DRAFT
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS AND
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 1, 2012

These minutes summarize discussions with the remedial project managers (RPM) and the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) for the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI). The meeting was held at 10:00 a.m. on August 1, 2012, at the office of Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tetra Tech) in Oakland, California. The agenda and sign-in sheet are included as Attachment 1.

The following participants attended the meeting:

Izzat Amadea, Department of the Navy Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC), via telephone

Lora Battaglia, Navy, via telephone

Jessica Beck, Tetra Tech

Bill Carson, Terraphase Engineering (consultant to Treasure Island Community Developers [TICD])

Dave Clark, Navy

Pete Coutts, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Group (Shaw)

Christine Donahue, Shaw

Carolyn Ferlic, Tetra Tech

Eric Goldman, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SF PUC)

Katie Henry, Tetra Tech

Danielle Janda, Navy, via telephone

Quinn Johnson, Tetra Tech

Tracy Jue, California Department of Public Health Environmental Management Branch (CDPH EMB), via telephone

Anthony Konzen, Navy

Steve Krueger, Tetra Tech, via telephone

Radhika Majhail, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), via telephone

Marcie Rash, Tetra Tech, via telephone

David Stensby, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), via telephone

James Sullivan, Navy

Guy Taibi, CDPH EMB, via telephone

Michael Tymoff, Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), via telephone

Denise Tsuji, DTSC

Scott Warner, AMEC (consultant to TIDA), via telephone

Matt Wright, CDPH EMB, via telephone

Myriam Zech, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board)

Tommie Jean Valmassy, Tetra Tech

I. Introductions, Meeting Guidelines, and Agenda Review

Jessica Beck (Tetra Tech) began the meeting with introductions and asked if any other items were to be added to the agenda (see Attachment 1). No new items were added to the agenda.

II. Approval of BCT Meeting Minutes

Ms. Beck said the January through June 2012 meeting minutes are outstanding to the BCT. The draft July 2012 minutes were distributed to the BCT on July 31.

III. Navy and Organizational Updates

Navy Organizational Updates
Mr. James Sullivan (Navy) said there were no organizational updates.

Other BCT Organizational Updates
No organizational updates were provided by the BCT.

Navy Funding
Dave Clark (Navy) reviewed the Navy's funding priority list for fiscal year 2012 (see Attachment 2), which does not include projects that have already been contracted. He said all project priorities for fiscal year 2012 will be fully funded and he provided the following update:

- Site 12 Phase II Westside Drive Removal Action and Building Demolition — will include the removal of possible commodities found by CDPH during an April 2011 scanning event. Solid waste disposal area (SWDA) A&B areas may be included. A figure of the buildings to be demolished and a Westside Drive update will be provided at future BCT meetings. Mr. Sullivan noted the Phase II demolitions are for additional buildings within the SWDA and only down to the foundation.
- Site 27 Clipper Cove Skeet Range Remedial Action (RA) — the Navy is soliciting bids for the dredging project.
- Lead-based Paint (LBP) Inspections — these inspections will support the 2013 initial property conveyance and are limited to target housing (residential structures) on TI. Mr. Bill Carson (Terraphase) inquired about Officer's Quarters 1 through 10 on Yerba Buena Island (YBI) and whether they were included. Deb Theroux (Navy) said Officer's Quarters will be included in the pre-closing conveyance of YBI. Mr. Sullivan noted the LBP inspections supporting the pre-closing conveyance were done and the LBP inspections listed in the priority funding list will support the 2013 initial conveyance property.
- Site 12, Building 3, Site 32, Site 6 and Pipeline Supplemental Radiological Scanning and Removal Actions — encompasses various radiological projects on NAVSTA TI. The Site 12 scanning will include roadways and areas not previously scanned, but will not include SWDAs. The optical repair shop formerly located on the roof of Building 3 and its associated sanitary sewer lines will be addressed under a separate contract.
- Land Use Controls (LUC) as needed — are not anticipated in the last month of fiscal year 2012.

IV. Transfer Update

Mr. Sullivan said there are no changes to the transfer update since the June BCT meeting. Michael Tymoff (TIDA) said TIDA aims to complete the pre-closing conveyance on YBI by December 2012.

V. Field Activities Update

Site 12

Pete Coutts (Shaw) reviewed the handout (see Attachment 4) for Site 12. Preparation for demolition at Buildings 1123, 1319, and 1321 began in July. All loose debris had been cleared from Buildings 1319 and 1321, and Building 1123 had been down-posted to a restricted contamination area. Guy Taibi (CDPH EMB) asked to elaborate on "down-posting." Ms. Christine Donahue (Shaw) explained the outside wall of Building 1123 had been posted as a "contamination area," and the other three walls of the building were enclosed within the fenced contamination area. It appeared the building wall was being used as a continuation of the fencing for the contamination area. Shaw surveyed the outside wall of Building 1123 following its work plan guidelines to ensure there was no contamination outside of the fenced contamination area. Shaw surveyed the surrounding 6 feet of soil to confirm the posting, as a contamination area designation requires additional personal protective equipment (PPE) and site control measures for the workers. The samples, which included smear samples, indicated there were no results above background. Ms. Donahue said Shaw compared results to the Regulatory Guide 1.86 limit for radiological contamination. She said loose radiological contamination above the Regulatory Guide 1.86 limit defines when an area must be posted as a contamination area. The degree of contamination zones from low to high: (1) controlled area, (2) restricted area, and (3) contamination area, which is the area with radiological contamination above the Regulatory Guide 1.86 limit. The outer side of Building 1123 did not exceed that limit; thus, the outside building wall was down-posted from a "contamination area" to a "restricted area," but is still within the "controlled area." Mr. Taibi asked if the survey will affect the interior surveys of the buildings. Ms. Donahue said it will not — the same methodology and procedures proposed in the work plan will be followed. The only change had been back-posting the back wall from a contamination area because there is no known contamination. Mr. Sullivan noted that the buildings will be demolished to the foundation to make room for field work. The foundations will later be removed and the building footprints will be excavated.

Mr. Coutts said the mold in the buildings is being addressed with a bleach spray to eliminate potential airborne exposure hazards to workers. Ms. Zech noted the airborne issues depend on the source of the mold. Mr. Sullivan explained the mold has grown because the buildings have been vacant for more than 15 years, along with exposure to the elements through broken windows and leaking roofs.

Mr. Taibi asked if radiological coverage is in place for non-radiological field work within Site 12. Ms. Donahue said all work in any areas posted under a radiological work plan requires radiological technician coverage. Mr. Coutts said a radiological technician had overseen all intrusive events during the Buildings 1311/1313 soil gas investigation.

Sites 31 and 33

Mr. Coutts reviewed the handout (see Attachment 4) for Sites 31 and 33. He said the excavations of Area-D-North and Area-D-South at Site 31 are 50 percent complete. The Area-D-North excavation will be completed on August 2 and Area-D-South will be completed by August 10 because Shaw has to coordinate with the City of San Francisco regarding the water line that was encountered during the excavation. Scott Warner (AMEC) asked whether there were any remarkable findings during the excavation. Mr. Coutts said, as discussed during the July 2012 BCT meeting, three inert, spent shell casings were encountered and the unexploded ordnance (UXO) procedures were followed. Eric Goldman (SF PUC) asked whether all UXO material encountered is inert. Mr. Coutts replied affirmatively. Mr. Goldman requested a size reference guide of the projectiles and shell casings. Mr. Sullivan said a photo with a size reference will be provided.

Mr. Taibi asked how many global positioning system (GPS) buggy units are used to survey. Ms. Donahue said, when possible, two GPS buggies and one backup unit are used. Mr. Taibi inquired about the survey procedures. Ms. Donahue explained that a three-step characterization process is followed, including: (1) perform gamma walkover survey (GWS) in 6 inch lifts — if there is a detection above the investigation level (IL), then (2) perform a static survey — if there is a detection above the IL, then (3) that soil is excavated and handled as low-level radioactive waste (LLRW). The static survey data are provided to the project's certified health physicist. No static samples exceeded the IL at Site 31. In the instances where the systematic static samples exceeded the IL at Site 33, multiple radionuclei in the soil and asphalt contributed to the static readings —specifically by higher levels of actinium-227 and one detection of potassium-40. There were no samples above the release criterion. Three data summary packages for the lifts, floor, and wall GWSs are posted separately for each of the five excavation areas. Mr. Carson asked to clarify whether the actinium-227 and potassium-40 are related to contamination or background. Ms. Donahue replied they are related to naturally occurring background.

Mr. Coutts said the Site 33 internal draft Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) was submitted to the Navy on July 31 in two volumes. The first volume is the RACR that addresses the remedial efforts for lead, with Appendix N containing the site radiological characterization and data that were gathered concurrently with the remedial efforts. Based on the Site 33 RACR, Site 33 is not impacted.

Building 233

Mr. Coutts reviewed the handout (see Attachment 4) for Building 233. He said a steel utility line was discovered above the sewer line and will be surveyed, removed, and characterized for disposal as part of a scope modification. There were no elevated readings on the steel pipeline. The steel line is consistent with a storm drain line, as the area was previously used as a parking lot during the Golden Gate International Exposition. A second terra cotta sewer line was also discovered below the sewer line and yielded an elevated reading outside the top of the pipe. Mr. Carson asked if a map is available that shows the known utility lines that were removed and the location of the newly discovered utility lines. Mr. Coutts said drawings of the removed lines are available on the Shaw portal. Mr. Carson asked to elaborate on the excavation of the utility lines. Mr. Coutts explained Shaw (1) removed the soil in 6-inch lifts down to the top of the

pipeline and surveyed the soil (there were no detections), then (2) surveyed around the line, (3) removed the pipeline, and (4) surveyed beneath the pipeline. The same three-step characterization process, as described for Sites 31 and 33, will be followed. All Building 233 data are available on the Shaw portal.

Mr. Warner asked to identify the work that has been conducted since the July BCT. Mr. Anthony Konzen (Navy) said the Navy is investigating where the second terra cotta pipe leads, which is a secondary 6- to 8-inch gravity line that is consistent with sanitary lines and does not match any lines in the storm drain system. The contract is being amended to include both pipelines in the scope and to investigate and remove the pipelines within the building footprint for the Building 233 Final Status Survey. The sanitary lines that extend past the Building 233 site boundary will be addressed under a separate contract that will be awarded in fiscal year 2012. Matt Wright (CDPH EMB) asked if the second contract will include investigating whether there are additional unknown utility lines besides the two newly discovered pipelines. Mr. Konzen said no additional lines are anticipated. The work instruction modification will detail the procedures to investigate the two additional utility lines, which are the same procedures used for previous pipelines. Mr. Taibi stated his concern regarding the challenge of conducting concurrent characterization and remediation when the nature and extent are not yet complete. He reiterated the challenge of proving there are no additional unknown utility lines or additional impacted areas. Mr. Konzen said, like most field events, the field variance will be documented in both the work instruction and the post-construction summary report. The work instruction will be available in a few weeks for BCT review before the field work begins. Mr. Sullivan stated the Navy recognizes the burden is on the Navy and the contractors to adequately characterize and remediate the site and make the case for release.

In response to a question from Mr. Taibi, Mr. Sullivan said only the eastern side of Building 233 (the side facing the shoreline) where the utilities are located has been excavated below 6 inches. Ms. Tsuji asked CDPH for its recommendations for how to address the concern that CDPH has regarding utilities. Mr. Taibi recommended ground penetrating radar or electromagnetic resonance testing could be used to locate potential utilities before field work begins. Ms. Tsuji noted terra cotta clay pipes would not likely be detected.

Action Items:

- Navy to provide SF PUC a photo with a size reference guide of the projectiles and shell casings.

VI. Site 27 Remedial Design Update

Lora Battaglia (Navy) said the agency comments on the Site 27 remedial design (RD) are due August 16. Acknowledging the tight schedule of the RD and remedial action (RA), she asked the BCT to discuss any comments the agencies have at this time. She noted that both Katie Henry (Tetra Tech) and Steve Krueger (Tetra Tech) were present to answer any questions. Tetra Tech is currently preparing the 90 percent Basis of Remedial Design for Site 27, which includes the size of the protective armor layer, initial specifications, and general plan and design drawings.

Mr. Krueger said as part of the RD, which will be focused dredging near the Clipper Cove shoreline, Tetra Tech performed bathymetric and topographical surveys. The bathymetric survey was an update to the 2005 analysis at the site. He reviewed the two main findings from the analysis. The dredge area had been previously assumed to be erosional, but the new data indicated there had been an accretion of only 0.5 to 1.5 feet of sediment between 2005 and 2012. Based on the location of the lead shot from the 2008 sampling event and the depth of the current accretion, the lead shot is located 20 to 32 inches below the current sediment surface and is now close to a depth that meets the remedial action objectives (RAO). Mr. Krueger said, based on this finding, it is proposed to change the remedy to dredge only enough material to install a protective armor layer; the exact depth will be determined in the RD.

Mr. Krueger said the original remedy had been to remove sediment located within 75 feet from the shoreline and backfill to prevent exposure to the lead shot. However, based on the bathymetric survey, the toe of the riprap approximately follows the mean lower low water (MLLW) contour, resulting in a shift of the proposed dredge area (as was depicted in the Feasibility Study [FS]) 30 feet to the northwest and extends 75 feet into the cove from the toe.

Ms. Tsuji asked whether the Navy consulted with San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regarding the proposed design changes. Ms. Battaglia said BCDC is currently reviewing the report. She noted the only change to the RD is the amount of sediment to be dredged. Ms. Tsuji recommended the Navy directly contact BCDC for any preliminary comments.

VII. Site 21 Soil Gas Investigation Update

Danielle Janda (Navy) provided the Site 21 soil gas investigation update (Attachment 5). She said the recent Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) Addendum originally calculated risk using soil gas data instead of groundwater data, which were used in the HHRA in the Remedial Investigation (RI). Per the request of EPA and DTSC, the Navy has calculated the risk using both groundwater and soil gas data in the recent report. Overall, the risk results were similar to the risk calculated in 2007. Risks were below or within the risk management range for current and future commercial/industrial workers; for residents, the risks were within or above the risk management range. She reviewed the basis, which the screening-level risk assessment is more conservative. Based on the results of the recent HHRA Addendum, no changes to the Record of Decision (ROD) are necessary. Ms. Janda asked the agencies to contact her as soon as possible if they have comments or concerns that will affect the Record of Decision (ROD).

Ms. Janda said the Site 21 LUC RD will detail how the LUCs will be enforced and discussed the boundaries of the areas of concern (AOC). The Navy proposes to use the soil gas residential risk isocontour of 1×10^{-6} as the boundary of the AOC where the LUCs will be maintained. Mr. Carson asked if the LUC will allow residential use if a vapor mitigation plan that is acceptable to DTSC is implemented. Ms. Janda replied in the affirmative, noting the language is stated in the ROD. Mr. Carson asked if the LUCs in the Site 21 ROD can be implemented in the portions of the AOC boundary (defined by the residential isocontour of 1×10^{-6}) that extend outside the Site 21 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) boundary. Ms. Janda said the portion of the AOC boundary that extends past the Site 21

boundary is within Building 3, which is already protected as a historical building. Ms. Tsuji asked for the CERCLA status of Building 3. Mr. Sullivan said Building 3 is not a CERCLA site. Ms. Tsuji said the portion of Building 3 that is proposed for inclusion within the LUC boundary will need to be surveyed to define the extent of the LUC. Mr. Sullivan said a survey will be needed to support a legal description in the LUC.

Ms. Janda said the risk estimate is also considered conservative because the highest soil gas concentrations (corresponding to a cancer risk of 1×10^{-4}) are bounded in an open space within Building 3 based on the step-out soil gas samples and that the risk was modeled using a small office space. Mr. Carson asked whether commercial/industrial use is planned for Building 3. Mr. Tymoff replied affirmatively.

VIII. Upcoming Documents and Field Activities

Upcoming Documents

Mr. Clark reviewed the document tracking sheet (DTS) (Attachment 6) and highlighted the upcoming documents anticipated for draft or final delivery and agency reviews that are due within the next 30 days. He provided updates on the following:

- Building 233 FSS is on hold pending completion of the contractual modification to address the two additional utility pipelines.

- Site 31 RACR — Mr. Carson asked whether a radiological analysis will be included or provided in a separate report. Mr. Clark said a radiological analysis will be included in the Site 31 FSS. He noted there will be no FSS for Site 33, but the radiological analysis for Site 33 is provided in Volume II of the Site 33 RACR.

- Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) Supplemental Technical Memorandum — Mr. Clark said he will e-mail the agencies during the week of August 20 to set up a meeting to discuss preliminary comments on the draft report. The agencies will provide their availability to the Navy.

- Site 6 RI/FS Report — Mr. Konzen asked if the agencies do not concur with the response to comments, they should contact him directly.

Action Items:

- Navy to organize a technical meeting with the BCT to discuss preliminary comments on the HRA Supplemental Technical Memorandum.

Field Schedule

Mr. Clark reviewed the field activities scheduled to begin within the next 30 days (see Attachment 7). Mr. Clark the Site 33 remedial action is on hold pending CDPH scanning and sampling. Ms. Tsuji asked if CDPH had retrieved the split samples. Mr. Coutts said CDPH had not. Mr. Taibi said CDPH EMB will not be conducting an independent scan. Ms. Battaglia said the Navy will confirm with CDPH RHB whether the department has any testing needs.

IX. RAB Meeting Agenda/Community Relations Update

Mr. Sullivan said the draft agenda for the August 21 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting (see Attachment 8) has not been prepared. Mr. Sullivan added that no new public inquiries had been received.

Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech) provided the community relations update (see Attachment 9), including an overview of upcoming items that will be distributed to the public.

X. Action Item Review/Other Meetings/Future BCT Agenda Items

Action Items:
Ms. Beck reviewed the action items list (see Attachment 10) and noted the completed and outstanding items. The following action items from the meeting were reviewed:

- Navy to provide SF PUC a photo with a size reference guide of the projectiles and shell casings.
- Navy to organize a technical meeting with the BCT to discuss preliminary comments on the HRA Supplemental Technical Memorandum.
- Navy to confirm what Site 33 data were requested in the previous action item: "*Navy will e-mail the BCT when all Site 33 data are available on the Shaw portal and recommend a due date for the BCT to provide input or concurrence to proceed with backfilling.*"

Ms. Zech noted she is waiting to receive the 2001 technical memorandum that had been listed as a reference for the Site 12 RI Report relative to petroleum and arsenic. Mr. Sullivan said the 2001 technical memorandum will be provided. Mr. Konzen said the recent Site 12 arsenic and total petroleum hydrocarbon data package that was provided to the Water Board summarizes the studies performed to date, which show natural attenuation is occurring toward the shoreline. Ms. Zech reiterated that proving natural attenuation is occurring will need to be investigated.

Future Agenda Items:
Ms. Beck asked for any additional agenda items to be included to the next BCT meeting, scheduled for August 1, 2012. No items were requested.

Future BCT Meetings:

- September 5, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California
- October 3, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California
- November 7, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.