

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
 INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITES 03 AND 07,  
 SUMMARY OF SITE VISIT  
 MEETING MINUTES

MAY 9, 2001

These minutes summarize the results of site visits to Installation Restoration (IR) Sites 03 and 07 that were performed on May 9, 2001. Draft site investigation reports recommended no further action at the sites prior to closure and transfer to the City of San Francisco. The purpose of the site visit was to review current site conditions and resolve inconsistencies in descriptions of conditions in reports prepared by different consultants. In a meeting at the Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI) San Francisco office on April 24, 2001, the California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and Geomatrix Consultants (representing the City of San Francisco) suggested that additional sampling might be required prior to site closure. Consequently, the site visits were scheduled to get a first-hand look at the site to determine whether additional sampling was warranted.

The following individuals were present during the site visits:

Representative	Organization
David Rist	DTSC
Peggy Peischel	Geomatrix Consultants (representing City of San Francisco)
Ellen Casados	Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest Division (SWDIV)
Steven Edde	SWDIV
Mike Mentink	SWDIV
James Sullivan	SWDIV
Marcie Rash	TtEMI
Doug Reaber	TtEMI
John Baur	IT Corporation

The following discussion summarizes the issues identified for each site, the site visit observation, and any resolution or further action required to address the issue.

## **IR Site 03 PCB Transformer Storage Area**

### **Issue 1 – Condition of the concrete pad and surrounding asphalt**

The concrete pad outside the entrance to Building 3 was in good condition and did not show unusual staining or cracking. The surrounding asphalt was in similar condition. Given the fact that heavy equipment was moved into and out of the transformer room, this area is thought to have been paved as long as Building 3 has been in use.

**Resolution** – No further action required.

### **Issue 2 – Possible location of paint cans**

Photographs showing the possible location of paint cans were presented and described in the environmental baseline survey (EBS) performed by ERM-West in 1995. The photographs were taken in 1994, *after* the preliminary assessment/site investigation (PA/SI) was completed in 1988 and during a period when a private tenant was using the subject property. Specifically, Photograph B-08-05 showed a number of 5-gallon plastic buckets stacked on a pallet and what appears to be a plastic mat. Although the EBS text indicates that several of the buckets were overflowing with rainwater, this cannot be confirmed with the photograph. The photograph was taken next to a wooden fence that no longer exists; therefore, the exact location is uncertain. However, no areas of heavy staining were identified.

**Resolution** – Mr. Rist agreed that no further sampling would be required at this site.

### **Issue 3 – Possible underground storage tank (UST) in the transformer room.**

A representative of Hetch Hetchy Power escorted the attendees into the transformer vault area within Building 3. One transformer present during the PA/SI had since been removed. No evidence that a UST was ever present in the room was noted.

**Resolution** – Mr. Rist concurred that the room or former transformer area did not warrant further investigation.

### **Issue 4 – Location and use of sinks.**

The EBS prepared by ERM-West in 1995 described sinks in Building 3. No sinks were noted within the former transformer area or room or immediately adjoining the concrete pad that was the focus of previous sampling at Site 03. Two sinks were identified within Building 3. Neither of these sinks showed evidence that they were routinely used for waste disposal purposes, i.e., there was no paint staining. Multicolor paint on floors in the building was determined to be the result of various repainting of the floors over the years of building operation.

**Resolution** – Although Mr. Rist indicated that the sinks do not pose a major environmental concern, it was agreed that TtEMI would perform a review of known existing engineering drawings to determine, if possible, the ultimate disposition of the drain lines for these sinks. Subsequent to the meeting, TtEMI reviewed all engineering drawings for Building 3 in the possession of the Navy. Although several of the drawings showed the location of drain and water lines around the building, none showed the location within the building.

In summary, representatives attending the site visit agreed that IR Site 03, as defined, does not warrant further investigation. TtEMI will respond to comments provided by Geomatrix Consultants on behalf of the City, and resubmit the supplemental site inspection for Site 03.

## **IR Site 07 – Building 62**

### **Issue 1 – Possible contamination below raised floors**

The visit to Site 07 was focused primarily on the north end of Building 62, which was historically used for pesticide and paint storage. Previous investigations identified one chlorinated herbicide at a concentration above the most-recent (2000) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 preliminary remediation goals (PRG) for residential reuse. Ms. Peischel relayed the City's concern that environmental contaminants may be unearthed during site redevelopment. This concern is based on the fact that the building has a raised wood floor and loading docks and no sampling has been performed beneath the building.

**Resolution** – Given access problems beneath the building and the lack of a true basis for selecting sample locations (that is, no release and/or location of a release has been documented or identified), collecting representative soil samples would be difficult. Therefore, one approach would be to close out the site based on the absence of any known releases. Any future redevelopment that may result in the discovery of a CERCLA substance release would be accounted for as a subsequent discovery under CERCLA 120(h).

### **Issue 2 – Future land use scenario**

The future land use scenario for this parcel has not been determined.

**Resolution** – The Navy and the City will continue to work towards an agreement on future land use.

In summary, a series of potential concerns identified for IR Sites 03 and 07 during a meeting on May 24 at the TtEMI offices in San Francisco were addressed during the site visit. As a result of the site visit it was concluded that further investigation was not warranted prior to closure of either Site 03 or Site 07.



TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N62474-94-D-7609

Document Control No. TC . 0241 . 10995

TO: Mr. Richard Selby, Code 02R1
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 6/01/01
CTO: 0241
LOCATION: NAVSTA Treasure Island, San Francisco

FROM: Daniel Chow, Program Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Naval Station Treasure Island, Installation Restoration Sites 03 and 07

Summary of Site Visit Meeting Minutes, May 9, 2001

TYPE: Contractual Deliverable Technical Deliverable Other

VERSION: NA REVISION #: NA

ADMIN RECORD: Yes No CATEGORY: Confidential

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 6/06/01

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/7C/8E

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

Table with columns: NAVY, TtEMI, OTHER. Rows include names like Ellen Casados, Steve Edde, Mike Mentink, James Sullivan, Diane Silva and their respective copy counts.

Date/Time Received