

**Final
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
19 April 2005
Meeting Number 117**

Community RAB Members in attendance:

John Gee	Nathan Brennan	Dale Smith
Alice Pilram	Douglas Ryan	

Regulatory Agency, City and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

Alan Friedman (Water Board)	James Sullivan (Navy)
-----------------------------	-----------------------

Other Agency, Navy Staff and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Marcie Rash	Jim Whitcomb	Scott Anderson
Tommie Jean Damrel	Todd Bernhardt	Victor Early

RAB Support from ITSI:

Joni Jorgensen-Risk	Steve Edde
Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter	

Public Guests

None in attendance

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 19 April 2005 meeting at 7:12 P.M. at the Casa de la Vista (Building 271).

Mr. Sullivan welcomed those in attendance and stated that there were extra copies of the meeting agenda available at the back of the room. There were no changes or comments on the agenda so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan stated that there were two public comment periods included on the agenda to afford members of the public the opportunity to comment on the Navy's environmental program at Treasure Island (TI). He announced that the very first TI Record of Decision (ROD), the Site 13 Offshore Sediments No Action ROD, has been signed. He followed the announcement with a brief slide presentation that chronicled Site 13 and outlined the steps that led to the ROD. Mr. Sullivan said that Site 13, the offshore sediments and outfall areas around TI

and Yerba Buena Island (YBI), was one of the original sites from when the environmental investigation program got underway in 1988. Additional slides illustrated the stages of the process, and concluded with a photo of Mr. Sullivan signing the ROD. He said the formal public meeting for the Proposed Plan for the ROD was held on 20 April 2004 before that evening's RAB meeting, and the final signature was put on the document at the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting on 7 April 2005. Mr. Sullivan emphasized that the ROD is a team process and he thanked the contractors, regulators, and the RAB for their participation. He said the next sites that are being prepared for ROD are Sites 9 and 10, scheduled for sometime later this year.

There were no other comments or announcements.

Field Activities Update

Mr. Sullivan introduced Scott Anderson, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), who would be filling in for John Baur who usually provides the field activities update.

Mr. Anderson said that there is really only one field project ongoing, and that is at Site 24. Therefore, he said he would combine the Field Activities Update for Site 24 with the next agenda item – the update on the treatability study for Site 24 and Site 21. The field activity that was just completed was the lead and soil abatement at the historical Quarters 1 through 7, Quarters 10, and at Buildings 230 and 62. Mr. Anderson said the draft field activities report summarizing the work conducted is scheduled to be issued in a week or two.

Site 24 and Site 21 Treatability Study Update

Mr. Anderson provided an update on the Site 24 and 21 treatability studies. Handouts were provided, though he was careful to note that there were one or two printing errors on the handout related to shifted site boundaries on the figures. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy is proposing to the BCT that the boundary of the Site 24 treatability study perimeter be expanded on the north and reduced on the south. He said they have just completed installing all the biobarrier wells around the site perimeter (biobarrier wells prevent contaminants from migrating offsite). He then summarized the lactic acid and water injection and recirculation/sampling methodology, and noted an unexpected "bulge" in one area but said they expanded their investigation area and changed the configuration of some of the extraction and injection well locations. He said plans include starting the recirculation within the plume on Monday, 25 April, and he hopes to have additional information by the next RAB meeting. Mr. Anderson opened the floor for questions.

Dale Smith commented on the reported bulge in the plume, and asked if it were possible the plume had a more gentle slope than anticipated. Mr. Anderson replied that it didn't appear so and that the initial locations for the biobarrier were changed slightly due to both elevated and depressed contaminant concentrations in the respective areas of change.

John Gee asked if there was any interactive effect between the enzymes and lactic acid that are being injected. Mr. Anderson replied that the compounds actually work in harmony with each other where lactic acid reduces the conditions so the bacteria can work better at eating the chlorinated solvents. This technology was shown to be effective in the pilot study within Building 99.

Mr. Anderson then discussed Site 21. He explained that the source of contamination is suspected to be a parts wash dip tank that had been near Building 3. He added that the resulting contamination levels are significantly lower than at Site 24. The treatability study at Site 21 will use the same technology as that used at Site 24; however, they are proposing to do direct injection only, with no need for recirculation at Site 21 due to the lower levels of contamination. In addition, they will be using water soluble iron as a biobarrier to increase protection for the bay. The Navy is planning a one-time injection, but will monitor the results and re-inject later if needed.

Ms. Smith asked why the temporary fence extends partially around the site. Mr. Anderson replied that the temporary fencing extends between an existing fence and a building, and is temporary in order to allow boaters access to the docks.

Nathan Brennan asked about hydrogen bubbles. Mr. Anderson replied that at Site 24, when hydrogen was injected into the wells along with the injection compounds, the results were very positive. The area on the figure with the highest concentration of contaminants is where the Navy will supplement the injection compound with hydrogen microbubbles to help better disperse the compounds into the groundwater and enhance the reactions. [Editor's Note: The hydrogen microbubbles are used to enhance the anaerobic environmental conditions for the microbes, and not for dispersal of the compounds.]

Site 12 Treasure Island Housing Update

Mr. Sullivan reviewed a brief history of Site 12 investigations and said the Navy has done extensive sampling at the site. All of which, he said, will be presented in the Site 12 remedial investigation (RI) report. Before the RI report is prepared, the Navy is preparing a work plan to describe an approach to handle the extensive sampling data. To present the details, Mr. Sullivan introduced Jim

Whitcomb, Navy RPM, along with Victor Early and Todd Bernhardt of Tetra Tech EMI (TtEMI).

Mr. Whitcomb stated that the draft Site 12 work plan would be finished soon and issued in two to three weeks. He added that the Navy would also be conducting the Halyburton Court soil gas sampling, which is a continuation of the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) work at the Halyburton court area. Mr. Early and Mr. Bernhardt presented the information on the Site 12 update.

Mr. Early said he has been involved with Site 12 for the past 5 years. The most recent data at Site 12 was collected in 2003 from a series of about 600 trenches excavated to a depth of about 4 feet in the common areas of housing. Three samples were collected from each trench, and the data gathered were used to fill-in data gaps and to help produce the draft RI report. Mr. Early said the Navy feels they now have a complete data set on Site 12 in terms of soil and groundwater samples. The only information that is lacking is soil gas data from the Halyburton Court.

The objective of the RI report is to document the nature and extent of contamination, along with distribution and concentration, in order to assess the risk to human health and the environment. To develop the RI, a work plan is being prepared which documents the methodology and procedures that will be used. The BCT has participated with the Navy for the past 6 months in developing the procedures included in the work plan. The work plan will include a description of the site history, a conceptual site model, preliminary exposure units, a description of how the contaminants of potential concern were selected, the exposure assessment, toxicity assessment, and the risk characterization.

The draft work plan is scheduled to be submitted by the end of April or early May. Comments on the plan should be submitted by late May. The final work plan is scheduled to be issued in June. Once the final work plan has been issued data evaluation and report preparation will begin.

Mr. Early then presented a history of Site 12. He said Site 12 is approximately 94 acres, or about one-quarter of Treasure Island. It is primarily residential, but also includes grassy open areas, parks, and paved areas. Historically, Site 12 contained ammunition bunkers. In addition, waste was burned and disposed along the shoreline. In the 1960's, housing was built in the area and the construction activities tended to spread the waste.

In an effort to characterize contaminant distribution, the Navy conducted a trenching investigation on a 60-foot grid. Mr. Early then turned the presentation

to Mr. Bernhardt, Tetra Tech's lead risk assessor, to discuss the conceptual site model.

Mr. Bernhardt distributed copies of the conceptual site model, which is a schematic representation of sources of the contaminants of concern and how those contaminants might reach potentially exposed populations. Because the site is primarily residential, both adult and child residents were included as potentially exposed populations. However, because the future land use is uncertain, they are also planning on evaluating exposure to construction workers during potential redevelopment. The construction worker scenario is also meant to protect people like utility workers who may come in contact with soil and shallow groundwater.

Mr. Bernhardt explained that because of the large size of the project, the Navy worked with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to subdivide Site 12 into potential exposure areas. Based on the sources of contamination and the potential exposure areas, there will be two sets of risk calculations completed for Site 12, Method 1 calculations and Method 2 calculations. Two methods are being used to address the differences between federal and state guidance on the risk assessment approach. Method 1 is designed to meet the federal requirements while Method 2 is designed to meet DTSC requirements. The methods differ in how the chemicals of potential concern are selected and in what toxicity values are used. Method 1 has additional risk based screening on a reduced number of chemicals. This method reduces the number of chemicals of potential concern to those that are likely to drive the remedial decisions.

Mr. Bernhardt then presented a slide that illustrated the exposure assessment in the RI work plan. Based on the results of the exposure assessment, a toxicity assessment will be done to evaluate the possible health effects from exposure. Method 1 will use Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) toxicity values. Method 2 will use DTSC preferred toxicity values.

Mr. Bernhardt turned the floor back over to Mr. Early for a presentation of the Halyburton Court investigation. A quantity of PCB contaminated soil was removed from the area in the summer of 2000. The area is currently fenced off and no one is living there. But there was concern about residual PCB contamination in the soil, primarily under buildings. The concern is that the PCBs could vaporize, enter the buildings, and cause a health risk. In order to evaluate whether or not PCBs in soil could vaporize into the buildings, they have developed a work plan for collecting soil gas samples in the buildings. The draft work plan will be submitted by the end of April. Soil gas samples will be collected from below Buildings 1100, 1102, 1104, and 1106. If soil gas concentrations are below the screening level, no further action will likely be

necessary. If results are above the screening level, the buildings will be cleaned and indoor air samples will be collected to determine if gas has migrated through the slab so that the potential health risk can be evaluated.

Mr. Early then reviewed the Site 12 schedule and opened the floor for questions. Mr. Brennan asked why there was only one sample point proposed in Building 1100. Mr. Early replied that the sampling was primarily based on previous indoor air sampling results that have been fairly consistent in detections. For Building 1100, they will be targeting only the one unit with this sampling effort.

Douglas Ryan asked how the samples were going to be collected. Mr. Early replied that a hole will be drilled through the concrete foundation, and a temporary well will be installed above the water table. A probe will be used to draw a gas sample from the well. The samples will be collected over the course of a day to get a 24-hour weighted sample.

There were questions about the 2000 soil removal action. Mr. Early explained that the soil excavation ranged in depth from about one and a half feet below ground surface (bgs) to four feet bgs, with an average depth of about two feet bgs. The goal was to remove soil with PCB concentrations above 1 part per million (ppm). The initial indoor air samples were collected after the removal action was completed.

Mr. Early stated that preparation of the draft Site 12 RI will begin in July. The RI will then provide the basis to conduct the feasibility study (FS).

Naval Station Treasure Island Property Transfer Update: SEBS and FOSTs

Mr. Anderson began by noting that the draft Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey (SEBS) has been submitted for BCT and RAB review. Although comments were due the previous week, he stated that he would still respond to additional comments received. He then provided a brief overview of the SEBS. The SEBS provides a condition of the property that identifies areas that are available for transfer and areas that need additional evaluation. The final SEBS is scheduled to be issued in mid-May.

The Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) documents are based on the information presented in the SEBS. The FOST states the official Navy finding that a property is suitable for transfer. It also identifies potential notices or restrictions that might be required for transfer, such as a groundwater use restriction.

Mr. Anderson noted that two FOST documents would be issued this year. The first would be the TI FOST. The revised draft FOST for TI is scheduled for submittal on 23 May and the final is scheduled for 25 July. The second FOST will

be the YBI-developed FOST for the residential areas on YBI, (excluding Site 28). The draft YBI FOST is scheduled for submittal in mid-June, and the final is scheduled for 19 August.

Ms. Smith asked why Building 3 was not included in the FOST. Mr. Anderson replied that Building 3 is part of Site 21 and consequently not suitable for transfer. Mr. Sullivan continued to explain that the environmental baseline survey (EBS) boundaries and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensations, and Liability Act (CERCLA) site boundaries are not the same, and if any part of a CERCLA site boundary is on an EBS parcel, then that entire parcel was not included in the FOST.

Mr. Ryan requested clarification on the meaning of the dark area on the map that was provided as a handout. Mr. Sullivan replied that was the Job Corps property that was no longer owned by the Navy; it had been transferred to the Department of Labor (DOL). Ms. Smith asked if any investigations had been completed at this location. Mr. Sullivan replied that some investigation had been done before the transfer. Mr. Anderson noted that all the transformers were retrofitted prior to transfer and the underground storage tanks (UST) issues were addressed under the petroleum program. Mr. Sullivan also pointed out that the DOL took responsibility for any lead-based paint and asbestos issues as part of the transfer. It was noted that this was similar to the YBI property the Navy transferred to the Coast Guard.

There was a discussion about a small area, included in the FOST, that was formerly part of the Site 8 Sludge Disposal Area on YBI. There was no evidence of contamination in that area, and so the Site 8 boundary was changed. This uncontaminated area, that is no longer part of Site 8, is now included in the YBI FOST.

Mr. Sullivan also clarified that a FOST does not transfer property, it is simply a document that states that the environmental program related to the property has concluded and that it is ready to be transferred. Property transfer negotiations are on-going between the City of San Francisco and the Navy. Mr. Brennan noted that the City is working on the disposition and development agreement (DDA) that will give guidelines to a developer and a timeline. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that right now the focus is on completing the FOST process. Then, once there is a timeline for transfer, the Navy will begin developing a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) for the remaining TI and YBI property that is not included in the FOST. While there has been some background work done for the FOSET, there will not be a firm schedule for this document until the property transfer schedule has been established.

Ms. Smith then questioned the groundwater classification in the area. Alan Friedman, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), responded that while there has not been a legal decision reached, from a practical standpoint, groundwater on TI would be difficult to use as drinking water. If the groundwater was pumped, there would likely be an influx of non-potable water from the bay. Also the island has a very small groundwater recharge area and it is hard to guarantee the water quality because of human activity on the surface. So, the groundwater does not meet a definition of a drinking water source. He continued to note that while the groundwater is not a potential drinking water source, groundwater contamination is still a concern because contaminated groundwater could affect the bay and vapors from contaminated groundwater could result in both ecological and human health concerns.

Upcoming Documents and Field Schedule

Documents

Reviewing the Document Tracking Sheet, Marcie Rash, TtEMI, stated there are 4 items that will be finalized in the next 2 months. They include the Technical Memorandum for Previous Investigations within the Lake of the Nations Footprint, the Site 21 RI, the Revised Site 27 FS, and the SEBS. The Site 12 draft work plan will be submitted in late April or early May, with comments due in May. Other draft reports that will be submitted in May include the Newsletter, the Halyburton Court addendum and the TI FOST. Drafts of the Site 30 RI, the 2005 Environmental Closeout Strategy and Schedule Update, and the Site 33 Groundwater Investigation Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) Addendum will be submitted by the end of May, with comments due in June. The Building 233 Asbestos Abatement and Radiological Survey Project Plans and the Site 24 Pilot Test Report are going final in May and April, respectively. The Site 24 Work Plan and SAP Addendum (to incorporate the Site 21 pilot study plans) is going out draft in April and should be finalized by late May. Finally, the Quarters 1 through 7 field activity report will go final at the end of May.

Field Activities Schedule

Ms. Rash stated that the soil gas sampling at Halyburton Court is scheduled to begin in early June. The only field activities scheduled in the next two months are the Petroleum Site D1B groundwater monitoring, which should be completed by the end of April, and the Building 233 abatement and radiological assessment which should be starting up late-May. Ms. Rash asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

February 2005 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor to comments on the February 2005 meeting minutes. Mr. Brennan made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Gee seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were approved pending one final review by Mr. Sullivan.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. Sullivan stated that they wanted to resolve the meeting time for their RAB conference calls. Alice Pilram, RAB Community Co-Chair, said they decided that call-ins would be scheduled for the first Wednesday of the month and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Sullivan stated that the calls would continue to be held at 7:00 p.m. The next call is scheduled for 4 May. Ms. Smith asked that the call notice be sent out earlier than the day of the meeting. Mr. Sullivan agreed to try and send out the notice earlier.

Ms. Pilram asked if it was typical to have a potluck in June. Mr. Gee stated that he thought that there was only a potluck at Christmas. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the Navy was open to any special events. He brought up the possibility of a site tour, similar to last year, and asked if there was any interest in scheduling the June meeting at 6:30 p.m. to look at Site 24.

Ms. Smith stated she would like to see the work at Building 233. Mr. Sullivan replied that the project should be underway by June. Ms. Smith questioned the schedule for Building 233. Mr. Whitcomb responded that there was a lot of sampling to be done, and the work plan needs to be finalized, which has pushed back the schedule for that project.

Ms. Smith then asked if they could see what the piping looked like (at Site 24). Mr. Anderson replied that they could see examples of the lactic acid, iron, and microbubbles with hydrogen. It was then agreed that the June meeting would be scheduled for 6:30 p.m., that they will visit Site 24, and that they would also visit Building 233 if field activity has started.

Mr. Sullivan then opened a discussion on the RAB operating guidelines. They are dated 1996 and need to be updated. He recommended updating them to reflect the current conditions and then making sure the updates are consistent with the proposed RAB rule. Once a draft update has been completed, it could be circulated to the community members to see if there are any substitutive changes. Ms. Pilram agreed with his recommendation.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any other co-chair announcements. There were none.

BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Mr. Friedman presented the update on the BCT meeting, which was held 5 April, beginning with a review of the composition and purpose of the BCT. He then stated that he saw the SEBS document as crucial since it contains a vast amount of information and details the environmental condition of every parcel on both islands. He added that the SEBS is important to the intelligent transfer of property, and that all of the agencies have commented extensively on the document.

Mr. Friedman stated that there was also another meeting to discuss the petroleum sites, and that the current assumption is that all of these sites are suitable for transfer as is. He is not sure at this time if he shares that assumption. There is an ambitious schedule that calls for closing all of the petroleum sites by summer. He hopes all the documents can be reviewed by the summer. Mr. Friedman said he does not know if everything can be agreed to on the petroleum closure documents in that timeframe, but that he is hopeful that discussions will be on going.

He then noted that there have also been ongoing discussions related to the human health risk assessments at Site 12 and other sites. Although there is some disagreement about the appropriate methods to conduct the risk assessments, once a model is agreed upon the assessments should proceed at a much faster pace.

The BCT discussed the treatability studies at Sites 21 and 24, which contained chlorinated solvent contaminated groundwater. The agencies unanimously agreed that the pilot study at Site 24 was successful. However, there were discussions about how to appropriately expand the study. There were also discussions concerning expanding and changing the boundary, relative to the details of the recirculation, the set up, and the data interpretation.

Mr. Friedman noted that the Site 13 ROD was a good example of a cooperative multi-agency agreement.

Mr. Sullivan said they were in the process of finalizing several meetings' worth of BCT meeting minutes and handouts. He is planning on submitting these to the RAB technical subcommittee. He also offered to provide this information to any other interested community member. Ms. Smith stated that it would be helpful to get the BCT meeting minutes in a more timely manner. She added that it was important in the RAB review of documents to know what the regulators have been talking about. Mr. Sullivan agreed, and said the goal will be to provide the community with the final BCT meeting minutes two months after the

BCT meeting. Mr. Sullivan also said that the minutes would be submitted on CD, because of the large number of handouts and odd-sized paper.

Other Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan turned the floor over to Mr. Brennan for an update on the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB). Mr. Brennan said the CAB had a meeting in March, and a subcommittee meeting on 22 March. The CAB is discussing green building standards. Alameda County made a presentation on their green building standards, which the CAB hopes can be applied at TI. The next CAB meeting is scheduled for 3 May at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Brennan suggested that anyone interested in attending check the website to find out if the meeting will be held at the DOL Building on TI or at City Hall.

Mr. Sullivan then showed some slides of a BCT field trip to the new East Span Bay Bridge construction. He showed slides of the piers under construction, one of the former Navy barges from TI, the existing Bay Bridge, and the new East Span construction. Slides also showed the two piers that were built onshore on YBI in the Site 8 area. Currently the two piers have been the only construction on YBI. However, there are more new piers planned on YBI that will connect to the existing tunnel.

Future Meeting Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan noted that he would add a 6:30 p.m. site visit to the agenda for the June meeting and asked if there were any agenda items anyone would like to see included at the next RAB. Joni Jorgensen-Risk, ITSI, noted that the December meeting minutes have not been finalized and recommended that be added to the June agenda. Mr. Sullivan agreed. Mr. Sullivan recommended that the agendas begin to include some brief educational items, and suggested that the first educational item should be on the RI and the risk assessment process. Ms. Smith agreed that was a good idea.

Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated the next BCT meeting will be 3 May. There is a conference call scheduled for 4 May, and another will be scheduled for 1 June. The next RAB meeting will be 21 June. Anyone interested in the CAB meetings should visit the CAB website for details.

Mr. Brennan mentioned that on 12 April the City provided the comments from the Treasure Island Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The comment period had ended 2 October 2004.

Mr. Sullivan thanked everyone for coming and brought the meeting to a close.
Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

April 2004 RAB Meeting Handouts

- Site 13 Offshore Sediments Record of Decision, April 19, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Sites 21 and 24 Treatability Study Updates, Treasure Island April RAB Meeting
- Treasure Island Site 12 Housing Update, April 19, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Figure 1, Conceptual Site Model, April 19, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Figure 2, 19 Proposed Exposure Units Overview, April 19, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Figure 3, Proposed Sample Locations Halyburton Court, April 19, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- NAVSTA TI Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey (SEBS) and Findings of Suitability to Transfer (FOST), Naval Station Treasure Island RAB Meeting, April 19, 2005
- Naval Station Treasure Island Restoration Advisory Board, Operating Procedure Guidelines, 21 May 1996
- Document Tracking Sheet
- Navy Field Schedule