

5090
Ser 1813EG/L3063
9 Nov 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 - 4 Nov 1992

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.

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, 1813EB, 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
NOVEMBER 4, 1992**

I. INTRODUCTION

The monthly progress meeting was held on November 4, 1992, at California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control, (DTSC) Office in Berkeley, California to discuss the status of the Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS). The meeting was attended by representatives from the Navy, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC), the 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 ten action items identified at the progress meeting held on October 6, 1992. All the participants concurred that all the action items had been addressed since the last meeting except those actions identified by the number used in the previous progress meeting minutes as listed:

2. Mr. Jim Sullivan, Navy NAVSTA TI Coordinator, did not attend the progress meeting; therefore, an update was not available from him on what progress had been made mailing letters to identify and solicit potential public participants for the December 1, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC).
3. Ms. Barbara Smith, RWQCB, is still working on identifying support to assist with the field survey at NAVSTA TI in support of the Ecological Assessment (EA).
5. Mr. Sullivan did not attend the progress meeting; therefore, an update was not available from him on what progress had been made to pump out the oil in vault No. 2.
10. Ms. Smith indicated she had not forwarded comments to Navy on the EA Work Plan.

II. STATUS OF FIELD ACTIVITIES

I. Sediment Sampling

Ms. Emily Pimentel reported that sediment sampling had been completed by PRC on October 14th, 1992. The sediment sampling approach had been modified based on discussions with Mr. Tom Lanphar, DTSC. The change consisted of taking two samples rather than three samples in the former pier area near site 21, and taking two samples in the near shore area of Clipper Cove. The project sampling and analysis plan (SAP) did not propose to take any samples in the Clipper Cove area, but it was considered appropriate to take samples in that area to evaluate whether the area is contaminated and to evaluate the human and ecological risk associated with potential exposure. It was also reported that of the two samples taken in the former pier area, both were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons, an analysis not proposed in the SAP.

The sampling team consisted of Peter Stang, the lead task manager, Emily Pimentel, Timo Allison, and two MEC staff, PRC's subcontractor. On the second sampling day, Mr. Ernie Galang (Navy) and Ms. Smith (RWQCB) joined the sampling team to observe and provide recommendations on the sampling details. Ms. Smith reported that she felt the sampling went well and complimented PRC and MEC on their performance.

2. Storm Water Sampling

Mr. Timo Allison reported on the storm water sampling progress to date, and some variances to the SAP that were developed in coordination with Mr. Lanphar. Ms. Pimentel discussed the agreements reached at a meeting on October 8, 1992 between Mr. Lanphar, Mr. Allison, and herself. At this meeting the following agreements were reached: (1) to sample outfalls A and B twice, once during the first rain storm and once during the second rain storm; (2) to sample surface runoff at the road or area just below Site 8 (sludge pile); (3) to develop a decision making process to sample based on a certain percent chance of rain; and (4) to verify the accessibility of the outfalls in relation to the tidal cycles. Mr. Allison reported that the outfalls were tidally influenced, and only accessible during certain low tide cycles; therefore, a response approach was developed taking into consideration this limitation. Additionally, outfall E was not located, and outfall J was associated with a pump house which periodically discharged water so it was not appropriate to sample, and the landfill did not have an outfall. Outfall C was found to be non-functional. During the first storm on October 20, 1992 PRC sampled outfalls A, B, and G. During the second storm on October 29, PRC sampled surface runoff for Site 8, identified as discharge area for H and sampled outfalls B and D.

Mr. Lanphar and Ms. Smith requested that PRC continue to try to collect storm water samples for the remaining outfalls representing areas A, E, F, and J. It was suggested that storm water be collected from the up stream manhole. Mr. Manny Bernal, Navy, suggested that PRC coordinate further with NAVSTA TI Public Works Center (PWC). Mr. Bernal proposed arranging for a meeting with PWC during the week. It was agreed to drop the landfill area (area I). Since surface runoff appears to be discharging directly into the Bay, contaminant discharge concerns would be addressed based on soil and sediment sampling results.

3. Geophysical Surveys Completed

Mr. Gordon Ballentine reported ~~that~~ the completion of geophysical surveys at Sites 20, 22, 24, and 25. The principal objective of the geophysical investigation was to determine if abandoned underground storage tanks and associated piping are present at Sites 20, 22, and 25. At Site 24, the principal objective was to confirm the location of the fuel pipeline between the large above-ground storage tanks on Avenue H and the eastern shore of NAVSTA TI. The methods used and preliminary results for each site are listed below in the order of discussion at the meeting.

Site 25 (Former Seaplane Maintenance Area): The area was screened for magnetic anomalies using a proton precession magnetometer. Measurements were collected in five-point clusters on a 20-foot grid spacing. Areas of anomalous magnetic readings were also investigated using ground-penetrating radar (GPR). A significant anomalous area was identified and is considered to be associated with a group of underground storage tanks. A second anomalous area has been identified but requires additional analysis before a determination of significance can be made. Further analysis based on directional aspects of the magnetic anomalies will be performed to support additional conclusions.

Site 22 (NEX Gas Station): This area was also screened for magnetic anomalies using a proton precession magnetometer. Measurements were collected in five-point clusters on a 20-foot grid spacing. Areas of anomalous magnetic readings were also investigated using GPR. A moderately anomalous area was identified but is not currently considered to be associated with underground storage tanks or related piping. Further analysis based on directional aspects of the magnetic anomalies will be performed to support additional conclusions.

Site 20 (Auto Hobby Shop): The area was screened for magnetic anomalies using both a proton precession magnetometer and a GPR instrument. GPR screening transects were run parallel to the outside walls to identify subsurface piping or utilities that enter or exit the building. Based on the GPR screening transects, magnetic measurements were collected in five-point clusters on a 20-foot grid spacing on the east and south sides of the building. No anomalous areas were identified and only minor additional analysis of the data will be performed.

Site 24 (Fifth Street Fuel Releases): The location of the pipeline was determined using GPR and was marked on the ground surface with paint and flagged stakes. The GPR investigation indicates that plans showing the location of the pipeline are largely accurate. The pipeline passes through three subsurface concrete vaults, one of which appears to contain a significant amount of black fuel oil. The location of the pipeline will be accurately depicted on a scale site drawing. No additional analysis of geophysical data is planned.

Mr. Bernal suggested that PRC meet again with PWC or NAVSTA TI staff civil engineering personnel since they may be able to provide additional historical information regarding areas where geophysical anomalies were identified. Ms. Smith indicated that confirmation of anomalous areas thought to be underground storage tanks can be easily performed through excavation. PRC indicated that they would coordinate with Mr. Bernal to meet with PWC or NAVSTA TI staff civil engineering personnel. A final analysis of the geophysical data will be completed by late November or early December; at that time the results will be discussed further in the appropriate progress meeting.

Mr. Lanphar indicated that PRC should review where the samples were collected and that Phase II recommendations should address whether additional samples should be collected now that information is available on the specific location of the fuel line.

III. LABORATORY

1. Transmittal of Data Packages

Mr. Thorsten Anderson reported that another set of unvalidated laboratory results would be submitted to Navy the following week.

2. Usability of Qualified Data

The issue regarding the usability of data which exceeded the holding time as a result of a laboratory error in following the quality control methodology was again discussed. Both Mr. Lanphar and Ms. Smith indicated that they would request the Navy to have samples retaken of each of the sites corresponding to samples which had to be qualified as a result of having exceeded holding times. Mr. Bernal asked PRC what provision there was in the laboratory contract between PRC and the laboratory to have the laboratory reanalyze the samples if the results are of unacceptable quality. Mr. Anderson reported that there are some provisions to request the laboratory to repeat the analysis at no additional cost.

Ms. Smith asked PRC what kinds of managerial level changes were being taken to limit these problems in the future. Mr. Anderson indicated that PRC does monitor the laboratory closely and already performs audits of all the laboratories performing frequent work under PRC's contract. He indicated that this particular lab exceeded holding times as a result of an individual's error in applying a quality control method, and that the laboratory performing the analysis has usually performed well in the past.

Mr. Lanphar indicated he would prepare a letter notifying the Navy that the data that exceeded holding times and was therefore qualified would not be acceptable for use in the remedial investigation report. Upon receipt of the letter, PRC will prepare a schedule and plan to have the samples retaken and analyzed.

IV. REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT ACTIVITIES/ HUMAN RISK ASSESSMENT APPROACH

Mr. Randy Fish discussed the proposed human health risk assessment approach to be taken as part of the RI report. The discussion was based on the document submitted to Navy on October 26, 1992. There were two main topics of discussion. One involved whether to approach the risk assessment individually for each of the 22 sites being investigated or whether to aggregate some sites into possible operable units. The other topic concerned how best to handle ambient levels of chemicals such as metals. It was determined that these issues would be best resolved by arranging a special meeting to address them and to have the data formatted by sites available prior to meeting. A meeting was set for December 17, 1992 at 10 a.m.

Ms. Smith asked how human health risks associated with recreational fishing and water contact sports would be addressed. Ms. Pimentel recommended that these be considered by collecting fish and performing tissue analysis. This could be considered in the Phase II RI based on the results of the Phase I human health risk assessment.

V. MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

1. Comments on Investigation Derived Waste Management Plan (IDWMP)

Ms. Pimentel reported that they anticipated completing the IDWMP in 2 weeks.

2. Status of Ecological Assessment Work Plan

Ms. Pimentel asked when PRC could anticipate comments on the EA Work Plan. Ms. Smith indicated she would be completing her comments on the EA Work Plan around November 14 or 15, 1992. These comments would be relayed through DTSC. Mr. Lanphar's comments would be included in DTSC's submittal.

3. Next TRC meeting

The next TRC meeting is still scheduled for December 1, 1992. PRC is preparing presentation materials which will include a site map.

4. Biological Surveys for NAVSTA TI

Ms. Pimentel indicated that PRC would like to schedule a site reconnaissance survey for the EA. However, since it is anticipated that the state natural resource trustees will participate in the survey, PRC can not schedule it until the natural resource trustees provide their schedule. Ms. Smith indicated she is still working on providing natural resource with support to conduct the survey. She anticipates coordinating a scoping meeting to determine what will be expected to conduct the reconnaissance survey in support of the EA.

5. Status of Community Relations Activities

Since Mr. Sullivan was not present at the progress meeting, Mr. Galang said he would check with Mr. Sullivan on this issue.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Ms. Smith will call Ms. Pimentel and Mr. Lanphar to arrange for a scoping meeting regarding the requirement for the EA site reconnaissance with the natural resource trustees.**

2. Mr. Bernal will call the Navy's public works center (PWC) to arrange a meeting to be attended by Mr. Bowen, Mr. Allison, and Mr. Balletine. The purpose of the meeting will be to assist PRC in identifying: manholes corresponding to the outfalls remaining to be sampled, assistance that can be provided by PWC to sample the manholes, and assist in identifying possible historical information regarding areas where geophysical survey anomalies were identified.
3. PRC will submit to Navy a field variance for the storm water and sediment sampling tasks for submittal to DTSC.
4. PRC will organize all available analytical data by sites by December 10, 1992 for use at the December 17, 1992 meeting.
5. DTSC will prepare a letter regarding the DTSC position on the use of the data that exceeded holding times, after receipt of the third unvalidated laboratory results from PRC. PRC expects to submit this package next week.
6. Mr. Galang will determine what progress has been made to remove the oil in vault No. 2.
7. RWQCB's comments on the EA Work Plan will be submitted by November 13, 1992 to DTSC. These comments will be forwarded along with DTSC's comments to the Navy soon there after.

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING
NOVEMBER 4, 1992
(DTSC BERKELEY OFFICE)

MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

- I. Review of 6 Oct 1992 Meeting Minutes/Action Items
- II. Status of Field Activities
 1. Sediment Sampling
 2. Storm Water Sampling
- III. Laboratory Analysis
 1. Transmittal of Data Packages
 2. Usability of Qualified Data
- IV. Remedial Investigation Report Activities
 1. Proposed Human Health Risk Assessment Approach
- V. Miscellaneous Topics
 1. Comments on IDWMP
 2. Status of Ecological Assessment Work Plan
 3. Next TRC meeting
 4. Biological Surveys for NAVSTA TI
 5. Status of Community Relations Activities
- VI. Next Meeting (TRC). Scheduled for December 1, 1992

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY

MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING

NOVEMBER 4, 1992

(DTSC BERKELEY OFFICE @ 9:00 A.M.)

PERSONNEL	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
1. Ernie Galang	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2560
2. Thorsten Anderson	PRC	415 543-4880
3. Barbara M Smith	SFRWQCB	510-286-4666 ²²²
4. Thomas Lanpha	DTSC	510-540-3809
5. Randy Fish	PRC	415 543-4880
6. Timo Allison	PRC	415 543-4880
7. Cindy Puente	PRC	415 543-4880
8. Gordon Ballentine	PRC	415 543-4880
9. Ken Bowen	PRC	415 543-4880
10. Manny Bernal	NAVY	415-244-2515
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		