

**INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM  
MONTHLY PROGRESS MEETING  
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND**

**July 20, 1993**

**Introduction**

On July 20, 1993, at 1:00 p.m., representatives from California Environmental Protection Agency's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB), the Navy, and PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) met at Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI), California, to hold the monthly progress meeting for the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) being conducted at NAVSTA TI. A copy of the agenda for the meeting and the attendees list are provided as Attachments 1 and 2.

**Agenda Topics**

**1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes**

The minutes from the June 21, 1993 meeting were reviewed for action items remaining to be addressed. The following items were identified for discussion.

- a. Mr. Tom Lanphar, DTSC, reported that Ms. Debra Oudiz, DTSC staff toxicologist, would review and provide written comments regarding the Preliminary Risk Assessment for the Family Housing Area.
- b. Mr. Lanphar responded to the Navy's request for a policy statement regarding the authority to conduct removal actions at petroleum-contaminated sites. Mr. Lanphar provided a copy of the DTSC Memorandum "Policy and Procedures on Petroleum Exclusion," dated September 8, 1992. In summary, the DTSC's policy is more stringent than the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) interpretation of the term "petroleum exclusion." The state does not exclude refined fractions of petroleum and crude oil. Mr. Lanphar indicated that the policy is interpreted by their department as not excluding substances such as benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, and xylene.
- c. Mr. Jim Sullivan of the Navy reported that he still plans to contact the NAVSTA TI Base Physician to discuss the concern about increased respiratory ailments that was brought up by a parent who attended the Open House on June 10, 1993.
- d. Ms. Pimentel, PRC, reported that she had failed to incorporate the name change agreed upon at the last meeting for Site 24. The site would in future documents be referred to as the Fifth Street Fuel Releases/Dry Cleaning Facility. The site was formerly referred to as the Fifth Street Fuel Releases. The name change reflects the discovery that a former dry cleaning facility was a source at this site.

## 2. Status of Extraction Well Installation at Site 14, Former Fuel Farm

PRC reported that three wells had been installed down to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs) at Site 14 during the week of June 26, 1993. The water table was reported at 6 feet bgs. It was reported that the wells will be developed and sampled during the week of July 19, 1993. During well installation, organic vapor monitoring with a photoionization detector (PID) calibrated to methane, detected readings in the parts per thousand. Dark staining was evident in the soil cuttings. The groundwater will be monitored for floating product during well development.

Mr. Lanphar made a recommendation to include Site 22, Navy Service Exchange, as part of any proposed removal actions for Site 14 because of the proximity of the two sites and similar contaminants in both soil and groundwater. The Navy commented that an existing contract modification is in process to include removal action for contaminated groundwater at Site 14 and Site 6, Fire Training Area. The inclusion of Site 22 into the current proposed removal action for Site 14 could probably be accomplished without significant delay, as long as the proposal was only to add a removal action for groundwater at Site 22 and assuming the contaminants are limited to petroleum products. The present proposed removal action does not include soil removal at Site 6 or Site 14. However, a future contract could include removal action recommendations for soil at Site 14 and Site 22. PRC indicated that a removal action for Site 6 was not recommended because of the complexity of the problem at this site. Specifically, metals, petroleum, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) are present at Site 6. Therefore, unlike Site 14 and Site 22, the contamination at Site 6 is not limited to petroleum products. Mr. Lanphar agreed to reconsider the recommendation for Site 6. The Navy indicated that soil removal actions at Site 14 and Site 22 were consistent with the Navy's intent to accelerate cleanups.

Note: Since the progress meeting, PRC has reviewed the data and found that the contamination at Site 22 includes PAHs as well as petroleum products. Therefore, it is recommended to eliminate from further consideration, a soil removal action at Site 22.

## 3. Planning for Phase II Field Investigation and Impact on RI/FS Schedule

The Navy reported that the addition of Phase II field work into the RI/FS program would result in a delay to the completion of the FS. The Phase II work is not anticipated to be awarded until November 1, at the earliest. Currently, the anticipated completion date of the FS, with inclusion of the Phase II data, is June 1996. Mr. Lanphar indicated that every effort should be made to complete the Phase II RI report concurrent with the FS. PRC indicated that the FS is already being prepared, and it is already assumed that the RI and FS will be completed concurrently. Mr. Lanphar also stated that a change to the present FS schedule due to the additional Phase II work is a reasonable basis for requesting a change. However, he stated that the state would prefer that the Navy make every reasonable effort to meet the existing Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA) schedule as it currently stands, and address a proposed change at a later date when it no longer seems feasible to meet the FFSRA schedule. It was agreed to not pursue any schedule change at this time until better information is available regarding the commencement and completion of the Phase II RI. Options such as providing a more limited form of the Phase II result and more limited review time between the Navy and the state were considered as strategies to reduce the production time of the Phase II report.

4. Recommendations for Possible Removal Actions at Sites 1, Medical Facility, and Site 9, Foundry

The Navy reported that Sites 1 and Sites 9 were being considered for removal actions. The RI data indicates that silver at Site 1 appears to be at background levels. However, the Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation (PA/SI) found silver at 7740 milligrams/kilogram (mg/kg), a level considered above background. Lead at Site 9 appears at 974 mg/kg at a single boring; all other borings appear to be at background levels. The risk assessment indicates that when calculating the average concentrations, these sites are within an acceptable human health risk range for exposure to silver and lead, respectively. The assumption in conducting the risk assessment is that the probability is low of encountering a higher-level metal contamination. If the contamination is limited to these single borings, then remediation does not seem necessary, since risk is considered to be low. Because the levels in these borings are indicative of a spill, a non-time critical removal action could be conducted to determine if the extent is beyond the borings and to remove the "hot spots."

In addition, the Navy recommended Site 3, PCB Equipment Storage, and Site 5, Boiler Plant, for no further action. With NAVSTA TI proposed for base closure, the Navy will be looking at possible clean parcels to transfer. Therefore, preparing no-further-action Record of Decision (ROD) documents is in the interest of the Navy. The recommendations are being made because contamination was not detected at these sites.

5. Confirmation of Meeting to Address Potential Biological Survey Needs

Ms. Pimentel asked SFRWQCB and DTSC to confirm that the next meeting is scheduled for August 17, 1993. This meeting is to address potential biological survey needs for NAVSTA TI. Ms. Gina Kathuria indicated that the meeting is still on schedule, and that Ms. Bobbie Smith, RWQCB, would be coordinating the meeting and will provide items to the Navy's agenda.

6. Other Issues

a. Mr. Lanphar indicated that the potential source of petroleum contamination detected at Site 11, Yerba Buena Landfill, was still a question. He suggested that the Navy review aerial photographs from the period around 1939 to determine if there were any tanks in the area. PRC indicated that it would search through photographs to investigate the potential source of contamination.

b. Mr. Lanphar commented that any remedies evaluated for NAVSTA TI should be based on flexibility in regard to future land use as a criteria for selection. Capping will probably not be a reasonable remedial action because of the shallow groundwater table. Mr. Marcelo Pascua of the Navy (reporting for Mr. Ernest Galang in his absence) indicated that with base closure the Navy will be under tighter schedules to complete cleanup. A copy of the draft FS Table of Contents was distributed to DTSC and RWQCB.

7. Action Items

- a. DTSC will have Ms. Debbie Oudiz review the Preliminary Risk Assessment.
- b. Mr. Sullivan will contact the Base Physician regarding respiratory ailments.
- c. The Navy will consider incorporating Site 22 as part of the removal action for groundwater planned for Site 14.
- d. The Navy will consider removal actions for soils at Site 1, Site 9, Site 14, and Site 22, and review documentation needs to proceed with a recommendation for no further action at Site 3 and Site 5.
- e. Mr. Lanphar will confirm with the Navy that the August 17, 1993 meeting will be at NAVSTA TI.
- f. PRC will review aerial photographs to investigation the potential source of petroleum contamination at Site 11.
- g. Mr. Lanphar will review the data for Site 6 and confirm if a removal action for the entire site is still recommended. Mr. Lanphar will also consider if the removal of "hot spots" at Site 6 is recommended.

ATTACHMENT 1

MEETING AGENDA

THIS ATTACHMENT WAS NOT RECEIVED IN THE  
RESTORATION RECORDS FILE.

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](mailto:diane.silva@navy.mil)

ATTACHMENT 2

ATTENDEES LIST

THIS ATTACHMENT WAS NOT RECEIVED IN THE  
RESTORATION RECORDS FILE.

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](mailto:diane.silva@navy.mil)