



Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
Base Realignment and Closure West,
San Diego, CA

**FINAL
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MINUTES**

Former Naval Station Treasure Island
San Francisco, California

March 10, 2020

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited



FINAL

Former Naval Station Treasure Island Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Meeting 201

10 March 2020

Community Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members in attendance:

Nathan Brennan, Becky Hogue, Alice Pilram, Dale Smith

Department of the Navy (Navy) and Regulatory Agency RAB Members in attendance:

Katrina Kaiser, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board)

Tahirih Linz, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental
Coordinator

Kim Walsh, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

Other Navy, Regulatory Staff, and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Dave Clark, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager

Bill Franklin, Navy

Marsha Maloof, Maloof & Associates

Kate Moore, DTSC

Kimberly Noble, Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO)

Joe Schwennesen, Adanta, Inc.

Karen Steen, DTSC

Peyton Ward, DTSC

Public Guests in Attendance:

Bob Beck, Treasure Island
Development Authority (TIDA)

Kevin E. Kempf, resident

Jeff Kline, resident

Sheridan Noelani Enomoto,
Greenaction

Welcome Remarks and Agenda Review

Marsha Maloof (facilitator) opened the March 2020 RAB meeting for Former Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI), held at One Avenue of the Palms, Building One on TI. Ms. Maloof initiated a round of introductions and reviewed the agenda (Attachment A).

New Business – Basewide Monitoring Program

Tahirih Linz (Navy) said the basewide monitoring program is specific to groundwater at NAVSTA TI. Ms. Linz explained that groundwater is evaluated in order to, depending on the site, protect ecological receptors and the San Francisco Bay, protect surface water, or to protect future construction workers

who could come into contact during construction activities. Lastly, monitoring groundwater ensures that any contaminants that create a gas that could be trapped inside a building are identified so they do not pose a risk. Ms. Linz clarified that groundwater is not a source of drinking water at NAVSTA TI.

The four sites where the Navy is monitoring groundwater include Sites 6, 12, 21, and 24. Site 6 was a fire fighter training school, an area use to train sailors in protocols for extinguishing fires. As part of training exercises, the Navy used a fire-fighting foam that contains a class of chemicals called perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). PFAS were used in many products and may be contaminating groundwater. The Navy is also monitoring groundwater for petroleum from the fuel that was used at the site, and for arsenic (a potential natural byproduct from the presence of petroleum).

Site 6 is closed, but the Five-Year Review indicated that cleanup goals for certain contaminants may have changed, so the Navy may have to lower those cleanup goals. Ms. Linz showed a figure with all of the well locations for Site 6 and noted all of them had detections of PFAS during sampling, and there may be PFAS outside the area of those wells.

Site 12 is primarily monitored in the solid waste disposal areas (SWDAs) and in the Gateview Avenue area, where a petroleum removal was conducted. There is a concern that petroleum and arsenic (naturally mobilized by the presence of total petroleum hydrocarbon) could discharge to the bay and affect ecological receptors. Site 12 is also monitored for radionuclides because radium-226 has been found in the SWDAs. Ms. Linz said radium-226 has not been found in groundwater at levels that exceed screening criteria. Ms. Linz reviewed a figure of the Site 12 groundwater monitoring wells.

Ms. Linz moved on to Site 21. This is the area where greasy machine parts were cleaned in a large tank full of solvents in order to degrease them for reuse. With such a potent degreaser it could pose a contamination issue when it was spilled and reached groundwater. A remedy is in place and the cleanup goals have been met, so the Navy stopped monitoring groundwater in 2015. However, in 2018 the Navy has resumed monitoring the groundwater to collect data for the Five-Year Review. The plan is to continue annual monitoring to verify that nothing changes.

Ms. Linz said Site 24 was a dry cleaning and laundry facility. Chlorinated solvents were used to clean clothes and are now in the groundwater at the site. This site has a remedy in place and remediation is ongoing; however, the cleanup goals have not yet been met. The Navy will continue to monitor. There are new regulations for monitoring soil gas data so additional wells installed at Site 24 will ensure adequate data are gathered to further analyze the site. Ms. Linz noted there are buildings within Site 24 that are used by commercial workers. Current conditions are safe but will be monitored in case they change.

Ms. Maloof opened the floor to questions from the RAB. Nathan Brennan (RAB member) asked if the wells at Site 6 will be closer to the bay. Ms. Linz said some of them, but they will be installed in all directions to encompass the entire plume.

Dale Smith (RAB member) noted the training ship USS Pandemonium was at Site 6. She asked if the cleanup concerns for that site were related to firefighting or if they are just radiological. Dave Clark (Navy) said the concerns for the USS Pandemonium were strictly radiological, and that area is encompassed by Site 32.

Ms. Smith asked what the result was of the petroleum contamination discovered at Site 27 because of the use of petroleum donuts. Mr. Clark said that was determined to be an on-shore issue, but not a risk to ecological receptors off-shore. Ms. Smith said she disagrees with that statement of risk.

Ms. Smith asked why arsenic is not being investigated at Site 24. Arsenic could be release in the soil because of petroleum, the same as at Site 12 where arsenic is being monitored. Ms. Linz said the Navy is not monitoring for petroleum at Site 24 either. The historical contamination driving that cleanup is chlorinated solvents. Katrina Kaiser (Water Board) noted there were two petroleum sites, Site 14 and 15, that were incorporated into Site 24. Mr. Clark confirmed that petroleum is not a contaminant of concern for Site 24. Sites 14 and 15 were closed in 2005 and 2004 respectively. Ms. Smith asked if it would be prudent for the Navy to test for petroleum at Site 24, just to ensure nothing has changed. Ms. Kaiser said the Water Board made a comment on the Five-Year Review related to that suggestion, and the Navy is preparing responses to those comments.

Ms. Maloof opened the floor to questions from the community. Jeff Kline (resident) asked for clarification on the location of Site 6, and whether it is adjacent to Site 12. Ms. Linz showed a map with the location and noted it is not immediately adjacent to Site 12. Mr. Kline asked if the Navy is considering sampling for PFAS at Site 12, given the fluctuation of the water tables. Ms. Linz said the Navy is installing wells near the perimeter of Site 6 to see if PFAS could be spreading past that site. If there is PFAS there, the Navy may step out further to sample for PFAS, possibly within Site 12.

Mr. Kline asked about the redevelopment plans for the Clipper Cove area and how those plans would impact contamination left in place. He added that he saw a presentation to the SF Board of Supervisors by a San Francisco Department of Public Health employee, and she stated that all of the contamination at NAVSTA TI will be removed before the city gets the land. Mr. Kline asked if that applies only to the land, and not any offshore areas. Mr. Kline added that the redevelopment plans for Clipper Cove have changed to include larger and deeper slips for larger ships, and dredging would be required. Ms. Linz said because the marina is not currently being redeveloped, the remedy is protective.

That will continue to be monitored and evaluated throughout the Five-Year Reviews. Mr. Kline noted that the marina development is not a project that is far out in the future; his understanding is that the plans are ready and only awaiting funding. Ms. Linz said there are land use controls and a management plan in place to protect the current remedy.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy is willing to come back and clean up Site 27 to the level that the developer would need. Ms. Linz said there is a “come-back clause” that requires the Navy to come back if greater contamination is discovered.

New Business – BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Update

Ms. Kaiser said the Water Board has been working with the Navy on corrective alternatives for site YF3 and regarding Water Board comments on the draft Five Year Review. In addition, the Water Board has done numerous site inspections related to redevelopment and to review some of the groundwater monitoring wells Ms. Linz discussed in her presentation. Ms. Kaiser said the Water Board submitted comments on the draft 2018 Annual Basewide Groundwater Monitoring Report. The Water Board plans to work with the Navy to address PFAS in groundwater.

Kim Walsh (DTSC) said DTSC conducted a site walk in February and brought issues to the Navy’s attention. They included a stockpile that needed to be covered and a broken well, both of which the Navy addressed.

Ms. Walsh said DTSC has met regularly with the Navy at BCT meetings and Site 12 technical workgroup meetings. Most recently DTSC provided input on the Navy’s conceptual site model at Site 12. Ms. Walsh said DTSC and the Navy have also been working through comments on the Five-Year Review, and she expects those to be resolved soon.

Ms. Smith asked Ms. Kaiser if the Water Board is happy with the Navy’s proposed solutions for cleanup at Site YF3. Ms. Kaiser acknowledged there has been some contention about the plan for that site. However, the Water Board has been able to work with the Navy on a path forward that addresses Water Board concerns about petroleum residuals.

Mr. Kline said he reviewed the post construction summary report (PCSR) for Site 12. Mr. Kline noted the conceptual site model appears to be a key element in planning intrusive investigations. Mr. Kline requested that at a future meeting more details about the conceptual site model and how it may have been changed based on new information be provided. Ms. Smith asked for a copy of the conceptual site model for Site 12. Ms. Linz said it is not a specific deliverable, but more of a research project, in progress, that will be used to plan future work. However, she can report on it at a future RAB meeting when it is updated.

New Business – Citizen’s Advisory Board (CAB) Update

Becky Hogue (RAB member) and Mr. Brennan are also members of the CAB, which is an advisory board to TIDA. Ms. Hogue said there is a new board chair, Tim Molinare. Mr. Brennan said the work on the westside causeway is almost complete, and work will soon begin on the eastern causeway.

The initial housing construction on YBI began, and three water tanks are being constructed as well. Information, including reports and meeting dates for the CAB, can be found at www.sftreasureisland.org.

New Business – Community Comments

Ms. Maloof opened the floor to public comments. Mr. Kline asked if the PCSR will be presented at the next RAB meeting. Ms. Linz said the topic for the next meeting is a presentation on the Five-Year Review. However, it may be possible to discuss it at a future meeting.

Mr. Kline said the San Francisco Board of Supervisors is having a hearing related to radioactivity on TI. The PCSR lists radiological commodities (low-level radiological objects [LLROs]) that were found. Mr. Kline said the table of commodities in the PCSR and in the Historical Radiological Assessment do not match, so they should be reviewed. In addition, it appears the Navy has found more commodities than expected. Mr. Kline suggested the Navy provide a presentation with a clear explanation to answer questions that the supervisors, residents, and media will have.

Mr. Kline said he is concerned that commodities from repair of Navy metascopes were stored in B-25 boxes at TI. He has read information about those boxes corroding. He would like to know more about the B-25 boxes, their contents, at what depth they were found buried, and how old they were.

Ms. Linz said the 2019 Site Management Plan has the comprehensive list of LLROs. The 2019 Site Management Plan was published in October 2019 and is available.

Mr. Clark clarified that the B-25 boxes at TI were not excavated, rather they were brought on-site specifically for the storage of temporary storage of excavated material. The remaining B-25 boxes are empty and are not being used.

The RAB members discussed the Site Management Plan. They would like a hard copy but did not receive it. The Navy will make sure to distribute that to the RAB members. Specifically, Mr. Brennan would like a hard copy, Ms. Smith would like a loose-leaf hard copy and she will put it in her own binder, and the other RAB members would like a CD.

Old Business – RAB Meeting Minutes Approval

The minutes from the December 2019 RAB meeting have not been submitted to the RAB for review. Those will be submitted, and comments will be taken at the next RAB meeting.

RAB Discussion Items, Co-Chair Announcements, and Future Agenda Items

Ms. Linz said she intends to present the Five-Year Review at the next RAB meeting. Ms. Smith said she would like a review of the LLRO table to be part of that discussion. Ms. Linz said the Five-Year Review does not pertain to LLROs because there are no radiological remedies in-place that are being reviewed. However, that can be discussed at a future meeting.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy will be gathering additional data at Site YF3 to determine a path forward to meet the Water Board's needs and the Navy's cleanup objectives. Mr. Clark said the collection of more data would depend on the remedy being planned. For example, if certain technologies or monitoring systems need to be tested, the Navy may gather more data at the site with those systems.

Ms. Smith said she has concerns about ecological receptors at several sites including YF3 and Clipper Cove. Ms. Kaiser said the Water Board technical lead is reviewing multiple options and is working with the Navy on the path forward for YF3. Mr. Clark said the Navy will continue to update the RAB on YF3 and Site 27.

Ms. Hogue asked for a status update on Northpoint Drive. Mr. Clark said he visited the site and spoke to the superintendent before the RAB meeting. The backfill at Northpoint will take several weeks to complete, with the assumption that several truckloads of backfill will be brought to the site daily. Once backfill is complete, the Navy can consider site restoration and provide a schedule for when the road will be restored.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

10 March RAB Meeting Handouts

- Attachment A: NAVSTA TI RAB Meeting No. 201 Agenda

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

Tuesday, 10 March 2020

One Avenue of the Palms, Building One, Room 117, Treasure Island

MEETING NO. 201

I. WELCOME REMARKS AND AGENDA REVIEW

7:00 – 7:05 Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Guideline Review

Marsha Maloof, Meeting Facilitator

7:05 – 7:10 Agenda Review

Alice Pilram, Community Co-Chair

II. NEW BUSINESS

7:10 – 7:55 Basewide Monitoring Program

Tahirih Linz, Navy

Presentation Q&A: RAB

Presentation Q&A: Community

7:55 – 8:05 BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Kim Walsh, DTSC and Katrina Kaiser, Water Board

8:05– 8:15 Citizen’s Advisory Board Update

Becky Hogue, RAB member

8:15 – 8:25 Break

III. OLD BUSINESS

8:25 – 8:35 Community Comments

Marsha Maloof, Meeting Facilitator

8:35 – 8:45 RAB Meeting Minutes Approval Meeting No. 200

Tahirih Linz, Navy Co-Chair

8:45 – 9:00 RAB Discussion Items, Co-Chair Announcements and Future Agenda Items

Alice Pilram, Community Co-Chair and Tahirih Linz, Navy Co-Chair

9:00 Adjourn

Next Regular Meeting: 7:00 pm Tuesday, 16 June 2020

Location: Treasure Island, Building One, Room 117

Next Treasure Island Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting: See the web site for latest dates and times for future meetings: www.sftreasureisland.org

Navy BRAC Web Site: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/NSTI>

Navy San Diego Office Address:

Navy BRAC PMO West
33000 Nixie Way
Building 50, Attention: Tahirih Linz
San Diego, CA 92147
Email: tahirih.linz@navy.mil
Local phone number: (415) 308-1458