From:	Hall, Steve
To:	Kito, Melanie R CIV NAVFAC SW; Koppel, Sarah A CIV NAVFAC SW; Forman, Keith S CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Callaway, Rex CIV NAVFAC SW; Cummins, John M CIV NAVFAC SW; Larson, Elizabeth A CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Cc:	Merrifield, Campbell; Kelly, Dennis
Subject:	RE: Internal Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease Parcel G, Hunters Point Shipyard
Date:	Friday, June 19, 2009 3:16:13 PM

Melanie,
We want to wait on making any changes until we get all the comments. Then we'd like to meet with the Navy team to discuss the comments and needed revisions to make sure we have the proper focus for the FOSL. I'm going to ask Dennis Kelly to be present at that meeting (either in person or by conference call). There will still be restrictions on what can be done with many buildings and across many areas until CDPH and EPA approve the radiological FSSs and SUPRs.

Maybe we could hold the meeting to discuss the FOSL comments on June 29 or 30? I suggest that we hold on submitting the Parcel B FOSL text for review until we get the focus better defined to address the comments, and then we'll make the revisions to the Parcel G portion and incorporate the comments into the Parcel B portion. Then we'll submit a revised internal draft that includes both Parcels B and G.

Steve Hall, P.G.
Senior Project Manager
Tetra Tech EM inc.
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101
Office: 619-321-6709
Cell: 713-829-5707
Fax: 619-525-7186

-----Original Message-----
From: Kito, Melanie R CIV NAVFAC SW [mailto:melanie.kito@navy.mil]
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 2:19 PM
To: Koppel, Sarah A CIV NAVFAC SW; Forman, Keith S CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Callaway, Rex CIV NAVFAC SW; Cummins, John M CIV NAVFAC SW; Larson, Elizabeth A CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Cc: Hall, Steve; Merrifield, Campbell
Subject: RE: Internal Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease Parcel G, Hunters Point Shipyard

Sarah and Team,

I have lots a comments so I will just list my main issues. Overall I think this FOSL needs much more detail than what is provided. The FOSL guidance does mention that we need to be brief and refer to other documents, but we still need to make this document is useful for its intended purpose. If I were the Leasee, I really have no idea what areas I can start activities in and what areas I can't.

I will be in SF on Mon and Tues and out of the office from June 24-29th, but I can discuss further when I return.

Major comments:

1. Should list a brief background history of parcel so Leasee knows what contaminates they can expect.
2. Page 1, section 2.0 - Under this FOSL, is the Leasee only allowed to demolish buildings and stockpile? What about the foundations? Can they sample groundwater, soil vapor and soil too?
3. Page 2 - We should mention the NEPA and reuse compliance for the site.
4. Page 2-3, section 3.1.1.1 - Since one of the restrictions are alterations, disturbance and removal of any component of a response or cleanup action, we should show where we plan to do these activities at instead of just

refer them to the ROD. We can add a figure that shows the areas where we need to excavate and where the GW wells for our RA are located at.
5. We need to discuss how much we depend on the RMP. After reading their first version of the Pre-development RMP, it scares me.
6. page 4, sec 3.1.1.2 - "The Navy has investigated ....and is in the process of demolishing buildings 364, 365 and 408" I think we have already demolished these. Check with Dane
    We are missing building 439 (at least one room)
    We should probably mention sand blast incase they find some.
7. Page 7 section 3.1.3.3 - UST and TPH - We need to mention our up coming investigations and what we are doing. Please add a reference and work with Simon Loli.
8. Page 12 - same comment as #5, be careful how much we refer to the RMP.
9. Page 12 - Notifications - with the high chemical contamination, where are these areas? Does this mean they cannot demolish a foundation? Please make this clear.
10. Overall - Do we need to mention the cultural resources sensitive areas for a FOSL?
11. Page 13, section 3.2.3. I would suggest another table with the buildings and what restrictions they have (rad, chemical, etc.)
12. Figures - we should include a figure that shows where we plan to do a RA from our actions in the ROD. At least the leasee will know where they can do activities at and where they cannot.

Melanie

-----Original Message-----
From: Koppel, Sarah A CIV NAVFAC SW
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2009 13:32
To: Kito, Melanie R CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: FW: Internal Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease Parcel G, Hunters Point Shipyard

Who gets this for review???

Thanks,
Sarah
-----Original Message-----
From: Merrifield, Campbell [mailto:Campbell.Merrifield@ttemi.com]
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2009 12:24
To: Koppel, Sarah A CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Hall, Steve; Kelly, Dennis
Subject: Internal Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease Parcel G, Hunters Point Shipyard

Sarah,
Attached is the PDF of the Internal Draft FOSL for Parcel G, as well as the Word document, hard copies will be delivered Monday.

We'd appreciate comments by June 30, 2009.

Thanks!

We Moved! -
Campbell Merrifield | Environmental Scientist Tetra Tech EM Inc.
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 500 | Oakland, CA 94612
Direct: 510-302-6339 | Main: 510-302-6300 | Fax: 510-433-0830 www.tetratech.com <http://www.tetratech.com/>
PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.