. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$600.

2.3.8 PREPARE FINAL FS ADDENDUM

Tetra Tech will prepare the final FS Addendum. Dr. Holder will be available for questions and to review this summary. It is assumed that there are no ODCs required for the completion of this task. Estimated labor costs for this task are \$600.

3.0 TOTAL COSTS

BBL estimates the total costs associated with this Statement of Work at approximately \$58,877 (Table 2). BBL assumes the period of performance is 18 months from the date of award.

If you have questions or concerns about this proposal, please feel free to contact Jennifer Holder at (805) 684-4066.

Sincerely,

BLASLAND, BOUCK & LEE, INC.



Jennifer Holder, Ph.D.
Principal Toxicologist/Vice President

jh

Table 1: Proposed BBL Labor Rates

BBL Level	RATE
Principal	\$200.00
Sr. Toxicologist II	\$177.00
Sr. Toxicologist I	\$155.00
Sr. Project Toxicologist II	\$141.00
Sr. Project Toxicologist I	\$130.00
Project Scientist	\$99.00
Life Scientist	\$80.00
Admin Support	\$64.44

Table 2: Estimated Costs per Work Element

Work Element 1 - Meetings

Proposal Section	2.1
Task Description	Team Meetings
Labor	\$16,929
ODCs	\$6,428
Task Totals	\$23,357

Work Element 1 Total: \$23,357

Work Element 2 - Remedial Investigation (RI) Addendum

Proposal Section	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3	2.2.4	2.2.6	2.2.6	2.2.7	2.2.8	2.2.9	2.2.10	2.2.11	2.2.12
Task Description	Document Review	EPC Screen	Calculate new Risk Levels	Tidal Marsh Asmp.	Tidal Marsh ERA	RAOs	Pre-Draft RI	RTCs to Predraft	Draft RI	RTCs to Draft	Draft Final RI	RTCs to Draft Final
Labor	\$2,900	\$1,260	\$3,900	\$2,400	\$10,000	\$600	\$4,100	\$800	\$800	\$2,500	\$800	\$860
ODCs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Task Totals	\$2,900	\$1,260	\$3,900	\$2,400	\$10,000	\$600	\$4,100	\$800	\$800	\$2,500	\$800	\$860

Work Element 2 Total: \$30,920

Work Element 3 - Feasibility Study (FS) Addendum

Proposal Section	2.3.1	2.3.2	2.3.3	2.3.4	2.3.5	2.3.6	2.3.7	2.3.8
Task Description	Summarize New Data	Summarize Tidal Marsh ERA	Review ARARs	Identify RAOs	Predraft FS	Draft FS	Draft Final FS	Final FS
Labor	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$800	\$800	\$600	\$600	\$600
ODCs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Task Totals	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$800	\$800	\$600	\$600	\$600

Work Element 3 Total: \$4,600

Grand Total: \$58,877

SulTech

A Joint Venture of Sullivan Consulting Group and Tetra Tech EM Inc.

TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-03-D-5104

Document Control No. DS . B016 . 13787

TO: Contracting Officer
Karen Rooney, Code 02RE
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 870
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 03/01/04
CTO: 016
LOCATION:
Moffett Federal Airfield, Mountain View, CA

FROM: *Michael Wanta*
Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Minutes from Project Kick-off Meeting on February 12, 2004

March 1, 2004

TYPE: Contractual Deliverable Technical Deliverable (DS) Other (TC)

VERSION: Version or NA REVISION #: NA
(e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final)

ADMIN RECORD: Yes No CATEGORY: Confidential

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: 03/02/04 ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 03/02/04

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/XC/E

O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

NAVY:
David Gromko (06CH.DG)
O/1E
Ernst Buijten (06CH.EB)
1C/1E
Nars Ancog (03EN.NA)
1C + letter only
Diane Silva *
(05GIH.DS)
2C/2E
Rick Weissenborn (06CH.RW)
1C/1E

SulTech:
File/Doc Control
1C/1E (w/QC)
Diana Visser
1C/1E
Michael Foster
1C/1E
Jim Knight
1C/1E

OTHER:
See Cover Letter

Date/Time Received

SulTech

A Joint Venture of Sullivan Consulting Group and Tetra Tech EM Inc.

TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT (continued)

COPIES TO (continued): (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

Navy (continued):

SulTech (continued):

OTHER (continued):

Andrea Espinoza (60CH.AE)

1C/1E

March 1, 2004

Mr. David S. Gromko
Southwest Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

**Subject: Minutes from Project Kick-off Meeting on February 12, 2004
Site 25 Feasibility Study Addendum
Moffett Federal Field, California
Contract Number N68711-03-D-5104, Delivery Order 0016**

Dear Mr. Gromko:

Please find enclosed the minutes of the February 12, 2004 project kick-off meeting for DO 0016, Site 25 Feasibility Study Addendum, Former NAS Moffett Field, Mountain View, California. The minutes were prepared by SulTech, a joint venture of Sullivan Consulting Group and Tetra Tech EM Inc., and represent the items discussed or introduced at the meeting.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at (619) 321-6717.

Sincerely,



Diana L. Visser, P.E.
Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Michael Foster - SulTech
Jim Knight - SulTech
Dr. Jennifer Holder - Blasland, Bouck & Lee
Rick Weissenborn - Lead Navy RPM
Andrea Espinoza - Navy BEC
Ernst Buijten - Navy Contract Specialist
File