5090
Ser 1813EG/L3020
14 Oct 1992

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 - 6 Oct 1992

1. Enclosure (1) is provided for your information regarding the Remedial Investigation at Treasure Island.

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

Original signed by:

GILBERT A. RIVERA
By direction

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

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

Blind copy to:
09B, 1813, 1813EG, Admin Records (3 copies)
Chron, blue, pink, green
Writer: E. Galang, 1813EG, X-2560
File: NS, Treasure Island

TREASURE ISLAND RI/FS
PROGRESS MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 6, 1992

I. INTRODUCTION

The monthly progress meeting was held on October 6, 1992, at Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTATI) to discuss the status of the NAVSTATI remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS). A copy of the meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees is attached. The meeting was attended by representatives from the Navy, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC), the California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Mr. Ernie Galang, Navy engineer-in-charge began the meeting.

II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MEETING ACTION ITEMS

The meeting began with a review of the eight action items identified at the progress meeting held on September 9, 1992. The action items were addressed as follows:

1. PRC submitted the first laboratory data package to the Navy. Ms. Barbara Smith of the RWQCB indicated she still needs to address electronic deliverable format requirements with her department.

2. Ms. Smith also said that she still needs to determine who will be available to participate in a survey of NAVSTATI. RWQCB is looking into obtaining a subcontract with the California Department of Fish & Game (DFG). In addition, she mentioned that the ecological assessment (EA) work plan was submitted to Mr. Mike Rugg of the DFG.

3. PRC has coordinated schedule and method details with Ms. Smith regarding sediment sampling. Sampling is scheduled for October 13 and 14, 1992. A variance was verbally approved by Ms. Smith to allow PRC to have the laboratory homogenize the sediment samples rather than homogenizing samples in the field. PRC agreed to cap the samples securely to minimize air space in the sample container.

4. The proposed variance for the storm water sampling task approach was not resolved. PRC submitted a letter and map dated September 1992, to Mr. Galang defining the proposed sampling approach and locations of outfalls to be sampled. The approach recommends sampling the first and second storm event and sampling one outlet twice to identify any differences in contaminants between the first and second storm event. The outlet to be sampled twice was not determined in the letter. There was considerable discussion of details regarding whether PRC was aware of the tidal influence at each outlet, the concern about access to each outlet, the time anticipated to mobilize after the storm begins, the integrity of sewers since the 1989 earthquake, and the location of sewer lines with respect to groundwater level (i.e., are lines above or below water). PRC representatives indicated that these concerns would be addressed in a follow-up letter to the Navy. Mr. Tom Lanphar of the DTSC suggested that if access to the outlet at site 25, sea plane maintenance area, is a problem because it extends a few feet out over the water, access may be possible through a manhole. Ms. Emily Pimentel indicated that PRC staff have already seen the engineering drawing showing the sewer lines. Mr. Jim Sullivan indicated that video tape of existing conditions of the sewer lines is available; and that the new contract for sewer repair will begin in late November or early December 1992. Ms. Smith indicated that PRC should note sampling time so that PRC could later check the tidal levels. There is a computer program available in the Bay Area that models tidal information; NAVSTATI is included in the area for which that kind of information is available.

5. Mr. Galang indicated that the Navy had not been able to finalize details on public participation in time for this meeting. However, Mr. Sullivan said that he had discussed this subject with Mr. Randy Friedman, (Navy) and Ms. Stacey Lupton (PRC). The Navy will send out letters to potential participants to solicit public participation in the project.

6. PRC submitted a schedule of the proposed geophysical survey work to Mr. Dennis McAuley in a letter dated September 16, 1992. The schedule should have been forwarded to Mr. Galang for eventual submittal to Mr. Lanphar, however, Mr. Lanphar did not receive a schedule.

7. Mr. Gil Rivera of the Navy indicated that he is still checking on the impact of the underground storage tank investigations on the RI/FS at NAVSTATI.

8. Ms. Smith is still reviewing the EA work plan.

III. FIELD ACTIVITIES

1. Work completed. Mr. Ken Bowen indicated that well development had been completed as of September 1, 1992, and that monitoring well sampling had been completed on September 16, 1992. Mr. Bowen also reported that the geophysical survey had been completed October 5, 1992. He reported that the survey results indicated that there was no evidence of underground tanks or fuel lines at Site 20, the Auto Hobby Shop or at Site 22, Navy Exchange. An anomaly was found at Site 25 the sea plan maintenance area, which was interpreted as a possible underground storage tank. Additionally, a geophysical survey was conducted at Site 24 the 5th Street fuel release area to confirm what is shown on the engineering/utility drawings. The drawings showed a fuel line leading to the dock; the survey confirmed the extent of the line. The survey also identified three vaults; one, vault No. 2 near Building No. 92, was found to be filled with oil. Ms. Pimentel asked the Navy whether any action should be taken to remove the oil. Mr. Galang and Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Sullivan if he could handle the removal. Mr. Sullivan said he would ask the Public Works Center (PWC) to have it removed. Mr. Sullivan will send a copy of the letter requesting removal of the oil to Mr. Lanphar and Ms. Smith, in addition to Mr. Galang.

Mr. Bowen said he had obtained aerial photographs of NAVSTATI dated January 27, 1939. The aerial photographs showed 2 storage tanks located next to an excavation. This area was investigated by trenching and by using geophysical methods but no UST's were located.

2. Work Outstanding. Ms. Pimentel indicated that most details regarding the storm water and sediment sampling program had been covered as part of the action item discussions at the beginning of the meeting. It was reconfirmed that both these sampling activities would still to conducted. Although it rained over the past weekend, Ms. Pimentel reported that rainfall was 0.04 inch in Alameda, 0.04 inch in Oakland, and 0.12 inch in San Francisco; therefore rainfall was considered to be between these two values at NAVSTATI, and was not considered significant enough to warrant sampling.

IV. LABORATORY ANALYSES

1. Data Management Packages. Mr. Thorsten Anderson reported that the first package of unvalidated data was submitted to the Navy. The next set of unvalidated sample results will be submitted to the Navy October 16, 1992. No progress was made on determining what type of electronic deliverable DTSC would find most useful.

2. Laboratory Validation Issues. Mr. Anderson reported that a laboratory error led to exceeding the holding times for approximately 20 semi-volatile samples. The problem was that the laboratory spiked the samples with matrix spike rather than surrogate spike compounds. The laboratory results would therefore be qualified as estimated values. Ms. Pimentel indicated that after reviewing the

problem, PRC recommended no resampling at this time. The decision was based on the following rationale: (1) detected and undetected values would be qualified because of exceeding holding times; however, since the semivolatiles do not easily degrade or volatilize, it is expected that the results are an accurate reflection of the actual concentration to be expected. (2) The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidance indicated that qualified data are useable in a quantitative risk assessment. (3) It has not been determined (and will not be determined until all the results are evaluated) whether there is a human or environmental risk.

Ms. Smith indicated that the guidance states that qualified undetected resulted may be used in the risk assessment. Mr. Lanphar indicated that it would be DTSC's is position to require resampling of all samples with undetected values. Resampling would not be required for detected samples with estimated concentrations. Ms. Smith also indicated that the decision to resample could be reversed if analytical results for oil and grease and the semivolatiles could be reconciled. This is based on the assumption that high concentrations of oil and grease would be accompanied by detected semivolatile. Since oil and grease are not part of the constituents analyzed for on this project, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) could be considered in lieu of oil and grease because samples were analyzed for TPH. Ms. Pimentel asked whether the decision to resample and reanalyze a sample based on an undetected value would be reversed if at least one semivolatile compound was detected. Mr. Lanphar declined to commit on these types of details at this meeting. Mr. Anderson indicated that the unvalidated results from samples having exceeded the holding time because of laboratory error will be submitted to the Navy by October 16, 1992. All participants agreed to meet to discuss this issue on November 4, 1992, at 9:00 a.m.

V. REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY ACTIVITIES

Ms. Pimentel is working on different sections of the RI and baseline human health risk assessment (BHHRA) report. One part of the BHHRA report involves specifying key elements of the risk assessment process and the proposed approach that would be taken to complete the risk assessment. For example, the process would initially address risks at each of the 22 sites, and if appropriate, depending on the analytical results, or exposure scenarios, the sites may be consolidated. However, this would be done only if it does not increase or decrease the risk of diluting or concentrating results during the risk calculations process for determining means or mean maximum values. PRC intends to prepare a document defining the key elements and will submit it to the Navy by October 23, 1992. PRC is proposing that this document serve as a point of discussion in the next meeting so that comments on the approach can be addressed early in the process of developing the BHHRA report. All participants agreed that key elements of the risk assessment approach would be discussed at the November 4th meeting.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

1. During the meeting, the Navy provided comments from DTSC and RWQCB on the waste management plan.

2. The DTSC and RWQCB still will comment on the EA work plan. PRC reported that work on the EA task was already begun.

3. Mr. Sullivan indicated that they expect to have public participants identified over the next 2 months; therefore it was unanimously that the first technical review committee (TRC) would be held December 1, 1992, at 1:00 p.m. at NAVSTATI, probably in the third floor conference room. PRC asked about the participation or support role required of PRC. Meeting participants indicated that PRC would likely prepare a presentation using maps and slides showing a conceptual site model, sampling areas, and other general site information since it would be the first meeting where the public would have the opportunity to hear what has been done as part of the RI. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there is a story board that will be brought to the TRC to describe NAVSTATI and the project.

III. ACTION ITEMS

1. The next meeting will be held November 4, 1992, at 9:00 a.m. and will be attended by PRC, Navy, DTSC, and RWQCB personnel. Issues to be discussed will include: (1) the laboratory data that exceeded holding times, as well as other qualified data: (2) the proposed risk assessment approach: and (3) geophysical survey results.

2. The first TRC meeting will be held Tuesday December 1, 1992, at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Sullivan will ensure that letters are sent out to identify and solicit potential public participants. PRC will be prepared to make a presentation.

3. Ms. Smith will identify who will assist in a field survey at NAVSTATI in support of the EA.

4. PRC will review the storm water sampling procedures and address associated details identified during this meeting.

5. Mr. Sullivan will arrange to have the PWC pump out the oil in vault No. 2 near Building 92. The oil was found during the geophysical survey. Mr. Sullivan will submit a copy of the letter requesting the PWC to remove the oil, to Mr. Lanphar and Ms. Smith.

6. PRC will submit the set of unvalidated data on October 16, 1992, addressing samples that exceeded the holding times.

7. DTSC would like PRC to present the geophysical survey results at the November 4th meeting.

8. PRC will send a letter to the Navy by October 23rd, defining the proposed risk assessment approach for the BHHRA.

9. The Navy will submit to DTSC and RWQCB a map of the proposed storm water sampling sites.

10. RWQCB will provide comments on the EA by the next progress meeting.

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING
OCTOBER 6, 1992

PERSONNEL	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
1. Ernie Galang	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2560
2. Gilberto Rivera	WESTDIV	244-2565
3. Emily Pimentel	PRC	415 543-4880
4. Thorsten Anderson	PRC	415 543-4880
5. Ken Bowen	PRC	415 543-4880
6. Jim Sullivan	NAVSTA Treasure Island	415-395-5454
7. Tom Langhar	DTSC	510-540-3809
8. CYRUS SHABAHARI	DTSC	510-540-3821
9. Barbara M Smith	RWQCB	510-286-4222
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING
OCTOBER 6, 1992
(NAVSTA TI TOWER ROOM)

MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

I. Review of 9 Sep 1992 Meeting Minutes/Action Items

II. Status of Field Activities

1. Field activities completed
   - -well development
   - -monitoring well sampling
   - -additional geophysical surveys

2. Field activities outstanding
   - -sediment sampling
   - -storm water sampling

III. Laboratory Analysis

1. Transmittal of data packages

2. Laboratory validation issue

IV. Remedial Investigation Report Activities

1. Human health risk assessment approach

V. Miscellaneous Topics

1. Comments on IDWMP

2. Comments on Ecological Assessment Work Plan

3. Next TRC meeting

VI. Action Items