

5090
Ser 1813EG/L3304
5 May 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 Progress Review Meeting Minutes - 30 Mar 1993

1. Enclosure (1) is 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.

GILBERT A. RIVERA
By direction

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Gina Kathuria)
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 4, 1813, 1813EG
Admin Records (3 copies)
Writer: E. Galang, 1813EG, X-2560
File: NAVSTA Treasure Island
Chron, blue, pink, green

**INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
MONTHLY PROGRESS MEETING
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
MARCH 30, 1993**

Introduction

On March 30, 1993, at 10:00 a.m. representatives from California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB), Navy, and PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) met at the DTSC Office in Berkeley, California to hold the progress meeting for the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) being conducted at Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTATI). A copy of the agenda and the list of attendees are Attachments 1 and 2.

Agenda Items

1. The meeting participants concurred that all except one of the action items from the February 10, 1993, meeting were completed. The Navy indicated that a meeting had not yet been scheduled between Kevin Spinks, the Navy's Engineer-in-charge for underground storage tank contract task orders at NAVSTATI, and the Installation Restoration Program management. The need to still schedule this meeting was acknowledged, though no date was set.

2. PRC reported that Jim Sullivan (NAVSTATI) and Emily Pimentel and Heidi Kritscher of PRC had met in March to discuss community relations (CR) needs for NAVSTATI. Ms. Kritscher was introduced as the CR specialist assigned to support CR needs for the RI/FS. Ms. Kritscher provided an overview of the CR public participation requirements and summarized activities completed to date to comply with requirements in the Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA), State regulations, and the National Contingency Plan (NCP). (This progress is summarized in Attachment 3.) Ms. Kritscher reported that the requirements for holding a Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting are not explicit. The attendees concurred that the format and frequency would be defined based on project-specific needs.

Although initial public interest regarding NAVSTATI has been limited, the current listing of NAVSTATI for possible closure has heightened interest, and it is expected to increase if NAVSTATI is on the final base closure list. The Navy acknowledged that there has been limited effort to identify citizen representatives for future TRC meetings. With PRC's assistance, the Navy expects to improve outreach to identify public interest and encourage representation. Mr. Tom Lanphar, DTSC, commented that he would like to see the Navy proceed with the proposed activities as soon as possible. Consequently, discussion focused on establishing a reasonable schedule to proceed. Additionally, to generate more public participation it was proposed to hold an "open house" type of meeting, in addition to a TRC and public meetings. The CR strategy is to produce a fact sheet, issue a press release to publicize the open house, hold an open house to generally inform the public and hopefully identify interested individuals to provide "citizen" participation at the next TRC meeting, and then hold the TRC meeting. The following activities and anticipated completion dates were agreed to at the meeting.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Anticipated Completion Date</u>
Produce a fact sheet	May 14
Provide a press release	May 14
Hold an open house	May 28
Conduct a TRC meeting	Middle to end of June

The meeting attendees also agreed to hold a public meeting during the regulatory comment period for the Draft RI. The Draft RI is expected to be submitted for regulatory comment October 25, 1993. Therefore, the public meeting is tentatively proposed to be held 15 to 30 days after that date.

Mr. Jim Sullivan also reported on the base closure process. Though the exact date may change, the base closure commission has until about July 1 to submit the base closure list to the President. The President can then send the list back to Congress for rework. If no action is taken by the President, the list is implemented as proposed. Mr. Sullivan stated that hearings regarding the Bay Area base closure lists were scheduled for Oakland, April 25 and 26, 1993. The list is not expected to become final until September 1993.

3. The Navy reported that PRC had submitted a letter proposing remedial action and removal action opportunities associated with sites, 6, 14, 22, 24, and 25. The Navy and PRC will hold a meeting to scope the approach to accomplish the proposed recommendations for action at these sites. As a result of the recommendation at site 24, PRC will have to go into the former dry cleaning building to determine if any existing or former tanks could be associated with the contamination found at the site. The details of the recommendations proposed for these sites were reported in the February 10, 1993, meeting minutes. In addition, PRC indicated that they would need to identify under what circumstances a removal action becomes more appropriate than a remedial action. A key requirement for proceeding with an interim remedial action is the preparation of a decision document. Guidance from the regulators will be required to determine whether a streamlined record of decision would be acceptable for that. Mr. Lanphar indicated he would inquire regarding what would be an acceptable decision document to proceed with the ground-water pump-and-treat approach proposed for some of the sites. In addition, Mr. Lanphar requested that Navy provide a general schematic showing the required steps to award a contract or modification under the Navy CLEAN contract.

4. Other agenda items were as follows:

a. Mr. Lanphar was asked if he had any comments on the letter provided by PRC regarding the electronic format to transfer results of laboratory data. Mr. Lanphar stated that he would submit written comments to the Navy.

b. PRC provided the remaining RI information, consisting of the sediment and storm water data. In addition, Mr. Lanphar asked when the Data Validation Summary Technical Memorandum would be submitted, and asked what the document is expected to summarize. PRC stated that the Technical Memorandum would be completed approximately April 16, 1993. The document will summarize the useability of the data from the perspective of the quality assurance (QA) objectives set forth in the QA Plan. The QA process has concluded that the data exceeded the data quality expectations identified in the QA Plan. The report will not provide a discussion of data gap needs related to filling in information, such as extent of contamination or source of contamination, that may not have been confirmed during the field investigations.

c. Mr. Lanphar asked for the status on conducting the trenching at site 25. The Navy reported that the contract modification is expected to be completed in April 1993.

d. Mr. Lanphar asked whether the Navy intends to conduct a site walk at NAVSTATI to support the ecological risk assessment. PRC responded that Ms. Bobby Smith, SFRWQCB, was expected to coordinate with the Navy to schedule a site walk.

e. Mr. Lanphar asked when the Navy expects to implement the work at site 14. Navy responded that the work is pending award to PRC and is anticipated to begin in the next month.

f. Mr. Lanphar reported that Mr. Jim Polisini was still expected to provide comments on the Draft Final ecological risk assessment work plan submitted by the Navy to DTSC and SFRWQCB.

TREASURE ISLAND NAVAL STATION

Community Relations/Public Participation Activities Update

I. FSSRA Requirements - Applicable Excerpts:

Public Participation - Section 26: "The parties agree that any proposed removal actions and remedial action alternative(s) and plans(s) for remedial action at the Site arising out of this Agreement shall comply with the administrative record and public participation requirements of applicable state and federal law and relevant community relations provisions in the NCP. The State agrees to inform the Navy of all State Requirements which it determines to pertain to public participation. The provisions of this Section shall be carried out in a manner consistent with, and shall fulfill the intent of, Section 17 (Statutory Compliance and Corrective Action)."

II. CR/PP Activities to Date

- A. Two Information Repositories established.
- B. Community interviews conducted and CRP prepared.
- C. Mailing list of community members developed.
- D. Information distributed on base.
- E. A large CR display (approximately 4 feet by 8 feet) set up at neighborhood events and locations.

III. Proposed CR/PP Activities

- A. Update mailing list, modify as necessary.
- B. Establish telephone line to receive questions and comments from community members.
- C. Prepare a fact sheet providing basic information on the site, work conducted to date, and future activities such as a public comment period on the RI, public meetings, a TRC meeting, and the Draft Remedial Action Plan.
- D. Select a citizen representative from the community to make a long-term commitment to participation on the Technical Review Committee (TRC).
- E. Once RI report has been produced, prepare fact sheet summarizing content and significant findings.
- F. Host periodic community workshops if interest is expressed.
- G. Conduct Public Meetings at critical decision points, such as at the time the RI and Draft RAP is published.

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING
9:00 A.M. TUESDAY MARCH 30, 1993
DTSC BERKELEY OFFICE**

AGENDA

1. Review of action items from previous meeting
2. Community Relations implementation strategy
3. Removal/Remedial Action opportunities
4. Phase II RI data needs
5. Other

NAVSTA TI PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING

DTSC OFFICE @ 9:00 AM

MARCH 30, 1993

Name & Company

Telephone

1. Ernie Galang WESTDIV (415) 244-2560
2. Gina Kathuria SFRWOCB (510) 286-4267
3. EDDIE V. GARMIENTO NAVSTATI (415) 395-5452
4. James Sullivan NAVSTA TI (415) 395-5454
5. Thorsten Andersson PRC 415 543-4880
6. Randy Fish PRC 415 543-4880
7. Christina G. Kahlitzke PRC 415 543-4880
8. Heidi Kritscher PRC (415) 543-4880
9. Ken Bowen PRC (415) 543-4880
10. Emily Priental PRC (415) 543-4880
11. Thomas Lanphan DTSC (510) 540-3809