

**NAVAL FUEL DEPOT, POINT MOLATE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
06 April 2000**

Location: Richmond City Hall, Conference Room 1
Community Services Building
330 25th St.
Richmond, CA

Purpose: To: 1) discuss and finalize last month's meeting minutes, 2) provide a presentation on the archaeological finds at Point Molate, 3) provide a presentation on the Site 1 Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Public Comments, 4) provide an update on the Installation Restoration (IR), Compliance and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) programs, 5) provide an update on the load test at Tank 19, 6) discuss the progress of the community outreach committee, and 7) discuss questions and suggested topics for the next meeting.

These minutes summarize the items discussed during the RAB meeting. They are not a verbatim transcript. Attachment A provides the attendance list.

RAB community members present: Bruce Beyaert, Henry Clark, Elizabeth Dunn, Lucretia Edwards, Sarah Eeles, Gaye Eisenlord, Bunny Ford, Richard Frisbie, Sharon Fuller, Don Gosney, Jil Kiernan, Nagaraja Rao, Elinor Strauss, and Terry Swartz.

Government agencies present: Marianna Potacka, Navy Co-chair and BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC); Linda Dorn, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); Michelle Gallice-Sondrup and John Kowalczyk, EFD SW.

I. Welcome and Meeting Minutes Approval

Don Gosney, Community Co-chair, commenced the meeting at 7:16 p.m. He welcomed attendees to the new meeting location. He explained that he has recently discovered that for the last few years, no arrangements were made for a regular meeting room; the RAB has been fortunate that a meeting room at the Community Services Building was vacant during most of the scheduled RAB meetings. He stated that the Navy will make arrangements for a regular meeting room for all future meetings. The City of Richmond will make these arrangements. He welcomed Lucretia Edwards back to the RAB. He encouraged attendees to sign the attendance sheet and called for changes to the minutes. Bruce Beyaert noted that on page 11, in the second paragraph, "mocaahete" should be changed to "molcajete." The minutes were accepted as corrected.

Mr. Gosney read a letter from Lisa Fasano, who resigned as the Bay Area Public Affairs and Community Relations Officer as she has obtained employment with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Her resignation is effective 21 April. Nagaraja Rao suggested that Ms. Fasano's letter be included in the next newsletter.

Ms. Edwards inquired about how the newsletter would continue. Mr. Gosney replied that the newsletter will continue as usual, with assistance from the Community Outreach Subcommittee, Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI), and Navy representatives. Patricia McFadden, Navy Environmental Liaison for Point Molate, will assist with community relations projects such as newsletters and the bulletin board. Michelle Gallice-Sondrup, EFD SW IR Program RPM, has also volunteered her services whenever necessary. The newsletter should be received by mail within the following week.

Mr. Gosney announced that the archaeology presentation will be delayed until presenter Andrew Galvan has arrived.

II. Site 1 EE/CA Public Comments

Brian Schuller, Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI), gave a presentation on the Site 1 EE/CA public comments. Site 1 is a landfill located within a ravine where the Navy dumped construction debris, oily waste and soil. There are an estimated 20,000 cubic yards of waste in a one-acre site. The EE/CA is a Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) document; it evaluates remediation alternatives based on their effectiveness in protecting human health and the environment, implementability, and cost.

Mr. Schuller stated that the Draft Site 1 EE/CA for the waste disposal area/landfill was issued on October 29, 2000 to the Water Board, City of Richmond, and RAB. A public comment period was held from February 15 to March 15 and a public meeting was held on March 1, 2000. He and Ms. Gallice-Sondrup met with the Technical Document Review Committee (TDRC) on Tuesday to discuss RAB comments received by the Navy on March 1, 2000. A tour of Site 1 was also provided.

Mr. Schuller addressed the RAB's comments. One comment asked that the Navy ensure that the public notices are posted in the more widely-read newspapers, such as the *West County Times*. It also stated that the EE/CA should note that documents are accessible at two information repositories, which are located at the Richmond Library and at City Hall. The public notice was posted in the *West County Times*, and the accessibility of both information repositories will be noted in the Final EE/CA.

Another comment was about the future risk to downgradient receptors, primarily through groundwater that could potentially leach contaminants out of the landfill and migrate downgradient. Mr. Schuller pointed out that Alternatives 2 and 3 address this concern. Alternative 2 is the simple soil cover that allows some infiltration of groundwater and Alternative 3 is a cover made of low-

permeable material such as clay. Both alternatives have drainage controls, institutional controls (ICs), and a monitoring program.

Mr. Schuller stated that the Navy and TtEMI recommend the simple soil cover because it has a monitoring program that would facilitate detection of contaminants migrating from the landfill, and the current levels of contamination both within, and downgradient of, the landfill are not of great concern. Also, the UST corrective action plan will evaluate the need for groundwater cleanup downgradient of Site 1. One of the downsides to Alternative 3 is the higher cost of low-permeable clay that would not prevent migration of groundwater into the waste from the sides and bottom.

Another comment pertained to the fact that the EE/CA did not include methane sampling. In response to the RAB's request, soil-gas sampling was conducted in January. Although methane was not detected in the samples submitted to the laboratory for analysis, methane was detected with field instrumentation exceeding 5 percent by volume in groundwater monitoring wells. Consequently, the Navy will plan methane gas monitoring as part of Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, and methane gas venting as part of Alternatives 2 and 3. This information will be included in the Final EE/CA.

Mr. Beyaert asked how the soil cover will be vented for methane. Mr. Schuller replied that venting can be achieved by putting a gravel trench within the waste with riser pipes perforated at the bottom; or wells can be installed above the groundwater table. Since the methane is limited, the latter option will likely be implemented along with monitoring.

Mr. Gosney commented that the Shoreline Amphitheater was built on top of a garbage dump. When it opened for concerts, there was unexpected venting of methane gas. He expressed concern with unexpected venting, noting that vent piping should be elevated up beyond the point where people can accidentally ignite the methane; he suggested elevating the piping ten feet above the ground. Mr. Schuller stated that this will be considered during the design. The RAB will have the opportunity to review and comment on the design report.

With regard to venting, Mr. Beyaert noted that a collection mechanism may be necessary in the absence of a clay cap. Mr. Schuller replied that the need for a collection mechanism depends on the extent of how much methane is venting, which has yet to be determined. The original probe found no methane, while only one groundwater monitoring well showed methane. The generation of methane gas by landfills is common, and there are many ways to collect it if deemed necessary.

Henry Clark noted that although not much methane may be detected at present, methane accumulation and landfills go hand-in-hand. He asked if a permit from the air district is necessary to implement venting activities. Mr. Schuller replied that there are certain regulations that pertain to specific concentrations of methane gas. Because the methane levels at the Shoreline Amphitheater caused some explosions, Mr. Clark suggested that methane be given serious consideration.

Mr. Gosney explained that methane is usually caused by the decomposition of organic materials. The Shoreline Amphitheater was built over a garbage dump of organic materials, not a landfill that is mainly filled with industrial debris, as is the case at Site 1. The risk for methane gas in the latter scenario is significantly reduced, although it should still be addressed accordingly. Mr. Clark stated that the risks should be researched and reported to the RAB.

Mr. Schuller stated that the RAB requested data that reflects decreasing contamination levels. He explained that the EE/CA typically focuses on the recommendation of a cleanup alternative, whereas the extensive data reporting is usually included in the Remedial Investigation (RI) report, which the RAB also reviewed. However, the data the RAB has requested will be included in the Final EE/CA, particularly a graph showing contaminant concentration reduction at well MW02-06.

Mr. Clark asked as to any innovative technologies, such as vegetation, that would be useful in reducing methane contamination. Mr. Schuller explained that the original probes went down to 12 feet, while the groundwater monitoring wells go down to 20 feet. He surmised that the roots that would absorb contaminants would be unable to reach those depths. However, the vegetative cover is important in that it protects the soil cover from erosion and helps to prevent infiltration of groundwater. He noted that there was also a comment from Mr. Beyaert about the utilization of native seeds. In response to Mr. Beyaert's comment, Mr. Schuller stated that they will look into the details of the revegetation.

Mr. Schuller gave an update of future plans. The EE/CA will be finalized and will address comments from the Water Board, City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, RAB and the public. An Action Memorandum (AM) will reflect the selected remedy. The design, construction, and monitoring and maintenance plans will follow; they will be documented in the Proposed Plan (PP) and Record of Decision (ROD). The RAB will have an opportunity to review the documents. A public comment period will ensue with the PP, as was done with the sandblast grit areas.

Adrienne Harris asked when construction at Site 1 would begin, and Mr. Schuller stated that construction will begin in the summer of 2002. The revised master schedule was negotiated by the Navy and the Water Board to allow sufficient review time in an effort to avoid the administrative civil liability (ACL) fines that the Navy is subject to for late submission of documents. The AM will precede the design, which is planned to be prepared through the end of this summer and fall. The monitoring and maintenance plan will precede the PP and ROD. Ms. Gallice-Sondrup commented that she hopes that construction can begin next summer and that it could take about six months. She projected that the ROD will likely be issued one year after the completion of construction, or the beginning of 2004, given the several steps within the process.

Mr. Gosney stated that the TDRC relies upon individual RAB members to review documents on a voluntary basis. He commended Mr. Beyaert, Stephen Linsley, Eileen Whitty, and Jil Kiernan for their comprehensive and diverse comments on the EE/CA. He thanked the Navy for the informative site walk last Tuesday evening, and for meeting with the RAB to resolve the points at issue.

Mr. Beyaert commended Mr. Gosney and the other members of the TDRC for their insight. Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that the Navy appreciates the input from the TDRC.

III. Point Molate Program Update

Brian Werle, TtEMI, gave an update on the status of the three cleanup programs and distributed a handout that will be included in the minutes. He explained that the IR program covers four sites under CERCLA. The Compliance program pertains to state regulations with regard to closing the fuel systems, dealing with pipes and tanks, and cleaning up petroleum products. The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program pertains to activities that facilitate property transfer; it picks up the odds and ends that are not included in the IR and Compliance programs.

IR Program

Mr. Werle stated that the Site 1 preliminary site assessment was completed. While not a detailed investigation, it identifies potential problem areas that are focused on in the Phase I and Phase II comprehensive remedial investigations (RIs). This is followed by the EE/CA, a public meeting, AM, construction design, construction, summary report, operation and maintenance (O&M) plan, groundwater monitoring plan, PP, public meeting, and ROD.

Most of the construction will begin once the AM is completed. Usually, many of the sites that will be closed under CERCLA will undergo the RI, a Feasibility Study (FS) and then a PP and ROD; this process could take several years before construction can begin. In order to fast-track the process, construction was scheduled first, so that the projected allocations can be used to fund the construction; the administrative process to close out the site will transpire last. This fast-track initiative was developed for all the IR sites.

The Site 2 IR program is finished. This covers the sandblast grit area which is a CERCLA site. The final signature from the Water Board is pending on the ROD.

The Site 3 IR program involves the treatment ponds and is a much more complex site. The preliminary site assessment led to a much more detailed investigation during which a fair amount of free product in the subsurface was identified. This led to an interim removal action which resulted in the installation of a containment wall to prevent fuel and other contaminants from leaching into the Bay. This interim removal action allowed extra time to finish the cleanup of the whole site.

Pilot and bench-scale cleanup studies were conducted as part of the Phase II RI to obtain data needed for a full scale design. This information led to the Site 3 EE/CA which is currently in process. It will be issued next year and will be followed by a public meeting, an AM, construction design, construction summary report, O & M plan, groundwater monitoring plan, PP, public meeting, ROD, operation and maintenance, and groundwater monitoring. The containment wall will be removed after the completion of cleanup.

Mr. Werle reiterated that the Navy and TtEMI considered opportunities to expedite the process and to get construction started sooner, rather than doing the ROD and administrative tasks in the beginning. In response to Mr. Beyaert's inquiry, the Site 3 construction will likely be phased to some degree. The ponds must be closed out and considered separately from what is underneath them. In addition, there is still a lot of subsurface piping that needs to be addressed through a groundwater action that will continue for some time. Natural attenuation will be considered. The containment wall will also need to be pulled out. Construction will begin in 2002 and will continue for about one to one and one-half years.

In response to Mr. Rao's inquiry, Mr. Werle stated that the administrative process will document the remaining tasks to verify the appropriateness of the actions taken. It is the formal check-off in closing out a CERCLA site. In contrast, when the administrative process precedes the construction, the ROD documents the pending activities.

Ms. Harris inquired as to any local oversight that ensures compliance with CERCLA cleanup requirements. Mr. Werle explained that the State Water Board and EPA typically oversee CERCLA sites, although counties do provide input for the compliance program which covers underground storage tanks (USTs) and fuel systems. Mr. Schuller noted that the County reviewed the Site 1 EE/CA. In response to Ms. Edwards' comment, Mr. Werle explained that County involvement in the compliance programs is required by law.

Ms. Gallice-Sondrup added that Linda Dorn, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), reviews the documents and provides concurrence for all of the CERCLA IR program sites. The Water Board is the lead regulatory agency. Ms. Dorn added that the County is involved in permitting USTs and landfill programs.

Mr. Beyaert commented that the rapid progress in cleaning up the shoreline should make it possible to build the Bay Trail soon. Mr. Werle replied that cleanup activities and the City's redevelopment plan should be coordinated. For example, many of the activities at Site 3 will be in-ground and can be concurrent with the Bay Trail development. Also, the area can be restored in such a way as to facilitate the developer's plans. Mr. Beyaert commented that the Bay Trail could showcase the property and help to attract developers.

In response to Mr. Gosney's inquiry, Mr. Schuller stated that the Site 3 characterization study was done in the 1992-1993 time frame, after which the containment system was installed. Mr. Gosney inquired if the data from the characterization study is still valid. Mr. Werle replied that as part of the EE/CA, TtEMI has decided to revisit some of the engineering data. The master schedule also includes plans for additional field work to verify the natural attenuation of petroleum products.

Ms. Harris asked if the state regulations on petroleum products have become more lenient or stringent since the study was done.

Ms. Dorn replied the State has loosened up regulations after the 1996 Lawrence Livermore report determined natural attenuation does occur with petroleum products. She clarified that monitored natural attenuation is not synonymous with a finding of no action.

Mr. Werle stated that Site 4 pertains to the shoreline areas, on which pipeline removal action is ongoing. This site has undergone a preliminary site assessment, Phase I and II RIs, and offshore aquatic ecological assessment. Groundwater sampling and a human/terrestrial risk assessment will follow. The information obtained will be used to determine if any action is needed. There have not been any major problems, but there are a few things that need to be verified along the shoreline areas. If there are problems or potential risks, this site will undergo the same process as Sites 1 and 3; this will include an EE/CA, design, construction, and post-construction documents. In any event, there will be a groundwater monitoring plan that will be followed by a PP, ROD, operation and maintenance, and groundwater monitoring.

In response to Ms. Harris' inquiry, Mr. Werle explained that the offshore aquatic ecological assessment focused on the offshore sediments. The pipelines are located on land; in many cases, the pipelines parallel the shoreline. The wildlife is not disturbed, given that the areas involved are all industrial areas, which few terrestrial creatures inhabit.

Mr. Werle explained that the offshore aquatic ecological assessment was conducted to determine if historical releases affected the health of the aquatic community. The offshore aquatic ecological assessment found that the aquatic community is very healthy, and that fuel itself is the food source for many of the microorganisms. This is not related to the pipeline pulls, nor to the groundwater sampling and the human/terrestrial risk assessment, which are required to close out the site.

Compliance Program

Mr. Werle explained that the compliance program deals with USTs and pipelines. With regard to the hillside pipelines that are not being pulled, a UST closure alternatives study was conducted. This was followed by a conceptual structural closure design and a structural integrity evaluation. The TDRC suggested the recent load test which passed; this is an example of teamwork between the Navy, TtEMI, and RAB.

The oily-water recovery system (ORS) evaluation is in process; this refers to the pipes and collections around the tank that collect and direct spilled fuel and water to the treatment ponds at Site 3. The information will be used to put together a design for closing the tanks and hillside pipelines, followed by a summary report and a monitoring plan. A request will be submitted for a structural closure, which entails checking off the structural components and contamination.

The basewide pipeline removal entails removing pipelines in easily accessible areas or in the shoreline. The first phase of construction will be finished soon. Construction will be followed by a summary report and a request for structural closure.

With regard to fuel leaks and spills, the Fuel Product Action Level Development Report (FPALDR) will determine the cleanup level that is protective of human health and the environment. Two phases of characterization have been completed and cover sampling and installation of wells to determine the location and extent of spills. The characterization report will be issued in the current year, which along with the FPALDR, will be fed into the corrective action plan (CAP) for the USTs. The CAP is similar to an EE/CA in that it evaluates cleanup alternatives. The cap will be followed by the design, construction, summary report, operation and maintenance plan (if there is an active treatment system), groundwater monitoring plan, and a request for closure from the Water Board. Operation and maintenance, as well as monitoring, will continue.

BRAC Program

The environmental baseline survey (EBS) identifies parcels for transfer on properties without tanks or IR sites. The basewide survey and two phases of investigation have been completed. The results will determine the action taken, if any. If contamination is found, an EE/CA and removal action may be conducted. If no further work is needed, the area is completed. This program deals with the rest of the base.

Mr. Gosney commended Mr. Werle for the informative update.

IV. Archaeology Discussion

Mr. Gosney stated that it is unlikely that the archaeological presentation will occur because of Mr. Galvan's absence. Marianna Potacka, Navy Co-chair and BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC), stated that she would present what she knew about the mortar and pestle; Patricia Duff, Navy archaeologist, informed her that once the mortar and pestle are in federal custody, it must remain in federal custody. Ms. Potacka explained that the archaeologists have not had a chance to study the mortar for any possible remnants such as pollen or food items which may become dislodged in transport. She expressed her disappointment that she was unable to present the artifacts to the RAB. She noted that Mr. Galvan's presentation will need to be rescheduled.

In response to Ms. Harris' inquiry, Ms. Potacka stated that the mortar and pestle is being stored by IT Corp. on Pt. Molate. Mr. Gosney suggested scheduling the next RAB meeting so that it coincides with the site tour; this will provide the RAB an opportunity to view the mortar and pestle. In response to Mr. Clark's inquiry, Dennis Julio, IT Corp., explained that the mortar and pestle is under joint control by IT and the Navy. IT is proposing that the Navy take full custody of the mortar and pestle, and that it be transferred to Building 6, which is the administration building at Pt. Molate. He added that 11 archaeologically significant items were found on the site over the last few months, including some small tools, charms, and a human bone. Ms. Potacka stated that Mr. Galvan has informed her that the Native Americans are sensitive to the public viewing of human remains. Mr. Rao requested that both co-chairs ensure that arrangements are made so that RAB members can view the nonhuman artifacts during the next meeting/site tour.

Ms. Potacka stated that she does not anticipate the artifacts will be moved to Richmond from Pt. Molate. She acknowledged the RAB members' concern regarding the City's retention of the artifacts.

Mr. Beyaert, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Rao asked who will decide where the mortar and pestle will ultimately be placed. Ms. Potacka stated that she will look into it. Mr. Beyaert asked if she can assure the RAB that the mortar and pestle will remain at Pt. Molate. Ms. Potacka replied that she cannot say it will stay there indefinitely, although it will remain there until such time that the archaeologists are able to study the content. There has been communication between the archaeologists and the Berkeley museum regarding where the artifacts will be stored. Mr. Rao commented that it is important that the interests of the City of Richmond be represented in this decision process.

Ms. Potacka replied that the applicable laws and regulations must also be considered. Mr. Clark commented that it would be inconsistent with environmental justice to transport the articles out of Richmond. Ms. Harris-Pitts asked that the applicable law be cited given the religious significance of the human bone. She also suggested that an Indian study area be created under the auspices of the Richmond museum as part of future development plans. As an action item, Mr. Gosney stated that the two co-chairs will provide the RAB with the information pertaining to the decision makers and the process involved.

Mr. Beyaert recalled that two RAB meetings ago, the RAB passed a motion indicating the RAB's preference that the mortar and pestle remain in the City of Richmond. He moved that the RAB send correspondence to the Navy, the Mayor, the city manager, and the Richmond Museum indicating this. A vote was taken and 12 were in favor, none were against, and one abstained. Mr. Clark suggested that the letter also mention that the RAB has already passed the above motion previously.

Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that the mortar is on the front page of the newsletter that was distributed to a mailing list of 500 individuals and groups; extra copies of the newsletters have been distributed all over the City of Richmond. Mr. Beyaert commented that this would provide a great article for the *West County Times*.

Sharon Fuller voiced her support in researching the decision-makers and the RAB's intent to solicit the support of local officials. She noted that motions are being passed that are not going anywhere. Ms. Potacka stated that she had been making inquiries in support of the RAB's objective. Ms. Kiernan requested information on the archaeologists as well. Mr. Gosney asked for the RAB to give the co-chairs an opportunity to research the information. Mr. Beyaert asked that this information be provided in a timely manner to allow the RAB the opportunity to take action prior to any decisions being made. Sunjay Nair, Redevelopment Agency, stated that he would request a review to indicate the City's position on this topic.

V. Load Test at Tank 19

Mr. Gosney explained that one of the UST Closure Alternatives at Point Molate was to seal the tanks and abandon them in place, which called into question the structural integrity of the tanks. The TDRC found a number of holes in the structural analysis. There were too many "best judgment" calls based on the engineers' experience rather than on empirical data. The Navy responded to the TDRC's concerns by conducting a load test.

John Kowalczyk, EFD SW, stated that the load test was conducted last month as part of the structural closure of the USTs. This test will support the structural evaluation report which will be issued in June. The tank passed its load test. Mr. Kowalczyk stated that the tank top's deflection was only 25 percent of what was allowable to pass, and the tank top had adequate rebound. Mr. Beyaert asked as to the rebound as a percentage of the deflection. Mr. Kowalczyk stated that he does not know the percentage, but he added that the deflection was less than a quarter of what was allowable to pass. He suggested that a presentation in June be given by the structural engineering company to discuss its recommendations regarding thickness of the soil cover and other items.

Mr. Kowalczyk explained that the test entailed placing water-filled, 55-gallon drums on the tank. The weight exerted is equivalent to 100 pounds per square foot which is similar to people standing shoulder-to-shoulder on top of a tank. The drums were loaded in four equal increments; the deflection was monitored at each point. The drums remained on the tanks for 24 hours for maximum deflection, after which the load was removed and the rebound was measured 24 hours later.

Mr. Clark asked how this test applies to the condition of the tanks five or 10 years into the future. Mr. Werle stated that the design will ensure the preservation of the tanks by preventing corrosion or the entry of water. He stated that although nothing can be guaranteed, 500 years from today, maintaining the condition of the tanks should ensure their structural integrity. He noted that the tanks' structural steel components will show indications well in advance of impending collapse.

Mr. Clark asked if there will be any type of identification for future land use purposes. Mr. Werle replied that the pending inspection plan will provide for periodic inspections with which the County will be involved. Mr. Clark stated that such inspections are crucial given that nothing stays the same, even if the condition of the tanks are maintained.

VI. RWQCB Update

Ms. Dorn stated that she issued two letters. One was in response to the Navy's response to her comments on the draft RI. Her letter pertained to a bedrock pathway for migration and leachate from the landfill into the groundwater. A working meeting on the previous day resolved the above comments. She issued her comments on the draft FPALDR. There is no update on the potential ACLs; she explained that there has been a personnel change in legal staff.

In order to follow up with Mr. Clark's question during the previous meeting with regard to the stormwater outfalls, Ms. Dorn stated that sampling results show 50 parts per billion (ppb) total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), as compared with the previous year's results at 1.5 ppm. There are not many data points, as only the previous year's data can be used as a standard of comparison. Next year's sampling should provide a better idea if there is an increasing pattern. Mr. Werle explained that such slight increases may be a result of lab differences; differences over time would be more significant. Ms. Dorn replied that this is the reason that she wanted to collect the samples; they would serve as a baseline with which to compare future data.

In response to Mr. Clark's inquiry, Ms. Dorn stated that there is no discharge limit for TPHs, although there is a generic National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for treatment systems at 50 ppb. There is no TPH limit for the Chevron refinery, for example, but there is a total oil and grease number which is 10 parts per million (10 ppm).

VII. Community Outreach Subcommittee

Mr. Gosney stated that he met with Ms. Fasano, Ms. McFadden, and Kathleen Ellis, Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI), regarding the next newsletter. Copies of the current newsletter were mailed and also provided at the meeting. Within the next week, the bulletin board will be updated with new signs and current information. It will be maintained routinely. He encouraged RAB members to help out with community outreach efforts.

Mr. Gosney stated that Lyle Fisher has submitted his resignation from the RAB; there are now 19 RAB members and two vacancies. Mr. Gosney stated that the RAB has been requesting that the Navy post announcements to solicit new RAB members, but he was informed that the RAB must post the announcements. He will fax a letter to the *West County Times* as well as a letter to the editor. The committee will also ask for assistance from the Neighborhood Coordinating Councils.

VIII. Community Input/Wrap-up

In response to Mr. Clark's inquiry, Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that the next BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting will be on 4 May at 1:30 p.m. Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that the exact location has not yet been determined, but the meetings are usually held on the second floor in the PWC conference room at City Hall. As an action item, she will provide the location of the BCT meeting to Mr. Clark before the next meeting. The public can observe the BCT meeting, but not participate.

Mr. Beyaert asked if the Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/EIS) was issued in late March, as promised by the Navy last December or January. Ms. Potacka replied that it has not yet been issued. It was supposed to be finalized in December 2000; she will provide a status on the report at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Beyaert stated that a summary of the report may be helpful. Mr. Gosney asked if it would be a better idea to postpone the presentation until the RAB has

reviewed the report and can ask some relevant questions. Mr. Beyaert asked for an overview of the EIS/EIR.

Mr. Gosney stated that the site tour will be held earlier than the normal meeting; it will likely begin around 6:00 p.m. The schedule will be shorter than usual.

Glen Stephenson stated he had applied for RAB membership at the inception of the RAB in 1997; he asked that his application be reactivated. He will meet with Mr. Gosney after the meeting. Ms. Harris thanked Mr. Gosney for volunteering his services as community co-chair for so many years.

Mr. Gosney concluded the meeting at 9:13 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Thursday, 4 May 2000.

A copy of the approved final minutes will be placed in the Information Repositories located at City Hall and at the Public Library.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

- Project Update
- Structural Closure of USTs
- Presentation on Archaeological Discoveries
- Pipeline Removal

HANDOUTS

Update IR/Compliance/BRAC Program