

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

---o0o---

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, 16 MAY 2000

7:00 P.M.

CASA DE LA VISTA

ORIGINAL

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 67

---o0o---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

MARY HILLABRAND, INC. (415) 255-1994

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

JAMES B. SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)

SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR'S OFFICE:

MARTHA WALTERS (SFRA)

REGULATORY AGENCY:

DAVID RIST (DTSC)

JOSEPH CHOU (RWQCB)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

NATHAN BRENNAN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)

THEODORE S. CONNELLY

LEW SCHALIT

TETRA TECH EM, INC.:

ANJU WICKE

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI):

MARIA VILLAFUERTE

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI)

MICHAEL, STONE

GUESTS:

JOHN BAUR (I.T. Corporation)

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I think we are ready  
2 to get going.

3 Welcome to our May Restoration Advisory Board  
4 meeting.

5 Someone just pointed out to me, after we  
6 printed the copies of the agenda, it still said April on  
7 it, but it is the May agenda. The date wasn't changed.

8 There are additional copies of the agenda in  
9 the back if anyone didn't receive one.

10 So the first item of business is, are there any  
11 comments concerning the agenda?

12 (No response.)

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. With that, we will  
14 proceed into the agenda.

15 The next item is public comment. We set aside  
16 this time at the beginning of each meeting for any  
17 member of the RAB or member of the general public to  
18 comment on aspects related to the environmental cleanup  
19 program.

20 We've also used this period for any

1 announcement for anyone who wants to make up front in  
2 the meeting.

3 So is there any comments or announcements for  
4 today's meeting?

5 (No response.)

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Our next item, we  
7 set aside time in each meeting for the City of San  
8 Francisco, for Martha to provide an update.

9 And since we have a few new members here, if  
10 you could give a little bit of background or overview of  
11 the City of San Francisco's role.

12 MS. WALTERS: City of San Francisco role?

13 Okay.

14 I'm Martha Walters. I'm the environmental  
15 project manager for the Treasure Island project. I work  
16 with Annemarie Conroy and the other members of the  
17 Mayor's Office of Treasure Island.

18 The primary role right now of the Mayor's  
19 Office is to, I guess, work with the Navy in the  
20 caretaker's status.

1           My role is to make sure that the environmental  
2 cleanup is integrated with the future reuse of the base.

3           I have been working on this project now for  
4 about five years, almost four-and-a-half, five years.  
5 It all kind of blends in after a while.

6           Jim and I have been working very well together  
7 over the past several years.

8           Basically, we are focused on the reuse of what  
9 we can do to generate revenue. Primarily, we have been  
10 focusing on the housing, and that's been very  
11 successful.

12           We have been working very closely with the John  
13 Stewart Company.

14           And in addition, our next main focus will be  
15 the Clipper Cove area, the Treasure Island Enterprise,  
16 the marina developers.

17           So we have been working closely with them to  
18 figure out what their specific plans will be for the  
19 development of the new marina.

20           So you can see that, I look at the

1 environmental cleanup issues to really make sure that we  
2 focus in on the priorities that the city has  
3 established.

4           The Treasure Island Development Authority came  
5 up with a reuse plan. It's still in its draft stage.  
6 It came out in July of '96. It's in the process of  
7 getting updated.

8           Also, another thing that the Development  
9 Authority is currently doing is preparing a master  
10 developer, RFQ, that's going to go out in the street  
11 probably in the next six months.

12           The office also looks at short term and long  
13 term goals. We have Bob Mahoney, who is the deputy  
14 director and the facilities manager. He oversees the  
15 daily operations of the base. That's quite a handful.

16           And then we have Stephen Proud, who is the  
17 director of development. He looks at the long term  
18 goals of what's going to happen to the base as it turns  
19 over to the city.

20           The city will be taking jurisdiction of the

1 base probably within the next year or two. They are in  
2 the process of applying for a no cost economic  
3 development conveyance. They are working with the Navy  
4 and the Pentagon right now to go through that process.

5 So there are a lot of things happening that  
6 you, the public, don't see, that we are constantly doing  
7 every day to make this a viable place, now and for the  
8 future.

9 So my job is to make sure that I agree and we  
10 work with Jim to make sure that the Navy does an  
11 adequate job of cleanup, not only for our use, but for  
12 public safety.

13 So that's about it in a nutshell.

14 MR. CONNELLY: Has the city set up a tax base  
15 yield in terms of development, what it sees Treasure  
16 Island might produce?

17 MS. WALTERS: I don't know. I would have to  
18 ask Stephen. I'm not really aware of it.

19 MR. CONNELLY: Somewhere we would have to find  
20 out.

1 MS. WALTERS: I'm sure Stephen would be able to  
2 readily answer you. I'm really not sure.

3 MR. CONNELLY: Okay. Thanks.

4 MS. WALTERS: Yes.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very much.

6 That brings us into our BRAC cleanup process.  
7 And the primary presentation tonight was to provide the  
8 RAB with an update on the former storage yard,  
9 background of where it started, the extent of the  
10 investigation, and where we are headed.

11 And so we wanted to allot sufficient time for  
12 this discussion. This is the Navy presentation. I'm  
13 sure that there may be some varying comments from  
14 members of the RAB. That's why we have a RAB, and have  
15 a public process to generate open discussion on this, so  
16 that we can keep the RAB involved and informed. This  
17 project is moving very rapidly. By this time next  
18 month, we will be in the field.

19 So with that, Anju Wicke is going to provide a  
20 presentation, and then we will develop discussion from

1 that.

2 I think if there is questions or comments, we  
3 can just interject them into the discussion.

4 MS. WICKE: Definitely.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is an informal  
6 process.

7 MS. WICKE: We have some figures that I wanted  
8 to put up.

9 And we brought some aerial photographs. So we  
10 can pass these out when the time comes.

11 So as Jim mentioned, we wanted to go over the  
12 former storage yard investigation.

13 We've actually done a number of different  
14 phases out in the former storage yard.

15 We will go through the history a little bit,  
16 the phases of the investigation, the results, and kind  
17 of what the Navy's proposal is for the next phase or the  
18 next step in the field.

19 The former storage yard was originally or  
20 initially observed in the 1946 and 1947 air photos. We

1 did bring the aerials so we can pass those around. You  
2 can't really see them too clearly if I stick them up.

3 But, basically, as you can see from the figure  
4 here, the storage yard is bounded on one side by the  
5 runway. It is below the Site 12 area. It is not within  
6 the current boundary of Site 12.

7 However, the Navy is discussing including the  
8 area within the Site 12 boundary, so that we can then  
9 document it and refer to it in the remedial  
10 investigation report.

11 No prior sampling had been conducted in this  
12 area, based on, there were really no historical records  
13 as to the use of the former storage yard, as well as it  
14 was, as I mentioned, outside the Site 12 boundary area.

15 It was used for storage until the 1100 series  
16 housing was constructed in 1966. And as we go through  
17 the data for all the phases of the investigation, you  
18 will see that this eastern portion of the storage yard  
19 was more heavily impacted by the use of that area.

20 As I've mentioned, the first phase of sampling,

1 no sampling was conducted initially in this area because  
2 it was outside of Site 12.

3           The first phase of sampling was conducted by  
4 the Navy in October of '99. The reason why we went out  
5 here to take some samples is, one, just the name, former  
6 storage yard. It begs the question, what was stored in  
7 this area, as well as if there was anything causing  
8 environmental impact to this area.

9           This shows our original sampling plan and the  
10 grid that was placed over the area (indicating).

11           What we did, we took samples in all of these  
12 locations at two depths, starting at surface as well as  
13 three to four feet. Surface, I believe, was .5 to 1  
14 foot. And then the three to four foot range are depth  
15 samples.

16           Let's see. That was the first phase. Once the  
17 first phase was completed, we received analytical data  
18 that indicated that we had PCBs, as well as some PAHs.

19           The first phase of the analytical included  
20 analyses for PCBs, pesticides, SVOCs, VOCs, metals and

1 TPHs. So the full suite of analysis was covered.

2           However, the only constituents that were  
3 detected were PCBs as well as PAHs.

4           Since we did find the majority of  
5 concentrations in this area (indicating), we then went  
6 on to three or two more phases, one in November of '99,  
7 and one in December of '99, where we tried to delineate  
8 the extent of the concentrations that we were finding.

9           So this next figure is a little bit busy, but I  
10 will explain it to you in detail.

11           So let me, it kind of summarizes the results.

12           Additionally, there is a table that should be  
13 passed around that has all the results on the table,  
14 actually.

15           MR. CONNELLY: What was actually stored?

16           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We don't know.

17           I mean, our clue to this site was the fact that  
18 it was labeled on -- well, we had some, actually,  
19 U.S.-EPA did some photo interpretation, photo analyses  
20 interpretation for us some years back. They looked at

1 old photographs. Based on what they saw in the  
2 photographs from their experience, they identified this  
3 area as a storage yard. It was a fenced area. It  
4 looked like it was used for storing storage of some sort  
5 of material, and so it was labeled the storage area.

6 But beyond that, we didn't know what was stored  
7 there, whether it was liquid or solid or anything else  
8 about it.

9 That's why we had conducted the initial grid  
10 sampling. That's very typical for an initial site  
11 inspection to initially grid the site and sample for a  
12 wide variety of chemical constituents and see, is there  
13 anything there?

14 We didn't know. In fact, we might not have  
15 detected anything, and we would have had the information  
16 needed to close the case.

17 But because we did detect PCBs and polynuclear  
18 aromatic hydrocarbons, then that led us to further  
19 stages of the investigation.

20 But we didn't have to sample for everything in

1 the later stages. If in the early stages, we did not  
2 detect certain chemicals, we wouldn't have to go back  
3 and look for those same chemicals.

4 So we start to narrow the focus down, both in  
5 terms of the area and in the particular chemicals we are  
6 looking for.

7 MS. WICKE: Right.

8 And as I stated before, once we had taken the  
9 grid samples, which are also in this figure, we then  
10 tried to move out to try to bound the extent of the  
11 contamination.

12 What this figure shows is three different  
13 symbols. There is circles; there is, I guess, hexagons;  
14 and there is squares. What those represent are the  
15 different phases.

16 I will pass this around, or you could take a  
17 look at it at the break a little closer.

18 But as I mentioned earlier, most of the samples  
19 were taken at surface and then down at three to four  
20 feet.

1           There was a phase of samples that were taken at  
2 three depths, meaning surface, between one and a half  
3 and two feet; and then again at three to four feet; and  
4 then this last round of sampling that we conducted about  
5 three weeks ago, was taken at three different depths, or  
6 actually -- yes, three different depths, with four of  
7 the samples actually taken at four depths.

8           It's a little bit confusing. We had samples  
9 taken at two depths, at three depths, and then at four  
10 depths.

11           There was four samples taken at four depths so  
12 that we could also take some groundwater samples in  
13 those same locations to see if any of the concentrations  
14 were affecting the groundwater in this area.

15           That data is also included in your data packet.

16           Basically, what this data shows is, all of the  
17 green is below this figure that depicts the PCB  
18 concentrations, which is what we were focusing on at  
19 this time.

20           We have detected some PAH concentrations.

1 However, they are generally limited. I did bring  
2 figures to show the PAHs. I will pass those around.

3 But, generally, the PCBs is what we are  
4 focusing our further field activities on.

5 And what this shows is PCB concentrations. If  
6 you see the red bottom, any time you see the red, it  
7 indicates a PCB concentration of greater than 1 ppm,  
8 which is an action level.

9 The middle bar is the 2 to -- 1-1/2 to 2 foot  
10 sampling.

11 And then the bottom is, again, the 3 to 4 foot  
12 sampling. So I can pass this around.

13 But as you can see, the red is generally  
14 limited, and to this eastern portion of the storage yard  
15 (indicating).

16 We feel, the BCT feels that we have delineated  
17 this area relatively well. As you can see, we have a  
18 lot of green that's bounding the area.

19 There are some areas where we will probably go  
20 out and do a little bit of data gap analyses to fill in

1 the blanks, but generally we feel we pretty much  
2 delineated the extent of the concentrations.

3 So what the Navy, what the next step is, the  
4 Navy is proposing to do a removal action in this area.

5 What we are proposing to do is to remove soil  
6 that has concentrations greater than 1 ppm of PCBs,  
7 along with the removal of the PCBs. As I mentioned  
8 before, there are some PAH concentrations that will also  
9 be removed.

10 There are actually -- actually, I don't have it  
11 with me, but I will pass the figure around.

12 There are probably three or four locations? I  
13 don't know, off the top of my head, that have PAHs,  
14 three locations that have PAHs. Some of them are  
15 co-located.

16 Yes, David?

17 MR. RIST: That's 1 part per million or  
18 greater, right?

19 MS. WICKE: Right, exactly.

20 MR. RIST: Not greater than one part per

1 million. One part per million greater.

2 MS. WICKE: One part per million greater,  
3 right. Thanks for the clarification.

4 So at this time, the Navy is proposing to do a  
5 removal action.

6 We, as I mentioned before, before we do a  
7 removal action or as we are doing a removal action, we  
8 will use field screening and confirmation samples to  
9 make sure that we are removing all the concentrations of  
10 concern.

11 The removal action will be discussed with the  
12 residents. There are generally people living up in Site  
13 12, as well as on this eastern or western side of the  
14 area. And the residents, all the residents will be  
15 spoken to.

16 I believe the City of San Francisco is going to  
17 go out and meet with the residents, not only tomorrow  
18 night, but they will also go to some of the residents'  
19 homes, who live in a little bit closer proximity, to  
20 make sure that they are aware of what is going on; as

1 well if they have any questions or concerns, they can be  
2 answered prior to any type of removal being conducted.

3 So we will definitely have community input.

4 We wanted to bring this to the RAB meeting  
5 tonight so that we could get all of your input and make  
6 sure that any questions or concerns that you all had  
7 were answered.

8 So, generally, the removal action is currently  
9 scheduled, as long as everything goes according to plan.  
10 We are planning on moving towards the June time frame to  
11 conduct a removal action.

12 Does anyone have any questions?

13 MR. RIST: One other element you might want to  
14 mention.

15 MS. WICKE: Sure.

16 MR. RIST: The CEQA process.

17 MS. WICKE: Yes. I will let you talk to that.  
18 I'm not as familiar with that, unfortunately.

19 MR. RIST: We are addressing the CEQA  
20 questions. I.T. has agreed to help me in preparing the

1 documents.

2           What we are seeking this evening is your input,  
3 like Anju said, on any of this, to field your comments  
4 tonight in order to be able to move on the schedule that  
5 we have set out right now.

6           MS. WALTERS: Why don't you explain a little  
7 further about the CEQA process?

8           Do you understand what the CEQA process is?

9           MR. CONNELLY: I need to be informed.

10          MS. WICKE: Of the CEQA process?

11          MR. CONNELLY: Yes.

12          MR. RIST: Do you want to take it on?

13          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, there are two --  
14 well, basically, NEPA is the federal law, the National  
15 Environmental Policy Act.

16                 And, in turn, California has an equivalent to  
17 that, the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA.

18                 In the case of our federal cleanup program, the  
19 process that we are already going through here is  
20 equivalent to what we might get -- you're probably

1 familiar or may have heard in the past, associated with  
2 the project, Environmental Impact Statements, EIS, which  
3 is under the federal law, NEPA; and Environmental Impact  
4 Reports, EIR, which is under the state regulation of  
5 CEQA.

6 Well, in the case of our federal cleanup  
7 project here, we meet the requirements of the federal  
8 NEPA without having to go through that separate process,  
9 because it's already, the public participation and  
10 public notice is already partly built into our process.

11 But the state still needs to follow the  
12 California Environmental Quality Act. So that's why the  
13 state needs to do a separate CEQA document.

14 MR. RIST: Right.

15 I guess, generally, though, what it is, to  
16 answer your question, CEQA is a process of evaluating  
17 potential impacts of an action under CERCLA, or any type  
18 of an action or activity that might impact the  
19 environment in California, be it under CERCLA or RIKLA.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So part of it is driven

1 that, this substance is a listed substance, therefore we  
2 fall into it.

3 MR. RIST: Right.

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Is that what triggered this?

5 MR. RIST: Right.

6 MS. WALTERS: Right. That's exactly right.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Because it's a listed  
8 substance.

9 MR. RIST: Yes.

10 MS. WALTERS: Right.

11 MR. RIST: But it's also, generally, it will  
12 have some impact on the environment. When we take an  
13 action, removing soil not only means impacting the  
14 location that you're removing it from, but also where  
15 you're taking it to. So there has to be the transport  
16 of that as well.

17 So there is a lot of consideration outside of  
18 just the spot you're removing it from.

19 It's also the whole entire process of doing  
20 everything that you do.

1 MS. WALTERS: It's a determination of what  
2 you're doing in that whole process.

3 MR. RIST: And whether it's going to have  
4 significant impact or not, and whether you sort of let  
5 it happen without a lot of constraints; or whether you  
6 need to jump through a lot of hoops.

7 So it's really a large program to evaluate the  
8 action and the impact on the environment.

9 MR. CONNELLY: Thank you.

10 MR. SCHALIT: I have a somewhat different  
11 question.

12 What kinds of polyaromatic hydrocarbons are  
13 they? Has any attempt been made to decide what they  
14 were from and what type of levels?

15 MS. WICKE: We mainly detected benzoapyrene,  
16 which is not, I don't believe, associated with PCBs.

17 MR. SCHALIT: It's not.

18 But at what levels? You just said elevated. I  
19 don't know if that means 1 or a million.

20 MS. WICKE: Yes. There was a table that went

1 around. Let me grab it.

2 MR. RIST: 19,000 PCBs, I think, is the high  
3 hit.

4 MR. SCHALIT: 19?

5 MS. WICKE: You didn't have the sheet. I  
6 apologize.

7 MR. SCHALIT: My fault.

8 MS. WICKE: If you look at the column, the BAP  
9 equivalent.

10 MR. SCHALIT: Yes.

11 Those are in ppms?

12 MS. WICKE: Yes.

13 MR. RIST: Well, the BAP equivalents are in  
14 ppbs.

15 MS. WICKE: The BAP equivalents are in ppbs.

16 MR. SCHALIT: Ppbs?

17 MR. RIST: Yes.

18 MS. WICKE: Yes. I apologize. I'm sorry.

19 MS. WALTERS: The PCBs are in ppms.

20 MS. WICKE: In ppm, yes, looking at the two

1 different columns.

2 MR. SCHALIT: That makes me feel a lot better.

3 MS. WICKE: The location where we detected the  
4 highest . . .

5 MR. RIST: 66.

6 MS. WALTERS: Yes. It was 66.

7 MR. RIST: It's on page 2.

8 We read the location ID column, the last two  
9 digits, generally, the location ID column, when we say  
10 66.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, in general, the PAHs  
12 have been co-located with a higher PCB concentration,  
13 which is what we are targeting the action towards.

14 But there may be some areas with lower PCB  
15 concentrations, with elevated PAHs, and so we would  
16 propose to take action at those also.

17 MS. WICKE: Right.

18 Actually, I have those figures.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we don't know the  
20 origin of either the PCBs or the PAHs at the site.

1           It may have been related to the storage, or it  
2 may have been related to the equipment that was either  
3 stored or operating on the site.

4           And then the fact that the site was graded when  
5 the housing was constructed has moved it around from  
6 what might have been the original point source.

7           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So location 53, is that  
8 really 150 parts per million?

9           MR. RIST: Location 53?

10          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, for the PCBs.

11          MR. RIST: Yes.

12          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It looks like it was spilled  
13 there.

14          MR. RIST: Yes.

15          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Did they put a tarp over  
16 that or something so it wouldn't blow away?

17          MR. RIST: Did you say 83?

18          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: No.

19          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, 53. 150 parts per  
20 million.

1 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That's right on the surface,  
2 too.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: A half a foot, a half a  
4 foot below.

5 MR. RIST: It looks like a couple of spots.

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: But you don't know. It  
7 could be right up there.

8 160,000?

9 MR. RIST: Yes. We retested. I think we got  
10 15.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We found about 15,000. It  
12 was still high.

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: But it's very high.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But it's very high.

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So I.T. is going to do a  
16 cleanup similar to the 1207/1209?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

18 So did we answer your question, Lou?

19 MR. SCHALIT: Yes.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

1 MR. SCHALIT: I was noticing the one value with  
2 160,000 ppm.

3 MS. WICKE: Right.

4 MR. SCHALIT: That's substantial.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

6 But we did retest it and got a number about  
7 15,000, which is still high, but not in the same order  
8 of magnitude.

9 That's consistent with the lower depth, which  
10 was 19,000.

11 MS. WICKE: And the location is right here  
12 (indicating). Actually, you can see it's all red. So  
13 it's definitely in the area of those removal actions.

14 MR. CONNELLY: Do these things migrate  
15 underground at all?

16 MS. WICKE: Into the groundwater?

17 MR. CONNELLY: Yes.

18 MS. WICKE: The groundwater data is in that  
19 spreadsheet.

20 We're seeing a couple of samples that have very

1 low concentrations of PCBs.

2 But I believe two of the samples don't show any  
3 concentrations, and two of them do.

4 MR. CONNELLY: Good.

5 MS. WICKE: So we are not seeing really  
6 anything that would cause us concern at this time.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So Nathan's question was,  
8 what is the nature of our action? What is the scope of  
9 the action?

10 And we are doing this as a time critical  
11 removal action. We would be removing soil and replacing  
12 it with clean fill.

13 We will be preparing a work plan, so what you  
14 would be seeing in the next couple of, in the next three  
15 weeks or so, would be a work plan that would define the  
16 exact scope of work.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Is it going to be done like  
18 1207/1209?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

20 For those of you who have seen the two other

1 removals we have done at 1207 and 1209 and 1133, I mean,  
2 the basic process is similar.

3 In the case of 1207/1209, I think we used  
4 individual bins.

5 In the case of Building 1133, we trucked it out  
6 rather than storing it temporarily in bins. I don't  
7 know if we determined --

8 MR. BAUR: Actually, the details of the  
9 removal -- I'm John Baur, with I.T. Corporation, project  
10 manager.

11 We are still kind of flushing out the details  
12 of the action.

13 But for right now, our game plan is that we  
14 would probably direct load soil into end dumps; tarp  
15 them, cover them, and go right off the island.

16 We would bring bins onto the base for backup,  
17 you know, overflow capacity.

18 And also for the area where the contamination  
19 that we saw was more elevated, we would load that into  
20 bins.

1           But for the most part, in order to expedite the  
2 process, make sure that we get everything off site in a  
3 timely manner, we propose to direct load it into end  
4 dumps.

5           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And then for dust control?

6           MR. BAUR: Constant dust control. There will  
7 be dust monitoring during all field operations in all  
8 areas surrounding the sites, not only perimeter air  
9 monitoring, but we will have dust control monitoring on  
10 our personnel as well.

11          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So what about the top there,  
12 was that characterized?

13          MS. WICKE: This is actually Site 12, and, yes,  
14 I brought a Site 12 map.

15          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So there is a top to this?

16          MS. WICKE: Yes.

17            You can see, this is where the storage yard  
18 sampling ended and the Site 12 sampling begun  
19 (indicating).

20            We did actually move further into Site 12 as we

1 were doing some of the storage yard sampling.

2 And as I mentioned, there is an area in here  
3 where we will need to go in before we begin the field  
4 work, or during the field work, to try to close out the  
5 data gap there.

6 But other than that, we feel relatively  
7 comfortable there.

8 We have quite a few samples up in Site 12 that  
9 don't indicate we are seeing the same type of pattern of  
10 constituents as in the storage yard. This is definitely  
11 a unique area.

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Now, because this is a time  
14 critical removal action, in the case of a nontime  
15 critical action, we would write an action memo first.

16 But in the case of time critical, the action  
17 memo would be written -- well, started while the work  
18 was progressing.

19 It wouldn't be completed until after the field  
20 work was done to document the action. And that's

1 similar to what we did at Building 1133.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So, Martha, are you the one  
3 meeting with the people?

4 MS. WALTERS: Yes.

5 Bob Mahoney and I will be meeting with the  
6 residents.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So if they have questions,  
8 you will answer them.

9 MS. WALTERS: Exactly.

10 We thought it was important to do the extra  
11 step and talk to the residents, as there are more and  
12 more residents living here now. We understand there  
13 will be more concerns.

14 MR. BAUR: There will be some pretty good  
15 levels of security as far as fencing and that goes.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It will probably have to be  
17 better than before because there are more people. A lot  
18 of kids wandering around.

19 MR. BAUR: The site will be secured.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In fact, it's probably

1 likely we will have security posted after hours, from  
2 what we learned after the last couple of jobs.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think it's  
4 increasing.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So what the RAB technical  
6 subcommittee will see over the next three weeks or so  
7 are the documents that we submit to the agencies and the  
8 city for review and copies to the technical  
9 subcommittee.

10 The review periods will be very compressed,  
11 basically; almost over the shoulder, a couple of days, a  
12 week at most.

13 So I think we will be able to discuss that  
14 further at our interim meeting. I think our next RAB  
15 interim meeting, when we set the date for that, which we  
16 need to do tonight, too, that will be right at about the  
17 time when we finalize documents. So that will be an  
18 opportunity to have a discussion at that meeting.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is there anything else we

1 needed to bring up relative to this project?

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So David's comment, we will  
3 change that in here, soil equal to or greater than.

4 MS. WICKE: Yes. That is the intent.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If it's greater than .99.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay.

8 MS. WICKE: Anything else?

9 MR. SCHALIT: I'm a little curious about one  
10 thing. It's probably trivial.

11 We are looking at sample locations starting at  
12 51 and going on up.

13 I don't see those numbers on here in the  
14 report.

15 MS. WICKE: That report, as I mentioned  
16 earlier, is prior to this latest round of sampling.

17 MR. SCHALIT: Okay. Thank you. So you will be  
18 putting that in.

19 MS. WICKE: Yes, exactly.

20 MR. SCHALIT: Okay. Thank you.

1 MS. WICKE: We will actually have a final  
2 technical memorandum coming out.

3 MR. SCHALIT: Yes. I'm just curious as to  
4 where that concentration, 15,000, came from.

5 MS. WICKE: Yes. That was the last field  
6 sampling that we did prior to this round of sampling.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So this investigation will  
8 be documented in a technical memo as well as it will  
9 feed into the Site 12 remedial investigation report.

10 So it will all be tied into the other work that  
11 we are doing on the site.

12 And then as well, there will be an action memo  
13 written to document the removal.

14 Okay. Well, thank you.

15 MS. WICKE: You're welcome.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next item is, we do  
17 have a document that's currently out for review. It's  
18 the soil gas investigation field sampling plan. The RAB  
19 technical subcommittee members should have gotten a copy  
20 of that.

1 I think it was mailed out on Thursday. I think  
2 some people received it on Friday.

3 MS. WICKE: Exactly. The soil gas.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The soil gas survey.

5 And so we are, actually, I think in the letter,  
6 I just kind of defaulted to, I wasn't thinking at the  
7 time. I just defaulted to a 30-day comment period.

8 But we had a project team meeting yesterday,  
9 Monday, and we did agree to expedite the comments this  
10 week.

11 So if there are any comments from the RAB  
12 technical subcommittee members, we would like to get  
13 them either this week or Monday, because we do want to  
14 go into the field before the soil gas sampling at the  
15 end of this month, at the end of May.

16 And, basically, the purpose of the soil gas  
17 sampling, in the course of investigation within the Site  
18 12 area, which is the northerly portion of the base  
19 here, we have detected some methane and some VOCs. We  
20 want to further sample within the site in order to

1 determine that the levels of methane and VOCs we are  
2 seeing do not constitute an issue.

3 So we, I mean, I think we are on track to  
4 resolving it as not being an issue, but we need to do  
5 the soil gas sampling on a more systematic basis through  
6 the site in order to be able to close this out as an  
7 issue.

8 So that basically, that's about all there is to  
9 it.

10 If there is any specific questions you might  
11 have on how we go about sampling for soil gas, we would  
12 be happy to entertain them.

13 MR. SCHALIT: I could ask a different question.

14 I have been sampling soil and gas for over 20  
15 years. Could I read a copy of the report?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually, I have a  
17 copy of the draft plan (indicating).

18 MR. SCHALIT: That went out to the technical  
19 subcommittee?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually, for those

1 of you who received it, there are two documents  
2 together. One is the actual field sampling plan. The  
3 other one is the quality assurance plan that goes along  
4 with it.

5 MR. SCHALIT: I could return this tomorrow if  
6 you want (indicating).

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. Just hang onto it.

8 MR. SCHALIT: Okay.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we would like to get  
10 comments this week or by the beginning of next week. We  
11 do want to go into the field at the end of the month.

12 Next, we are actually about 10 minutes ahead of  
13 time, so with the consensus of the group, we could take  
14 a break or proceed into organizational business.

15 MR. CHOU: Yes. I just want to basically  
16 introduce myself.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I'm sorry.

18 MR. CHOU: My name is Joseph Chou from Water  
19 Board. I replaced Chris Maxwell.

20 We have two project managers working on

1 Treasure Island right now. I'm one of them. The other  
2 is Linda Dorr (phonetic). We both are going to work on  
3 Treasure Island to oversee different issues.

4 The reason why we split into two different  
5 project managers, because we currently all work on other  
6 sites. We pretty much are booked with different issues.

7 So we feel we will be appropriate to have two  
8 different project managers, and in this case, we won't  
9 cause any delays or any other kind of significant impact  
10 to the project, because we understand it's under a  
11 pretty tight schedule.

12 We really want to work with other regulatory  
13 agencies, and also the Navy to move this project along.

14 So we understand in the past, Chris has laid  
15 out a pretty good foundation for both Linda and myself  
16 to continue working on different issues, for instance,  
17 petroleum sites, the CAP sites, and offshore sediment  
18 issues and other general groundwater issues. So we will  
19 continue that path.

20 You won't see any deviation or some other

1 things causing potential inconsistency.

2           So we were moving along, and we will continue  
3 doing what we are doing, what we have been doing in a  
4 couple of years, and especially for the last six months  
5 when Chris worked on this project.

6           I personally will work on the general  
7 groundwater issue, and also offshore sediment issues.  
8 That's pretty much about it. Linda is going to work on  
9 the UST sites.

10           I personally worked with DoD sites in the last  
11 seven years. Linda, she has tremendous experience on  
12 UST sites when she was with Santa Clara Valley Water  
13 District.

14           So I'm very happy to be part of the RAB meeting  
15 here, and I will be the official representative for the  
16 RAB, to represent the regional board for all the RAB  
17 meetings and other points of contact.

18           Thank you.

19           If you have any questions, we can talk about it  
20 at the break.

1 MR. CONNELLY: Just, briefly, can you give us  
2 an idea of the offshore issues?

3 MR. CHOU: I'm in a learning curve right now.

4 I understand there are several different places  
5 where the Water Board has the concern about the Navy.  
6 There could be some kind of discharge exceeding the  
7 ambient water quality criteria.

8 In that sense, we need to look at what the  
9 extent of the sediments, what the contaminations are.

10 The Navy, they have conducted some kind of  
11 investigation before.

12 But what we are concerned with, probably we  
13 need further refined or trying to know the extent of the  
14 particular contamination, especially there is something  
15 also related to the reuse in the, I think, the Coast  
16 Guard area. There is some sediments for the Clipper  
17 Cove area. There used to be a skeet range. So there is  
18 some kind of lead contamination that's been found.

19 But we understand probably there is some pretty  
20 good level of lead concentration being buried below the

1 top of the sediment.

2 So we want to know what is going to be the  
3 impact as one of the things we are looking at, and for  
4 some other sites, I think there is also, we have maybe  
5 some low level of mercury that will be a concern, and  
6 probably PCB as well.

7 Those things particularly relate to the ambient  
8 water quality criteria. That's something we want to  
9 further figure out.

10 If my statements are incorrect, please correct  
11 me, because I'm just trying to learn all the issues at  
12 this point.

13 MR. CONNELLY: Sure. Thank you for that.  
14 That's very helpful.

15 MR. CHOU: Thank you.

16 MR. CONNELLY: There is one other idea.

17 Clipper Cove has been discussed here several  
18 times.

19 Off the top, do you have any other locations on  
20 the island, offshore, that's of particular interest?

1 MR. CHOU: Well, what I understand -- go ahead.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Just by way of a little  
3 background, we have, well, as you know, we drove around  
4 the base on Saturday morning and gave a tour and worked  
5 our way through the 25 investigation sites we have, two  
6 of those sites represent areas in the water. One of  
7 those sites, Site 13, represents all of the stormwater  
8 outfalls around both Treasure Island and the Navy  
9 portion of Yerba Buena Island. So that one site  
10 actually represents all of the stormwater outfalls, and  
11 that is Site 13.

12 The other site is Site 27. It's a much smaller  
13 site, and it represents the former Navy skeet range in  
14 Clipper Cove.

15 So the extent of the site represents the area  
16 of shotgun pellets, the extent to which they were shot  
17 out into the water, as well as the clay pigeons.

18 So when we talk about Clipper Cove, it actually  
19 represents both Site 27 as well as the stormwater  
20 outfalls that ring the cove.

1           We have taken these two sites, Site 13 and Site  
2 27, and we grouped them together into what we refer to  
3 as the offshore remedial investigation.

4           And so as Joseph pointed out, we have been  
5 sampling the sediments all around these areas, and there  
6 are some sample locations where we are continuing to  
7 have discussion with both the agencies and the city as  
8 to the results and where we go from there.

9           MR. CHOU: I think the knotted (phonetic) area  
10 is Site 11, Area E, right?

11           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

12           Site 11 is an onshore -- well, it's a landfill  
13 area at the shoreline. So the landfill itself is on the  
14 shore.

15           But, of course, it extends all the way to the  
16 shoreline. So we have sampled the sediments off of the  
17 Site 11. So there is some discussion as to the results  
18 of that sampling.

19           So this is sampling, what we are doing, we  
20 sample the actual sediment, the soil material, as well

1 as we try to get samples of the pour water inside the  
2 sediment.

3 MR. CONNELLY: Are there any particular hot  
4 spots in those two areas, other than skeet area -- well,  
5 that's pretty localized.

6 Around the perimeter of the island, is there  
7 anything that has come to one's attention as  
8 particularly interesting?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In general, none of these  
10 sites are screaming hot. In fact, a number of the  
11 sites, I mean, we basically reached an agreement on most  
12 of these areas as having sampled the sediment. My  
13 understanding, having sampled the sediment, they have no  
14 further issues.

15 But there is several areas, sub areas where we  
16 are continuing to have discussions. So the discussion  
17 is not continuing on the entire perimeter but on some  
18 several sub areas along the perimeter.

19 MR. CHOU: I think I agree with what Jim  
20 mentioned.

1           There are several places, we have some kind of  
2 anomaly where high concentration, but how is those  
3 areas, are they really hot spots, or are they going to  
4 expand?

5           That's something we want to further the  
6 dialogue between the regulatory agencies and the Navy to  
7 identify, either using existing data, or maybe we need  
8 to further define the extent of the particular area.

9           Then we can move, we can move forward trying to  
10 decide the strategy we need to take.

11           So at this point, I think the data is still, it  
12 shows some high concentration, but it's maybe not  
13 well-defined as a hot spot right now.

14           MR. CONNELLY: Thank you.

15           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And that's something we  
16 could cover in more detail in a future meeting, if the  
17 RAB community members would like us to.

18           We have also in the past held some separate  
19 workshops on ecological risk assessment which builds  
20 into our offshore investigation.

1           Okay. Well, thank you, Joseph. And that  
2 actually puts us right about 8:00. So we can go ahead  
3 and take a break.

4           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, let's take a break.

5           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And resume for the rest of  
6 the meeting.

7           So our next item up after the break is  
8 organizational business.

9           (Short break taken.)

10          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This moves us into  
11 organizational business. We have a couple of items  
12 here.

13          The first item is the draft April meeting  
14 minutes. They went out last week. I don't know if  
15 anyone had a chance to look at them. I didn't have at  
16 the time -- I was trying to juggle my San Diego and San  
17 Francisco offices -- I didn't have the benefit of  
18 Stephen's transcript at the time, so I wasn't able to go  
19 through it in a lot of detail.

20          Has anyone had a chance to look at the April

1 meeting minutes? We have an option to either defer  
2 action on those until next month or finalize them as  
3 written; or the Navy can take a look through the  
4 transcript and make sure there isn't anything that's  
5 significant that needs to be corrected.

6 MR. RIST: I don't have any comments.

7 MR. CONNELLY: Did you say these were mailed?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

9 We haven't gotten you all on the mailing list  
10 yet.

11 I gave GPI, our consultant, the updated mailing  
12 list today, so you're on the mailing list now. You  
13 probably weren't last week.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I had looked through them  
15 and they looked okay. And David looked through them and  
16 they looked okay.

17 So at this point, why don't we go ahead and  
18 approve them?

19 And then if you two read them and find  
20 comments, you could bring them to the next meeting.

1 MR. CONNELLY: Sure.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the Navy will go ahead  
3 and finalize the minutes. I will work with our  
4 consultant and make sure that the transcript agrees with  
5 the minutes. Great.

6 The next item was just to give everybody an  
7 update on our site overview and tour.

8 We did conduct a workshop this past Saturday  
9 morning. It was for primarily the new members, but we  
10 also invited all RAB members to attend. So we had two  
11 of our new members and a couple of our older members  
12 attend the workshop.

13 We had a background brief on Treasure Island.  
14 And then we took a van tour around at least for a good  
15 hour and a half. We went through all 25 of the  
16 installation-restoration sites and also pointed out the  
17 pipeline site.

18 So I think it was a good morning for those  
19 people who were able to attend.

20 We hadn't done a van tour in a couple of years.

1 We would be happy to do it again, if there is interest.

2 MR. CONNELLY: I would like to add to that, if  
3 I can.

4 I'm getting to know you, and what you did for  
5 us on Saturday was just magnificent.

6 MR. SCHALIT: It was extraordinary.

7 MR. CONNELLY: It was well done. Well put  
8 together. You weren't pausing. I thought: When is  
9 this guy going to get tired? You didn't. It was a very  
10 interesting two hours, and you're to blame.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, thank you.

12 And Jack Savage also attended. And from his  
13 experience of being a docent at the Treasure Island  
14 museum, he also added a tremendous amount to the tour.  
15 It was really great of him to attend.

16 I also want to recognize, take this opportunity  
17 to recognize Jack. He's been a long-time member of the  
18 RAB. But he's unable to, he informed Nathan and I that  
19 he is unable to continue on a regular basis due to  
20 circumstances beyond his control. He has been a

1 valuable member of the RAB, and we will keep him in a  
2 kind of a hold status.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: He said he would like to  
4 stay on.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So he will continue to be a  
6 member of the RAB, but he will be unable to attend  
7 meetings at this time.

8 I really appreciated him coming out on Saturday  
9 morning, and thank you for attending.

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I would say that we probably  
11 would like to do this again when we get a little more  
12 interest and when we get some more new members.

13 It's kind of fearful that this is May and we  
14 are heading for summer, so it may not be until  
15 September.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. It could be that we  
17 will probably try something like this again in the  
18 September-October time frame.

19 I would be happy to do it again. I think I  
20 enjoyed it as much as anybody.

1 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: One thing: Maybe you could  
2 have Gina look for Stacey's materials, because I think I  
3 received a lot more materials at the briefings.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

5 As a lesson learned, we didn't have as much  
6 briefing material as we had at some of the previous  
7 workshops.

8 There are some items, as Nathan pointed out, a  
9 list of abbreviations and things that we should provide  
10 you with, that we had provided earlier RAB members.

11 Well, that was the next item, ideas for RAB  
12 training and workshops. We are still open to a request  
13 for training and workshops. We have done them on  
14 Saturdays, as we did this last tour.

15 We also had workshops and training built into  
16 our regular monthly meeting. And we also had separate  
17 evening meetings devoted to training topics.

18 So we are open to whatever works best for the  
19 community members. Maybe that is something we could  
20 take up, Nathan, at the next interim meeting?

1 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, at the interim meeting.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the last item I had --  
3 well, it was more of a bookmark, but the TAPP program.  
4 Marcello Pasqua, who is our environmental liaison for  
5 Treasure Island, for the Navy at Treasure Island, he is  
6 not here tonight, but he is also our TAPP expert. I  
7 think we will have to -- maybe that's another item we  
8 could put on our list for the interim meeting.

9 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. Maybe we need to set  
10 up where he comes to the interim meeting and goes back  
11 over with the documents.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. There is a good  
13 chance he could attend our next interim meeting, so that  
14 we could use that to get the TAPP projects going again.

15 Okay. That's a good point.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And that would be the next  
17 topic, when do we want to have the next interim meeting.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Pat is not available on the  
20 Tuesday again, or Wednesday.

1           She would like to keep it on Monday. That  
2 would be June the 5th, Monday.

3           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

4           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Does that work for you?

5           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That works for me.

6           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: David, does that work?

7           MR. RIST: Yes.

8           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And then she is flexible  
9 after that.

10          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So starting in July, we can  
11 have it whenever it works.

12          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, because you said you  
13 would have schedule conflicts, too.

14          MR. RIST: What is that date?

15          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Monday, June 5th.

16          MR. RIST: Okay.

17          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we will set the interim  
18 meeting for Monday, June 5th, and that's at 6:30 p.m.

19                 We started a little earlier because it's in the  
20 city. And that's, generally we run from 6:30 until

1 about 8:00. It depends on what our agenda items are.

2 That will be at Pat Nelson's offices at Pacific  
3 Gas & Electric, downtown.

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Ted knows the address now.

5 MR. CONNELLY: Yes. Special address.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So I will send out a notice  
7 for the meeting date.

8 MR. SCHALIT: The 24th?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, the 24th floor.  
10 Actually, Room 2420, which is the conference room.

11 Okay. General updates. Any announcements?

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Just one more thing.

13 Has anybody noticed how the traffic is affected  
14 by the Giant's games?

15 We have one meeting, not in June, but in July  
16 and August where we are on the same night as the game.

17 We may want to consider that. That may reduce  
18 the population here by half if it's really bad.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: July or August?

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I don't have my

1 schedule with me. It's not next month. It's after.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, what we could do is  
3 check our meeting dates against the Giants schedule and  
4 see.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Maybe we could get some of  
6 the island members. Maybe it's no problem. I don't  
7 know if it does affect the traffic. But that would be  
8 something we should check.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a good point.

10 Okay. Under general updates, we have a  
11 standing item for any announcements, if anyone would  
12 like to make any.

13 (No response.)

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So there being none, the  
15 next item is just a brief report on our monthly project  
16 team meeting.

17 We had a project team meeting on the 2nd of  
18 May. These are the monthly meetings at which the  
19 project team, which consists of the Navy, the regulatory  
20 agencies and the city, and then we also have a standing

1 invitation to a representative from the community  
2 members of the RAB to attend the monthly project team  
3 meetings.

4           So our last regular meeting was on Tuesday, May  
5 2nd. Most of the meeting, or the major topic of the  
6 meeting, was an update on our Site 12 activities.  
7 Specifically, the former storage yard area that we  
8 talked about tonight.

9           And then we just have general administration,  
10 or administrative items, getting ready for tonight's RAB  
11 meeting, updating our ongoing action items.

12           And we also had an update on our CAP and  
13 pipeline investigation program. The CAP sites, which  
14 stand for Corrective Action Plan, are those sites where  
15 petroleum fuels are our main concern.

16           And so those fall into a program outside of the  
17 CERCLA program, which deals with nonpetroleum  
18 contaminants.

19           So the process is a little bit different, and  
20 that's why it's in the separate program.

1           So we had an update on these CAP sites and the  
2 fuel pipeline investigation.

3           So our next project team meeting is a change.  
4 We are going to be meeting down in San Diego. Most of  
5 you know, we shifted our regional management of the  
6 Treasure Island cleanup program, which was formerly  
7 managed out of our regional office out of San Bruno near  
8 the airport. That's now shifted to our regional office  
9 in San Diego. So myself and other people working on the  
10 Treasure Island project are now headquartered out of San  
11 Diego. So we decided to have one of our meetings down  
12 there.

13           Because of the travel, we extended that meeting  
14 over two days, on the 13th and 14th of June.

15           And then in July, we will resume our regular  
16 monthly meetings up here in the Bay Area.

17           But Lew has expressed an interest in attending,  
18 so we are going to provide him with an agenda to the  
19 meeting. We would be happy to have him attend all or  
20 parts of the meeting in San Diego.

1 I also wanted to provide an update on the  
2 ARCADIS, Gary Miller demo project at Site 12, or Site  
3 21.

4 The RAB has had, over the last probably 18  
5 months or so, there has been, I think, probably about  
6 two, at least two presentations relative to this demo  
7 project.

8 And, in short, we wanted to update you that the  
9 project has been canceled, or the Navy has canceled the  
10 project at Site 21.

11 And, in short, what this was was a Department  
12 of Defense demonstration project. It was not directly  
13 related to our cleanup program here, but they were  
14 looking for some various Department of Defense sites at  
15 Navy, Army, Air Force and Marine bases to apply this  
16 technology at for solvent contamination.

17 And so Treasure Island was picked as a proposed  
18 demo site, but the schedule for the demonstration, since  
19 it is a demonstration project, is over an extended  
20 period of time.

1           And so, initially, we thought it was going to  
2 be in place at an earlier date. But based on what their  
3 current schedule is for the demonstration, we didn't  
4 feel it would fit within our cleanup program in order to  
5 close this site for future reuse.

6           So we made a decision to terminate the project.

7           So Site 21, then, will continue under our  
8 overall onshore program.

9           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Except that, I mean, the  
10 cleanup you picked may even . . .

11          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It could very well end up  
12 using this technology or like this.

13          CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Then we would have lost  
14 eight months or a year.

15          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, except, because it's  
16 a demonstration project, it's time line is over an  
17 extended period of time. They go through several  
18 phases, first to determine site suitability, then to do  
19 a limited pilot, and then periods of reporting in  
20 between.

1           Since it is a demonstration project, it's not  
2 on the same time line as the rest of our cleanup  
3 projects.

4           MR. CHOU: Jim, was this funded, the base  
5 cleanup?

6           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In this case, it was a DoD  
7 funded project through, the Department of Defense was  
8 the overall sponsor. But it was being managed through  
9 the Air Force's Center for Environmental Excellence.

10           So they had contracted with ARCADIS, Gary  
11 Miller, at various Department of Defense locations. So  
12 Treasure Island was picked as a Navy site.

13           So ARCADIS got involved in initially looking at  
14 Site 21 and developing the schedule.

15           But we felt that, really, the schedule didn't  
16 fit within our cleanup program.

17           MR. CHOU: Thank you.

18           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then document status,  
19 there is an updated document status sheet on the back  
20 table. This is something we do as a regular monthly RAB

1 item.

2           It's a list of all the program documents for  
3 the cleanup program, and it's sorted in two ways: One,  
4 it's sorted by individual program, like the UST program,  
5 the onshore, the offshore remedial investigation. And  
6 then it's also sorted just by date of document, so that  
7 you could quickly look and see, regardless of the  
8 individual program, you could see which document was  
9 coming next chronologically.

10           So there should be two sorts of the same data.

11           But you will notice that a number of the  
12 document dates are listed as TBD, to be determined, and  
13 that's because we haven't finalized what the schedule is  
14 for those documents.

15           So once we have a scheduled date for the  
16 documents, then we would make that change in the  
17 document status.

18           Relative to that, the Navy has been drafting an  
19 environmental close-out strategy and schedule. I think  
20 we either have or are in the process of mailing this to

1 our technical subcommittee. You may have not gotten  
2 this yet.

3 This is dated March 9th. It is a draft  
4 document. We are already working on an update of the  
5 document. When we provide the updated document to the  
6 regulatory agencies and the city, we will also be  
7 providing it to the RAB technical committee.

8 So, ultimately, the dates that are finalized in  
9 the schedule will then be reflected in those document  
10 dates.

11 So we have been working hard to develop a good  
12 solid schedule, and that's from experience in the past  
13 with having schedules that are constantly changing.

14 And so we have been working hard to develop a  
15 good, solid schedule that we can hope to sustain and  
16 that meets the needs of both the regulatory agencies and  
17 the city for their reuse plans.

18 Flipping over to the back page, I just came up  
19 with agenda items for the next two meetings. This was  
20 just my first shot at it.

1           We want to solicit any comments, either tonight  
2 or at our, we also use our interim RAB meeting which we  
3 will now have on the 5th as a preparation for the RAB  
4 meeting.

5           For June, we did put out a questionnaire a  
6 couple of meetings ago, and we have gotten back some  
7 questionnaires. We also got back verbal comments from  
8 previous RAB meetings.

9           We were going to present the results of that.  
10 We would like to present the results of that at the June  
11 meeting. That's a good item because we wanted to use  
12 that as a tool to use that feedback to improve our RAB.

13           And then the second item would be the next  
14 likely, we will have another version of the draft  
15 environmental schedule for the cleanup sites. So that  
16 would be a good agenda item for June.

17           And then in July, we will be, since we will be  
18 starting the removal action at the former storage yard  
19 in June, and probably by the time of our June RAB  
20 meeting on the 20th, we will probably just be starting

1 the field work. So we could provide a limited update,  
2 but there won't be that much information.

3 But by July, we will have a lot of information  
4 that we can provide as a technical update to our storage  
5 yard removal action.

6 And then I also penciled in, also an update on  
7 our CAP site and fuel line investigation, which has been  
8 ongoing for the last couple of months.

9 We will be getting, by July, we will be getting  
10 near the end of the field work on that, also. We will  
11 have a good idea where the sites of concern are along  
12 the pipeline.

13 And the next item is other items. This is a  
14 catchall for any items that we haven't otherwise  
15 discussed in the meeting.

16 Anyone like to bring anything up?

17 (No response.)

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: This came out from the Navy.  
19 I gave one copy to Lew to look at. I will give this one  
20 to Ted. I have two and you have one.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think I have two also.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: This is a summary of various  
3 Navy and Marine bases.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's an annual, I think  
5 it's an annual report to Congress on the cleanup  
6 program.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It's looking forward to the  
8 years 2000 and 2004. It talks about the various bases.

9 You would be surprised that there is Navy bases  
10 in almost every state no matter how far from the water  
11 it is.

12 It does give you a summary. It give you an  
13 idea of some of the cleanup going around. It's a gauge  
14 for comparison of what is happening here.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The only thing I would note  
16 on this, the time line for preparation for this document  
17 is so long, that when you look in the Treasure Island  
18 information, for those of you who, since you follow the  
19 program now on a monthly basis, you will see that the  
20 information is maybe somewhat dated already. But that's

1 something that couldn't be helped in a document of that  
2 magnitude. It has to cover all of the DoD sites.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: One question:

4 Why do they call Hunter's Point the Treasure  
5 Island annex?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because, originally, when  
7 the shipyard closed in 1974, and in 1978 -- wait.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, until 1974.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Now, I'm trying to remember  
10 now. It was either '78 or '87, it became an -- I think  
11 it was '87, 1987, it became an annex to us here at Naval  
12 Station Treasure Island as part of the proposed home  
13 porting of the Missouri.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I see. It says here it went  
15 from AAA from '76 to '86.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the Naval Station  
17 Treasure Island took over the shipyard in preparation  
18 for its recommissioning as a naval station for potential  
19 home port for the U.S.S. Missouri and possibly some  
20 other ships.

1           But when that didn't come about, the naval  
2 station continued to manage the site. I was the  
3 environmental manager for both the naval station here,  
4 as well as Hunter's Point, up until 1995, when we  
5 transferred it to the BRAC program.

6           MR. SCHALIT: Just out of curiosity, Treasure  
7 Island has shifted to San Diego.

8           Have any of the other sites shifted to San  
9 Diego? In other words is San Bruno out of business?

10          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the program that we  
11 operate under for both environmental and real estate,  
12 relative to base closure, is called BRAC, Base  
13 Realignment and Closure.

14          All BRAC bases have shifted management from our  
15 office in San Bruno to San Diego. So Naval Air Station  
16 Alameda, Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Treasure Island,  
17 Hunter's Point, Point Melotti, and a couple of others in  
18 the Bay Area, all have shifted management to San Diego.

19          Now, there are some, the BRAC legislation, if a  
20 base is small enough, and I think it's mainly defined by

1 number of personnel who work at the base rather than its  
2 physical size, but at any rate, if a base is small  
3 enough that it doesn't come under the BRAC program, then  
4 it's still being managed regionally up here. That would  
5 include like Skaggs Island and also Stockton, the Naval  
6 Communication Station there, and a couple of other  
7 smaller sites that continue to be managed by our San  
8 Bruno office. But all the major bases are now managed  
9 by San Diego.

10 But we do have a small office in San Bruno.  
11 They are San Diego staff, but they are physically  
12 located in San Bruno in order to provide day-to-day  
13 coordination.

14 So you may not have met him, but Marcello  
15 Pasqua is our environmental liaison for Treasure Island.  
16 He's up here full time.

17 But the majority of the project staff is now  
18 down in San Diego.

19 Well, with that, it moves us to closing of the  
20 meeting.

1           So our next meeting will be on Tuesday, the  
2 20th of June.

3           And then July's meeting will be on the 18th of  
4 July.

5           We will check the Giant's schedule to see if  
6 any of those dates fall on a Giant's game.

7           CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It's either July or August.  
8 I'm not sure.

9           MR. SCHALIT: Jim, you said it, but where is  
10 NFEC, what is the address in San Diego?

11           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the organization's  
12 name is Southwestern Division.

13           NFEC, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, is  
14 the overall organization in Washington.

15           MR. SCHALIT: I know.

16           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Southwestern Division  
17 is located at 1220 Pacific Highway.

18           MR. SCHALIT: Okay. Thank you.

19           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's across from the Amtrak  
20 station.

1 MR. SCHALIT: Right.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But our office, our BRAC  
3 office in San Diego is a couple of blocks away at 1230  
4 Columbia.

5 MR. SCHALIT: The meeting will be where?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We haven't yet determined.

7 We are not sure if we have meeting space at our  
8 Columbia Street office or in our main office on the  
9 Pacific Highway.

10 MR. SCHALIT: You will let me know.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.

12 MR. SCHALIT: Thank you.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then our interim  
14 meeting will be on Monday, the 5th of June.

15 And then our BCT meeting will be on the 13th  
16 and 14th of June in San Diego.

17 Is there anything else before we close?

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That's it.

19 MR. CONNELLY: Just a glossary.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think there is a

1 glossary in there, too (indicating).

2 Well, with that, thank you very much for  
3 attending our May meeting.

4 We will see some of you either on the 5th of  
5 June or the 20th of June in our regular meeting.

6 Thank you very much.

7 (The meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.)

8 ---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, the undersigned, a duly authorized  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that  
the within proceedings were taken down by me in  
stenotype and thereafter transcribed into  
typewriting under my direction and supervision, and  
that this transcript is a true record of the said  
proceedings.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STEPHEN BALBONI  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER NO. 7139  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA