



**Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command
Southwest
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
Program Management Office (PMO) West
San Diego, California**

**FINAL
Restoration Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes, Meeting Number 202**

Former Naval Station Treasure Island
San Francisco, California

September 15, 2020

Approved for public release: distribution is unlimited



**Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command
Southwest
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
Program Management Office (PMO) West
San Diego, California**

**FINAL
Restoration Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes, Meeting Number 202**

Former Naval Station Treasure Island
San Francisco, California

September 15, 2020

DCN: TRBW-0202-4856-0021

Prepared for:



**Department of the Navy
Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Southwest
BRAC PMO West
33000 Nixie Way, Building 50
San Diego, California 92147**

Prepared by:



**9775 Businesspark Avenue, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92131**

Contract Number: N62473-18-D-0202, Task Order N6247320F4856

FINAL
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
FORMER NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
15 SEPTEMBER 2020
Meeting Number 202
Virtual Meeting Number 1

Community Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members in attendance:

Nathan Brennan, John Gee, Alice Pilram, Dale Smith

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

Tahirih Linz, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator
Celina Hernandez, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board)
Peyton Ward, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

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

Dave Clark, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager
Sarah Ann Moore, Navy
Dennis Parker, Navy
Marsha Maloof, Maloof & Associates
Kim Walsh, DTSC
Geoff Mordock, Fleishman Hillard
Rick Wice, Battelle
Megan Kranz, Trevet-Bay West Joint Venture

Public Guests in Attendance:

Bob Beck, Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)
Carol Harvey, journalist
Jessica Joseph, resident

***As a result of technical difficulties with the audio of the virtual meeting, additional attendees who did not identify themselves during the roll call are not recognized as attending.

Welcome Remarks and Agenda Review

Marsha Maloof (facilitator) opened the September 2020 RAB meeting for Former Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI), held virtually because of COVID-19 restrictions. Ms. Maloof initiated a round of introductions and reviewed the agenda ([Attachment A](#)).

New Business—Treasure Island Second Five-Year Review

Tahirih Linz (Navy) reviewed the process the Navy followed to conduct the Second Five-Year Review at NAVSTA TI ([Attachment B](#)). She said site documents were reviewed and

site visits and interviews with Navy personnel, stakeholders – regulators and developers, and residents of Treasure Island — were conducted. The Navy used the information to make a determination if the remedy selected in the Record of Decision (ROD) for each site remains protective of human health and the environment.

Public notices were provided to the public in the *San Francisco Examiner* and at RAB meetings. A copy of the draft report was available at the information repository for public review and comment. Ms. Linz said a fact sheet summarizing the findings is currently being prepared.

Ms. Linz said Sites 21, 27, and 30 were determined to be protective; Site 24 was determined to be protective in the short term, and a protectiveness determination was deferred for Sites 6 and 12.

Ms. Linz provided an overview for each of the sites discussed in the Five-Year Review Report, including location, past uses, remedial actions, and results and recommendations (slides 10 through 27). She reviewed the issues, recommendations, and milestone dates for responsible parties to complete follow-up actions (slide 28).

Ms. Maloof opened the floor to questions from the RAB members. Nathan Brennan (RAB member) asked if the transformer bases that were encapsulated, such as those on Buildings 1 and 3, would be included in future Five-Year Reviews. Dave Clark (Navy) said those specific polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) sites were transferred to the new property owner, TIDA, which is required to maintain and protect the locations and these sites will not be included in future Five-Year Review.

Dale Smith (RAB member) had thoughts about the Second Five-Year Review Report including that the Navy is trying to “tiptoe away” from persistent problems and not wanting to pursue solutions other than monitoring. She asked if the RAB would be part of the review process for the total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) and arsenic issue at Site 6. Mr. Clark said the RAB would be involved in the environmental process going forward for Site 6. He said a remedial investigation is planned for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) at Site 6.

Ms. Smith said remedial action objectives (RAOs) have not been met at two wells at Site 6 and expressed concern that the Navy has not proposed any further investigation, but only monitoring. She said the planned reuse at Site 6 is open space, which is ecologically sensitive. She said ecological receptors have a lower threshold for contaminants than do humans, and the remedy might not be protective of wildlife and aquatic and benthic species. She said aquatic species are being hard hit by contaminants in the bay.

Ms. Smith said the Navy has previously stated that cleanup cannot be assured until an assessment can be completed at Site 12, however, the Five-Year Review states that after a limited investigation, the site is meeting all of the RAOs. She said after a year of monitoring there should be enough data to determine if there is a real problem, however, the Five-Year Review only recommends continued monitoring.

Ms. Smith said at Sites 21 and 24, carbon tetrachloride, benzene, ethylbenzene, and naphthalene are listed as contaminants, which she does not recall being discussed in the past. She said more contaminants are discovered over time, like PFAS, but there is no indication of any kind of follow-up. She said chemicals at Site 21 are not coming from the subsurface; instead, they are derived from the ambient indoor air. Ms. Smith said the building at Site 21 is on the National Register of Historic Places and believes the federal government is responsible for the cleanup, yet there is no information in the Five-Year Review Report about remediating the issue. She said the investigation of the impact to benthic species at Site 21, completed in the 1990s before diving ducks were recognized as a problem, is also a concern. She said the statement in the report that the plume is stable may not be valid because there are no sentinel wells along the bay. These wells were removed.

Ms. Smith said in addition to carbon tetrachloride, there are concentrations of vinyl chloride in soil gas at Site 24 and asked if concentrations are increasing or decreasing. She said the Five-Year Review Report is confusing because it initially states concentrations are increasing, where other parts of the report indicate concentrations are decreasing or stable.

Ms. Linz explained that the attenuation factor used to calculate risk changed, and as a result, the Navy will expand the soil gas network and continue to monitor trends. She said Site 24 is protective for the current use, but the Navy recognizes that more evaluation is required. Mr. Clark said the updated Mann Kendall trend analysis graphs, which will provide the most up-to-date evaluation of the data, would be included in the 2020 Basewide Groundwater Monitoring Report. He said his understanding is some trends are decreasing, but the report will provide more detailed analysis.

Ms. Smith asked about the new remediation goals (RGs) at Site 12 for skin exposure. She said the new RGs were based on regulatory changes and asked if the Navy could reach the new goals without any additional remediation, but only through monitoring. Ms. Linz said the Navy is monitoring to determine if the remedy is working. She said the excavation completed in 2018 included addition of an oxygen release compound, which is expected to work overtime. She said it appears the remedy is successful. However, DTSC changed the screening criteria and the Navy is currently monitoring to determine if the selected remedy will meet the updated goals or if additional remediation will be required. Ms. Smith asked how long it would take to reach the new goals. Ms. Linz said it is difficult to predict: the arsenic levels are not highly elevated, and TPH was removed. The arsenic concentrations should continue to decrease below the new goal of 15 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) to be protective of construction workers. She said there is no risk to construction workers since there is no construction currently at the site and redevelopment is not planned.

Ms. Smith said the draft Five-Year Review Report referred to barium, manganese, and iron as above the RG, but these metals were not discussed in the final report, and asked why they were tested if they were not relevant to the Five-Year Review. Ms. Linz said she would follow-up with Ms. Smith on the question.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy would consider advancing a core to determine if settlement is occurring rather than erosion, which is what the regulators were suggesting, if the integrity of the backfill at Site 27 is questioned.

Ms. Linz explained the remedy at Site 27 is to implement land-use controls (LUCs), so the site is not disturbed and then every 5 years conduct a bathymetric survey. By comparing the data from the current bathymetric survey and the previous survey conducted 5 years ago, a change greater than 3 inches over 20 percent or more of the area triggers further evaluation, such as coring or a video-scoping survey. The change between the 2018 and 2013 bathymetric surveys did not reach that trigger point. Ms. Linz said she would look for the reference that was the basis for the protectiveness statement in the Five-Year Review and provide Ms. Smith with the backup information.

Ms. Smith asked why a concrete pad was installed at Site 30 if it was not needed. Ms. Linz said she was referring to the concrete slab that is the foundation of the building. She explained the remedy included excavation of soil around the building, but not underneath the building; therefore, the building slab foundation serves as the barrier to prevent contact with soil. The Five-Year Review determined the building slab is not compromised. Ms. Smith said she was referring to the concrete pad in the photograph that is outside the building, not inside. Ms. Linz said she would review the photograph and follow up with Ms. Smith on the question.

Ms. Maloof closed the question and answer period.

New Business—Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) Update

Ms. Maloof asked DTSC and the Water Board to provide brief updates.

Peyton Ward (DTSC) said DTSC conducted a site walk in May and brought issues to the Navy's attention. Issues included a request to maintain the fence at the Northpoint solid waste disposal area (SWDA) and to add multilingual signage on the fencing throughout the Westside area, both of which the Navy addressed. DTSC also provided oversight during a soil sampling event at the Northpoint SWDA in July during a non-time critical removal action (NTCRA) to determine if clean backfill placed during a previous phase of work contained chemical concentrations greater than the screening levels. The Navy explained the elevated chemical concentrations were the result of cross-contamination during the current removal action. The results confirmed that the backfill was clean, and the contamination detected along the boundary of the excavation was from cross-contamination during construction.

Ms. Ward said DTSC has met regularly with the Navy at BCT meetings and Site 12 radiological technical working group meetings between March and August. Ms. Ward said field work at Northpoint has been concluded, soil stockpiles have been removed from Site 32, and hardscaping was restored and hydroseeding completed.

She said the Site 12 radiological technical working group has been working through issues identified in the Site 12 Technical Memorandum requesting unrestricted

radiological release of selected open spaces. She said the technical working group has been working on developing a path forward for radiological closure at Site 12.

She said DTSC reviewed and has no further comments on the Second Five-Year Review Report. Ms. Ward said DTSC reviewed the 2018 Groundwater and Soil Gas Basewide Monitoring Report, which includes recommendations from the Five-Year Review process to be implemented in 2020 and 2021. These recommendations include sampling for PFAS at Site 6 and conducting a trend analysis of data.

DTSC is also reviewing the PFAS Preliminary Assessment (PA) and a Phase IV work plan for the NTCRA at SWDA Westside. She said there are a few technical memorandums related to Site 12 that are being discussed in the technical working group under the context of updating a conceptual site model for radiological contamination at Site 12.

DTSC has been reviewing the YF3 Corrective Alternative Evaluation Report and has no further comments, so the document should be available shortly.

Celina Hernandez (Water Board) said she joined the Treasure Island team on April 1, 2020. She said the Water Board has been reviewing the 2019 YF3 Corrective Alternative Evaluation Report and the revised YF3 Corrective Alternative Evaluation Report dated June 9, 2020; the Water Board provided comments on the revised report on July 29, 2020. She said the Water Board is waiting for responses from the Navy on the July comments. She said she is also reviewing the Draft PFAS PA and awaiting the Draft 2019 Annual Basewide Monitoring Report.

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. Alice Pilram (RAB Co-Chair) said she was not aware of any recent CAB meetings. Bob Beck (TIDA) said there had been no meetings since mid-March because of COVID-19, but a video meeting for the advisory board was scheduled for October 6, 2020. Information will be posted on the website and distributed to the e-mail list.

New Business—Community Comments

Ms. Maloof opened the floor to public comments. Jessica Joseph (community member) asked to be added to the mailing list and requested copies of meeting minutes. Ms. Linz said she would add Ms. Joseph to the e-mail list.

There were no other community comments.

Old Business—RAB Meeting Minutes Approval

Ms. Linz asked for comments on the December 2019 and March 2020 RAB Meeting Minutes. Ms. Smith had minor comments on the December 2019 minutes but was unable to find them in her notes. Ms. Smith provided two comments on the March 2020 minutes. Ms. Smith asked that an “Action Items” list be included in the minutes as

before to remind people of the action items. Ms. Pilram said the RAB members had not asked for the action item list to be dropped from the minutes.

Ms. Smith moved to accept the December 2019 and March 2020 minutes as revised. Ms. Pilram seconded. The motion was approved.

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

Ms. Pilram had no items for discussion.

Ms. Linz said the usual topic for the December RAB meeting is a look-back at 2020 accomplishments and a look-ahead for 2021 plans presented by Mr. Clark. The next RAB meeting will be December 8, 2020, also a virtual meeting.

Ms. Smith said she had trouble accessing the meeting with the password provided. Ms. Linz explained that the format was changed to ensure that closed captions would be available. Ms. Pilram said the link provided on the agenda worked well. Ms. Maloof asked if there was other feedback regarding the virtual meeting. John Gee (RAB member) said he had trouble accessing the meeting based on the password confusion. Ms. Linz apologized for the confusion and said these meetings are a learning process and the Navy will work on making it a smoother process for the next meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Action Items

Ms. Linz will provide responses to Ms. Smith about the removal of the reference to barium, manganese, and iron concentrations at Site 12 that were above the RGs in the Five-Year Review; the Site 27 reference stating the 2018 bathymetric survey results; and the photograph of a concrete slab outside the building at Site 30.

15 September RAB Meeting Handouts

- Attachment A: NAVSTA TI RAB Meeting No. 202 Agenda
- Attachment B: Treasure Island Second Five-Year Review

Attachment 1 NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting No. 202 Agenda

This page intentionally left blank.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

Tuesday, 15 September 2020

Join by computer, enter this link into your browser, then follow the prompt to enter name, email address, and **session password** below to enter the meeting:

<https://trevetinc.webex.com/trevetinc/j.php?MTID=m8aa6593d85ab496c7b3a5ed03a66898b>

Session number: 146 282 7137

Session password: qDTeJMPf886

Join by telephone, call Toll Free: **1-844-621-3956** and enter the **session number** above when instructed.

MEETING NO. 202

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 Five-Year Review Report
Tahirih Linz, Navy
Presentation Q&A: RAB
Presentation Q&A: Community

7:55 – 8:05 BRAC Cleanup Team Update
Peyton Ward, DTSC and Celina Hernandez, 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. 201
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, 8 December 2020

Location: Virtual

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