5090
Ser 6225EG/L8167
23 Apr 1998

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 – 17 March 1998

1. Enclosure (1) is the approved and final Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes and is 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
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER
By direction

Distribution:
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Mr. David Rist)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Mr. David Leland)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. James Ricks, Jr.)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Mr. Richard Knapp)

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8167
23 Apr 1998

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

Distribution: (cont)
Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo
~~Mr. John Andrew~~
Mr. James Aldrich
Mr. John Allman (Alt Co-Chair)
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)
Mr. Nathan Brennan
Ms. Peggy Chiang
~~Mr. Douglas Cormack~~
Ms. Wendy Easley (Alt Co-Chair)
Ms. Carolyn Froeberg
~~Ms. Laurie Glass~~
Mr. Michael Gross
Mr. Richard Hansen (Co-Chair)
~~Ms. Jeannette Tan Hayden~~
Mr. Paul Hehn
~~Mr. Gary Jensen~~
Ms. Alice LaPierre
Mr. Clinton Loftman
Mr. Daniel McDonald
Mr. Brandon McMillan
Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. Ernest Michelsen
Ms. Patricia Nelson
~~Mr. Earl Newbro~~
Mr. Henry Ongerth
Mr. Carlos Penafiel
Mr. James Rodriguez
Mr. Jack Savage
Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Thomas Thompson
Ms. Usha Vedagiri
~~Mr. Richard Vivio~~
Mr. Harlan Van Wye
Mr. Brad Wong

Blind copies to:
622A, 6225EG, 64
Information Repository (3 copies)
Chron, RF
Writer: E. Galang, 6225EG, X-2560
File: NS Treasure Island

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, 17 March 1998

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 17 March 1998 at 7:10 p.m. at Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to: 1) receive a report from the City of San Francisco including discussion of reuse issues and the Geomatrix review of IR Site 12, 2) discuss the draft Zone 5 Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL), 3) present the draft Zone 6 FOSL, 4) discuss the EIS Process for Treasure Island, 5) receive a presentation on the contracting process for the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program, 6) discuss general updates, 7) review action items, 8) attend to organizational business, 9) review the upcoming environmental report review schedule, 10) provide open questions and discussion, and 11) review the proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings and new action items.

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 Co-Chair, welcomed all meeting attendees. He stated that it is the general consensus of the RAB to continue to meet at the Casa de la Vista building as long as the location remains available. Mr. Sullivan added that it is possible the building may be leased out by the City but expects it to be available to the RAB for at least the next several meetings.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda
Martha Walters, City of San Francisco, noted that the Geomatrix review will be for both IR Site 12 and IR Site 6. There were no other comments on the agenda, and so was approved as written.

Discussion/Approval of the 17 February 1998 Minutes
Pat Nelson asked if all RAB members would receive a copy of the RAB Community Member's comments on the Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Mr. Sullivan stated that he was making copies available to RAB members at this meeting and that additional copies would be mailed out to RAB members not present. The meeting minutes were approved as drafted.

II. Public Comment
It was noted that no members of the general public were present.

Enclosure (1)

Ms. Nelson stated that discussion was held at the last interim meeting about the RAB submitting a letter of interest to the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) to hold a position on their Citizens Advisory Committee. She stated she had volunteered to draft a letter; copies of her draft letter were distributed to RAB members for review. She requested that the RAB give consideration to the letter that evening so it could be finalized. John Allman noted the importance of submitting a letter to the TI Development Authority because they had held recent discussion on the formation of the Citizens Advisory Committee and are deciding how it should be implemented. Ms. Walters stated that the next meeting of the TI Development Authority will be April 1, 1998.

Ms. Nelson stated that the letter proposes a position be held on the committee by a RAB member, and that she and Paul Hehn would work cooperatively to fill the position. Mr. Hehn clarified the intention to propose one seat for the RAB, and that he and Ms. Nelson would jointly share the responsibility. Richard Hansen, Community Co-Chair, stated that their presence on the committee would provide good balance, and asked for clarification on voting procedures. Mr. Sullivan stated that for administrative matters, the RAB can reach a consensus and approve an action. Mr. Hansen noted that there are two issues at hand - to get RAB representation on the committee, and to approve the two RAB nominees. Mr. Allman pointed out that individuals can also apply for a position on the committee. Harlan Van Wye suggested that the Community Co-Chair designate a principal and an alternate to fill the proposed RAB seat on the committee. A motion was made and approved by the RAB Community Members to accept Ms. Nelson's draft letter requesting a RAB seat on the Citizens Advisory Committee to be shared cooperatively by Ms. Nelson and Mr. Hehn.

Mr. Hansen asked whether all RAB members had received information packets from the San Francisco Planning Commission. Ms. Walters commented that the packets had been prematurely sent out by the Planning Department and were not reflective of what has been planned for Treasure Island. The April 4 meeting noted in the packet has been canceled, but will likely be rescheduled in May.

Ms. Walters announced that Annemarie Conroy has placed Larry Florin as Mayor Willie Brown's Executive Director of the Treasure Island Development Authority Project. Ms. Conroy is a former Supervisor on the San Francisco Board. She noted that the TI Development Authority was formally sworn in on February 25 in the Casa de la Vista, and that the Authority Board may be expanded in the future. She also stated that, due to the persistence of the RAB, the status of the environmental cleanup has been made a standing item on the TI Development Authority's agenda. She noted they are taking the RAB's concerns seriously. Concerns will be presented by either Ms. Walters or by Ms. Conroy as part of the report from the Project Director. RAB members wishing to be placed on the agenda can contact either Ms. Walters or Mindy Linetzsky. Ms. Walters will serve as the single point of contact between the RAB and the TI Development Authority. Mr. Allman noted that at the recent swearing in meeting they discussed when to hold the public comment period, and Ms. Linetzsky suggested that she be contacted to request a specific item be addressed at the beginning of the meeting. He noted the advantage to

being able to contact Ms. Linetzsky or Ms. Walters to get on the agenda or address an issue early in the meeting.

III. City of San Francisco

Geomatrix Review of IR Site 6 and Site 12

Ms. Walters stated that the City of San Francisco hired Geomatrix Consultants to provide an independent third party review of the Remedial Investigations (RI) of Sites 6 and 12. She introduced Amanda Spencer, a hydrogeologist; Pamela Rey, an engineer; and Greg Blorby, a toxicologist, of Geomatrix to present their findings. Ms. Spencer noted that their findings are based on the Remedial Investigation reports for those sites prepared by the Navy.

Site 12 Review and Evaluation

Ms. Spencer first summarized the historical uses of Site 12. From 1944 to 1968, the site was used for many purposes, to include ammunition bunkers, debris and trash disposal, waste ash disposal, rubbish disposal, operation of a waste incinerator and trash trailer, tanks for short-lived radionuclide liquid waste and an underground storage tank (UST) for oil. The 21 ammunition bunkers were used to store ammunition, tear gas, electrical equipment and film. There was also reported use as an air landing strip. In the late 1960s - early 1970s, the area was redeveloped for housing for Navy personnel, which was used for that purpose until 1997. A number of geotechnical and environmental investigations were also conducted from the early 1970's.

In 1992, PRC began investigations to support a preliminary risk assessment. A sampling program for the RI followed. The RI was performed in several phases; the first two phases focused on target areas of potential sources; the bunker areas and the trash storage areas between the bunkers, the former waste incinerator area in the trash area on the northern part of the site, the former rubbish disposal area, and the UST area. Additional characterization was performed to establish the extent of some target areas. Non-targeted sampling was conducted on Site 12 in 1997, consisting of 58 borings on a 200 foot grid, to broaden coverage across the site.

Ms. Spencer stated that Geomatrix determined the methods and procedures used for the remedial investigations were consistent with federal and state guidelines. The following data gaps, however, were noted: insufficient analysis of pesticides in surface soils; no dioxin data collected in the upper three feet of soil; silica-gel cleanup not applied to sample extracts prior to analysis for heavy petroleum hydrocarbons; and groundwater samples were not filtered prior to analysis for metals which makes it more difficult to analyze their actual potential effect on ecological life and to do modeling evaluations. If you have naturally occurring biogenic material, or if you have degredation products from old petroleum sources, that material can cause false-positive results in your petroleum hydrocarbon analysis if silica gel clean-up on the abstracts prior to analysis is not included.

Ms. Spencer stated that the Human Health Risk Assessment was generally conducted in a manner consistent with state and federal guidelines. Several minor issues were noted but should not affect the overall conclusions. The issues are: identification of chemicals of potential concern, possibly determined too conservatively since some of the metals appear to be in background concentrations at the site; the exposure assessment, which did not evaluate all the chemicals of potential concern for the homegrown produce pathway; and the toxicity assessment, which did not provide explanation for evaluating elemental mercury rather than inorganic or organic mercury, inconsistent application of the route to route extrapolation, and the guidance used for evaluating dioxins appeared to be misapplied. She stressed that these issues are considered minor and they would not affect the overall conclusions of the human health risk assessment.

Ms. Spencer stated that Geomatrix concurred with the Navy's general approach for screening-level evaluation for the Ecological Risk Assessment. She noted, however, several specific issues that may affect the overall conclusions. These include: use of only the Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC) for screening level evaluations; several assumptions for the environmental Fate and Transport Modeling were used without basis; and the AWQC for total petroleum hydrocarbons was problematic, specifically that some of the bioassays were confounded by outside factors, and that there seemed to be no relationship between the TPH concentrations of the sample and the toxicity of the event evaluated based on the bioassay. She stated that these issues did not seem to be strongly supportable criteria to be applied to the site. She noted that it is difficult to evaluate TPH mixtures, and suggested consideration be given to apply evaluation of constituents of TPHs and use the criteria of constituents only.

In conclusion, Ms. Spencer stated the following recommendations for Site 12:

> The Risk Assessment should be revised to include additional grid sampling data and data obtained from filling identified data gaps, and to address inconsistencies identified in the Ecological Risk Assessment
>
> Areas of Potential Concern should be identified from the results of the risk assessment and included in the final RI
>
> The FOSL should be revised to incorporate any changes to the RI

Site 6 Evaluation and Review

Pamela Rey stated that the Geomatrix evaluation of Site 6 is based on review of the Navy's Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP). She noted that this site comprised the former fire training school from 1946 until 1992. Gasoline and diesel were stored in four underground storage tanks, and runoff from the fire fighting exercises were collected in a trench, then run through two oil and water separators before being routed to the sewage treatment plant.

Ms. Rey explained that investigations were conducted on the site conditions around the USTs between 1986 and 1992. Tank removal occurred between 1992 and 1995. The RI for Site 6 was

conducted in two phases from 1992 to 1995, that included about 36 soil sampling locations and 26 groundwater sampling locations. She noted two general comments for the Site 6 RI: Geomatrix agrees with the treatment of Site 6 as a TPH site, however, a data gap was identified in the soil sampling (only one sampling location occurred outside of the concrete-lined trench).

Ms. Rey stated that screening evaluations for ecological risk and human health were conducted for the CAP. Geomatrix found that the evaluations were generally conducted in a manner consistent with available guidelines for screening evaluations. Although the Navy's Human Health Risk Assessment concluded there was no risk to human health, Geomatrix noted several issues that may affect this overall conclusion. These issues are that: for occupational and residential use scenarios, data from depths below two feet from ground surface did not consider vapor-causing volatile chemicals; for the construction worker scenario, data from the saturated zone soil samples were compared to U.S. EPA Region 9 Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs), but PRGs for soils should be compared to Vadose Zone soils that are not saturated; and exposure to chemicals in the groundwater were not considered for the exposure scenarios.

Regarding Ecological Risk, Geomatrix noted several of the same issues as in their evaluation of Site 12. These included: using AWQC criteria rather than other criteria available; giving no basis for the 200 year modeling for the environmental Fate and Transport Modeling; and using AWQC for TPH as a mixture instead of constituents.

Ms. Rey stated that the CAP identifies Areas of Concern (AOCs) based on comparison of TPH screening criteria for soil and groundwater for ecological risk concerns. AOCs were classified into three main types - surface, subsurface, and groundwater - that exceeded screening levels. The CAP remedial options proposed include either natural attenuation or excavation and transport to a thermal desorption facility for surface soils, bioventing for deeper soils, and biosparging for groundwater areas. Geomatrix had the following comments on the AOCs and remedial options identified in the CAP: TPH screening criteria used to identify AOCs should be re-examined due to the TPH mixture screening level approach; the CAP identified benzene, toluene and ethylbenzene in sampling wells that exceeded AWQC, but the data was not used to determine AOCs at Site 6, indicating an inconsistency in the report; and, there was no evaluation of time for bioventing to complete the remediation.

Ms. Rey concluded by recommending the following:

> The Risk Assessment should be revised to incorporate data from filling data gaps and all data in the Vadose Zone for all use scenarios, to evaluate exposure to chemicals in groundwater and to address inconsistencies in the Ecological Risk Assessment.
>
> The AOCs should be reevaluated based on results of the risk assessment and using constituent-specific data.
>
> The CAP should be revised to incorporate any changes to the risk assessment and AOC determination.

Mr. Hansen asked if the fire fighting school would continue at Site 6. Mr. Sullivan stated that this was a former site for fire fighting activities, and that the new fire fighting school is located in another area at TI.

Mr. Allman stated that he appreciated the independent review performed by Geomatrix, and brought up two issues. The first concerns the geotechnical aspects of TI, and whether their review included addressing potential problems of new interactions and mixing of contaminants that could be caused by earthquakes. Ms. Walters stated that the purpose of the evaluation was to review the work that the Navy has performed to date. Mr. Allman stated he considered lack of this information a deficiency in the RI.

Mr. Allman's second issue regarded the synergistic aspect of contaminants on Site 12. He noted that he had spoken with a representative from ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry) a few months ago and that the representative had seen as least three pairs of constituents on Site 12 which are known synergistic combinations. He stated his understanding that human health risk assessment guidelines include performing a qualitative assessment of the synergistic effects that may occur on a site. He asked if this is correct, and whether synergistic effects were considered when determining the contaminants of potential concern.

Greg Blorby of Geomatrix Consultants stated that Mr. Allman had focused on a question that is probably one of the hardest to deal with in the field of risk assessment and public health; the exposure to multiple chemicals simultaneously. He added that in our daily lives we are exposed to chemicals by various means and that the consideration of synergistic effects is a technical limitation that has not yet been solved. He noted that antagonistic effects should also be considered, and added that it is recognized that the effects of multiple chemicals is likely underestimated in some cases and overestimated in other cases. Mr. Blorby noted that he was not aware of a particular qualitative guidance that requires assessment of synergistic effects. He stated that the purpose of Geomatrix's evaluation was to review the work already performed by the Navy to make sure it is consistent with current federal and state guidelines. Mr. Allman commented that RAB member Usha Vedagiri had stated that she was required to consider qualitative assessment of synergistic effects in the risk assessments that she performs. Mr. Allman requested clarification on whether there are equally random occurrences of both synergistic and antagonistic effects which cancel each other out, but that the cancellation comes in the overall statistics, not chemical for chemical. Mr. Blorby agreed, that the antagonistic affect on one body organ like the liver doesn't necessarily affect what might be seen in another body organ like the kidney. Mr. Blorby responded that the reality is that neither synergistic nor antagonistic effects are evaluated because of the technical limitations.

Mr. Hehn stated that the screening criteria used for the CAP for Site 6 has not been accepted within the Regional Water Quality Control Board as to what kind of screening levels are accepted for soil and groundwater. He asked for comment on the Regional Board's leaning toward acceptance of significantly lower screening criteria for soil and groundwater, and how this will affect the remedial areas and the human health and ecological risk assessment. Mr.

Blorby responded that the Regional Board accepts U.S. EPA Region IX's PRGs for screening. Ms. Spencer clarified that for TPHs, the Regional Board is being pushed to evaluate constituents, and that significantly lower criteria would have a significant impact on the work at Site 6.

Mr. Hehn pointed out that the problems identified in the risk assessments for Sites 6 and 12 will likely be similar for other sites on TI and YBI; potential data gaps for other sites should also be resolved early on. Mr. Hansen asked what will follow the review by Geomatrix. Ms. Spencer stated that the City has asked Geomatrix to collect additional data on pesticides and dioxin and that the Navy is considering silica-gel applications. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Navy will be discussing the report further with the City, adding there are areas of agreement and of disagreement by the Navy on the report. Ms. Walters stated that copies of the report and tonight's slide presentation would be shared with the RAB.

Mr. Allman noted his concern for the species selected for performing bioassays for TPH levels — a monovalve and a bivalve. He stated that he did not believe these were the best choice of species because of the ecology changes around the Bay, and may not be the best representatives for Treasure Island. He added that no bioaccumulation effects were considered, but noted that there are studies that show metabolites can be more toxic than the TPHs. He asked if the bioassay was extensive enough and whether bioaccumulative effects would typically be included in such an investigation. Mr. Blorby clarified that he is a human health toxicologist, however, he noted that he is aware of discussion suggesting use of shrimp for bioassays. Knowledgeable experts counter that shrimp are water column species, but that bioassays are best performed on benthic species, such as the monovalves and bivalves. Regarding concerns on bioaccumulation, Mr. Blorby stated he understood that standard protocol was followed, and in addition, that TPH is not particularly bioaccumulative.

Mr. Hehn asked what Geomatrix's opinion is on the risks involved to occupants at Site 12 regarding the short term or long-term lease agreements, based on their review of the Site 12 additional data and concerns expressed on assessment determinations. Ms. Spencer stated that the question cannot really be answered yet; this is why Geomatrix is recommending additional sampling. Other than concerns about peticides and dioxin, they agree with the Navy's conclusions, that there is probably not a human health risk.

IV. Technical Assistance for Public Participation Contracting Presentation

Mr. Sullivan introduced Mark Meadows of EFA West to discuss contracting procedures for the TAPP program. Mr. Meadows introduced Daisy Traylor, the TAPP coordinator within the Contracting Division of EFA West, and Mr. Albert Chan, Contracting Officer for Treasure Island and Hunters Point Shipyard. Mr. Meadows noted that his presentation focuses on the contracting process followed after a TAPP application is approved.

Mr. Meadows stated that the TAPP contract will follow a Simplified Acquisition Procedures (SAP) process. This means that the governmental contracting process is simplified for purchase

orders under $100,000, and are also reserved for small businesses. Mr. Meadows noted that purchase orders are the type of contract awarded under the SAP process. Purchase orders over $2,500 must have competition: purchase orders are negotiated and awarded to the contractor that provides the best value.

The typical SAP award process will take approximately two weeks from initiation to completion, following these steps:

(1) prepare a request for quotation (RFQ) (3 days)
(2) issue a RFQ (1 day)
(3) receive the quotations (1 week)
(4) evaluate the quotations and select a contractor (2 days)
(5) issue a purchase order (1 day)
(6) acceptance of a purchase order by the contractor (1 day)

Mr. Meadows stated that in order to initiate the SAP process, the RAB and the Co-chair must provide an approved TAPP application, a potential providers list, the evaluation criteria and qualifications of the contractor, a scope of work, and a government estimate (to gauge the cost of the project and determine a fair and reasonable cost).

The next step is the evaluation of the quotations. Mr. Meadows noted that the quotes must be evaluated on the basis established in the RFQ. The contractor selection is based on who provides the best value, including whether their price is determined to be fair and reasonable.

Mr. Meadows stated that there are two options for RAB participation in the contracting process. In the first option, the BEC assists the Contracting Officer in evaluating the quotes, the Contracting Officer selects a contractor, and then briefs the RAB if other then a preferred provider is selected. A purchase order is issued. Option 2 follows the same process except that the RAB Community Members assist the Contracting Officer in the quote evaluation.

If Option 2 is used, one Community Member must serve as the point of contact and will be required to be briefed on Procurement Integrity Regulations, and sign non-disclosure and conflict of interest statements. The Community Member will then review and evaluate the quotes, and prepare a recommendation of contractor selection to the Contracting Officer, in writing.

Mr. Meadows noted that the provider must meet the following mandatory qualifications: knowledge of hazardous or toxic waste issues and/or laws; academic training in a relevant discipline; and an ability to review, understand, and put technical information into understandable lay person terms. Additional desired provider qualifications include: experience working on hazardous or toxic waste problems; experience in making technical presentations; demonstrated writing skills; and previous experience working with community groups.

Mr. Meadows explained that the final steps in the process are award and performance. He noted that the contractor accepts the purchase order after the Contracting Officer issues it. The contractor then provides the services and invoices the Navy for payment. Once the BEC certifies

the acceptability of the services, the Contracting Officer processes the invoice for payment. Mr. Meadows stated that the government would not make the payment if the services are found unacceptable. He provided the following phone number of as a Contracting Office point of contact for Treasure Island: Albert Chan (650) 244-2359.

Mr. Allman asked where on the application the estimated amount of the project is indicated. Mr. Meadows stated that a simple estimate is needed, to include estimated personnel, number of man hours, travel, and copies, however this item is not on the application form. He noted that the contract is awarded as a fixed price lump sum.

Mr. Hansen noted that Mr. Allman is interested in pursuing TAPP funds to obtain technical expertise regarding the geophysical mixing of contaminants at Treasure Island in the event of an earthquake. Mr. Allman stated that the Technical Committee has identified Frank Rollo as a potential technical expert for this project. Mr. Rollo performed the geotechnical survey for the San Francisco Citizen's Reuse Committee; he will be contacted to see if he can perform a detailed analysis of the outcome of chemical mixing of such an event, the probability of an event occurring, and whether it would pose serious concern. Mr. Hansen pointed out that other providers can be suggested by the RAB for this project. Mr. Allman noted that this project might require the expertise of both a geotechnical expert and a toxicologist. He asked whether their services would have to be requested through two separate applications. Mr. Meadows indicated that they may need separate applications if a single firm cannot provide both types of expertise. Mr. Meadows also noted that providers must provide conflict of interest certification; some providers may be ineligible to participate due to financial interests or because they have worked with the Navy contractors.

Ms. Nelson asked if the RAB should review the TAPP application once it was completed. Wendy Easley asked about the requirement for certification by the majority of community RAB members. Mr. Allman stated that the RAB needs to approve the project, not necessarily the application, and noted that the topic of geotechnical assistance was discussed and approved at the last RAB meeting. He added that the scope will be discussed with Technical Committee members. This will be a pilot effort to determine how smoothly the process goes. Mr. Meadows pointed out that the TI RAB should expect approval for the project if they meet all the criteria. Mr. Meadows can be contacted at (650) 244-2355 to provide assistance and answer questions on the TAPP contracting process.

V. Draft Zone 6 FOSL Presentation

Rebecca Sugerman of Tetra Tech EM Inc. noted that Reuse Zone 6 has been divided into two subzones: Reuse Zone 6A (Nimitz Area) and Reuse Zone 6B.

Reuse Zone 6A

Reuse Zone 6A is comprised of Parcel YB019, consisting of residential Quarters 1 through 7 and Buildings 83 and 205. The area is considered historic housing.

There are no IR sites within or adjacent to YB019. The parcel has been proposed for reclassification from Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) Area Type 7 to 2-7 because petroleum is the only issue of concern from USTs and fuel lines. Further investigation is required. Only TPH has been detected and the parcel has been evaluated as having no risk.

The asbestos inspection for Reuse Zone 6A was conducted in May 1997 for the Quarters 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 and the abatement was completed for Quarters 2, 5, 6, and 7 in December 1997. The remaining damaged, friable, accessible asbestos will be abated by the Navy before the area is leased. Based on the age of the buildings and on lead paint inspections, all seven quarters within the reuse zone contain lead-based paint on interior and exterior surfaces and in soil surrounding the buildings.

Ms. Sugerman defined abatement as any set of measures designed to permanently eliminate lead-based paint hazards, including encapsulation, enclosure, removal and/or replacement. The interim controls during this period are any set of measures designed to temporarily reduce human exposure or likely exposure to lead-based paint hazards, including specialized cleaning, repairs, maintenance, painting, temporary containment, on-going monitoring of lead-based paint hazards, operations and maintenance, and education programs. Abatement is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1998 by the Navy.

Status of Quarters 1
The Navy conducted interim controls on the interior surfaces of the building, and removed the top six inches of the soil in November 1996. The confirmation samples taken at six inches indicated there were elevated levels of lead in the soil. The building will be leased for special events purposes only — the lessee will be required to maintain interim controls on the interior/exterior surfaces of the building.

Status of Quarters 2, 3, 4, 5, 83, and 205
There were no lead hazard abatement or interim controls performed at these quarters. The lessee is required to perform interim controls in accordance with "*U.S. Department of the Interior, Preservation Briefs #37, Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing,*" to make the buildings suitable for general residential use.

Status of Quarters 6
The Navy removed the top 12 inches of soil in January 1998. The confirmation samples at 12 inches indicated there were elevated levels of lead in the soil. The area was backfilled with 12 inches of clean soil. The lessee is required to perform interim controls on the interior/exterior surfaces of the building to make it suitable for general residential use.

Status of Quarters 7
In January 1998, the Navy removed the top 12 inches of soil; the City conducted interim controls on the interior/exterior surfaces of the building. The confirmation samples indicated there were elevated levels of lead. The area was backfilled with 12 inches of clean soil. A lessee or

sublessee is required to maintain interim abatement on the interior/exterior surfaces of the building.

Notifications/Restrictions
Ms. Sugerman stated that general residential use in Reuse Zone 6A is prohibited at Quarters 1 through 6. An adult caretaker residence is permissible at all quarters.

Mr. Hansen stated his concern that child relatives might visit the adult caretaker at the residence and risk exposure. Mr. Sullivan responded that occasional contact is not considered detrimental under this scenario, and that it is assumed no children would be residing there for any significant period of time. Ms. Sugerman added that notification would be provided to any resident of a lead-based paint area.

Reuse Zone 6B
Reuse Zone 6B is comprised of parcels YB024, YB025 and YB026. Three buildings and two structures are located on these parcels; two buildings are owned by Pacific Bell (Parcel YB026). The contamination in all ECP Area Type 6 parcels have been identified; response actions have not yet been taken.

Ms. Sugerman noted that the following IR sites are within Reuse Zone 6B:

IR Site 29 (located on the East Side of the on/off ramps) is partially located on all three parcels in Reuse Zone 6B. The site has a potential risk to children from lead in the surface soil under the residential and recreational land use scenarios.

IR Site 08 (located at the Army Point Sludge Disposal Area) is located on Parcel YB024. Risks are within the target risk range for all the land use scenarios.

IR Site 11 (located at the YBI Landfill) is located on Parcel YBO25. There is a potential risk to children from lead in the surface soil under the residential and recreational land use scenarios.

Notifications/Restrictions
Ms. Sugerman stated that Reuse Zone 6B is restricted to commercial or industrial use only. The remediation may be disruptive to the lessee.

Mr. Hansen expressed his concern over the lack of institutional controls, and asked when the City takes over the parcels, is it prepared to erect fences to keep children out. Ms. Walters responded that children on the site is not an issue because it is unlikely the caretaker will have children. She added that it would be addressed in an appropriate manner by the City if it were to come up. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the housing area use is in a transitional phase because lead abatement plans are in process for all seven quarters. The abatement project is scheduled for award later this year. Once the abatement is completed, the parcels will be "re-FOSLed" for general residential use. He added that he has recently been discussing institutional controls with

Ms. Sugerman; he recognized that some access restriction action may be considered in other, more industrial areas.

Harlan Van Wye stated that the concern of access by children is a non-issue because there has been no evidence of problems with Navy children that have lived on TI and YBI during its many years as a Naval base. He added that the reconstruction of the east side of the Bay Bridge will also affect use of that area, and minimize the issue of access by children.

James Aldrich noted the presence of Pacific Bell offices on YBI and asked if there are other buildings owned by non-government entities. Mr. Sullivan replied that this is a real estate question, but noted that public utilities are located here similar to other municipalities, and that he believes the facility provides telecommunications linkage between the east and west Bay areas.

Mr. Allman asked Mr. Van Wye if he is aware of any studies that have been performed to determine the health effects to Navy children from living on TI. He added that studies have been performed for lead exposure by children living near freeways and in lead-based paint housing in other areas, but he was not aware of any studies for TI. He added that it is unfair to claim that no health effects have been determined if no studies have been made on Navy children living on TI. Mr. Van Wye restated that there have been no concerns so significant as to raise a red flag. Ms. Sugerman reminded the RAB that abatement will begin in 1998, and so this will no longer be an issue. Mr. Sullivan concurred that public access is an issue to keep in mind, and that there may be other places on TI and YBI appropriate to take action.

Mr. Sullivan announced that the comment period for the Draft Zone 5 FOSL has been extended to the next interim meeting, scheduled for 1 April 1998. He pointed out that the FOSL may be revisited in the future. The Navy is evaluating a scenario of use, but may update and re-evaluate the FOSL as more data is received, as the remediation is conducted, or as other uses are proposed. The ultimate document will be the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST), which will be issued once the cleanup is completed.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Draft Zone 5 FOSL was issued at the last RAB meeting; the Draft Zone 6 FOSL is scheduled to be issued Monday, March 24. Copies of the Draft Zone 6 FOSL will be mailed to the Technical Committee members. Other RAB members can also request a copy, if interested. Nathan Brennan commented that the organization of the Zone 5 document is difficult to review and recommended that all of the information on each parcel should be located together in one place. Mr. Sullivan noted that the zones are divided and grouped into subzones, each of which may contain multiple parcels. Each subzone is organized as a complete document. Mr. Brennan suggested that a map be provided at the beginning of each subzone for easy reference. Ms. Nelson noted that similar comments have been made to the Navy in the past on other documents. Mr. Sullivan stated that concerns for boundary lines of parcels should be addressed at the beginning of the process, and that more time may be needed for outlining parcels for the RAB before development of the document. He added that the upcoming FOST document will provide an opportunity to comment on the ways to draw parcel boundary lines.

VI. EIS Process for Treasure Island

Due to the limited time remaining for the meeting, Ms. Nelson suggested that the EIS Process topic be deferred to the next month's meeting. She also noted that some of the items under organizational business has already been covered. Ms. Nelson asked when the Draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR will be available. Mr. Sullivan responded that it will probably be delayed for several more months because there are several issues that still need to be addressed before the draft can be finalized. He agreed to notify the RAB when he learns that the document will be available.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

VII. General Updates

Mr. Hehn asked about the results of the decision on the TPH cleanup levels for soil and groundwater discussed at the March 4 RPM/BCT meeting. Mr Sullivan stated that the Navy is summarizing the results of the first meeting held with the regulatory agencies on TPH screening levels, and added that they are preparing for a second such meeting in the next two to four weeks. He noted that there are issues of agreement and disagreement, and they are looking at ways to bridge the areas of disagreement. The TPH cleanup level decision will effect issuance of the CAP and some of the smaller UST site projects this year. The cleanup levels need to be finalized in order to complete some of these documents. The Navy is committed to reaching a conclusion as soon as possible so that the affected projects can move ahead.

OTHER BUSINESS:

VIII. Organizational Business

Mr. Hansen asked Stacy Lupton, Tetra Tech EM Inc. to brief the RAB on the training session recently held for RAB members. Ms Lupton explained that the Navy provided an orientation program for new RAB members, which reviewed all of the cleanup programs at TI and how they integrate. She noted that the training could be offered again and that it is not restricted to only new RAB members.

Ms. Nelson asked if an inventory is being kept of attendance by new RAB members at recent activities such as the site tour and training session. She stated the RAB may need to be more diligent in keeping members active. Mr. Sullivan offered to send out letters to those not attending recent activities, requesting that they contact the RAB if they are interested in remaining on the board.

IX. Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Van Wye stated that he had been informed by City staff that there is a holdup by the Navy in issuing a lease to the City for Parcel T-2 Reuse Area 1. He asked if there were issues of environmental concern or other areas of concern regarding this parcel. Mr. Sullivan replied that there are no environmental issues, and a FOSL was issued, but he will try to determine the situation.

Ms. Nelson requested an update on the RFP process for selection of a marina operator by the City. She also asked about the status of the finalization of the April 1997 meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan stated he would substitute a copy of the transcript for the meeting minutes if he is unable to complete the revisions. He agreed to report on the status of the minutes at the next interim meeting.

X. Closing Remarks

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the next regular meetings as follows:

April	Draft Zone 6 FOSL Discussion Site 12 Technical Memo
May	Final Remedial Investigation Report/Response to RAB and Agency Comments

Next Regular Meetings:

7:00 p.m. **Tuesday, 21 April 1998** Casa de la Vista, Treasure Island

7:00 p.m. **Tuesday, 19 May 1998** Casa de la Vista, Treasure Island

Next Interim Community Member Meeting:

6:30 p.m. **Wednesday, 1 April 1998** Pacific Gas & Electric, Room 2420

Next BCT/RPM Meeting:

9:30 a.m. **Monday, 6 April 1998** DTSC, Berkeley

Next Treasure Island Development Authority Meeting: (Subsequently Cancelled)

1:00 p.m. **Wednesday, 1 April 1998** Ferry Building, San Francisco

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:33 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 21, 1998, at 7:00 p.m., at the Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI.

N60028_000844
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

DATED 17 MARCH 1998

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000842