

5090
Ser 6225EG/L9280-1
7 Oct 1999

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) Monthly Status Report – September 1999
(2) Final RAB Meeting Minutes – August 4, 1999

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are provided for your use and information.
2. Thank you for your guidance and involvement in this project. For further information, please call me at (650) 244-2560.


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. Chris Maxwell)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. James Ricks, Jr.)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)
Geomatrix Consultants (Attn: Ms. Carol Yamane)
IT Corporation (Attn: Mr John Baur)
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Ms. Anju Wicke)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. James Aldrich	Mr. Clinton Loftman
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)/(Ms. Chris Shirley)	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. Nathan Brennan (Alt Co-Chair)	Ms. Patricia Nelson
Mr. Richard Hansen	Mr. Jack Savage
Mr. Paul Hehn (Co-Chair)	Ms. Dale Smith
Ms. Alice LaPierre	Mr. Harlan Van Wye

Blind copies to:

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

**INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
NAVAL STATION, TREASURE ISLAND**

September 1999

1. PROGRESS DURING THIS PERIOD

Completed the removal action activities for the lead-contaminated soil at Site 12.

Continued the preparation of final onshore RI report and responses to comments on the draft final RI report.

Continued the preparation of the final offshore OU RI report.

Continued the preparation of the draft onshore feasibility study report.

Continued the CAP for the TPH-contaminated soil and GW at Site 12.

Continued the preparation of the draft final Site 12 OU RI report.

Continued the pilot-test activities at Site 6.

Continued the additional focused investigation activities for CAP sites.

2. MEETINGS AND REPORTS DURING THIS PERIOD

Meetings:

September 21, 1999 - Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting

Reports:

Monthly Progress Report/Meeting Minutes

3. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND RESOLUTIONS

Appropriate TPH screening levels for soil and groundwater at NAVSTA TI have not been resolved. However, in the 19 November 1998 resolution meeting, a business decision was made to expedite the FOSL to the City for the rest of Site 12 housing units. To meet the 1 August 1999 leasing date, the Navy agreed to use 1.4 mg/L as TPH screening level for groundwater only for Site 12.

4. MEETINGS AND REPORTS SCHEDULED FOR THE NEXT TWO MONTHS

Meetings:

October 4, 1999 - RPM/BCT Meeting
October 19, 1999 - Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
November 1, 1999 - RPM/BCT Meeting
November 16, 1999 - Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting

Reports:

Project Monthly Status Report/Meeting Minutes
Final Groundwater Status Report
Final Field Sampling and Analysis Plan for Additional Sampling at Corrective Action Plan Sites
04/19, 06, 14/22, 15, 16, 20, and 25
Final Site 12 CAP for Petroleum Hydrocarbon-Contaminated Soil and GW
Draft Final Remedial Investigation Report for Site 12 OU
Draft and Final Field Sampling Plans for Site 12 AOCs Additional Investigations

5. ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR THE NEXT TWO-MONTH PERIOD

Continue the CAP for the TPH-contaminated soil and GW at Site 12.

Continue the preparation of the draft final Site 12 OU RI report.

Continue the preparation of the final onshore RI report.

Continue the preparation of the final offshore OU RI report.

Continue the preparation of the draft onshore feasibility study report.

Continue the pilot-test activities at Site 6.

Continue the additional focused investigation activities for CAP sites.

Initiate the additional investigations for identified AOCs at Site 12 and vicinity.

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**August 4, 1999
Meeting No. 58**

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 4 August 1999 at 7:14 p.m. at Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were: 1) to have discussion/approval of the 15 June 1999 minutes, 2) to provide time for the City of San Francisco, 3) to review organizational business, 4) to discuss the Draft Site 12 OU Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, 5) to discuss the completed TAPP Review of Draft Site 12 OU RI, 6) to receive general updates, 7) to discuss the status of environmental documents, 8) to provide open questions and discussion, and 9) to 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 and Agenda

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy Co-chair, called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m. He explained that the regular 20 July meeting was rescheduled on this 4 August date to allow the TAPP consultant to review the Site 12 Draft RI. The comment date was extended until 6 August. The next meeting will be on 14 September.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sullivan called for comments on the agenda; none were voiced.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Sullivan called for public comments and general announcements; none were voiced.

III. Discussion/Approval of the 15 June 1999 Minutes

Nathan Brennan moved to accept the minutes without changes; all were in favor.

IV. City of San Francisco

Martha Walters, San Francisco Department of Public Health, stated that in late June residents moved into 40 units in the Site 12 housing area. The Site 12 RI needs to be finalized in consideration of the time. The City is focusing on the South waterfront area; Treasure Island Enterprises and the City of San Francisco are still working on outstanding issues to facilitate the ongoing negotiations. City attorney Michael Cohen is on vacation and will not return until 17 August; at this point, Ms. Walters does not know when the negotiations will be finalized.

V. Organizational Business

Approval of TAPP Proposals for Upcoming Document Reviews

Paul Hehn, Community Co-chair, announced that the TAPP proposal was approved and sent out the previous week. Jeff Hawkins, EnviroSolve Corp., submitted his review of the Site 12 RI report. Mr. Hehn will inquire if he will be able to give a presentation at the September RAB meeting.

Mr. Hehn will begin another TAPP proposal for the significant documents expected in the October/November time frame. As these larger documents will exceed the \$2,500 limit for a sole source, the RAB will have to obtain bids. Ms. Walters inquired how the request for bids will be announced. Mr. Sullivan explained that the contracting is handled by the Navy.

In this case, the Navy was able to do a "micropurchase," a purchase that is below \$2,500. The same source cannot be used for continual micropurchases, as this would equate to a larger contract with one source. The second tier is the \$2,500 to \$25,000 range, for which the Navy must provide Requests for Proposals (RFPs) to at least three vendors. Anticipated purchases above the \$25,000 must be advertised, but expected amounts are likely to be in the middle range.

Ms. Walters asked when an RFP will be put out, given the October/November time frame. Mr. Sullivan replied that the FY1999 funds will be prioritized. Ernie Galang set aside the maximum \$25,000 to be awarded by the end of September. If not, they have to wait for FY2000 funds given that although the fiscal year begins in October, funding at times is not available until December or January. Therefore, documents being issued in the October/November time frame must be handled with this year's funds.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the intent is to award another TAPP contract before September 30 to cover documents that will be issued between the present and the end of the year. Mr. Hehn asked if a TAPP proposal can be issued for two or three large documents, and Mr. Sullivan replied that the terms of the contract are based on the number of hours needed rather than on the number of documents.

In response to Richard Hansen's inquiry, Mr. Sullivan explained that the comment period is usually 30 days for small documents, and 60 days for major documents. Dale Smith asked if there is a list

of vendors, and Mr. Sullivan replied that the Navy has developed a list. He stated that the RAB can also recommend any vendor. He stated that for purchases under \$25,000, the Navy is not required to advertise. A minimum of three vendors must be contacted; there is no maximum number.

Ms. Smith inquired if the list of contractors will be released. Mr. Sullivan replied that it can be provided. Mr. Hansen made a motion to empower Paul Hehn and the Technical Committee to work with the Navy to submit TAPP proposals; all were in favor. Mr. Brennan suggested that the interim meeting be moved to allow more attendees. It was decided that the interim meeting will be on 18 August and the regular RAB meeting on 14 September. There will not be an interim meeting in September.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the TAPP proposal must specify the documents to be reviewed, with an estimated number of pages so that the vendor can have a basis for their proposal. In response to Ms. Smith's inquiry, Mr. Sullivan stated that some of the upcoming documents are revisions, while others are new.

Publicizing the RAB

Pat Nelson stated that she had not yet had time to draft a newsletter. She added that she noticed a leasing office on TI on her way in. She asked if any information on the RAB had been provided to the leasing office. Mr. Sullivan replied that no information has been provided as yet.

Alice LaPierre stated that she had brought some sketches for a newsletter masthead for Ms. Nelson's perusal. Harlan Van Wye asked if there is a national RAB logo that can be used. Chris Shirley, Arc Ecology, replied that there is none. Ms. LaPierre added that RAB publications are an individualized process, with RABs developing their own logos.

Mr. Hehn suggested a one-page flyer to invite public participation as community members or as prospective RAB members. It could be posted or distributed at the leasing office. Mr. Sullivan stated that flyers and other materials that the Navy has used for previous membership recruitment are still available for use. Mr. Hehn suggested that a one-page flyer be drafted at the Technical Subcommittee meeting. Ms. LaPierre suggested distributing a fact sheet. Ms. Smith commented that the publication needs to be visually appealing in order to attract attention.

RAB Membership Advertisement

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy is working on a RAB membership advertisement to be posted in *The Guardian* and the *East Bay Express*. It should be in print by the end of the month. Mr. Hehn stated that a notice can also be posted in the leasing office.

Mr. Sullivan gave a brief overview of changes planned for the Navy's environmental cleanup organization. Over the next six months, the environmental positions that were located at EFA West in San Bruno will be moved to Southwestern Division in San Diego. Some will be relocated to San Diego, while others at San Bruno will be laid off on 1 May 2000. In effect, no functions are being lost. There will still be Navy BECs (BRAC Environmental Coordinators) and Remedial Project

Managers (RPMs), but they will be located at the San Diego office. The new position of environmental liaison was created to act as a link between the BECs and RPMs in San Diego and the regulators, the City, and the RAB in the Bay Area. The BECs and RPMs will also travel to the Bay Area to attend meetings.

Mr. Hansen inquired if the environmental liaison will be based in the Bay Area, and Mr. Sullivan replied that both of the environmental and non-environmental liaisons will be physically located in the Bay Area. The San Bruno office may be relocated to a smaller commercial office space in the Bay Area.

Mr. Sullivan confirmed that BECs and RPMs may be reassigned to different bases. Ms. Shirley expressed her interest in Mr. Sullivan remaining in the Bay Area. Ms. Walters stated that they are starting a letter-writing campaign in support of Mr. Sullivan remaining in his current position. She commended Mr. Sullivan on the extent of his institutional knowledge and cooperative manner. Mr. Van Wye suggested that the RAB should also consider Mr. Sullivan's plans. Mr. Sullivan stated that he has applied for a BEC position in San Diego. He explained that the San Diego positions are going to be filled first. He applied for the position so that he can have the opportunity to decline or accept the position, if it were offered.

Mr. Van Wye asked if the liaisons report to the BEC. Mr. Sullivan replied that the four Bay Area liaisons are not decisionmakers; they would report to someone else in San Diego. The liaisons will handle the "Big Four" bases: Treasure Island (TI), Hunters Point Shipyard, Alameda Point, and Mare Island. A number of smaller bases will be grouped under the larger bases. The TI group consists of TI, Novato, Oak Knoll Hospital, and Moffett Field.

Ms. Shirley expressed her interest in the Southwest Division's recognition that the TI RAB would like to retain Mr. Sullivan's services, irrespective of his location. Mr. Sullivan replied that there is no guarantee that the current BECs will be assigned to the same bases.

In response to Mr. Van Wye's inquiry, Mr. Sullivan confirmed that a "four-stripe" is in charge in San Diego. He also confirmed that he himself is a civilian employee. Mr. Hehn commended Mr. Sullivan on his efforts; he expressed his willingness to write a letter in support of Mr. Sullivan's continuing association with TI. He added that retaining Mr. Sullivan's services would prevent a learning curve which is typical with the arrival of new personnel.

BRAC CLEAN-UP PROCESS

VI. Draft Site 12 OU RI Report Open Comments/Discussion

Mr. Sullivan stated that the comment period for the Draft Site 12 RI has been extended until 6 August.

Removal Actions Status

Buildings 1207 and 1209 - Lead Removal

Mr. Sullivan stated that this was a former burn pit area. From review of the investigation reports, Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) had identified three sample points where there was elevated lead. The Navy initially intended to conduct a further investigation, but removal action was decided upon during the Issues Resolution meeting last November. Other than the UST and fuel-line removals, this is the first environmental cleanup action at TI. The removal action documents are a joint effort between the Navy and DTSC. The original estimation was about 300 cubic yards to be removed; currently, over 1200 cubic yards have been removed from around the two multi-family housing structures. He stated that they were never able to go consistently below 400 parts per million (ppm) of lead at the bottom of the excavation; they stopped at groundwater and it was backfilled with clean soil.

In response to Ms. Smith's inquiry, Mr. Sullivan explained that the excavations were timed at the low tide period, which is about four to five feet. The sidewalls reached 400 ppm. The contamination extended to the backyard of Building 1209 across the back of the building. Sample results from the end of the building shows one sample slightly above 400 ppm, and well below that amount on the other samples. The lead removal has stopped at that point, backfilling with clean material has begun, and the site will be fully restored.

Mr. Sullivan explained that as the soil turned out to be somewhat cohesive, they were able to get fairly close to the building; the objective was to protect the building. He added that dioxin sampling was done at the burn pit as well as other locations throughout Site 12. At one location, both sample points were around 50-60 parts per trillion (ppt), which is slightly above the lowest numbers which are generally in the 1 to 10 range. As a result, additional dioxin samples were taken for the 1207 and 1209 removal. The highest number was around 196 ppt, which is about one-fifth of the EPA's action level of 1,000 ppt or 1 part per billion (ppb).

In addition, the Navy was already removing a vast quantity of soil. There is some correlation between lead and dioxin. Dioxins present would likely have been removed along with the lead in the removal action.

The site restoration should be finished by the first week of September. The excavation will continue until the end of the following week; Mr. Sullivan encouraged any interested individuals to contact him in regard to a site tour.

Ms. Shirley inquired how the remaining material is being documented. Mr. Sullivan replied that IT Corporation will issue a closure report. Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI) will also provide additional documentation. Jerry Wickham, TtEMI, confirmed that documentation will be issued regarding the sampling locations and results. Mr. Sullivan stated that IT Corp.'s survey of the extent of the excavation would be overlaid onto TtEMI's clean up maps and subsequently carried over to the Final RI and FS, and the RAP ROD.

Mr. Brennan asked if the bottom of the excavation had been marked, and Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative, adding that the depth of the excavation would be surveyed. Ms. Shirley stated that the bottom of the excavation was marked at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) due to the more extensive contamination. In response to Mr. Hansen's inquiry, Mr. Sullivan explained that the estimated cost is about \$1 million: over \$800,000 for the construction and over \$100,000 for the engineering, documentation, and chemical analysis. A significant portion of the construction cost is the disposal to Kettleman, a Class I disposal site.

Mr. Hehn inquired about the TPH odor sampling results at Building 12-09, and Anju Wicke, TtEMI, replied that the results were not yet available. Mr. Sullivan stated that further evaluation may be necessary in this regard.

Building 1311/1313 - TPH removal

The site will be undergoing *in situ* treatment due to the unexpected amount of TPH found. Field work will begin around the October time frame and should be completed by the end of the year. Ms. Smith inquired about the MTBE on Site 12, noting the dearth of information on the topic. Mr. Sullivan stated that he thought the one location at Site 12 with an elevated MTBE level was not high enough to warrant further action, but could not recall for sure. Mr. Wickham added that he would check for further information on this concern.

In response to Ms. Smith's inquiry, Mr. Wickham explained that the unexpected amount of petroleum hydrocarbons found did not contain MTBE. Mr. Galang stated that the Navy is preparing a new sampling and analysis plan that will include MTBE.

Mr. Hehn noted that consideration be given to the depth of TPH concentrations at other TPH sites since concentrations of TPH occurred at much greater depth than expected at Building 1311/1313. Mr. Wickham stated that as a result, one of the major changes of the CAP sites field sampling and analysis plan has been to define vertical extent. Mr. Hehn questioned how samples from impacted groundwater are differentiated from what is in the soil. Mr. Wickham replied that the fact that there will be saturated soil samples, rather than separate data for soil samples and groundwater samples, will have to be taken into account in analysis.

Zone 4 Revised FOSL

Ms. Wicke referred to the Revision 2, Reuse Zone 4 Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) map (sent in the mid-month mailing): the light blue portions depict the areas that were "FOSL'd"; yellow depicts locations where there is ongoing action; and dark blue depicts areas in the revision 2 Reuse Zone FOSL draft stage. Comments will be incorporated in the draft final which will be issued within 30 days. The DTSC had concerns about the Building 1207/1209 concentrations. The dark-blue area was removed from the Revision 2 FOSL, given its proximity to the former debris disposal area.

Mr. Hansen suggested that the map be distributed in the RAB newsletter at the leasing office. Ms. Smith pointed out discrepancies between the explanation just provided and the actual legend on the map. She added her agreement that a map should be available in the leasing office, but advised that

this particular map not be distributed until the information is clarified. Ms. Wicke and Ms. Walters stated it would be premature to distribute it at this point, given that it is in draft form and will likely be revised following review and comments.

Mr. Sullivan pointed out the dark blue area of the map, and noted it as an area that was originally being prepared for lease. The Navy decided to take another look at the area, however, due to concern expressed by regulators. All of the lead data was plotted across the entire site, and it was determined that the site wide average for lead was about 70ppm.

Lynne Srinivasan, Uribe & Associates, stated that three different concentrations were plotted, taking into account home grown vegetables, no home grown vegetables, and ambient conditions. A few samples were found to be within the range or above the range for home grown vegetables. In the dark blue area on the map, the surface lead was determined to be below the (HUDs?) 400ppm number and appears to be okay. DTSC's concern was based on boring logs that were located at depth. There are already restrictions in place on intrusive activities and disturbing the ground. The area is suitable for lease, however, if the City wants to do so.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the area is barricaded to keep people out because the buildings are vacant, and there is some construction activity occurring. Ms. Smith commented that beyond physical restrictions, there should be additional information included in the lease. Mr. Sullivan stated that although the areas that are not leased are still under investigation, there is no need to install a physical barrier to prevent someone from walking across the site.

Mr. Hehn inquired as to the status of the fencing that John Stewart Company had previously proposed to erect in order to isolate remediation activities. Ms. Walters expressed her concern and stated that she would look into this. Mr. Van Wye asked if anyone would be harmed simply by walking through any site. He added that installing fences for contaminants that are underground could unnecessarily confuse and scare people. Ms. Walters stated that she had access to the 1207/1209 area when visiting the site; she expressed the need to further secure the area.

Mr. Van Wye acknowledged that although security is important, the focus should be on renting the property as soon as possible. Ms. Walters replied that ideally this should be the focus, but that not all of the 1207/1209 area has been adequately characterized. Mr. Van Wye stated that three generations of Navy children played on the area, with no indication of harm having been done.

Mr. Hansen stated that whatever the disclosure policy, he suggested that the tenants be informed as to which areas they should avoid. Ms. Walters stated that there is an environmental conditions disclosure in the lease; she is not aware if there is information regarding the avoidance of designated areas. Ms. Shirley commented that a couple of people had contacted Arc Ecology for advice on whether or not it was safe to move to this area. She told them that walking around on the site is not harmful, and encouraged them to pay attention to the lease agreement. Ms. Shirley noted that more effort should be expended in giving out information to address this concern. Ms. Walters stated that the Navy and John Stewart Company need to collaborate in this regard.

Ms. LaPierre commented that the buildings need to be secured due to the asbestos under some buildings. Mr. Sullivan replied that there were cases where the buildings are elevated and there may be asbestos material underneath those buildings. He added that the Navy has installed screens around the perimeter of these buildings, but that the final course of action has not yet been decided. David Rist, DTSC, said that he does not believe that there are any elevated buildings with these conditions within a residential area.

Ms. Smith referred to the aforementioned map and asked why 1307 and 1309 are included in this area, if the concern is with the area between 1311/1313. Mr. Sullivan replied that this is a buffer area around the project sites.

Mr. Sullivan called for any comments/discussion on the Draft Site 12 RI. He added that he would be taking the TAPP consultant's report, and any other comments from the RAB member, agencies and City until Friday, 6 August. Ms. Shirley noted that the consultant's report is subject to RAB approval, and asked Paul Hehn if there was a mechanism for this process. Mr. Hehn said that he would delay the RAB approval decision until Friday, but suggested that the consultant's report be provided to the Navy tonight.

VII. Completed TAPP Review of Draft Site 12 OU RI

Mr. Hehn summarized the major issues on the Draft Site 12 OU RI, reported by Jeff Hawkins, the TAPP consultant. Mr. Hawkins's general opinion was that the overall conclusions at Site 12 indicate that circumstances are appropriate for proceeding to a feasibility study stage. Based on his review, Mr. Hawkins recommended that a Geographic Information System (GIS) database would be helpful for managing the large volume of data for this site.

In response to Mr. Hawkins concern that the metal concentrations were exceeding the Site 12 criteria around monitoring well MW04, Mr. Hehn suggested that the Navy investigate the MW04 sampling well in this regard. He added that since Mr. Hawkins was unaware of any additional TPH sampling in the 1311/1313 area, he therefore recommended additional sampling around 1311/1313, both to the south and the north of the plume, particularly around Building 1228. Lastly, Mr. Hawkins discussed an alternative method for sampling metal in groundwater. He suggested the use of the alternative filtered, rather than the unfiltered, method for sampling. He also recommended that the Navy investigate a viable alternative using a low flow sampling criteria. He noted that one such alternative is based on some EPA protocol that might eliminate having to do both filtered and unfiltered types of samples.

In reply to Mr. Hehn's suggestion, Mr. Van Wye made a motion to submit Mr. Hawkins' review of the Draft Site 12 OU RI as the RAB's response and review document for this report; all were in favor. Mr. Hansen noted that individuals can also submit comments by the Friday deadline. For clarification, Mr. Sullivan explained that the TAPP consultant report is intended as an additional tool to the RAB and does not supercede RAB comments. In response to Ms. Smith's inquiry, he explained that the report becomes the community members' comments. Mr. Hehn stated that

ideally, RAB members would have more time to review documents. Mr. Van Wye commended Mr. Hehn on his summary of the consultant's comments.

PROGRAM UPDATES

VIII. General Updates

Announcements

Ms. Shirley stated that the National Caucus of RABs met in July. She offered a copy of the list of common issues of concern which includes environmental justice, depleted uranium, the cancellation of the Fort Ord RAB, and lead-based paint. She also brought copies of a presentation on the budget process.

Proposed Demo Project for *In Situ* Remediation of HVOCs at Site 21 or 24

Mr. Hehn explained that this pilot demonstration involves adding a sugar or carbon-based substance to groundwater. The sugar would be metabolized, resulting in the utilization of oxygen in the groundwater. This anaerobic environment would result in a marked reduction of solvents in groundwater. Site 21 has a higher profile for the South waterfront area, but it has lower concentrations. The pilot demonstration will likely remove all of the solvents in the groundwater and prepare it for transfer. However, Site 24 has higher concentrations and is therefore more difficult to remediate. Additional information will be provided at a presentation next month. Mr. Sullivan said that the purpose of the project is to find the sites that best demonstrate the technology and not simply to provide a free cleanup at Treasure Island.

2 August 99 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated that there was a briefing on the demonstration project by Arcadis' Gary Miller. Additional field sampling for hydrocarbons was discussed; a decision was made to release the Draft Final Field Sampling Plan on the 16 August, with the comment period ending on 27 August in order to allow the field work to begin by 1 September. Mr. Wickham added that another field sampling plan will be issued in relation to the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the fuel lines.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the alternative method being developed by Patel Labs uses fractional analysis rather than the total TPH analysis that TI has been using to date. He noted that, for the initial characterization, the Navy has since decided to proceed with using the traditional method to correspond with the existing data set. At a later date, as the alternative methodology is developed, the Navy intends to selectively sample using fractional analysis. They will then develop a correlation between the fractional analysis data and the total TPH data rather than resample the entire site using fractional analysis.

IX. Environmental Document Status

Mr. Sullivan stated that as a result of comments from both community members and regulators, the Navy has reorganized document schedule by category. He said that if the RAB wants the schedule

also sorted by date, he will supply that schedule for the next meeting. Ms. Smith suggested that changes should be highlighted in italics or bold on the draft final copy of documents, so it would be easier to compare the earlier versions with the draft final copies. Mr. Sullivan said that the problem with including both the old and new text on the draft final adds to the amount of text and involves numerous formatting changes. He said the Navy would evaluate the impact of making these changes.

OTHER BUSINESS:

X. Open Questions/Discussion

Mr. Sullivan informed the group that instead of operating separate sediments programs at individual bases, the Navy has formed a regional sediments group. The group is currently reviewing the data set for all the bases, and they may recommend further sampling if necessary, at the bases. He said that the group is undecided as to whether or not additional sampling might be needed for TI. A representative of the Navy sediments management team program will be reporting to the RAB in the near future.

XI. Proposed Agenda Items for Next Meetings and Review of New Action Items

July

Comments on Site 12 OU RI

Presentation on Site 12 OU RI by consultant, pending approval of TAPP grant

Zone 4 Revised FOSL

Phase 2A SEBS

Fuel Line Removal Results

XII. Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the following meeting schedule:

Next Regular Meeting:	7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 20 July 1999 Casa de la Vista, Treasure Island
Interim Meeting:	6:30 p.m. Wednesday, 7 July 1999 PG & E office
BCT/RPM Meeting:	9:30 a.m. Thursday, 15 July 1999 Geomatrix Consultants, Oakland

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Mr. Sullivan will bring the TAPP proposal to the Contracts Office.
2. Mr. Sullivan will provide a list of alternate contractors to the interim meeting.