

5090
Ser 1813EG/L3215
9 Mar 1993

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR NAVAL STATION
TREASURE ISLAND, SAN FRANCISCO

Encl: (1) Monthly Status Report - Jan 1993
(2) Meeting Minutes - 10 Feb 1993

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are provided for your information.
2. Thank you for your guidance and involvement in this project. For further information, please contact Mr. Ernesto M. Galang, Code 1813EG, at (415) 244-2560.

Original signed by:

GILBERT A. RIVERA
By direction

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Barbara Smith)
California Department of Fish and Game (Attn: Mike Rugg)
US Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Julie Anderson)
US Fish & Wildlife Services (Attn: Steve Schwartzbach)
US Army Corps of Engineers (Attn: Sharon Moreland)
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Attn: Brian Jennison)
Bay Conservation and Development Commission (Attn: Chris Perry)
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (Attn: Denise Klimas)

Copy to:

NAVSTA Treasure Island (Attn: Jim Sullivan)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Emily Pimentel)

Blind copy to:

Team 2, 1813, 1813EG
Admin Records (3 copies w/encl)
Writer: E. Galang, 1813EG, X-2560
File: NS, Treasure Island
Chron, blue, pink, green

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
JANUARY 1993

1. PROGRESS DURING THIS PERIOD:

Work Performed

The Navy and its contractor:

Continued to prepare the RI and risk assessment reports.

Completed responses to DTSC and RWQCB comments on the proposed human health risk assessment approach document.

Completed responses to regulatory agencies' comments on the ecological risk assessment work plan.

Managed laboratory data packages, arranged for the primary data validation, and reviewed the validation packages for completeness.

Prepared summary report regarding disposal of investigation derived waste (IDW).

2. MEETING AND REPORTS DURING THIS PROGRESS PERIOD

MEETINGS

No meetings were scheduled this reporting period.

REPORTS

The Navy forwarded the following documents/reports to the regulatory agencies for review and comments:

- Proposed Draft Site Characterization Summary Report Outline	5 January 1993
- December 17, 1992 Meeting Minutes	5 January 1993
- Monthly Status Report (Nov 1992)	5 January 1993
- Monthly Status Report (Dec 1992)	25 January 1993

3. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND RESOLUTIONS

Based on analytical results, elevated levels of of contaminants were found in the groundwater monitoring wells at sites 24, 5th Street Fuel Releases and site 25, Sea Plane Maintenance Area. These sites have been recommended for interim groundwater treatment. Floating petroleum products detected at site 22, Navy Exchange and site 6, Fire Training Area, will be addressed similar to site 14, New Fuel farm Area.

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
JANUARY 1993

4. MEETINGS AND REPORTS SCHEDULED FOR THE NEXT TWO MONTHS

Meetings

A progress review meeting has been scheduled for 10 February 1993 at NAVSTA TI control tower conference room.

A working and progress review meeting has been scheduled for 30 March 1993 at DTSC office in Berkeley, California at 9:00 A. M.

Reports

Project Monthly Status Report (February 1993)
Preliminary Summary Tables of Analytical Results (Partial)
Ecological Assessment Work Plan
Characterization Well Installation at Site 14, Final Field Work Plan, Volume 1

5. ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR THE NEXT TWO-MONTH PERIOD

The Navy and its contractor will:

- Start trenching work at Site 25 to confirm whether the anomaly at the site is a result of a buried storage tank.
- Continue the disposal of waste generated from the field investigations based on the approved waste management plan.
- Finalize the Investigation Derived Waste (IDW) Summary Report.
- Complete the Final Ecological Assessment Work Plan.
- Complete the Characterization Well Installation at Site 14, Final Field Work Plan, Volume 1.
- Continue validating the laboratory data.
- Continue working on the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report task, ecological assessment and human health risk assessment tasks.

**INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
SPECIAL TECHNICAL MEETING
RI/FS - PROGRESS STATUS
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
FEBRUARY 10, 1993**

Introduction

On February 10, 1993 at 10:00 a.m. representatives from California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC), Navy, and PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) met at the Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) to hold the progress meeting for the remedial investigation/feasibility study being conducted at NAVSTA TI. A copy of the agenda and list of attendees is attached.

1. There were no comments made on the minutes and the minutes accepted for the last two meetings held in December.
2. PRC reported that the field resampling was successfully completed in December, and that all analytical results had been received. The resampling results were similar to the original sampling which was resampled due to a procedural error in the laboratory, resulting in the samples exceeding their holding times. The resampled data has been validated and results indicate that none of the compounds analyzed were detected at the specified detection limit.
3. PRC indicated that the analytical results remaining to be submitted to Navy and DTSC are the storm water and sediment sample results. PRC provided the validated results for the ground-water samples and the resampling results at this meeting.

DTSC indicated that they would like to have a copy of all the results on a disc formatted in dBase III. Mr. Tom Lanphar, DTSC provided written details on format for the disc copy. PRC will respond to Mr. Lanphar regarding the ability to meet his request, although it was stated by PRC that no problems were anticipated.

Mr. Lanphar also asked whether Phase II sampling is anticipated and whether there would be sufficient time to collect Phase II samples so that the results could be incorporated into the RI. PRC indicated that there would be an opportunity to determine what kinds of samples need to be collected in April. The Navy would then have to issue a contract modification. If the modification were issued in May, PRC could prepare the contract required paper work in May. On the assumption that PRC could use the same field sampling protocols, PRC could begin field work in late June. If only soil borings were needed the time frame would be about 2 weeks to complete sample boring collections; however, it is anticipated that more monitoring wells will be required, and that the time frame in the field would be about six weeks. The Draft RI report is scheduled for submittal to DTSC in November 1993; therefore, if sample results were available in September, only the raw data could be provided in the currently scheduled RI. It was agreed to have a working meeting in late March to discuss the sample results and obtain DTSC's input on what additional samples they would want to see in a Phase II sampling. The meeting was scheduled for March 30th.

PRC also noted that it would be important to keep in mind remedial action data needs, for example, "was it possible for the project to proceed with the FS on the basis of the existing Phase I data?" If the purpose of Phase II is only to better define the boundaries of contamination, then perhaps the FS could proceed if there were sufficient data to begin screening and developing alternatives. Definition of the boundaries is usually continued in the remedial design phase. Three items were listed as the considerations as to whether Phase II sampling data would be necessary:

- data sufficient to complete risk assessment
- data to characterize extent of contamination
- data to perform alternatives analysis

4. Navy reported that the trenching to verify a possible buried tank at site 25, Sea Plane Maintenance Area, should be able to begin upon award of modification to PRC's current contract task order. The modification is expected in about 3 weeks.

5. Navy provided DTSC with a copy of the response to regulatory comments on the proposed baseline human health risk assessment approach document prepared by PRC (October 26, 1992).

6. PRC reported that they are near completion of the Investigation Derived Waste (IDW) Summary Report that discusses the characterization and disposal of the IDW. DTSC asked what the IDW were characterized as for disposal purposes. PRC reported that the IDW was classified as non-hazardous based on RCRA requirements. The analytical results were provided to a qualified waste hauler. The most competitive of the qualified firms was selected. Although the IDW was classified as non-hazardous, the proposal from the waste hauler was to dispose of the IDW at a Class I facility. A possible explanation as to why the disposal still went to a Class I disposal facility is the potential future liability disposing of contaminated IDW even though the constituents or concentrations may not be considered hazardous.

7. Navy reported that PRC is finalizing the Ecological Assessment Work Plan. The response to regulatory agency comments will be provided as an appendix to the work plan. This document will be submitted by PRC to Navy in about 2 weeks.

8. DTSC acknowledged not providing comments to the RI outline submitted by Navy for their review, but indicated that comments would be provided soon.

9. PRC indicated that some of the ground-water analytical results indicate elevated levels in the ground water. At site 25, elevated levels of diesel at 1,890 micrograms per liter (ug/L) and benzene at 1,700 ug/L were detected. At site 24, 5th Street Fuel Release, elevated levels of tetrachloroethene, trichloroethene, and 1,2 dichloroethene were detected at concentrations of 750 ug/L, 200 ug/L, and 31 ug/L, respectively. At site 14, Former Fuel Farm, and Site 22, Navy Exchange, elevated levels of fuel products were also detected. Consequently, PRC recommended that additional remedial actions be considered along with the proposed remedial action for Site 14. Navy reported that they would investigate the feasibility of an interim remedial action (IRA) for all of these sites. In addition, the IRA proposed could include Site 6, Fire Training Area, since floating product was reported to be present about the same time that remedial action was proposed for Site 14. Currently, Navy is pursuing installing wells at site 14 to begin a ground-water pump and treat program. Consequently,

Navy stated they will pursue modifying PRC's current contract task order to address IRA at sites 6, 22, 24, and 25.

Remediation for site 14 was proposed since it involved above ground tanks regulated under another program and was determined to be able to proceed independently from site 6, which contained contamination associated with USTs.

PRC asked if sites having contamination resulting only from USTs could be investigated and remediated apart from the RI/FS process and proceed under RCRA corrective action guidance. The potential advantage is to begin the cleanup of these sites on a separate track from that of the RI/FS and presumably the process would be completed sooner. Navy stated they would investigate what types of institutional or funding constraints may limit remedial action at sites with only fuel contamination. Mr. Lanphar encouraged such discussions within the Navy.

10. Navy acknowledged receipt of regulatory comments on the Field Work Plan for site 14, to design and install wells to begin ground-water pump and treat. PRC will begin addressing these comments.

11. Two items not on the agenda were added as follows:

DTSC asked whether the analytical results revealed elevated levels of lead that could be attributed to paint chips from the Bay Bridge. PRC indicated that this had not specifically been addressed that at this time.

DTSC asked for clarification regarding any plans to collect samples to develop background levels for NAVSTA TI. PRC indicated that there were no plans to collect samples for this purpose, and had assumed that it had been agreed at the December 17 meeting to proceed with the RI by evaluating the literature to determine background for Yerba Buena Island, and research possible literature on fill for Treasure Island.

12. The following action items were identified.

a. The next progress meeting was scheduled for March 30, 1993. This meeting will also have a working session following the meeting to discuss the analytical results to determine potential sampling needs for a phase II RI.

b. Navy will schedule a meeting with PRC to discuss the relationship between the UST and IR program and possible institutional or funding constraints of removing the UST sites from the IR program and have them proceed under RCRA corrective action guidance.

c. PRC will contact Jim Sullivan to determine the following: (1) whether notices have been mailed out to advise potential TRC participants of the March 2nd TRC meeting and, (2) whether the TRC meeting should still be held. If the meeting will still be held, then the presentation to the TRC will include the proposed remedial action plans and progress in completing the RI.

d. PRC will prepare a letter to Navy regarding the proposed sites to consider for remedial action.

e. DTSC will provide response to comments on the RI outline.

f. PRC (Thorsten Anderson) will respond to DTSC regarding submittal of laboratory data on a dBase III formatted disc.

g. Navy (Eddie Sarmiento) will check historical documents to determine whether there was a dry cleaning facility in Building 99.

AGENDA
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND RI/FS
MONTHLY PROGRESS MEETING
FEBRUARY 10, 1993, 10:00 A.M.
NAVSTA TI TOWER

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes (TRC, Technical Meeting)
2. Summary of Field Resampling for Samples Exceeding Holding Time
3. Status of Laboratory Analysis and Data Validation

Resampling Laboratory Analysis
Sediment/Stormwater Analysis
4. Status of Pending Field Work - Site 25 Trenching to Verify Possible UST
5. Completion of IDW Summary Report
6. Response to Regulatory Agency Comments on Human Health Risk Assessment Approach
7. Response to Regulatory Agency Comments on Ecological Assessment Work Plan and Completion of Ecological Assessment Work Plan
8. Response to Navy Submittal of Proposed RI Outline
9. Proposed Action to Investigate Contamination in Ground Water at Site 24
10. Receipt of Regulatory Comments on Field Work Plan for Installation of Remediation Wells, Former Fuel Farm Area
11. Other
12. Action Items and Next Meeting

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING

FEBRUARY 10, 1993

(NAVSTA TI TOWER @ 10:00 A.M.)

PERSONNEL	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
1. ERNIE GALANG	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2560
2. EDDIE V. SARMIENTO	NAVSTATI	(415) 395-5452
3. Gil RIVERA	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2551
4. Emily Puntel	PRC	415 543-4880
5. Ken Bowen	PRC	415 543-4880
6. Inorsten Anderson	PRC	415 543-4880
7. Thomas Lanphar	DTSC	510 540 3809
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		