

**Final
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
13 December 2005
Meeting Number 121**

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Dale Smith Alice Pilram Anthony Fo

Regulatory Agency, City and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

Alan Friedman (Water Board) James Sullivan (Navy)
David Rist (DTSC)

Other Agency, Navy Staff and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Marcie Rash Pete Bourgeois Jim Whitcomb
David Donohue Tommie Jean Damrel Marc McDonald
Dan Kim

RAB Support from ITSI:

Joni Jorgensen-Risk Steve Edde
Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter

Other community members and interested parties:

Atta Pilram Dan Leininger Nathan Hunsperger
Sophia Wann Anthony Singleton Rena Morabe
Ryan Lutz Reginald Haviston

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 13 December 2005 meeting at 7:11 p.m. at the Casa de la Vista (Building 271).

Mr. Sullivan welcomed those in attendance and thanked everyone for participating in the holiday social before the meeting. He pointed out there were extra copies of the meeting agenda and other meeting materials available at the back of the room, and asked attendees to be sure to sign in so they could be added to the mailing list for future meeting mailings. 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). There were no comments or announcements so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

Field Activities Update

Mr. Sullivan introduced Pete Bourgeois, Shaw Environment and Infrastructure (Shaw E&I), to provide the field activities update for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Sites 10 and 32.

Mr. Bourgeois started by saying that the handout for his presentation included five pages of photos and a few figures. He reviewed the figures stating that they completed their field work in the areas of the water plant and the old gas station. Site 10 was an extension of a petroleum excavation remediation that was completed a while back when they found a layer of burnt ash material about a foot and one-half to two feet deep. Samples were collected at the time that the ash was originally exposed and the results showed dioxin constituents present.

During the excavation removal for petroleum, they removed most of the material up to the fence of the Rubicon yard and what is now called Site 10. The Navy collected additional samples over the years and elected to remove what remained of the site, which was considered a very small area. The removal of that material was completed the week of the RAB meeting.

Mr. Bourgeois stated that they were still awaiting the submittal of all the preliminary data and indicated that they found little, if anything, during the excavation of the material.

At Site 32, they excavated 12 trenches measuring approximately four feet deep, by five feet long, and two feet wide. Samples were collected from the trenches and the data will be used for the Risk Assessment in that area. According to Mr. Bourgeois, previous sample results indicated that PCBs and dioxins were present. Again, they are awaiting the preliminary data from the laboratory. He added that they did not find any layers of burnt material or ash at Site 32 either.

There has also been some sampling at Site 24, near Buildings 96 and 260. He stated that they are sampling quite a few wells to assess the effectiveness of the bioremediation system. Laboratory results are expected in the next few weeks. Mr. Bourgeois asked if there were any questions. There were no questions and he handed the floor back to Mr. Sullivan.

Navy Environmental Program 2005 Accomplishments and 2006 Look Ahead

Mr. Sullivan introduced Marcie Rash, Tetra Tech (TtEMI), to give a presentation on the 2005 accomplishments and the look forward to the 2006 environmental program.

2005 Accomplishments

Ms. Rash stated that in terms of **site closures**, which is the ultimate goal of the Navy, they were able to complete the following:

- No Action Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in April for Site 13
- No Action Site Closure for Site 7
- No Further Action Concurrence for Sites 14/22, 25, and F2A/F2B
- No Further Action Concurrence for Site D1B soils

Ms. Rash continued with the **field work** conducted in 2005 that included:

- Ground water investigation at Site 33 completed
- Expanded groundwater treatability study at Site 24
- Groundwater Pilot Study at Site 21
- Sites 10 and 32 investigations
- Lead-based paint in soil abatement at Quarters 1-7 and 10
- Site 27 Hydrographic survey
- Installation of permanent fencing around Site 12 solid waste disposal areas
- Installation of two monitoring wells in the C-zone to further define the site boundary at Site 24 (before initiating the Remedial Investigation [RI])
- Completion of seven groundwater monitoring events at the petroleum sites (to collect standard groundwater data)
- Disassembling the soil vapor extraction (SVE) system at Site 25

Dale Smith asked Ms. Rash to identify the function of Site 33, to which she replied it was the waterline replacement area. In explaining that the Navy generally develops the names for these sites based on some historical association, Mr. Sullivan stated that Site 33 was a result of reviewing information from a waterline replacement project in the late 1980's and early 1990's where debris was encountered during trenching operations. In discussions between the Navy and the regulatory agencies, debris locations and contaminants of potential concern were identified for the site, and it was added to the program for a CERCLA investigation.

Ms. Rash continued with the **final documents** completed in 2005:

- Site 12 Groundwater Monitoring Optimization Technical Memorandum
- Site 27 Sedimentation Point Paper
- Closure Reports for Sites Underground Storage Tank (UST) 180C, D1B, F2A/F2B, and 14/22
- Closure Reports for Sites 6 and 25
- Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey (SEBS)

Ms. Rash stated that the purpose of the Optimization Technical Memorandum at Site 12 was to look at how to continue monitoring the groundwater at the site for the next couple of years.

Community relations activities that were completed in 2005 included:

- Completion of the Naval Station (NAVSTA) TI General Fact Sheet
- Completion of the Spring/Summer edition of the NAVSTA TI Island Times Newsletter, mailed to over 1,100 interested parties
- Completion and mailing of the Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) Fact Sheet

Ms. Rash added that several documents are very near completion, and they include:

- Final Site 30 RI Report
- Final Site 12 RI Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) Work Plan
- Final HRA
- Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) for TI
- FOST for YBI

Ms. Rash asked if there were any questions. Ms. Smith asked why the apartment housing located on the western side of YBI were not investigated for lead-based paint and wondered if it was because of the date of the housing. Mr. Sullivan responded that the cutoff date for use of lead or larger quantities of lead in paint was 1978. All of the housing on YBI was built before 1978.

There is another cutoff date that the Department of Defense (DoD) follows under Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines for assessing lead-based paint in housing. There was also a point in 1960 where there was a reduction of the amount of lead being used in paint. The HUD criteria calls for investigation and abatement of housing constructed prior to 1960 and investigation of housing constructed between 1960 and 1978. The newest housing on YBI was built in 1968, and it was assessed. There is also some housing on YBI built prior to 1960 that was both assessed and lead abated. He added that the Navy is in the process of doing some follow-up abatement to some of the pre-1960 housing units.

Ms. Smith asked if the units built in the 1960's had been suitably abated. Mr. Sullivan responded that all of the housing on YBI has been assessed and that is reflected in the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) and the SEBS. He added that on TI, the 1400 series housing was built in 1989 which is past the point when lead-based paints were used.

Looking Ahead to 2006/Planned Environmental Cleanup Program Activities

Ms. Rash continued with a look at what is expected for 2006 beginning with **final documents** scheduled for release. These documents include:

- Site 6 RI Report

- Sites 8, 28, and 29 RI and Feasibility Study (FS) Reports
- Sites 30, 31, 32, and 33 RI and FS Reports
- Site 24 RI and Focused FS Reports
- Site 9 and 10 Proposed Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Halyburton Court Soil Gas/Indoor Air Investigation Technical Memorandum
- Site 12 HHRA Work Plan and RI Report
- Site 12 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memorandum
- Site 21 RI and Focused FS Reports (site is currently going through some treatment)
- UST Summary Report
- Site 6 Petroleum Closure Summary Report
- HRA
- FOSTs for TI and YBI

Field work that will be conducted in 2006 includes:

- Well deconstruction at some of the petroleum program sites that have closed
- Electrical Transformer Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB) Investigation in Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) property areas
- PCB remediation in FOST and FOSET areas
- Re-evaluation of lead-based paint in the YBI residential units
- Complete Building 233 asbestos and radiological investigations
- Conduct radiological surveys of sites identified in the HRA

Finally, Ms. Rash noted that the Navy is expecting to complete **site closures** in 2006 at the following:

- Site 6, Petroleum Program, Soil and Groundwater
- Site D1B, Petroleum Program, Groundwater
- Sites 9 and 10 ROD

Mr. Sullivan added that there was a handout in the back of the room titled "FYI 2006 Navy Funding" that he said listed everything that the Navy is planning to get started on or awarded for the current fiscal year. Mr. Sullivan suggested that there could be more work to be awarded for 2006, but all that has been awarded to date was presented by Ms. Rash.

Marc McDonald asked if there was a schedule available that provides a breakdown of when these tasks will be accomplished. Ms. Rash responded that the Document Tracking Sheet and the Field Schedule (to be reviewed later in the evening) would provide that information for the upcoming 6 months.

Ms. Smith added that the Navy also has a timeline to closure document that Mr. McDonald might find helpful. She asked if that was updated and available on the Web site. Ms. Rash confirmed that it was updated and could be found on the Web site. Ms. Rash provided a brief overview of the timeline to closure document and offered to bring copies to the next meeting. She added that the Document Tracking Sheet and the Field Schedule are much more accurate than the timeline to closure.

Dan Leininger, Treasure Island Sailing Center, asked if he needed to be concerned about lead-based paint on the cranes that he uses to lift sailboats in and out of the water. He is considering repainting the cranes and wanted to know his best course of action. Mr. Sullivan responded that it would depend on the age of the cranes as to what his course of action would be, and thought that those cranes may have been brought in when the sailing center was being developed. He suggested that between the Navy and the TI Development Authority (TIDA) they could find out where the cranes came from and their dates. He added that they would not want the sailing center to paint or scrape when they are not yet certain if that paint contains lead or not. He added, that if there is lead in the paint, there is a fairly common practice of removing the paint that will prevent a release to the environment. In fact, they are using the procedure in the YBI housing area.

Mr. Sullivan, responding to an earlier question regarding the 2006 budget from Ms. Smith, stating that the budget for the current fiscal year (beginning 1 October 2005) is 14 million dollars. A big chunk of that 14 million dollars will be directed towards the removal work at Site 12 in the solid waste disposal areas (primarily within the fenced areas at the TI housing). He added that the funds will likely get awarded later in the year, with the work possibly starting in fall. There were no additional questions.

Environmental Components of the TI/YBI Property Transfer Process

Mr. Sullivan stated that there was RAB member interest expressed in understanding how the environmental program fit into the overall property transfer process. He stated there are essentially three things that need to take place in order to transfer TI and YBI property from the DoD to the City of San Francisco.

The first item is a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Record of Decision (ROD) which was a result of the 1969 NEPA and states that, if the federal government is to take an action (in this case transfer a property), and the property is to be redeveloped, then the environmental impacts must be evaluated. The ROD is the final part of the NEPA process. The ROD for the disposal and reuse of Naval Station Treasure Island was signed October 2005 and published in the Federal Register in November. He said that copies of the ROD were available in the back of the room, as well as on the project Web site. Essentially, what the ROD says is that

potential impacts were analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS was circulated for public review from June through July of 2003.

Because the EIS (California equivalent is an Environmental Impact Report [EIR]) is so voluminous, Mr. Sullivan brought copies of the executive summary from the EIS. The executive summary was also available on the Web site. The EIS basically identified the action to be taken as the city's reuse plan for TI.

The second item necessary for transfer is a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). The TI FOST was public noticed for 30 days in July 2005, and the YBI FOST was public noticed in August for 30 days. Several comments were received from the regulatory agencies and the public that the Navy is working with the BRAC cleanup team to finalize the FOSTs.

He explained that the FOSTs are also supported by the SEBS that was completed in July 2005 in time for the Navy to issue both FOSTs for TI and YBI. He added that the FOSTs do not FOST the entire Navy acreage; that will be done in the future for remaining acreage either with a FOST or a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET). Essentially, the FOST says that the Navy has completed the environmental program and the acreage is ready for transfer. The FOSET says that they have not completed the environmental program, but will do so after the transfer.

He then provided a brief overview of the CERCLA, petroleum, asbestos, lead-based paint, and radiological programs, and how these programs feed into the SEBS and the FOST. Steps one (ROD) and two (FOSTs) are being completed by the environmental program at the Navy, and step three is being completed by the real estate divisions. When all three are completed, the property can be transferred. Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any questions before proceeding to the next agenda item.

YBI Sites 8, 28 and 29 Pre Draft Remedial Investigation Report

Mr. Sullivan introduced Dave Donohue with TtEMI to provide the next presentation on the Pre Draft RI Report for YBI Sites 8, 28 and 29. Mr. Donohue stated there are four components that he wanted to review that included the history of the sites, sampling results, investigations, and the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). The ERA is currently under review and, for that reason, the conclusions and recommendations included in the ERA would not be presented. He provided a brief review of CERCLA and the purpose of the RI.

Site 8 was an area used to accept waste from the wastewater treatment plant at TI. During the 1960's and 1970's the sludge was spread on the ground to dry. Though it is not documented where the sludge was moved to once it was dried, it is not likely that it was left on site because of the shallow soils and the bedrock within several

feet of the surface on YBI. In addition, with Caltrans construction at the site, approximately one third of the surface soils have been removed from the site or otherwise disturbed. The proposed reuse for Site 8 is residential and publicly oriented uses.

The investigation phase at Site 8 did not start until the results were reviewed on Site 7, which had a similar history as an area used for drying of sludge. A site investigation was completed at Site 8 in 1990 with some detected concentrations in the soils (pesticides and metals). The Phase I RI collected additional soil borings but was unable to install monitoring wells because of the bedrock and lack of shallow groundwater. The Phase II RI looked at additional soil sampling and completing a pesticide analysis of leachate present. The results indicated that there was no movement of pesticides from soil to the groundwater. In 2001, Caltrans completed a site investigation to look at potential contaminants that may be encountered during the Bay Bridge construction.

Based on the results of the Phase II RI, the BCT agreed that further evaluation of the risk be conducted, including risk to the peregrine falcon, a listed species at that time. The Navy completed a validation study (similar to a baseline ecological risk) at Sites 8, 28, 29 and 11.

At Site 28 there was possible surface soil contamination from lead and other metals from maintenance of the bridge and vehicle emissions. The proposed reuse is for shoreline open space. Environmental assessments were initiated by Caltrans looking at health and safety concerns for its workers. Soil samples were collected and analyzed for metals by the Navy as part of the Phase II B RI.

Site 29, constructed in 1936, had similar surface soil contamination as Site 28. Site 29 reuse is designated as residential and publicly oriented uses and institutional. No work was conducted at the site under the Phase I, but it was included in the Phase IIB when metals were detected at Site 28 as a result of the Phase I. Soil samples were analyzed for metals. Based on the results of the Phase IIB there was a potential human health risk (residential use scenario) associated with lead, but there was no risk under the industrial use scenario.

All of the past data collected as part of the previous RIs have been reevaluated based on current standards. Therefore, recommendations from the Phase I and Phase II may not be consistent with current recommendations.

Site 29 also had several additional investigations current or following the RI. UST investigations were completed in the 1990's. Fuel line investigations took place in the 1990's and in 2000-2001 looking at contamination along the pipeline. Samples were collected at that time for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and petroleum. In addition, Caltrans conducted a

large study in 2001 that included portions of Site 29 to characterize contaminants that might be encountered during bridge construction. They also collected groundwater grab samples at that time and analyzed them for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), VOCs, and SVOCs.

A validation study was completed by the Navy and evaluated the risk to Peregrine Falcon. In 2002, TtEMI conducted an additional investigation to evaluate the concentration of lead in surface soils and to fill the data gaps from previous studies.

Mr. Donohue then reviewed the nature and extent of contamination: soil and groundwater data were compared to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region IX preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) and were also compared to background soil values at YBI. He added that all of the data that have been collected over the years were assessed for data quality and incorporated into the risk assessments.

Mr. Donohue reviewed the results of this study:

- Benzo (a) pyrene detected at Site 8 above the PRG
- Arsenic, Iron, and Vanadium exceedences above the PRGs at Site 8
- Arsenic and lead detected at Site 28
- Soil detections of TPHs (from the diesel range, motor oil and gasoline range organics); SVOCs with some exceedences of the PRGs; and metals at Site 29
- Groundwater collected at Site 29 had exceedences of the screening criteria for petroleum
- Ecological risk was re-evaluated using the new data
- Human health risk assessment was reassessed

Mr. Sullivan added that, at this time, no conclusions have been made since the risk assessments have not been completed. He suggested that the RAB members should be seeing the conclusions included in the next iteration of the document before the next RAB meeting in February. Ms. Smith considered that the document may not be through the internal review cycle to meet the RAB schedule. Mr. Sullivan suggested that it was still possible and added that the goal of the presentation was to provide the RAB members with some background information that could assist in their review of the document. He added that Sites 8 and 29 are now on Caltrans property, and are no longer considered Navy property.

Before moving on to the next agenda item, Mr. Sullivan asked those in attendance to take a look and provide any comments they might have of the draft poster hanging up in the back of the room entitled "What is a RAB?".

Upcoming Documents and Field Schedule

Ms. Rash reviewed the list of documents coming out over the next two months that included:

- Lake of the Nations footprint Tech Memo will be finalized early February
- Site 12 Risk Assessment/RI Work Plan expected to be finalized 23 December
- TI FOST expected to be finalized 28 December
- Site 30 RI looking to be finalized 3 January
- YBI FOST expected to be finalized 30 January
- Draft RI for YBI Sites 8, 28 and 29 scheduled for 21 February
- Draft Site 12 History Fact Sheet scheduled for 2 February; comments due 9 February
- Draft Site 12 RI Fact Sheet scheduled for agency review 3 February
- Final Winter Edition Island Times newsletter scheduled for 17 February
- HRA expected to be finalized 14 January
- Final HRA Fact Sheet currently scheduled for 3 February, but it may move into January

Ms. Rash then reviewed upcoming field activities for the next two months:

- Site 12 soil-gas sampling investigation in the Halyburton Court area started that Monday and is expected to go into the following week
- Site 21 Pilot Treatability Study expected to be completed 31 December
- Sites 10 and 32 dioxin investigation is expected to be completed 28 December
- Site 24 Treatability Study also expected to be completed 31 December
- Lead-based paint abatement at Quarters 2 through 7, 240, 83 and 61 expected to be completed 30 December

Ms. Rash asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Mr. Sullivan suggested that , since the meeting had gone a little over, and there were still some agenda items to cover, maybe a change to the agenda was in order. Ms. Smith suggested that the future meeting agenda item could be dropped. That was the only change to the agenda.

October 2005 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Smith stated that the only concern she had regarding the minutes was that she was attributed to a comment regarding a new application for membership that she did not recall making. Mr. Sullivan stated that a review would be completed and

the minutes would be corrected as appropriate. Ms. Smith then moved to approve that minutes as corrected, and the motion carried.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. Sullivan turned the discussion over to Alice Pilram who stated that she had no announcements.

BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that there had been two BCT meetings since the last RAB meeting, one in November and one in December (for two days). The November meeting was primarily an update meeting where they reviewed the status of the FOSTs, the Site 12 RI Report, and plans and scheduling for conducting removal actions in 2006. The remainder of the meeting included an update on documents and field activities and discussions about the upcoming RAB and community relations efforts.

The December meeting in San Diego included a review of Site 31 comments, development of the Site 6 RI Report, a discussion about the Site 21 and 24 treatability studies, and Sites 10 and 32 fieldwork. They also discussed the Site 12 RI Work Plan comments and removal action scheduled for 2006. The Navy provided a presentation on the hydrographic survey completed at the Site 27 Clipper Cove Skeet Range; he hopes to present that to the RAB in February. They discussed the planned pilot study for the Site 12 arsenic and groundwater and plans for getting that work underway. The second day included a discussion of the comments received on the HRA and plans were made for the December RAB meeting. They also talked about the TI FOST comments received that will assist them in working through the YBI FOST. They wrapped it all up with future plans for future meetings.

Because of the holidays, the January BCT meeting was moved to the second Tuesday (10 January) at the San Francisco offices of TtEMI. As always, the RAB is invited to send a representative to the BCT meetings.

Other Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor for public comments or announcements. He added that Nathan Brennan generally provides an update on the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) at this time, but since he could not attend, CAB details could be found on the agenda. He suggested that anyone interested could go to their Web site for future meetings. Mr. Sullivan stated that the TIDA Board meeting was scheduled for the next day at city hall.

Future agenda items were included on the agenda and Mr. Sullivan stated that if anyone had anything to add to please let him know or bring it up during the RAB conference calls.

Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated the next RAB meeting would be in February. There are conference calls scheduled for January and February. Mr. Sullivan also indicated that he scheduled the January call for the first Wednesday of the month; 4 January. He suggested that he would send out an email to those that regularly participate in the conference calls to see if that date is good for them.

Mr. Sullivan then thanked everyone for coming both to the social and the meeting. Before adjourning the meeting he apologized for the level of information that was presented at the meeting. He realized it was a great deal of information, but added that the purpose of these meetings is to address their interests and questions regarding the program. He suggested that if material needed to be better explained, the Navy is more than happy to make that happen in order to get the information to the members of the community. He asked those in attendance to feel free to talk with the members of the team after the meeting and to help themselves to the food that remained. Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

December 2005 RAB Meeting Handouts

- Trenching/Excavation for Dioxin in Soil Site 10 and 32, December 13, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Site 10 & 14/22 Investigative Trenching
- 2005 Accomplishments, Environmental Cleanup Program Activities, December 13, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Looking Ahead to 2006, Planned Environmental Cleanup Program Activities, December 13, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- FY 2006 Navy Funding, Naval Station Treasure Island (FY06 Funds- 1 Oct 05 to 30 Sep 06), 13 December 2005
- Environmental Components of the TI/YBI Property Transfer Process, December 13, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Draft Remedial Investigation Report, Sites 8, 28, 29, Yerba Buena Island, December 13, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Navy Field Schedule
- Document Tracking Sheet