

5090
Ser 1832.5/L7258
4 Sep 1997

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

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Encl: (1) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 20 May 1997
(2) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 17 June 1997
(3) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 22 July 1997

1. Enclosures (1), (2), and (3) are the approved and final Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes and are provided for your file and information

2. Thank you for your guidance and involvement in this project. For further information, please call me at (650) 244-2560.

Original signed by:

ERNESTO M. GALANG
By direction of
the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Ms. Mary Rose Cassa)
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Ms. Francesca D'Onofrio)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Ms. Gina Kathuria)
California Department of Fish and Game (Attn: Dr. Michael Martin)(w/o encl)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. Tom Huetteman)
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services (Attn: Mr. Steve Schwarzbach)(w/o encl)
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Attn: Mr. Julian Elliot)(w/o encl)
Bay Conservation and Development Commission (Attn: Mr. Steve McAdam)(w/o encl)
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (Attn: Ms. Laurie Sullivan)(w/o encl)
NAVSTA Treasure Island (Attn: Mr. Jim Sullivan)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Mr. Richard Knapp)

5090
Ser 1832.5/L7258
4 Sep 1997

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Distribution: (Cont.)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. James Aldrich	Mr. Rick Nedell
Mr. John Allman	Ms. Patricia Nelson (Co-Chair)
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Mr. Richard Hansen	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Paul Hehn (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Mr. Gary Jensen	TI Museum (Ms. Laurie Glass)
Ms. Alice LaPierre	TI Yacht Club (Mr. Harlan Van Wye)
Mr. Clinton Loftman	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Mr. Daniel McDonald	Mr. Brad Wong

Blind copies to:

1832(w/o encl) 1832.5EG, 64

Information Repository (3 copies)

Chron, RF

Writer: E. Galang, 1832.5EG, X-2560

File: NS Treasure Island

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 20 May 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 20 May 1997 at 7:15 p.m. at the Nimitz Conference Center, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) discuss comments on the Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 1, 3) introduce the Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 2, 4) present Remedial Investigation Revised Recommendations and Conclusions, Addendum 4, 5) receive an update on the Nimitz House Complex lead in soil, 6) summarize the Remedial Investigation Report commentary process, 7) provide general program updates, 8) review action items, 9) attend to organizational business, 10) provide an upcoming environmental report review schedule, and 11) review proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

I. WELCOME REMARKS

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed meeting attendees and announced that the next RAB meeting will likely be held at the Nimitz Center, meetings thereafter may be held in the Conference Room in the Bachelor's Quarters (next to the Nimitz Center).

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, requested an update on Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) funding changes and agency oversight.

The Navy Co-Chair reported to the RAB that the Department of Defense (DoD) reimburses states for regulatory oversight through DSMOA. Federal budget changes have provided fewer resources to DSMOA which may equate to reduction in state regulatory oversight. In cases where DoD sites have multiple regulatory agencies participation, all state parties may not be able to attend every meeting.

Mary Rose Cassa, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), added that there is a Bay Area list that delegates oversight responsibilities. The list indicates that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will provide oversight for Point Molate, Hunters Point, and TI; DTSC will oversee FISC Oakland, Alameda Annex, former Alameda Air Station, and Mare Island.

Gina Kathuria, RWQBC, noted that many factors are involved in the decision. Discussion took

place on the criteria being used to designate regulatory oversight, such as petroleum, ecology, and health issues, and status of the environmental cleanup process.

John Allman expressed concern regarding the potential decision to reduce agency oversight. Ms. Kathuria encouraged RAB members to voice their concerns if they disagree with the proposed change. Martha Walters noted that the list is "proposed" and has not yet been finalized.

Henry Ongerth asked Ms. Cassa whether agency staff could carry on adequately with the reductions. Ms. Cassa noted there would be an increased work load on each project manager. Mr. Allman motioned and Paul Hehn seconded that a letter be drafted expressing objections to the proposed reduction in agency oversight. Discussion of contents of the letter concluded that regulatory reductions could: 1) seriously narrow the scope of available expertise for a complex installation, 2) seriously overtax the project manager which may lead to quality issues, 3) affect the review time schedule, and 4) may affect protection of public health. It was agreed that Ms. Nelson and Mr. Hehn, together with Ms. Walters, and Bill Lee, City Administrator for the City of San Francisco, would draft a letter to be sent immediately to Paul Blais, Deputy Director of DTSC, and John Adams, head of the State Water Board in Sacramento.

Mr. Lee emphasized that the City supports the continued regulatory overview partnership between DTSC and the Water Board at Treasure Island. He offered to contact the Chair of the Appropriations Committee as well as personally contacting the heads of the Water Board and DTSC to express San Francisco's concerns over regulatory oversight reductions. Ms. Kathuria suggested that the RAB may want to consider joining with the Hunters Point RAB to strengthen their appeal.

Mr. Bill Lee introduced himself as the City Administrator for San Francisco. He stated that the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor had asked him to take a look at base closure issues. He has met with three of the RAB community members. Ms. Walters and Ms. Kathuria are also keeping him abreast of issues. He offered to involve City agencies in the TI process if requested by the RAB.

Ms. Nelson concluded the discussion by recognizing that a consensus had been reached among community members on the DSMOA issue. She stated that she and Paul Hehn would prepare a letter to the State with copies to Bill Lee and Martha Walters.

Mr. Sullivan introduced Ryan Brooks as the new Community Relations Director for EFA West. Mr. Brooks will be attending the RAB meetings and stated he will serve as a resource for the RAB. He can be reached at (415) 244-3109.

Discussion/Approval of 15 April Minutes

Mr. Sullivan noted that revisions to the March meeting minutes have not been mailed out; therefore, they were unable to be finalized.

The April meeting minutes were called into question by John Allman. He stated that there were several places where he thought things were not adequately expressed. He asked if the minutes could include Harlan Van Wye's concern about exposure of workers to contaminated sediment during pier piling removal (page 3, 5th paragraph). Mr. Allman cited page 6, last paragraph, should include a statement made by him stating that Site 12's high silver concentrations may be attributed to disposal of silver waste from photography labs. Also, page 9, first paragraph should include Dan McDonald's name in conjunction with development of the newspaper advertisement for RAB membership recruitment.

Mr. Allman also asked to include discussion about other buildings being sampled for lead in addition to the Nimitz House. He suggested sites historically known to contain buildings, since demolished, be investigated for lead based paint. Mr. Allman requested transcripts be attached to the minutes; he also requested a personal copy of the April and May RAB meeting transcripts.

Ms. Nelson expressed concern about the ongoing need for revision of the meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan stated the Navy will review the meeting minutes more closely and will send out court reporter transcripts of the last two meetings to John Allman; discussion at the interim meeting will help develop procedures for 17 June RAB meeting minutes.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Sullivan suggested that the Navy would like to partner with the City to disseminate information and solicit increased public interest in the RAB. Mr. Lee agreed to investigate how the City can help. Mr. Sullivan suggested information may be circulated in appropriate City publications.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

III. COMMENTS REGARDING THE DRAFT FINDING OF SUITABILITY TO LEASE FOR REUSE ZONE 1

James Aldrich volunteered to serve as timekeeper for the remainder of the meeting. Mr. Sullivan opened discussion on the Draft Reuse Zone 1 FOSL stating that the Navy was hoping to incorporate tonight's comments into the document.

Paul Hehn recalled UST issues pertaining to Zone 1, such as diesel tanks and impact to soil and groundwater. Mr. Sullivan noted that standard lease restrictions will be incorporated into this FOSL, and reiterated that all USTs are moving through the Water Board's Corrective Action Process (CAP). The Navy has proposed closure of some tanks in Zone 1; others are proposed for continued remedial investigation.

Ms. Nelson asked for clarification on comment period deadlines for three items that she understood the RAB was to comment on by 23 May: 1) Zone 1 FOSL, 2) TPH Toxicity Testing

Results, and 3) Additional Investigation for Sites 12 and 17. Mr. Sullivan noted that the comment period for the Zone 1 FOSL needs to be closed out as soon as possible because the City has leasing plans they want to put into effect. He agreed to extend the comment period to Friday, May 23, and noted that the Navy will try to set comment closure dates several days following a RAB meeting when possible.

IV. DRAFT FINDING OF SUITABILITY TO LEASE FOR REUSE ZONE 2

Mr. Sullivan stated the Draft Reuse Zone 2 FOSL will be issued Friday so that Zone 1 FOSL comments may be considered and incorporated where appropriate.

Nicole Peirce, Uribe Associates, introduced the Draft Reuse Zone 2 FOSL and provided a handout (Attachment C). Reuse Zone 2 will potentially be used by movie studios.

Zone 2 is divided into three reuse zones: 2A, 2B, and 2C. Reuse Zone 2A is comprised of one parcel, T009, which is classified as Environmental Condition of Property Area (ECP) Type 6 (an area with known contamination where response actions have not yet been taken). The area is co-located with IR Site 21. Parcel T009 is entirely paved and as such permits no direct exposure to soil or groundwater. Lease restrictions will be implemented that restrict invasive underground activities.

Reuse Zone 2B is comprised of 13 parcels: three are classified under Area Type 1, four are classified under Area Type 2; one is given an Area Type 6 classification; five are classified as Area Type 7 parcels. All parcels in Zone 2B, except those given Area Type 1 classification, will have restrictions on invasive underground activities. Area Type 1 classification is given where there is no release or disposal of contamination and unrestricted leasing is granted. Area Type 1 parcels are T013, T025, and T026.

Type 2 parcels have had petroleum releases or disposal. Type 2 parcels (T018, T109, T020, and T024) have underground fuel lines scheduled to be removed in fiscal year 1997. The Type 6 Parcel, T016, is co-located with IR Site 15. Ninety-five percent of the parcel is paved and presents no exposure risk from soil or groundwater contamination and no health threat from inhalation of VOCs.

The five Type 7 parcels (T011, T012, T015, T017, and T023), have potential contamination beneath storm drain lines. Storm drains were cleaned in 1996, and sampling results are not yet available. Results are expected by the beginning of June. Type 7 parcels in Zone 2B may have contamination migrating from adjacent IR sites and there is a potential effect from remedial activities. It has been determined that there is no soil or groundwater exposure risk and no health threat from inhalation of VOCs.

Reuse Zone 2C is comprised of Parcel T119 which has an Area Type 7 classification due to potential sediment contamination beneath Pier 1. There is a minimal risk from exposure to

sediment contamination. Parcel T119 has a lease restriction which allows no dredging.

Usha Vedagiri asked if the deed restrictions and risk from exposure are based on the assumption that paving will always remain in place. Mr. Sullivan clarified that lease assumptions are based on existing conditions of property. If improvements are proposed, they will be reviewed by the City staff and Navy.

Mr. Allman asked if there is a work plan for the Offshore Sampling Plan. He asked whether the Navy was planning to sample under the piers and where fuel piers have been demolished. Mr. Sullivan replied that samples are being taken in the Offshore Operable Unit in the vicinity of Pier 1, Clipper Cove, and in other locations around the island where there is reason to believe there may have been a release. Mr. Sullivan added that the Offshore Work Plan has been finalized for over a year and field work is being undertaken at this time.

John Allman questioned whether sampling was conducted inside the Reuse Zone 2B, Parcel Type 7 storm drains. Mr. Sullivan clarified that the inside of the drains were not sampled, but efforts focused instead on areas in the immediate vicinity of the lines thought to have a high probability of contamination, such as downstream damaged storm lines and potential upstream sources. He noted that sampling plans are found in the EBS Sampling Work Plan. Brad Wong asked if the Navy has reserved the right in all leases to continue IR work. Mr. Sullivan responded that the Navy has reserved the right of entry in all leases to conduct cleanup.

Mr. Hehn noted a fuel line crossing sites 15, 16, and 20 that he did not see addressed in the Reuse Plan, especially with regards to Parcel 15. He also noted above ground storage tanks (ASTs) indicated on parcels 15, 16, and 12 and wondered if they were considered in the FOSL. In follow-up, he questioned what the anticipated reuse was of the identified sites, and whether the AST and fuel lines would affect reuse. Ms. Peirce noted that one AST with secondary containment remains on parcel 18. Mr. Sullivan added that most ASTs in this FOSL are associated with the Clean Steam Plant. He added that site inspections and Environmental Baseline Surveys (EBS) that investigate and document signs of release are referred to in the FOSLs. At this time, the City is still assessing whether or not they will continue to operate the boiler plants. If the City does not use the boiler plants, the Navy will drain and clean the tanks.

Mr. Hehn asked what the reuse plan is for the FOSL. Mr. Sullivan stated the plan is to allow the City to make early, interim use of the facility in a similar manner to its current use. The City does not yet have a specific reuse proposal for those parcels in the Zone 2 FOSL.

Ms. Nelson asked when the results from the Pier 1 sampling would be made available. Mr. Sullivan stated the sampling was part of the Draft Offshore RI Report and would be available in January or February, 1998.

Mr. Sullivan announced that the Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 2 will be released May 23. He will provide copies to those interested.

IV. REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS, ADDENDUM 4

Mr. Sullivan announced that comments on Addendum 4 are to be received by 27 May. Richard Knapp, PRC, reviewed the contents of Addendum 4. Three previous addenda contribute to the fourth addendum: Addendum 1, Groundwater Modeling; Addendum 2, Additional Investigation of Sites 12 and 17; and Addendum 3, Petroleum Screening Levels.

Included from Addendum 1 are constituents projected to reach the Bay in concentrations greater than the ambient water quality concentrations (AWQC). These constituents are labeled ecological contaminants of concern (COCs). Included from Addendum 2 are additional data gathered from Site 12, monitoring well #16, and VOC data from Site 5. Addendum 3 adds total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) screening level data. Data was gathered using aquatic toxicity values protective of ecological receptors at the point where groundwater enters the Bay. The screening level threshold for TPH in groundwater was determined to be 14.3 mg/L and for soil 430 mg/kg. The soil threshold level incorporates a soil leaching factor that measures the amount of petroleum transferred from soil into the groundwater.

Mr. Knapp handed out a table indicating changes that will appear in the Draft RI. In summary, no new COCs were found in groundwater at sites 5, 7/10, 9, 17, and 21; no potential ecological impacts to the Bay were found at sites 5, 7/10, 9, 17, and 21. An Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) will be recommended for sites 7/10, 9, and 21. EE/CAs are recommended for expedited removal of high concentration contamination sources. Groundwater COCs were determined at sites 11 (copper, lead, silver, and zinc), 12 (silver), and 24 (PCE and TCE). Removal of total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) contamination at Site 17 was proposed under the Navy's UST program. Additional groundwater sampling is proposed at Site 24 that will characterize dense nonaqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) likely found beneath Building 99.

Mr. Knapp noted the change in emphasis for Site 12. The original RI objective for Site 12 was to evaluate the site for potential wetlands or park reuse; now residential standards are being considered and more investigation is being recommended.

Ms. Nelson asked about RAB comments on the Site 24 Work Plan that were to be considered by PRC and the Navy. She questioned whether discussed changes in scope would revise the conclusions in the Work Plan. Mr. Knapp stated that recommendations are to do additional sampling of DNAPLs. Ms. Nelson noted that Site 24 is adjacent to two other sites with petroleum issues. Mr. Knapp said he has reviewed data from Site 17 and Site 24, and information indicates there is no likelihood of commingling of petroleum and VOCs in that area. He added that these results will be reflected in the sampling plan.

Mr. Hehn asked how the groundwater leaching factor was used when the SESOIL modeling was

determined faulty. Mr. Knapp explained the soil leaching process and noted that SeSoil modeling was separate from the groundwater leaching factor. Mr. Hehn noted one or two other sites may have been candidates for the soil leaching process.

Mr. Hehn handed out comments for review on Addenda 1-3. He questioned the validity of Phase IIB data on which the addenda are based. Mary Rose Cassa stated that the addenda will be incorporated into the Draft Final RI, and issues may be revisited during the comment period for that document. Mr. Sullivan noted that there will be a 60 day comment period between the Draft Final and Final RI. The goal is to work towards issuing the Draft RI on 22 July.

Gina Kathuria offered to provide copies of the Eco-Tox TPH results to the RAB. Ernie Galang, RPM, will provide copies of the regulatory comments to the Technical Committee.

V. NIMITZ HOUSE COMPLEX LEAD IN SOIL DATA UPDATE

Jim Sullivan handed out the latest results of lead-in-soil sampling at Quarters #1, Yerba Buena Island. He explained that the Navy's intentions were two-fold: 1) to take additional samples from front and back lawn areas and 2) to do confirmation sampling after the upper 6 inches of soil was removed from the building perimeter. Results showed high levels of lead, so the Navy will remove another six inches of soil from the building perimeter and resample. Lead results from the lawn are not as high as from the planter box area, but several samples exceeded 400 parts per million. By the next RAB meeting, the additional six inches of soil will have been removed and confirmatory samples taken. If high levels of lead remain, the Navy may need to consider other options instead of further excavation.

Henry Ongerth asked if high levels of lead originated from house paint. Mr. Sullivan stated that high levels of lead determined in the planter boxes (in the order of thousands of parts per million) were from house paint. The lead levels (two hundred to six hundred parts per million) in the lawn were more likely caused by bridge maintenance rather than by house paint. Mr. Sullivan noted that the lead sampling plan is based on extensive sampling at the Nimitz House, and will be used at the other quarters in the area, since they are similar in nature. The Navy anticipates conducting less sampling around these buildings and spending more time on actual soil removal.

Ms. Vedagiri asked where the excavated soil is disposed of. Mr. Sullivan explained that the six inches of soil were deposited into two soil dumpsters where composite samples were taken. Results helped determine the appropriate type of landfill for disposal. The Navy is required to follow regulations for hazardous waste disposal. They sign a manifest certifying that the material goes to the proper type landfill and that it has been properly characterized.

Brad Wong asked about an earlier proposal to cover areas with high lead levels by the bridge with wood chips. Mr. Sullivan stated that as a result of RAB comment, the Navy performed additional testing of these areas, and may instead remove the soil with high lead levels. They are following

HUD guidelines for housing which sets 400 ppm as the upper limit. Lead removal falls under the Housing Lead Based Paint Abatement Program, which is not a CERCLA RI program. The latest results will be shared with the regulators and further plans will be developed which may include removal of soil with high concentrations of lead.

VI. REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT COMMENTARY PROCESS

RAB members met on May 13 with agency representatives, the Navy, and PRC to discuss data validity and the Site 24 Field Work Plan. Ms. Nelson drafted a written response from RAB member comments submitted in January outlining particular concern about immunoassay results and validity. Ms. Nelson noted that while no resolution was reached on the issues, the meeting proved to be useful. Issues were identified regarding Site 12 which the Navy responded to by developing a Supplemental Field Work Plan. A follow-up meeting will be held at the PGE Building on 11 June to discuss the Work Plan and other issues of interest.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Draft Site 12 Work Plan is scheduled to be issued in the middle of June. The Navy would like to discuss the Work Plan about a week before issuing the draft.

Mr. Wong asked how the addenda is integrated into the RI. Ms. Cassa explained that the RI process includes a report, a draft, a draft final and a final document. The RI was considered incomplete and these issues were address by the addenda. The addenda will be incorporated into the Draft Final RI. The Draft RI Addenda will be discussed at a workshop held on 03 June. The Draft Final RI will be issued on 22 July followed by a 60 day comment period.

PROGRAM UPDATES

VII. GENERAL UPDATES

a. RPM/BCT Updates

The RPM/BCT Meeting last month provided a general update on status of projects. Some discussion was held about Site 12. Meeting minutes will be available in about two weeks. Rachel Simons announced that she will be leaving U.S.EPA to further her education at Stanford University. She will continue to attend RAB meetings through June but is unsure about July. She noted there may be a gap in RAB meeting attendance until a replacement is found. The RAB extended appreciation to Rachel for her involvement with the RAB.

b. Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan has invited Larry Florin, the Mayor's Project Manager for TI Conversion, to attend a future RAB meeting. He will be encouraged to attend next month's meeting for discussion of the Housing FOSL.

VIII. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the following action items:

- The Navy awarded a data management contract for a UST GIS demonstration project. The sites TI plans to use for the demonstration are primarily in Zone 1 around Bldg. 1 and 227 with inclusion of YBI 270. An initial demonstration may be available for next month's RAB meeting. The information may lead to plans for data management for IR sites.
- A draft list of UST and fuel line documents has been provided to the RAB. Mr. Sullivan asked for RAB commentary on the list. A list of compliance documents will be available next month. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Information Repository (iR) contains CERCLA based documents; UST, AST and fuel line documents are not part of the CERCLA process, so these documents will be categorized separately from the rest of the IR documents.
- Official budget information should be available by the interim meeting on 11 June. There is likely to be some adjustment in the budget but it should not affect reuse, although parts of the Feasibility Study may be affected.
- Hugo Berston and Dan McDonald have drafted an ad soliciting new RAB members. John Allman suggested recruitment efforts be combined with the Hunters Point RAB for member solicitation.
- DTSC briefed the RABdsign
- on property transfer issues. The Navy will invite the City to discuss reuse issues, possibly next month.
- The UST decision making process will be worked out with Gina Kathuria.

OTHER BUSINESS

IX. ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS

Ms. Nelson thanked the Navy and Jim Sullivan on behalf of the RAB for the invitation to attend the NAVSTA TI closing ceremony.

X. UPCOMING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT REVIEW SCHEDULE

Jim Sullivan noted the Upcoming Document Schedule handout with changes as follows:

Comments are due on the Additional Investigation Sites 12/17 by 23 May.

Comments are due on the Groundwater Monitoring Results by 27 May.

Comments are due on TPH Toxicity Testing Results by 23 May.

Comments are due on the Draft Zone 2 FOSL by 20 June.

Comments are due on the Site 24 Investigation Work Plan by 29 May.

The Site 12 Investigation Work Plan will be available in mid-June; comment due date will be mid-July.

Comments for the Draft Zone 3 FOSL are due the Friday after July RAB meeting (July 22) and for the Draft Zone 4 FOSL, the Friday after the August RAB meeting (August 19).

The Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) will probably be available in September.

An informational fourth quarter groundwater report will also be made available 23 May.

The Draft Final RI Report will be released on July 22 for a 60 day public comment period.

XI. PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETINGS

June

- Zone 3 YBI Housing (may add areas of TI Housing)
- brief presentation on fuel line removal project
- EBS data
- Interim Uses

July

- Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (tentative)
- Reuse Zone 4 (TI Housing) FOSL

Mr. Hehn distributed copies of his comments on the four addenda to RAB members.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m., most likely at the Nimitz Conference Center, NAVSTA TI.

N60028_000746
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 20 MAY 1997

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000717

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 17 June 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 17 June 1997 at 7:20 p.m. at the Nimitz Conference Center, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) discuss comments on the Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) for Reuse Zone 2, 3) introduce the Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 3, 4) present an overview of the Fuel Line Removal and Closure Project, 5) receive summaries on the EBS Data Integration with CAP and CERCLA Programs, and Integration of Interim Uses and Cleanup, 6) provide general program updates, 7) review action items, 8) attend to organizational business, 9) provide an upcoming environmental report review schedule, and 10) review proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

I. WELCOME REMARKS

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed meeting attendees and announced that the next RAB meeting will likely be the last one held at the Nimitz Conference Center, RAB members will be notified of the new meeting location once identified. Mr. Sullivan added that the meeting may have to move to different locations monthly.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, announced that efforts are being made to tailor the agenda to keep with a 9:30 p.m. adjournment. Items identified as "time allowing" on the agenda will be taken up following the break as time permits. The RAB members indicated their agreement with this procedure.

Discussion/Approval of Draft 20 May Minutes

Mr. Sullivan stated that following discussion at the interim meeting, it was agreed that additional time will be devoted to review of the February, March and April draft meeting minutes.

Discussion and approval of these minutes will take place at the July RAB meeting. Mary Rose Cassa, DTSC, noted the following changes to the May meeting minutes: 1) corrected the spelling of the name *Blaise* on page 2, 2) corrected spelling of the word *SESOIL* on page 6, and 3) revised the sentence in the fifth bullet on page 9 to read *DTSC briefed the RAB on property transfer issues*. Ms Nelson stated that RAB member John Allman had volunteered to work out the issues with the prior minutes and help with future minutes. She thanked Mr. Allman for his efforts and proposed to approve the May meeting minutes as amended by Ms. Cassa. Mr. Sullivan noted the approval of the minutes and echoed thanks to all who provided assistance.

PAGE 2

THIS PAGE IS NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY NAVFAC
SOUTHWEST RECORDS OFFICE TO LOCATE THE MISSING
PAGE. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A
PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED SHOULD THE
MISSING ITEM BE LOCATED.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

DIANE C. SILVA, COMMAND RECORDS MANAGER, CODE EV33
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, SOUTHWEST
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY (NBSD BLDG. 3519)
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280

E-MAIL: diane.silva@navy.mil

activity. Mr. Sullivan responded that the restrictions are directed primarily towards the users of the property, in this case the residents. The Navy repair crews will be working with the City repair crews where municipal and public works type repairs are required. Mr. Hansen noted the need to be explicit due to rigorous OSHA requirements. Mr. Sullivan agreed on the need for clarification on the restrictions for invasive operations.

Ms. Nelson requested a summary of the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) data from which classification Type 6 and Type 7 were derived, and also asked about the sampling analytes that were being analyzed in the recent work performed at one of the sites. Lynne Srinivasan, Uribe and Associates, responded that the sampling took place from a work plan designed to evaluate theoretically highly contaminated storm drains. The work plan recommended sampling near storm drains in areas classified as Area Type 7 along with several other parcels. The work plan was implemented and the samples collected are now being evaluated. The results of the data may be ready for presentation to the RAB at the next meeting. Ms. Nelson asked the reason for restricting invasive underground activities at some of the parcels associated with the storm drains. Ms. Srinivasan stated that some of the locations are near IR sites and the Navy wants to prohibit digging activities. Some sites may be reclassified once all the EBS sampling data has been evaluated.

Ms. Srinivasan summarized the IR sites associated with Reuse Zone 3. The information is based on Phase IIB results and the Draft Remedial Investigation Report.

Reuse Zone 3A:

- parcel YB0002 is co-located with IR Site 16 and has been designated Area Type 2 due to release or disposal of petroleum products only.
- parcels YB0001, YB010, and YB017 are co-located with IR Sites 28 and 29 and have been designated Area Type 6 due to metals contamination.

Reuse Zone 3B:

- parcels T097, T105 and T106 are adjacent to IR Sites 6, 7, 12 and 20 and have been designated Area Type 7 due to potential contaminant migration from the IR sites. Contaminants at these sites include petroleum and metals.

Ms. Smith requested further information about the Yerba Buena small arms target range, noting she had not previously heard of this site. Mr. Sullivan responded that they only recently learned of its existence while conducting the EBS. The range was likely built in the pre-World War I era and closed prior to World War II. Through historical records, they believe to have identified the general location of the range, although the shoreline has changed over the years and it is in a very rugged area. Sampling was conducted at the site. Mr. Ongerth asked what the point is of transferring this parcel if it is essentially unusable due to the limitations of access and rugged terrain. Mr. Sullivan replied that the goal is to lease and transfer property for reuse, including the

housing and shoreline area. He noted that the site has to be included somewhere, but perhaps it may not need to be a part of this parcel. As an option, it could be separated from the rest of the parcel if determined that it would impede the lease of an adjacent facility.

Mr. Hehn asked if the small arms range site was sampled for lead. Mr. Sullivan indicated that it was. Mr. Hehn asked if parcel YB0002, co-located with IR Site 16, would carry a lease restriction for no invasive underground activity. Ms. Srinivasan affirmed that it would carry this lease restriction. Mr. Hehn then asked if the risk evaluation noted under Reuse Zone 3B Area Type 7 parcels was the result of a different risk assessment. Ms. Srinivasan noted that a risk evaluation was performed specifically for leasing these particular parcels and is part of the EBS report. Ms. Cassa noted that evaluation is the key word, and does not represent a rigorous risk assessment. Mr. Sullivan added that the use of a lease restriction for non-invasive underground activities represents a conservative approach. The thrust is to make use of existing facilities without performing site improvements.

Ms. Nelson pointed out that the Reuse Zone 3 FOSL will be issued on 27 June with comments due on 28 July. Karen Mendelow asked if the term invasive includes such activities as gardening. Mr. Sullivan replied that they had not reached a point of stipulating no gardening activities however, it raises a good point about distinguishing between allowable and non-allowable activities.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Reuse Zone 3 FOSL covers all of the YBI housing except the Nimitz Housing complex. There are 96 housing units in all. The seven-unit Nimitz Housing complex is being handled under another FOSL; there are a total of 103 housing units on YBI. Several hundred more housing units on TI will be added to the Zone 3 FOSL.

Mr. Hehn asked if additional sampling was performed at IR Sites 28 and 29, referring to the lead problem at the Nimitz housing complex. Ms. Srinivasan stated that there was no housing on the IR sites. For the current use of IR Sites 28 and 29 within Zone 3, it is not expected for people to be there on a regular basis. She also confirmed that lead was the primary metal contaminant at Sites 28 and 29. Martha Walters asked if the Navy had contacted Caltrans about their responsibility for the lead contamination. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Navy, Caltrans and the City are currently in discussions regarding bridge right-of-way and all of the issues including lead contamination will be handled in one negotiation. It is unknown how long the negotiations will take.

Mr. Ongerth asked Ms. Cassa about DTSC's view on casual exposure to lead contamination. Ms. Cassa responded that the risk assessment procedure addresses many factors including whether exposure is to an adult or to a child. Preliminary remediation goals have been developed by both U.S. EPA and DTSC for lead in soil. In the case of the Reuse Zone 3 FOSL, the area is not considered residential because the housing is not located in the parcels which have lead contamination from the bridge. DoD follows Housing and Urban Development guidelines for lead contamination in housing areas rather than considering it a release which falls under CERCLA guidance. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the issue of lead in soil pertains to all military bases and is being discussed at the Washington level between DoD and U.S. EPA.

V. Overview of Fuel Line Removal and Closure Project

Mr. Sullivan distributed a summary of the Fuel Line Removal and Closure Project (Attachment C) noting that the project was just getting underway. He explained that on TI, the underground fuel lines were used to transfer gasoline and fuel oil between tanks and the former piers, and that underground fuel lines on YBI transferred fuel oil from storage tanks to steam boilers. On TI, the fuel lines predominantly run along the east side of the island and also along 5th Street. The investigation included geotechnical sampling; a construction plan was developed for removing and closing the lines.

Mr. Sullivan continued that the basic scope of the work is to remove the lines on TI and to close the lines in place on YBI. The lines on TI are in poor condition and are located near the water table, whereas the lines on YBI are in good condition, lie above the water table and would be difficult to remove due to the rough terrain. Mr. Sullivan added that some sections of lines which run under buildings on TI may be closed in place, and that a short section of line on YBI will be removed. He noted that the procedure for closing a line in place includes purging it out, plugging the line with grout (an inert substance) and sampling both soil and groundwater in the vicinity of the closed pipe for leakage. He noted that the procedure is similar to closing a UST where it is closed in place and then monitored.

Mr. Sullivan stated that contingency work, such as additional lines found, removal of free product, and additional soil excavation along the trench wall will probably not be funded this year. This contingency work will still be done but at the cost of deferring some sections of the project to FY98. Harlan Van Wye asked if the fuel lines on Pier 1 would be left in place for possible commercial use. Mr. Sullivan stated he didn't think there were any fuel lines along the pier, only steam and electric lines. Ms. Nelson asked if there was a map showing the 11,202 lineal feet of underground fuel lines on TI, noting that it would help illustrate the areas addressed in this phase of removal and closure. Mr. Sullivan replied that it would be helpful to identify the total work under the contract; however, the contracted amount of work may be reduced due to the lack of contingency funding. He offered to prepare a better illustration indicating which fuel lines are included in this contract for both TI and YBI. Rachel Simons, U.S. EPA, pointed out that the work plan already contains several illustrations that may be suitable.

Ms. Smith asked whether monitoring will be conducted around the fuel lines on YBI. Mr. Sullivan affirmed that monitoring would continue along the lines. Ms. Smith asked if there was a map showing the groundwater and soil monitoring sites. Mr. Sullivan responded that a Remedial Investigation report will be generated as part of the data set developed from sampling activities. No samples have yet been taken. The data will be included in a Fuel Line Closure Report. Ms. Cassa added that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has carefully considered the spacing of the sampling points along the lines.

Mr. Sullivan stated that investigations are continuing to locate some additional, smaller-diameter lines that may exist underground. It is expected that if they do exist, they will contain only small quantities of hydrocarbons. Mr. Sullivan also noted the distinction made in handling fuel lines that

run outside of an IR site, which will require separate investigation, compared to lines that run through an IR site, which will be removed in the Fuel Line project and then evaluated as part of the IR investigation.

Mr. Hehn asked what would be done with the soil excavated around the pipes. Mr. Sullivan responded that it would be stockpiled then sampled, following UST guidelines. Heavily contaminated soil would be disposed of off-site however, a small quantity may be treated in place, depending on the contaminant levels. He noted that there would be several options available for treating the soil, although a method could not be determined at this time. Mr. Sullivan stated he was glad to get the fuel line project funded and underway because it impacts much of the base.

VI. EBS Data Integration with CAP and CERCLA Programs

Mr. Sullivan distributed a handout summarizing the EBS Data Integration with the CAP and CERCLA Programs (Attachment C) and briefly reviewed the information. He stated that sampling was conducted to fill some data gaps noted from the 1995 EBS. A draft copy of the Sampling Data Report will be available to the RAB within about a month. Recommendations will then be made for either no further action or be referred to either the UST or CERCLA program.

VII. Integration of Interim Uses and Cleanup

Mr. Sullivan reviewed a handout outlining the Integration of Interim Reuses and Cleanup (Attachment C). He noted that interim reuse is highly desired by the City and the Navy during the next 5 - 10 years and that they must work together to plan interim reuses. The Navy maintains the right of entry and when proceeding to site remediation, but will take adjacent lease tenants into account so they are not impacted upon. Some leases may require adjustment in order to proceed with cleanup however, the objective is to achieve a successful parallel of both reuse and cleanup.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

VIII. General Updates

RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan announced that the June 2 BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting included discussions on lead-based paint issues, no further action documents, EBS Sampling and the FFSRA schedule. The next BCT meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 1, 1997 at 9:30 a.m. at the DTSC offices in Berkeley. Mr. Sullivan added that future RAB agendas will include BCT meeting information.

Ms. Smith asked about the status of Sharon Tobias as PRC's general contact person for TI. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that Richard Knapp of PRC was transitioning into the project manager role in place of Ms. Tobias. Ms. Smith asked where the off-shore sediment sampling had been conducted.

Mr. Sullivan replied that these sediment sampling sites were part of one comprehensive off-shore sampling plan. Ernie Galang, EFA West, noted that the information could be found in the Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment document. Ms. Smith asked about the discussion with EPA at the BCT meeting regarding off-site soil disposal. Ms. Simons responded that she had informed the Navy about a regulation that requires CERCLA contaminated waste taken off-site to be disposed of in an EPA-certified landfill.

Ms. Nelson directed a question to Ryan Brooks, EFA West, about the reason for holding a BCT meeting prior to tonight's RAB meeting. Ms. Cassa noted that the meeting was an agenda item at the last BCT/RPM meeting; it was thought that the BCT might benefit from an informal meeting with the Co-Chairs of the RAB. Ms. Nelson noted for the record that she did not receive adequate notice for attending the meeting and added that the invitation should be extended to all RAB members. She did, however, like the idea of meeting with the BCT, given proper notice and open invitation to all RAB members. Mr. Brooks explained that as EFA West's new Director of Community Relations, his intent was to meet with the co-chairs to get their input. Ms. Nelson noted the difficulty in members attending the regularly scheduled monthly BCT meetings due to scheduling conflicts. She further stated that any additional BCT meetings, such as the one called earlier tonight by Mr. Brooks, should be noticed at least a week in advance, and that if Co-Chairs are to attend as representatives of the RAB, that they have the opportunity to meet with RAB members separately prior to the BCT meeting. Mr. Brooks agreed to provide adequate notice for future meetings and inform them of intended agenda items.

Mr. Brooks distributed a questionnaire to RAB members requesting that they be filled out and returned to him at the next meeting. He will then compile the responses and work with the BCT and the RAB members to interpret the results.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan informed the RAB that the Conference of Mayors will be held at TI this coming Sunday. No other City reuse issues are pending other than to complete the FOSLs. He is hopeful that City representatives will attend the July meeting and provide their thoughts on reuse. Ms. Smith stressed the importance that City representatives, and in particular Larry Florin, attend the RAB meeting to receive RAB input on possible flaws in the cleanup process. She added that if the City doesn't attend, the purpose of the RAB becomes questionable. Mr. Sullivan responded that he has encouraged Mr. Florin to attend the RAB meeting.

IX. Review of Action Items

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the status of the following action items:

- The data management contract for USTs is underway and a demonstration is scheduled for the July meeting.
- A list of compliance documents is being developed to add to the list of UST documents.
- Official budget information is not available yet but may be available by the interim meeting,

following the Navy's briefing of the regulators. The remaining funding is expected to be minimal. Site 12 sampling and lead-based paint and asbestos abatement in the housing remains a priority. Of the \$9-10 million projected budget, TI is likely to get about \$5-6 million, representing about a one-third cut. It is difficult to determine the budget prospects for FY98. The \$80 million estimated for total cleanup of TI is a target number which will be adjusted as the remediation stage is reached at the sites. Much of the remediation costs are unknown at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS:

X. Organizational Business

Recruitment Efforts

Mr. Sullivan stated that efforts towards RAB membership recruitment were behind however, he plans for the contract documents for the advertisements to be out by the end of June so the ads will run in July. Mr. Hansen added that RABs at other sites in Northern California are in a similar situation regarding recruitment. Tunstall Lang from Hamilton AFB announced that their RAB had minimal success with advertisements and received a much greater response from press releases sent out to the media. She recommended this approach because they found it highly effective with minimal associated cost.

Ms. Cassa asked if the RAB had considered using the Internet as a recruitment tool and suggested that Aimee Houghton of Career Pro might offer assistance. Mr. Sullivan agreed that they should expand efforts because interest in TI is Bay-wide. He suggested that the RAB consider developing a standard continuing process for membership recruitment. Thomas Thompson offered to help put together a press release. Mr. Brooks offered to look into Internet possibilities and will report back progress at the next meeting.

In other business, Ms. Nelson noted that the community member comments on the RI Addenda will be mailed out to RAB members. She and Mr. Hehn sent a letter to DTSC and RWQCB requesting that DTSC remain involved in the cleanup of TI. No agency response has been received back as yet from the letter. Ms. Cassa added that no decision has been made yet on the part of the agencies regarding this issue. Ms. Nelson noted that a copy of the letter would be included with the RI Addenda comments mailing.

Interim Meetings

Ms. Nelson stated that two interim meetings had been held since the last RAB meeting. Mr. Hehn summarized them by informing RAB members that the additional meetings have been an effort to establish a process with the Navy, the regulators and PRC in reaching a higher level of dialogue and dealing with issues earlier on. He added that the additional effort is improving the dialogue and making the process work more smoothly.

XI. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the schedule for major documents over the coming six months to include:

- Zone 3 and Zone 4 FOSLs
- The Draft Final RI expected to be released July 22.
- There may be additional FOSLs, although TI may reach a slowdown in work due to questionable funding
- The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is planned for release in September
- There may also be a few more UST-related documents

As an informational note, Mr. Van Wye stated that the Yacht Club had identified repairs needed to the docks noting the repairs would be conducted in an environmentally sensitive manner. The City will select the contractor to perform the work.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the coming meeting schedule, noting that the July RAB meeting will be shifted to the fourth Tuesday due to conflict with a Navy conference; all subsequent RAB meeting will keep to the third Tuesday of the month. The interim meetings will now be held on the second Wednesday of the month. Ms. Nelson requested that Mr. Hehn fill in for her as Co-Chair of the July meeting because she will be unable to attend.

XII. Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the proposed agenda items for the July and August meetings in addition to unscheduled topics as follows:

July

- Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 4 (TI Housing)
- Discussion/Approval of the February, March and April Meeting Minutes
- GIS for UST Sites demonstration (tentative)

August

- Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) presentation
- Petroleum Issues on Adjacent Property on Yerba Buena Island

Unscheduled

- Introduction to the Geographic Study Site for the Cleanup Process
- Role of the RAB
- Information Repository/Administrative Record
- CERCLA Feasibility Study (FS) Overview
- BTAG Update

Stacey Lupton, PRC, announced plans to prepare a "meet the RAB" poster that would include information on the history and purpose of the RAB. She briefed the RAB on the project and recruited Karen Mendelow to serve as a reviewer of the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 22 at 7:00 p.m., at the Nimitz Conference Center.

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 17 JUNE 1997

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000726

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 22 July 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 22 July 1997 at 7:17 p.m. at the Nimitz Conference Center, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) have a presentation of the Technology Needs Assessment by the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team Environmental Technology Partnership (BADCAT ETP), 3) comment on the Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) for Reuse Zone 3 (Yerba Buena and South TI Housing), 4) preview the Draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 4 (North TI Housing), 5) receive a UST Investigation Report for Sites 1A, 1E, 180C, 201, 368A and 368B, as well as a draft Work Plan for UST Site 270, 6) receive a FY97 project update and discuss FY98 planning, 7) review the Fuel Pipeline Oversight and Sampling Program, 8) provide general program updates, 9) review action items, 10) attend to organizational business, 11) provide an upcoming environmental report review schedule, and 12) review proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

I. WELCOME REMARKS

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed meeting attendees and announced that the next RAB meeting will likely be held at the Nimitz Conference Center, although it has not yet been confirmed. RAB members will be notified of any meeting location change. Mr. Sullivan reminded RAB members to turn in their completed RAB surveys to Ryan Brooks, EFA West.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

There were no comments on the meeting agenda. Mr. Sullivan announced that a photographer was present to take photos of the meeting for use in the RAB poster. He requested permission from the RAB members to have the photos taken.

Discussion/Approval of Draft 17 June Minutes

Mr. Sullivan pointed out that draft copies of the meeting minutes are now stamped with the word "DRAFT", to distinguish between those and the final approved version. Christine Shirley noted a misspelling of the name Aimee Houghton, page 8, third paragraph. Mr. Sullivan suggested that approval of the June 17 meeting minutes be deferred until the interim meeting, noting the low number of members in attendance. Henry Ongerth stated that a vote should be taken now on acceptance of the minutes rather than prolong the process. A vote was taken and the June 17 meeting minutes were approved as amended.

II. Public Comment

There was no comment from the public.

III. BADCAT ETP Technology Needs Assessment Presentation

Mr. Sullivan noted that representatives from BADCAT were not present and so there would be no presentation this evening. The presentation will be rescheduled and it is expected that copies of the technical needs assessment document will be distributed to RAB members at that time.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

IV. Comments Regarding the Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease for Reuse Zone 3

Mr. Sullivan opened the meeting to comments for the Draft Reuse Zone 3 FOSL which covers the housing on Yerba Buena Island (YBI) and portions of TI housing not included in IR Site 12. He noted that the document was issued on July 8, 1997 and the public comment period will close prior to the next RAB meeting, on August 8, 1997. There will be an additional opportunity to comment at the interim meeting on August 5, 1997; written comments can be submitted as well.

Paul Hehn asked if the underground pipes had been removed in these areas. Mr. Sullivan stated that on YBI, the pipelines will be either closed in place or some cases will be removed. On TI, the pipeline does not run through the housing area; pipeline removal will not affect this area. Chris Shirley asked if the FOSL addresses Best Management Practices for storm water discharges. Mr. Sullivan explained that the Environmental Baseline Survey is not a compliance document but evaluates the current condition of the property. Storm water discharge practices are addressed in the leases which contain environmental protection clauses. He also noted that TI operates under a state-directed storm water compliance program. Ms. Shirley stated that the lawsuit between the Navy and Baykeeper/ARC had been settled, and the outcome beefs up the storm water compliance process. Gina Kathuria, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), noted that the storm water permit is issued by the Water Board. Mr. Sullivan added that the Navy still runs the storm water compliance program although it may eventually be run by the City. He noted the importance that compliance programs be adequately linked to the leasee; the Navy will inspect leasee activities to ensure they remain in compliance.

EBS Screening Level Data Report

Mr. Sullivan announced that the EBS Screening Level Data Report just became available a week ago and introduced John Borrego of Uribe and Associates to provide a review. Mr. Sullivan added that this document is a follow-up to the EBS performed in 1985.

Mr. Borrego distributed a handout (Attachment C) and explained that the purpose of the EBS Sampling and Analysis is to resolve data gaps identified in the basewide EBS and to evaluate the storm sewer system as a potential source or conduit for contaminant migration. Four target areas where potential releases may have occurred, and eight storm sewer corridors were identified.

Target Area T002: A former generator pad; total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) detected below screening criteria; no further action recommended.

Target Area T018: Above ground storage tank (AST) 34A; one of three samples taken of THP was above screening criteria; follow-up sampling recommended three additional surface samples be taken in a 10 feet radius along with one subsurface soil sample and one groundwater sample.

Target Area T029: An incinerator building; incinerator equipment appeared to contain friable asbestos material and therefore no sample was taken; potential for dioxin release noted in basewide EBS; wipe sample collected from sooty material on inside walls of building did not detect dioxin; no further action was recommended.

Target Area YB03/20: Former pistol and small arms target range; potential lead release noted in basewide EBS; eight surface soil samples collected; lead detected within background in six of eight samples; additional two samples above background (63 mg/kg) but below preliminary remediation goal; no further action was recommended.

Target Corridors: The storm sewers were evaluated to determine if they are a potential source of contamination and act as a conduit for contaminant migration from nearby IR sites. The sediment sample results indicated that the compounds detected are related to vehicle and road runoff as well as nearby IR sites. MTBE was detected in some samples; there is no published screening criteria or cleanup goals for MTBE in soil.

The EBS Sampling and Analysis Screening Level Report of July 16, 1997 details the follow-up sampling recommendations for the extent of TPH contamination at Target Area T018 and for sources of MTBE contamination in four of the eight target corridors.

Mr. Ongerth asked if the catch basins and manholes sampled for sediment contamination were part of active lines. Mr. Borrego indicated that the lines were active and had been cleaned in 1996, so those contaminants detected were recent accumulations. Mr. Hehn asked why no further action was recommended at some of the target areas. Mr. Borrego responded that the recommendation was based on the limited sampling and the limited potential for a release.

Mr. Hehn asked how the samples are analyzed. Mary Rose Cassa, DTSC, explained that the analysis are performed to the same standards as the IRP, and that the testing is done in the lab and not in the field. Mr. Hehn asked if historical changes in the topography had been examined regarding the location of the small arms firing range, and whether subsurface investigations were conducted. Mr. Borrego stated that the subsurface had not been looked at because many physical

changes have occurred in that area and the actual location of the range is unknown. Mr. Hehn asked if it was fair to recommend no further action if there is no information on which to base the decision. Mr. Borrego noted that they do have some information. Ms. Srinivasan added that it is difficult to determine where to collect samples due to the dramatic change in topography, and expressed confidence that additional samples would not yield a definitive answer. Mr. Ongerth pointed out that the small arms firing range is a low priority in the whole cleanup process. Mr. Hehn agreed that the issue was low priority, but expressed his concern regarding the no further action recommendation.

Ms. Shirley asked if EPA's residential Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) were used. Mr. Borrego stated that they were. John Allman asked if other contaminants, such as TPH gas, would be evaluated along with the MTBE. Mr. Borrego indicated that evaluation would include TPH gas, BTEX and diesel as well as MTBE. Mr. Allman asked how they would go about conducting an evaluation, considering these compounds could wash down into the basins from the roads. Mr. Borrego stated that the drainage areas are well delineated and would be part of the determination in where to put sampling locations. Mr. Allman asked how this would affect off-shore sampling, since the compounds could be entering the Bay. Mr. Borrego pointed out that the contaminants were not detected in the catch basin samples, only in the soil samples along storm drain lines.

Mr. Sullivan stated that TI still has an on-going storm water program as part of the compliance program, and samples are required to be taken during the year as part of the monitoring process. Joseph Alcedo asked what the half life is of MTBE in the soil. Ms. Srinivasan replied that MTBE is less volatile than similar compounds such as benzene and toluene and that it generally moves into the groundwater. She added that EPA has not issued an official statement on MTBE, and that its carcinogenicity is unknown. Mr. Sullivan noted that copies of the report have been distributed to Mr. Allman, Ms. Shirley and Mr. Hehn for review, and that anyone else may request a copy from him.

V. Preview of Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease for Reuse Zone 4

Mr. Sullivan distributed a summary of the Draft Reuse Zone 4 FOSL (Attachment C), noting that this is the last of TI's large FOSLs for the 1997 program year. The document is expected to be released in early August. The FOSL covers the TI housing within IR Site 12.

Mr. Srinivasan stated that Reuse Zone 4 is comprised of seven parcels, with one parcel designated as ECP Area Type 1, two parcels as Area Type 6 and four parcels as Area Type 7. She then reviewed the environmental issues related to Reuse Zone 4, namely IR Sites 12, 06 and 20, and the storm sewer lines, as follows:

IR Site 12

Based on information from the draft Remedial Investigation Report and the Risk Assessment for IR Site 12, it is estimated that the carcinogenic risk from exposure to soil is within the target risk

range. Lead in the soil is the primary risk driver for this site. EPA and DTSC have been asked for input on the approach to handling the risk. A lead distribution map is being proposed to identify concentrations on the property and to be used for comparison with NAVSTA TI acceptable concentrations. Concentration levels would guide use of the area - some areas may not be leased or may be fenced off, while others might prohibit or limit activities through lease restrictions. Ms. Srinivasan asked for comments on this approach.

Ms. Shirley commented that she considered "acceptable lead concentrations" to be a red flag term. Mr. Alcedo asked if consideration was given to the mercury in lead-based paint. Mr. Sullivan responded that some elements were screened out as potential contaminants of concern during the original IR site investigation, and so no further studies have been performed on them.

Mr. Allman commented that the synergistic effects of elements such as antimony, silver and lead should be considered at IR Site 12. Ms. Srinivasan stated that the distribution of these elements is not widespread especially for antimony. Richard Knapp, PRC, added that a suite of metals are being investigated through the entire process. Mr. Allman asked if silver was detected in the soil as well as in the groundwater. Mr. Knapp indicated that it was. Mr. Allman commented about adding the risks of different metals together, noting that small amounts of several metals when combined may create a greater risk than when they occur individually. Ms. Srinivasan stated that the combinations do get evaluated as part of the risk assessment. Mr. Allman referred to studies evaluating the effects of the combination of metals and agreed to provide literature citations for the research he is aware of.

Laurie Glass recommended that there should be requirements for landscaping or vegetative cover to reduce contact with the soil in IR Site 12. She also suggested that a safe play area for children should be provided as well as a vegetable garden area so alternatives are available for tenants. Richard Hansen expressed concern over proposing to limit lease renewals. Mr. Sullivan noted that the recommendations proposed are for interim measures to lease the housing while completing remediation. He added that this approach allows more housing to be leased in the interim, and also puts a cap on the duration of use, since some remediation activities may require the housing to be vacated. Ms. Glass asked if there is a public trust issue with long-term lease of that housing. Mr. Sullivan replied that it may be considered a Tidelands Trust issue, however it is outside of his area of expertise.

Mr. Alcedo commented that prohibiting children may jeopardize interest in use of the housing. Harlan Van Wye asked if there was any evidence that the children of base personnel had been harmed by lead concentrations in the soil over the years. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there has been no evidence of harm at TI, and that normal medical care would have identified any problems associated with exposure to lead. He added that the military population is a largely transient population and so exposure may have been limited.

Mr. Van Wye asked if the Navy has used lead-based paint. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy had up until the 1970s. The newest TI housing was built in 1989 and so has no lead, however 700 of

the 900 housing units were built during the period when lead-based paint was used. Mr. Hansen asked if lead was the only issue in making the housing safe. Mr. Sullivan responded that the FOSL presents the last hurdle, and that the housing has otherwise been found suitable for use for the short term.

Mr. Hansen asked why the Navy can't just remove the top six inches of soil and consider the lead risk to have been minimized. Mr. Allman noted that there are other contaminants of concern besides lead. Ms. Srinivasan noted that lead is the primary concern, although it would be very expensive to remove the top layer of soil. She added that landscaping would help minimize the risk of lead in soil exposure.

Mr. Hehn stated that a lead distribution map would be a good start if it is based on an adequate amount of information. He asked if this evaluation would await the results of the additional investigation of IR Site 12. Mr. Sullivan stated that the draft work plan for the additional investigation would not be available until mid-August, and the Navy is still seeking the funding to do the field work planned for this fall. Mr. Sullivan added that the EBS FOSL process is intended as a screening process for determining the suitability of property for lease, and not as part of the cleanup investigation process. The EBS FOSL makes an evaluation based on the existing data. Mr. Sullivan noted that it does raise the issue of whether taking a remedial action, such as soil removal, might have a significant effect on the EBS FOSL evaluation for the leasability of a property.

Mr. Hehn expressed concern that the FOSL would proceed without the information provided by the additional sampling. Until this information is available, he added, the risks are unknown. Ms. Srinivasan stated that the source areas have been identified and sampled, but the additional information from further sampling is not likely to prohibit leasing the areas. Mr. Hehn expressed disagreement, stating that a lot of the source areas identified have not been sampled and it therefore can't be assumed there are no other sources due to lack of information. He added that moving through the FOSL process at this point presents a potential endangerment to those who might live on the property.

Dan McDonald proposed an additional restriction to not allow pregnant women, as part of the City's homeless housing program, to be housed at the site due to health risks. Mr. Sullivan clarified that the City's use of the term *transient* does not necessarily refer to homeless people. He noted that he will be attending a meeting with the City tomorrow and will bring information back to the RAB on this topic. Mr. McDonald stated that the City is under pressure to house the homeless, and they may be inclined to use the property more quickly for homeless housing. Mr. Allman noted that lead does not pose much risk to a fetus; it is primarily a risk to children who ingest it. Mr. McDonald acknowledged that the issue involves political and social policy concerns. Mr. Hansen suggested that the City Housing Office be contacted.

IR Site 06

This site was paved so there is no direct contact with the soil. No potential human health risks were determined.

IR Site 20

This site is either paved or landscaped, minimizing direct exposure to soil. Concentration levels were significantly lower than those for IR Site 06, so no potential human health risks were determined.

Storm Sewer Lines

The catch basins and manholes were cleaned in 1996. Some TPH-associated runoff was detected in the lines. Follow-up sampling is recommended to determine MTBE concentrations.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the document would be released in early August and that there would be opportunity for further discussion at the August 5 interim meeting as well as the next RAB meeting. Mr. Allman asked if the GIS information would be accessible. Mr. Sullivan indicated that it would be accessible, possibly at the library site, but a time has not yet been determined. Some information may be put on a Web site on a trial basis.

VI. UST Investigation Report for Sites 1A, 1E, 180C, 201, 227, 368A and 368B, and Draft Work Plan for UST Site 270

Mr. Sullivan distributed summaries of the draft final Revised UST Investigation Report and Corrective Measures Study as well as the draft RI Work Plan for Former UST Site 270 (Attachment C), noting they are two separate documents. He stated that the Navy wants to close out comments for these documents on July 25. The intent is to finalize the documents, however they do not yet have funding to undertake the investigation and remediation. The information from some of these documents will be loaded into the GIS program. Mr. Allman asked if the Navy will re-evaluate the location of the groundwater plumes once funding is received. Mr. Sullivan expressed hope that it won't take long to get the funding.

VII. FY97 Project Funding Update and FY98 Planning

Mr. Sullivan informed the RAB that all funding allocated to TI for FY97 has been spent. Additional funding has been requested for several priorities: additional sampling at IR Site 12, and asbestos and lead paint abatement. Mayor Willie Brown sent a letter to EFA West requesting the Navy to get the necessary funding to support proceeding with IR Site 12. It may be incrementally funded. Mr. Sullivan agreed to see if a copy of Mayor Brown's letter could be provided to the RAB.

Ms. Shirley asked if the RI was not going to be funded. Ernie Galang, EFA West, stated that the draft final would be issued in early August, and they are awaiting funding for the final RI. He noted that the final RI will be only a few months behind schedule.

Mr. Alcedo asked if the housing considered not rentable will not undergo lead and asbestos abatement. Mr. Sullivan explained that the Navy follows HUD guidelines for lead-based paint.

Housing from 1960 on must be inspected and occupants have to be informed of potential hazards. Housing built after 1978 is not required to be tested. TI has a total of 1,007 units, 43 units constructed prior to 1960 and which might need remediation. Most of the other units can be leased out with just notification to occupants about lead. If asbestos is present, then it must be disclosed, and if it is damaged, it must be either repaired or removed.

Ms. Shirley asked if the fuel line project would be affected by the funding situation. Mr. Sullivan stated that the contract had been awarded and construction begun on the project. There is currently no contingency funding, and so some of the pipeline work will be shifted into 1998 to allow for contingencies this year. He added that because the Navy is closing out this fiscal year, some remaining work for the UST Program and lead paint and asbestos work may be deferred to the next fiscal year. Mr. Allman asked if money for budgeted work can be taken back by the Navy. Mr. Sullivan stated that in this case the money was budgeted but then became unavailable; all the money has been used so TI won't be penalized next year.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the information for the FY98 budget is more sketchy, and he will provide a summary handout to the RAB at the next meeting. The broad goal is to complete the investigations in 1998 so TI can then move into the cleanup phase.

VIII. Fuel Pipeline Oversight and Sampling Program

Mr. Sullivan stated that the work plan for the Fuel Pipeline Oversight and Sampling Program is available, and he will send out copies upon request. The information will be used in a potential remedial investigation of areas around the pipeline.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

IX. General Updates

RPM/BCT Meeting

The July 1 meeting of the BCT included discussion on the FOSLs, an update on leasing and transfer issues (Site 12), funding, the Site 12 Work Plan, and an update on the FFSA schedule for IR sites. The next meeting is scheduled for August 12 at EFA West.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Van Wye noted that the City Parks Department will take over operation of the TI Marina, and that the Yacht Club will continue to use the facilities. Mr. Sullivan reported that the Navy and the City are close to agreement on use of the museum in Building 1. Requests for Proposal have been issued for use of Casa de la Vista and the Fogwatch buildings and should soon be leased.

X. Review of Action Items

Mr. Sullivan noted no new action items. He is developing a list of compliance documents. RAB membership efforts may be combined with the Hunters Point RAB, including a joint newspaper ad soliciting new members. Mr. Brooks has also expressed interest in helping to develop a press release targeting new members. Mr. Allman noted that he had not yet received copies of all the meeting transcripts so he could review them. Mr. Sullivan stated he would see that Mr. Allman receives transcript copies.

OTHER BUSINESS:

XI. Organizational Business

Mr. Hehn reviewed the following items of business discussed at the interim meeting:

- Provide a list of standard items of concern for the FOSLs to be used while preparing the documents; a list will be provided at the next interim meeting for RAB comments.
- Further explanation of the Corrective Action Plan to include why it only covers UST sites transferred out of the IR program, and not all UST sites (Jim Sullivan will give a presentation on this topic).
- Getting support for the necessary funding for investigation and remediation work at TI and YBI to include some form of letter writing campaign.

Ms. Glass recommended developing a list of points to include in the letter. Mr. Hehn stated that he would like to see the RAB work with the City on this and perhaps get more local authorities involved in the funding issue, like Supervisor Yaki. The RAB members concurred that a letter writing campaign would be beneficial. Mr. Hehn suggested that they might write the letter at the next interim meeting.

Mr. Allman asked what resulted from the RAB's letter to DTSC and the Water Board regarding their proposed division of duties for the base cleanup programs. Ms. Kathuria stated that the split between the two agencies had occurred with some bases, however they chose to remain status quo for TI.

XII. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan stated that an updated document review schedule would be included with the next meeting minutes mailing.

XIII. Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan reviewed next month's RAB meeting agenda as follows:

August

- Site 12 Investigation Work Plan
- Draft Final Remedial Investigation Report
- Comments Regarding the Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease for Reuse Zone 4
- Draft FY98 Project Execution Plan
- GIS for UST Sites Demo
- Discussion/Approval of the February, March and April Meeting Minutes

September

- Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Presentation
- Petroleum Issues on Adjacent Property on Yerba Buena Island
- Integration of Interim Uses and Cleanup
- Draft Reuse EIS/EIR

Unscheduled:

- Introduction to the Geographic Study Site for the Cleanup Process
- Role of the RAB
- Information Repository/Administrative Record
- CERCLA Feasibility Study (FS) Overview (pending funding)
- BTAG Update

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 19 at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1. The specific location in the building will be identified in the separate meeting agenda mailing.

N60028_000746
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 22 JULY 1997

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000738