

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)

STEVE EDDE

TONY TACTAY

SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR'S OFFICE:

MARTHA WALTERS (SFRA)

REGULATORY AGENCY:

DAVID RIST (DTSC)

SARAH RAKER (RWQCB)

PATRICIA RYAN (DTSC)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

NATHAN BRENNAN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)

RICHARD HANSEN

SCOTT LUNT

DALE SMITH

TETRA TECH EM, INC.:

VIRGINIA DEMETRIOS

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI)

VILA-SHEREE GERMANY

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 (Continued)

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI) (Continued)

SONNY SONIA

MICHAEL STONE

GUESTS:

NATASHIA HARRIS

MICHAEL JAMES

LOREN SANBORN

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, we will go
2 ahead and get started. Welcome to our October
3 Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

4 Probably most of you are aware that we did not
5 have a regular September meeting, so this is our first
6 meeting since the August meeting.

7 There are copies of the agenda out on the back
8 table, if you don't already have one.

9 So our first item on the agenda is the
10 discussion and approval of the agenda.

11 Are there any comments concerning tonight's
12 agenda?

13 (No response.)

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. There being none, we
15 will move into the rest of the meeting.

16 The next item is public comment. And we set
17 aside time at the beginning of each regular meeting for
18 members of the general public, if they would like to
19 speak regarding the environmental cleanup program at
20 Treasure Island.

1 So is there any member of the public who would
2 like to say anything? And there is time available
3 during the rest of the meeting. But we wanted to make
4 sure that we have a public comment period at the
5 beginning of the meeting, so that if someone wanted to
6 speak, they wouldn't have to wait until later in the
7 meeting. So feel free to ask questions later in the
8 meeting as we go on.

9 So if not, we will --

10 Richard?

11 MR. HANSEN: This is not a comment, Jim, but
12 actually a question I would like to direct to Martha.

13 If she could say a few words about how the city
14 stands on their master plan, and also about the, what do
15 you call it, the Citizens Advisory Group, or whatever
16 that is.

17 MS. WALTERS: Well, the Citizens Advisory
18 Committee -- I was talking to Nathan about it before the
19 meeting started -- the very first meeting will be held
20 on Wednesday, October 25th over -- what is the building

1 number, Nathan? It's at the Department of Labor
2 facility.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I will find it.

4 MS. WALTERS: It's at 6:30.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Building 442 655 Avenue H.

6 MR. HANSEN: 44?

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: 442 and I think the address
8 is 665 Avenue H.

9 MR. HANSEN: Here?

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. The Department of
11 Labor.

12 MS. WALTERS: It's not at this building, but
13 here on the island.

14 MR. HANSEN: Okay.

15 MS. WALTERS: And the master plan, I'm not sure
16 what you mean by that.

17 MR. HANSEN: A few months ago, I heard the city
18 was reviewing the master plan and trying to get a master
19 developer.

20 Just basically how do they stand?

1 MS. WALTERS: Right.

2 The city is in the process of putting together
3 an RFQ. We are actually setting up RFQs to those
4 parties who are interested, and then going through, I
5 think, about a six-month selection process.

6 And probably -- what is today, today is
7 October? I think it's like April or May. They will
8 come up with their selection of a master developer.

9 MR. HANSEN: And has the RFQ gone out as yet?

10 MS. WALTERS: No, it has not.

11 I think it's going out next week sometime.

12 MR. HANSEN: The reason I ask that, I went to a
13 SPUR (phonetic) meeting maybe a month or two ago, where
14 several people spoke about it. Annemarie Conroy at that
15 time had a broken leg, so it was her deputy or someone
16 like that.

17 MS. WALTERS: Bob Mahoney?

18 MR. HANSEN: I just wanted to make sure that
19 that got into the minutes somewhere.

20 MS. WALTERS: Certainly.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

2 MR. HANSEN: Because I'm sure that other people
3 are interested in what the status is.

4 MS. WALTERS: Sure.

5 MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

6 MS. SANBORN: Can I ask a question?

7 What is the Citizens Advisory Committee?

8 MS. WALTERS: It's a committee that oversees
9 the whole development of --

10 MS. SANBORN: The whole island?

11 MS. WALTERS: The whole island. Actually, you
12 guys should be a part of it.

13 The mayor and the board of supervisors select
14 the citizens from the City of San Francisco.

15 They played a very, very important part in the
16 development of the draft master plan.

17 They actually are critical. They are
18 absolutely critical. When I first joined this project
19 about five years ago, it was a very, very active
20 committee. And they worked really hard with the

1 Redevelopment Agency staff in coming up with a revision
2 of the draft master plan.

3 MS. SANBORN: So the committee exists now?

4 MS. WALTERS: It's actually now the Treasure
5 Island Development Authority. It's a new legal body.

6 MS. SANBORN: Okay.

7 MS. WALTERS: One of their requirements is to
8 have a Citizens Advisory Committee, and they have
9 finally formulated that. It took a long time to get
10 there.

11 MS. SANBORN: So it's formulated.

12 MS. WALTERS: Yes.

13 The very first meeting will be October 25th,
14 Wednesday, at 6:30.

15 MS. SANBORN: Okay.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. With that, we will
17 move into our cleanup process.

18 First, I should pass these out (indicating).

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So tonight, we wanted to
20 provide the RAB with an update of our site investigation

1 of Building 1211.

2 This investigation occurred after our August
3 meeting, and so we haven't had a chance to update the
4 RAB on this investigation.

5 In consultation with the agencies, the Navy
6 conducted a site inspection of Building 1211 on two
7 days, on August 21st and August 30th of this year.

8 Building 1211 is located right here on Bayside
9 Drive in the Treasure Island housing area (indicating).

10 As part of the investigation, we inspected four
11 backyards of the six backyards that constitute the
12 building. And as part of that inspection, we hand dug
13 five, what we call, potholes in each of the backyards,
14 roughly to be representative of the four corners of the
15 yards as well as the center of the yard.

16 This blowup shows the location of the potholes
17 as well as the letters that denote the sample numbers
18 that were taken (indicating).

19 So at the bottom of each one of the potholes,
20 which was about 12 to 18 inches deep, a sample was taken

1 for analysis.

2 We did the tech constituents that exceeded our
3 screening criteria. The constituents that we evaluated
4 included lead, PCBs and PAHs.

5 Sod and pavers were placed in the yard in order
6 to restrict the pathway from soil exposure.

7 The soils in the existing, or the cover in the
8 existing yard varied. There was originally kind of a
9 crab grass and weeds before the housing was occupied,
10 and in some of the yards, that grass was still there.
11 But we felt the best thing to do was to place a cover
12 over all of the backyards. The tenants have been
13 present there for less than a month.

14 MR. HANSEN: Jim?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 MR. HANSEN: What inspired that investigation,
17 and why did you look at four backyards rather than all
18 six backyards?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Building 1211 is adjacent
20 to Buildings 1207, 1209, where we had previously

1 observed some debris and had a removal project last year
2 that removed a large portion of debris.

3 We had additional samples, both geoprobes as
4 well as trenches, all up and down this street, including
5 in the front and back of Building 1211.

6 And at the time that we prepared the finding of
7 suitability to lease, we didn't see any indication that
8 would cause us to think that there was additional debris
9 in this area.

10 However, we did get a call from a resident
11 elsewhere in the housing area who had, when he started
12 to do some gardening, had noticed some sort of rubbish.

13 We went out and investigated that. While we
14 did observe some rubbish type material and sample it,
15 the analysis showed it didn't exceed what would have
16 been our cleanup level. But we still did get detections
17 above what would be the typical background in the soil
18 at TI.

19 So I think the fact that we had gotten that
20 call, the one call, the only call we had gotten of that

1 sort, caused us to want to look closer at buildings that
2 were in proximity to other areas where we had
3 investigated.

4 So we made a decision to go out and look at
5 1211. Unfortunately, it was just about the time that
6 the residents were moving in. We really didn't want it
7 to turn out that way, but we felt we needed to go in
8 there as soon as possible. But it was coinciding with
9 the residents moving in.

10 MR. HANSEN: Why didn't you look at B and E?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, initially we wanted
12 to get a sense of what was in the area, if anything.

13 Initially when we went in there, we didn't know
14 whether we would see anything at all. In fact,
15 obviously, that was the desired outcome to inspect and
16 not see any signs of rubbish or any other material
17 beyond the typical soils.

18 So we looked at the backyards where we had, at
19 the time, we had access to.

20 I think, at the time, people had just moved

1 into B and E. And so we thought we would at least look
2 at these four backyards that were still vacant in order
3 to get an assessment of the building as a whole, and
4 then we could make a decision to go from there.

5 MS. WALTERS: Also, if I may, Richard, one of
6 the other things that the Navy did, Jim obviously
7 indicated that the Navy was sampling on both sides of
8 1207 and 1209. So they sampled 1211 and 1205. 1205
9 came up clean.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

11 MS. WALTERS: So just to let you know, it was
12 sampled on the other side as well.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

14 So we did look at the building on the
15 completely opposite side, and there we saw nothing.

16 But in this case, we did observe some rubbish
17 type material. We didn't see the kind of staining or
18 odor or burnt material that we had seen in the other
19 areas, the vacant areas that we had investigated.

20 But we did see some rubbish type material, and,

1 therefore, we sampled. We did get some detections above
2 the screening criteria. Like for lead, it would be
3 above the 400 parts per million.

4 MR. HANSEN: Have you invoked this restriction
5 so that the residents cannot plant trees and tomatoes
6 and other fruits and vegetables?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, our first priority
8 was to inform and protect the residents.

9 So the first thing we could do -- well, one, to
10 inform the residents and let them know that we advised
11 them not to, not to dig into the soils or conduct
12 activities that would cause them to come in excess
13 contact with the soils.

14 But beyond that, we felt that it was best to
15 place, since most of the backyards still had the
16 original grass and crab grass and weeds that had been
17 present before the buildings were occupied, we felt it
18 was the best decision to just go in and place a good sod
19 cover over all of the backyards.

20 So at least there was a usable backyard that

1 would also provide a cover over the existing soils until
2 we could take further action.

3 Yes, Natashaia?

4 MS. HARRIS: My name is Natashaia Harris, and I
5 live in Unit E there.

6 Unfortunately, I moved in before they started
7 the testing.

8 When I moved in, I know that the building next
9 to us was what they classified as suspect, so they knew
10 something was in the background.

11 Even though we were less than 100 feet away
12 from that building, there was never any testing done
13 until after we moved in.

14 As a resident, I was very disturbed because it
15 was okay, and I had already moved in and I had already
16 started working in my backyard. I built a rock path
17 that went to the gate. My next door neighbor did
18 extensive landscaping on his backyard before we knew
19 anything about this, before we ever received the results
20 back.

1 And as we had discussed before, Jim, in our
2 other meeting, everybody was pretty upset because we had
3 dogs running in and out of the house. Some dogs were
4 digging and bringing that debris inside.

5 Since then, the management company offered to
6 vacuum and things like that, but we felt that the damage
7 had already been done. And we felt that that testing
8 should have been done before any residents came in,
9 since the building next to it had already, there had
10 already been discovered these types of chemicals.

11 MS. WALTERS: Well, actually, can I just say
12 something?

13 I think that you need to keep in perspective
14 the sense of where the chemicals were found. They were
15 found from 12 to 18 inches below the surface, so
16 anything that came in would be surface soil.

17 And I know that the Navy, nobody knows what
18 that surface soil really indicates.

19 MS. HARRIS: Yes. Actually, it wasn't surface
20 soil.

1 As I kind of indicated before, I had built a
2 rock path. That was more than 12 inches beneath the
3 surface.

4 So my dog was bringing in the excess soil that
5 we had already dug out and put in another spot.

6 MS. WALTERS: Okay.

7 MS. HARRIS: My next door neighbor had dug well
8 beneath that, because he does wine, home wine, and he
9 was setting out jugs. He had dug well beyond that
10 point.

11 Not to mention the flowers that I had planted
12 in the front yard. As Jim kind of explained, it was
13 nothing but crab grass and things like that, and so
14 immediately when you move in, you want to make it
15 better.

16 We had already been working on our backyards
17 long before, or a few days before they even done the
18 testing. And they knew that these chemicals were not
19 even, like I said, 100 feet away from where we were
20 going to be living.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, at the time, prior to
2 the site inspection in the backyards, over a period of
3 time, we had taken a large number of samples, both in
4 back of the building, in front of the building, and
5 along the sides, as well as up and down the block.

6 And at that time, the information indicated
7 that the area of debris was confined to the Building
8 1207, 1209 area.

9 And, in fact, we had excavated out the
10 backyard, the backyards of Building 1209 next door.

11 And as we got further to the west-east here,
12 the debris became less and less, to the point where, by
13 the time we got to the last backyard over here
14 (indicating), we did not observe any debris type
15 material, and had also sampled the soil. All of the
16 lead detections were below 400 parts per million.

17 MS. HARRIS: One other concern that I had also
18 was for the other buildings that are not yet ready. You
19 said you received a call just anonymously, basically,
20 from a resident who said they saw garbage in their

1 backyard, basically. And that's why you did the
2 testing, and that's why you found the levels of PAHs and
3 lead and things like that was because of a call from the
4 residents.

5 In the future, are you going to wait for that
6 call before you do such testing?

7 And, also, my second question was, the areas
8 that you have tested were around the building but not in
9 the living areas, like the backyard, the planter in my
10 yard. You tested all around that but not where people
11 were going to be living where they are in danger of
12 picking up these things.

13 Do you plan to do that in the future?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, at the time, the
15 equipment we were using was pretty large.

16 Typically, the geoprobe is basically like a
17 drilling rig. So we were limited to where we could get
18 the equipment in. We were limited to where we could put
19 the equipment.

20 And so the drilling rigs, we could get in only

1 so close to the building; and as well, we used a small
2 excavator that could trench close to the building but
3 was too big to go into the backyards.

4 So we collected a large amount of data.

5 But you're correct, it didn't include samples
6 directly in the backyard.

7 But when you look on a map and see the density
8 of the samples, it appears to be quite large, or quite a
9 dense amount of samples.

10 But because of, you know, the call that we had
11 gotten from another resident, as well as the experiences
12 that we have gone through here is causing us to
13 evaluate, reevaluate our sampling methods and make sure
14 that we are doing the right amount of sampling in the
15 right locations.

16 MR. RIST: Jim, I would like to add a little
17 bit about some of the information we had before.

18 In March of last year, we did an additional
19 trenching investigation that went around the end of
20 Building 1209 and around 1211 and in front of 1213, and

1 all out from the area adjacent.

2 And we did have one trench that was outside of
3 Unit A that had only a slight concentration.

4 So at that point, it was a question of how far
5 that went, and we never really resolved it. And that's
6 sort of how we got that situation.

7 MS. HARRIS: So there was lead in Unit A.

8 MS. WALTERS: No, outside.

9 MR. RIST: Outside.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. There was one sample
11 somewhere.

12 MR. RIST: It was right next to the gate.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably right here
14 (indicating).

15 MS. HARRIS: I thought you said something else.
16 So there was something else next to Unit A.

17 MR. RIST: Right outside the gate of Unit A.
18 You could still see the trench. There was a sample
19 collected. We never called on and determined the extent
20 of the contamination in the area.

1 MS. HARRIS: And why was that?

2 MR. RIST: I can't say.

3 It was my impression that we were going to
4 eventually, and then we learned that folks would be
5 moving in.

6 That's what prompted this additional testing
7 that's led to the situation we are in now.

8 So it was always, my understanding, DTSC, that
9 we would eventually carry out that investigation.

10 MS. HARRIS: Before I moved in.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we did have a lot of
12 other samples. That was one sample.

13 But we did have a lot of other samples all
14 around the building and up and down the street where we
15 had not gotten detection.

16 So it was a matter of whether or not that one
17 sample needed to be further followed up on or not.

18 MR. RIST: Yes, that's a fair representation.

19 It's always been a mystery to us how the stuff
20 has been distributed, the debris, in these areas. You

1 could collect a sample a foot apart, two samples a foot
2 apart, and one will be 30 parts per million lead, for
3 example, and the next will be 1,000 parts per million.

4 So it's so heterogeneous. It's really hard to
5 define the area and the level of contamination you need
6 to deal with and that distribution.

7 And so it's been very difficult to really get
8 at the extent of these areas until you really start the
9 excavation process and start stepping out a very
10 intensive sampling program to get at the extent of the
11 contamination.

12 So it was always sort of thought, in my mind,
13 that we would address the end of 1209, and we never knew
14 exactly how far we would have to go and whether that
15 would take in Building 1211. It was never really
16 discussed.

17 It was always sort of thought that maybe if we
18 did 1209, that we might hold back 1211 as a buffer
19 building just to keep it so that there wouldn't be that
20 impact to residents while some work was going on. But

1 it fell through the cracks, if you will.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Loren?

3 MS. SANBORN: Am I mistaken that we didn't have
4 a finding of suitability to lease?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We had a finding to
6 suitability to lease in February of this year.

7 MS. WALTERS: Actually, it was March 6th.

8 MR. RIST: Yes, and subsequent to that,
9 additional investigation was done around 1209, and that
10 end of 1211, that there may be additional work needed.

11 That's the point. We started picking up the
12 former storage yard and got involved with the storage
13 yard. We shifted our focus away from 1211 and this area
14 because the former storage yard was easier to handle, we
15 thought.

16 And so we sort of focused down there and didn't
17 pick this up again until recently.

18 MS. HARRIS: Wasn't this whole area a garbage
19 dump? That's what I understand. I could see where it
20 could be scattered about.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. I mean, this was
2 originally, actually, originally, the whole north end of
3 the island was the parking lot for the World's Fair.
4 That's how it was originally built.

5 And then when the Navy took over in 1940, it
6 was used for a variety of purposes. It was used for
7 vehicle storage, equipment storage. There were some
8 small bunkers located in the area that appeared to store
9 like maybe small arms ammunition, and also things like
10 photographic film, and things like they wanted for
11 safekeeping.

12 So it was a large, open space area, but from
13 the information that we had gathered and the aerial
14 photos that we looked at, there were a couple of
15 locations where there was debris that may have been
16 piled, or where it may have been incinerated in small
17 spots typically at the north end.

18 But it appears that when the housing was
19 constructed in the 1960s, that material may have been
20 pushed around a little bit. And that's why, instead of

1 seeing it all in one spot, it seems to trail off a
2 little bit.

3 And so where we had investigated and removed
4 some soil at Building 1207, 1209, that seemed to be a
5 location where the material was originally deposited;
6 but, apparently, some of it had been pushed away from
7 those buildings.

8 MS. HARRIS: One of these -- I'm not a doctor
9 of chemistry or toxicology -- but isn't either the PCBs
10 or PAHs indicative of burning something, burning garbage
11 or something, and that's what you found in the
12 backyards?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's probably indicative of
14 the fact that materials had been disposed of as rubbish.
15 And if it was wood material, old wood material, it would
16 have had lead based, you know, all paint, prior to 1978,
17 had some amount of lead contained in the paint.

18 And so where you might have had old wood, paint
19 that had flaked off, then you might see lead in the
20 soil.

1 And it might have been things that were just
2 disposed of just from typical rubbish that you might
3 have anywhere. Because we did see things like broken
4 bottles, broken porcelain from plates and bowls and
5 small pieces, like things like small bolts, typical
6 things like you might find in rubbish.

7 But it was not a landfill area or a dump where
8 things were just brought in.

9 It appeared to be just small areas where things
10 were deposited, but then later, it was pushed around a
11 little bit when the housing was constructed.

12 MS. HARRIS: You know, I see bottles and things
13 like that all the time just laying around, broken
14 bottles and things, but there were elevated levels here.

15 What does that show, then? It seems like more
16 than just a bottle here or a plate there.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the bottles like
18 themselves, glass by themselves would not cause the lead
19 and the PCBs or PAHs.

20 But the wood may have contained paint, and

1 probably just any garbage type material, especially if
2 it had been partially burned, might be resulting in the
3 chemical detections that we are seeing.

4 Although we did not see any significant sign of
5 burning in the potholes that we had dug here.

6 Elsewhere, in vacant areas, you know, we have
7 seen things that looked obviously burnt, and you could
8 obviously smell it. It's a more sootier color.

9 But what we saw here was generally more rubbish
10 type and more scattered.

11 MR. RIST: Yes, I will add to that a little
12 bit.

13 All we have to go on in this area, in general,
14 is some aerial photographs dating from the war, and we
15 have scattered years.

16 And then some technical reports that were done
17 prior to the construction of the housing to determine
18 the feasibility of constructing housing on this soil
19 type.

20 With those two pieces of information, any

1 investigations that we have done, we could look at the
2 photographs and see that these cells (phonetic) that Jim
3 is talking about were used up until the time the housing
4 was constructed. So they were used for a period of 20
5 to 30 years.

6 And at the time housing was contemplated, the
7 Navy employed a contractor to go out and evaluate the
8 soils and generate a report on the appropriateness of
9 constructing housing on these soils, and what to do to
10 make sure that they could, because they obviously wanted
11 the space for housing.

12 What the report noted was that there were these
13 cells, and that for the most part, that contamination
14 remained.

15 And what would need to happen, they would need
16 to be excavated down a couple of feet, mixed with some
17 other soil, and then have that all redistributed so that
18 they could get compaction.

19 And that's obviously what I think has happened,
20 based on the data that we have collected and the way

1 that we are looking at the distribution of the material
2 and what we are seeing and what we have investigated.

3 So there is this cell originally that was taken
4 off the, the top was taken off, if you will, had soil
5 mixed to it, and then it was distributed. And then they
6 compacted it and built the housing right over the top of
7 it. That's why you see this.

8 So the cells themselves probably have been
9 there for 20 or 30 years. And, generally, they were
10 located between munition bunkers prior to the housing
11 that existed, prior to the housing being constructed.

12 Those bunkers probably were just destroyed in
13 place, and a lot of the rubble that we are seeing, also
14 probably laid out in this entire area as well,
15 distributed, and we see a lot of concrete. We still
16 excavate down in some places and find things like roads
17 or bases of buildings, possibly. A lot of the wood that
18 you see may have come from those bunkers.

19 And the Fair buildings also that existed on
20 this property were torn down. We surmise they were

1 taken down there and possibly burned down as well.

2 We wouldn't imagine that it was hauled off
3 site. It is an island. It would have been tough to
4 tear it down and take it somewhere. So probably just
5 hauled out to a dumpster and burned to reduce the
6 volume.

7 So that's the way that we are looking at these.

8 MS. RAKER: And the PCBs?

9 MR. RIST: The PCBs, what I have come to, in my
10 evaluation of the island, how we see PCBs out there,
11 PCBs were used in oils, various reasons. They are
12 contained in transformer fluids, hydraulic oils.

13 It's possible some of the oils that were spent
14 were just simply taken out and disposed of in these
15 cells. That's why we see some low levels of PCBs,
16 generally low levels.

17 Yes, they are above action levels in some
18 cases, but for the most part, in those cells out there,
19 we don't see the higher levels.

20 And the PAHs, probably from burning activity of

1 some sort. But we can't say that all the time. And
2 there are other sources. We have background
3 concentrations of PAHs everywhere, auto emissions,
4 smokestack emissions, from all types of sources.

5 MS. WALTERS: Barbecues.

6 MR. RIST: Yes, barbecues, for example.

7 So it depends upon the volume that we see.

8 Generally, for PAHs, we have never seen large
9 volumes of PAHs anywhere in the cells that we are
10 looking at.

11 Unfortunately, in this one spot, we have seen a
12 little more than we normally see, so it's raised our
13 consciousness. We want to go in there, be diligent and
14 be sure it doesn't spread.

15 Generally in the past, we haven't seen high
16 concentrations over a large area. And they are probably
17 our primary concern along with lead.

18 So that's where we are at, and that's how I see
19 it.

20 MS. HARRIS: One more question:

1 I know the last time we met last month, there
2 wasn't any action plan. So pretty much the sod was laid
3 down to protect us, I guess, from any more exposure from
4 bringing it in the house or anything.

5 Have you guys come up with an action plan to
6 remove this?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have been looking at
8 some alternatives.

9 In fact, we are meeting with the agencies
10 tomorrow to further go over that -- I'm sorry, I should
11 have put up the other slide.

12 So we did meet with the residents in September,
13 and we did provide follow up letters in September and
14 October.

15 We are going to maintain the interim protective
16 measures of the sod.

17 In one of the backyards, because of the dog
18 present, the sod was being impacted. So the sod was
19 replaced with pavers.

20 We are meeting tomorrow, and we intend to keep

1 the residents informed of our progress. Obviously, our
2 first concern is with the residents. We want to first
3 protect them.

4 And, then, secondly, move through this process
5 as expeditiously as we can. I think we all felt badly
6 about having to go in a meeting and inform the residents
7 of what we had found.

8 And so we want to get through this process as
9 expeditiously as possible and take care of the
10 residents.

11 MR. LUNT: How does that apply to other
12 residents on the island? Is there going to be further
13 investigation in other places that are already lived in?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, this building was
15 located next to one of the previous investigation areas.

16 We did look at another building on the other
17 side and didn't observe anything.

18 I think we are going to, as a result of this,
19 make sure that we are looking, make sure that we have
20 collected all the data that we feel we need to.

1 We have collected an extensive amount of data
2 on the site. It's probably a little hard to read, but
3 you can see, representative-wise, this represents all of
4 the sample points that we have collected throughout the
5 housing area (indicating). That's either by probe, by
6 borings, or by trenches.

7 And so I think it's a matter of, before we
8 close out this whole project, determining whether or not
9 we have taken the right amount of samples.

10 MS. RAKER: Jim, can you bring that forward so
11 they can see how many zillion samples you have taken?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I can pass it out.

13 MS. WALTERS: It's an extensive sampling.

14 MS. SANBORN: I would just like to comment for
15 Scott that, in fact, we have had cleanups in occupied
16 areas. It's happened before.

17 And as long as, I think, the residents feel
18 their best interests are taken seriously, and that
19 everything is fair and reasonable, that they get
20 properly informed, and so on.

1 We can't always know exactly where some of
2 these things are going to lead.

3 As the management company, it's a sticky wicket
4 sometimes because we don't know, and we rely on certain
5 people. We just hope that the resident safety is first
6 and foremost.

7 We did have a problem with the cleanup in the
8 last area, and David, DTSC, spent a lot of time, the
9 city did, the Navy did, to make sure to everyone it was
10 clear what was going on.

11 MR. LUNT: Well, obviously, and I don't
12 remember your name.

13 MS. HARRIS: Natasha.

14 MR. LUNT: Natasha has asked what about the
15 other people.

16 Since I'm a resident, her area was, apparently,
17 quote, unquote, missed, so to speak.

18 Does that mean that there might be other areas
19 that are lived in that are also, we don't know that they
20 are missed as well?

1 And is the book closed on, say, my building or
2 buildings next to me? Or is there any reason to go in
3 and maybe do another sample in my backyard or my
4 neighbor's or whatever?

5 MS. SANBORN: That's where we rely on the Navy
6 and DTSC.

7 MR. RIST: Generally speaking, when we're
8 looking at Site 12, the residential housing area, we're
9 looking at the perimeter closest to the bay.

10 And most of the areas that we have yet to
11 investigate are not occupied.

12 MR. LUNT: Why closer to the bay?

13 MR. RIST: For whatever reason, that's where
14 the Navy operations --

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If you look at the
16 aerial --

17 MR. LUNT: Historical data?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

19 We have looked at all the historical data that
20 was collected by the engineers who were building the

1 housing, as well as we have a series of aerial
2 photographs every couple of years. You can see a trend
3 that the presence of rubbish is predominantly along the
4 very perimeter.

5 And then we have also supplemented that by,
6 we've dug -- well, as you can see on the drawing -- we
7 have dug a tremendous amount of trenches at a number of
8 other locations, and we have not observed that type of
9 debris. So as we have gone in, we have observed less.

10 MR. LUNT: So then it is, basically, a closed
11 book.

12 MS. SANBORN: Well, I don't think it's ever
13 closed.

14 MR. RIST: Until we sign what we call a
15 remedial action plan, or a record of decision, the final
16 document that closes the book, if you will. And it's
17 something that the public has a chance to comment on
18 when we get that far in the process.

19 So until then, it's still an open book.

20 MR. LUNT: Okay.

1 MS. HARRIS: And, also, I know there were, the
2 buildings next to us are still not occupied. And one of
3 them is where you found a higher concentration. It's
4 the building next to ours.

5 That area is still open. And I see people all
6 the time with their dogs and everything else running
7 back and forth along that area inside of the gate. What
8 about those residents? It seems like it's beyond just
9 us and 1211. There is people constantly going back and
10 forth.

11 We were lucky enough to get the sod to protect
12 us, a protective layer from these chemicals, but there
13 is no sod or anything back there to protect those people
14 who don't even know what they are getting into every
15 time they take their dog to play ball or play catch to
16 have a football game like they do.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, in terms of casual
18 contact and traversing areas, we don't feel that there
19 should be a concern.

20 We are, as part of the overall process in order

1 to close out this project, we will be making sure that
2 we are looking at all possibilities.

3 But just the typical walking around,
4 recreational type of activities, we don't feel that
5 there is a concern.

6 The major concern was with the backyards
7 because we know that is a private space. It's a space
8 people want to work in. And because it's not an
9 improved area as opposed to the common areas, which are
10 maintained in common by the management, the backyards
11 have been the focus because we know that's where people
12 potentially come into more contact.

13 MS. HARRIS: Well, the reason I ask that
14 question, at the meeting, some of the toxicologists say
15 the dogs bring the things, the soil into the house and
16 that could be problematic.

17 I know the exposure wasn't immediate, they
18 said, but it could be a long term, over a few years.
19 You could get sick and there is problems, and that's why
20 you guys are cleaning it up.

1 I know it is a concern to you. Isn't that the
2 same kind of casual contact these people will be having
3 by playing there if they do it regularly?

4 MR. RIST: Can I answer that?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sure, David.

6 MR. RIST: It's what we need to evaluate as
7 well.

8 I'm trying to get a meeting going now, sometime
9 this week with the Navy, to bring toxicologists and the
10 Navy and others as well that are involved in those
11 discussions.

12 We will sit down and evaluate that very concern
13 and determine what, if anything, should be done for
14 those common areas.

15 Should there be a measure taken that's going to
16 prevent some type of casual contact that any resident
17 could have, like passive to the area, football game or a
18 picnic, whatever.

19 That's something we will discuss this week and
20 look at all the areas in the residential areas we are

1 concerned with and proposing a remedy in the near
2 future.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Also, the 1207 and 1209,
4 that's new soil in there. That was trucked in.

5 MR. RIST: Right.

6 MS. WALTERS: It's clean soil.

7 MR. HANSEN: How deep, how deep is the new
8 soil?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Four feet.

10 MS. WALTERS: Four feet.

11 It's really deep. It's new soil.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Also, I wanted to point
13 out, the housing was occupied by over 30 years by
14 military family residents.

15 As part of our health program for the military,
16 we did have a childhood lead prevention program, which
17 is now becoming more common in any area where you might
18 have housing constructed prior to 1978.

19 But as part of that lead prevention program, in
20 testing the children who lived here over a period of

1 years, we did not detect any concerns that would have
2 caused us to come back to the housing area for further
3 investigation.

4 So, I mean, that's not the only yardstick we
5 should be using. But just to let you know, among the
6 people who lived here for a number of years and were
7 tested for lead in this case, we did not observe any
8 problems that would have caused us to have to go back
9 and investigate the housing area.

10 MS. HARRIS: And we could get copies of those
11 reports for the children, or whatever, who lived in
12 those areas, 1211 and 1209?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what it would be,
14 it was probably not. I have done a little
15 investigation. The records were probably not kept by
16 individual housing units or individuals, even, but it
17 was rather catalogued amongst the whole housing area.

18 But we will probably be looking at that, and
19 probably incorporating that into our future reports.

20 So I can't go back to a single building and

1 say, what's the result of a particular child who lived
2 in that particular building?

3 But when you look at all of the information
4 that was collected throughout the housing area, you
5 didn't see anything that would indicate that there was a
6 problem with lead in the Treasure Island housing area.

7 MS. HARRIS: But the site that we are concerned
8 about where there may have been burning and may have
9 been oils that were disposed of and things like that,
10 there is no way, I mean, I'm not sure if the other areas
11 were used for the same purpose, but I'm really concerned
12 about this particular area.

13 Has there been cataloging, since you know these
14 types, the PCBs and PAHs and lead, in this particular
15 area?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, all of this
17 information we have collected just over the last several
18 years.

19 MS. SANBORN: She means cataloging from
20 reviewing the families in those locations.

1 MS. HARRIS: It doesn't seem like there is a
2 concern with the areas that are more inland. Is it
3 referring to the area around the perimeter?

4 I would be concerned with those children on the
5 perimeter. Do they have cancer now? Those are some of
6 the problems that come out of these types of chemicals
7 in the lead.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, there wasn't anything
9 that would, we don't have access to, and it may not even
10 be compiled, all the medical records of all the people
11 who may have lived here over the years.

12 But I would think that if there had been some
13 problem that was identified, that it would have been
14 flagged.

15 And in the case of the lead, the children on
16 the base throughout the housing area were regularly
17 screened. All of that information was compiled as a
18 whole. It did not indicate that there was a problem
19 with lead in the housing area.

20 But that's just one yardstick. That's not the

1 only yardstick we do.

2 We have all of the sampling that we have done
3 to date, and the investigations that we will complete
4 before we close the book.

5 MR. RIST: We have had the same concerns, and I
6 think it's an interesting piece of information.

7 But in any type of a study, you would start to
8 question the parameters and look at, like you're
9 questioning, what residents were looked at, for what
10 duration did they live there, what were their habits.

11 There are so many considerations that it would
12 be problematic to make real conclusions from a study
13 like this.

14 And, also, at that time, the lead levels that
15 were allowed or deemed acceptable in blood at that time
16 were much higher than they are today.

17 I don't know if the evaluation has been done to
18 look at their lead levels to accepted levels today or
19 not, but at that time, they would have been flagged
20 because the levels were much higher than they are today.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, Richard?

2 MR. HANSEN: I apologize in advance if I asked
3 this question before, and I may well have.

4 Does the lease through the John Stewart Company
5 carry restrictions on the tenants planting trees,
6 digging to plant a tree, a fruit tree, in particular?

7 I think it's commendable that the residents are
8 cleaning up the backyards and making them look nice and
9 the kids are playing in the backyards.

10 If I lived here, I would probably be tempted to
11 put in a little swimming pool in the backyard.

12 Is there a limitation on that? Can the
13 residents go out and dig in the backyard?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, as I recall, the
15 way it was written -- I had some part in that -- we
16 permitted routine landscaping activities, and we felt
17 that that would include the typical things that people
18 would do in a backyard.

19 But I think anything, you know, like building a
20 swimming pool --

1 MR. HANSEN: Wading pool not a big pool.

2 If I had kids under four years old, I would
3 like a wading pool aboveground or below ground.

4 MS. SANBORN: They are told specifically that
5 they are not to alter the existing landscaping without
6 management approval.

7 For example, we have people removing large
8 beautiful trees because they don't like them. That
9 happened recently. They are told not to. On occasion,
10 people go above and beyond that. They can plant small
11 plants but nothing large.

12 MS. SMITH: Jim, wasn't there a restriction on
13 vegetable gardens?

14 MR. LUNT: I know that it was in my contract.
15 Well, I read, don't plant anything you're going to eat.
16 So I knew that before I even came to this meeting.

17 MR. HANSEN: And you represent the John Stewart
18 Company?

19 MS. SANBORN: Yes.

20 As long as we know it, we planted some trees

1 that came down, unfortunately. We don't see people
2 planting.

3 You may see some things decorative in the front
4 yards. No one is digging huge holes in the ground we
5 have seen.

6 MS. HARRIS: As a person who has owned and
7 rented -- I have rented my own home, I moved here
8 recently from Southern California -- as a renter, there
9 are things you do to the apartment to make it look
10 better, and when you move out, you do, too. And I
11 wouldn't remove trees. But there are things you do and
12 make them the way they were before you leave.

13 So maybe there should be more, more attention
14 given to that. I would do something like that, and I
15 have had renters do minor changes.

16 MS. SANBORN: I thought we gave, I didn't write
17 it, but I thought we had a depth maximum.

18 MS. WALTERS: I think it's two feet. I would
19 have to go back and check. I think two feet.

20 MS. SANBORN: I believe that's what that says,

1 nothing edible.

2 MR. LUNT: There is certainly not enforcement I
3 am aware of.

4 Although I don't want people coming in my
5 backyard to look, anyways. That would be a tradeoff.

6 MS. SANBORN: We are in our first year. We
7 will be around once a year.

8 MR. LUNT: Oh, okay.

9 MS. SANBORN: But we see when things come down
10 or go up are big, because we can see them.

11 MS. WALTERS: Like a tree.

12 MS. SANBORN: Like trees.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I would like to thank
14 Natashia for coming out tonight, and thank the residents
15 for their patience and understanding.

16 It is understandably a trying time. And we all
17 intend to work with the residents to move through this
18 process as expeditiously as possible and get them to a
19 point where they can fully enjoy their backyards.

20 Okay. Thank you.

1 Next, we have Tony Tactay, one of our project
2 managers.

3 Tony is going to present an overview of our
4 2001 program. And it being October, this is the
5 beginning of the federal fiscal year. We will be
6 receiving our funding soon for new projects.

7 We wanted to give the RAB a general overview of
8 our program for this year.

9 MR. TACTAY: Good evening. My name is Tony
10 Tactay. I am the new remedial project manager for the
11 onshore IR site.

12 I joined the BRAC organization of Southwest
13 just two months ago. And I came from EFA West in San
14 Bruno. I worked for EFA West for about 15 years. I was
15 the lead remedial project manager for the Alameda
16 facility, Alameda Annex.

17 During that two-month period I stayed with
18 Southwestern, I had attended several meetings
19 internally, and we also met with our lead contractors,
20 Tetrattech. We met with the contractors that we had, IT.

1 The focus of that meeting that we had is to
2 look at the overall environmental programs for Treasure
3 Island. This includes the IR sites, the USTs, and other
4 cleanup activities that we have.

5 We look at each site and look at the cost for
6 that particular site.

7 We look at also the priorities we have for that
8 site.

9 We look at the duration of the city's
10 requirements.

11 And overall, we look at the overall budget for
12 01 and 02 and beyond.

13 And for fiscal year 01, we had an approximate
14 budget of \$30 million. Just a reminder that 30 million
15 is not really concrete. It's just an approximate. It
16 can be more, it can be less. We have not received any
17 money yet from the headquarters. We expect to receive
18 it sometime by the middle of November, I believe, or the
19 first week of November.

20 That \$30 million, actually, is distributed to

1 the installation-restoration site, which includes the
2 onshore and the offshore IR sites.

3 It also includes the underground storage tanks
4 and the pipelines that we have.

5 It includes the lead-based paints and also the
6 environmental baseline survey.

7 In the installation-restoration site, we have
8 an approximate budget, therefore, of about \$16 million
9 for the period 01.

10 for the underground storage tanks and the
11 pipeline, we had a total budget of almost 14 million.

12 And for the lead-based paint and the asbestos,
13 including the EBS, we have a budget for almost a million
14 and a half.

15 Where we are right now on the onshore -- I mean
16 the environmental programs -- I don't know whether the
17 community members particularly are familiar with the
18 onshore and the offshore.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The RAB members are.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes

1 MR. TACTAY: Okay. We submitted, I believe,
2 the draft final back in September of '97 for all of the
3 IR sites --

4 MS. RAKER: I'm sorry.

5 Tony, could you explain so that Natasha could
6 understand the onshore and the offshore?

7 MR. TACTAY: Okay. Well, actually, I have maps
8 here. I don't have any place to put it. Maybe I could
9 just explain it.

10 Actually, there are only two sites for the
11 offshore.

12 MS. HARRIS: Is it a drainage system?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

14 What it is, it's the stormwater system on the
15 base here, on Treasure Island and on Yerba Buena Island.
16 When rainwater flows into the drain system, it goes
17 through a series of pipes and then directly out to the
18 bay.

19 And so we have a series of these outfalls, the
20 pipes extending just off of the seawall around both

1 Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

2 And we were investigating to ensure that things
3 like oils and gasoline and things that may have been
4 washed into the storm drain system were not deposited
5 out into the bay around the island.

6 And then we had another location, a former
7 skeet range where the skeet shooters would shoot their
8 skeet out into the bay. And so the pellets from the
9 shotgun shells would land in the bay, and they contain
10 lead.

11 And, in fact, even the pigeons themselves, the
12 clay has some petroleum component to it. So those are
13 our two offshore sites and everything else is onshore,
14 on the land.

15 MR. TACTAY: As I said, the draft final
16 remedial investigation was submitted back in September
17 of '97.

18 Looking at that data we have in the RI report,
19 we still, we filled up Site 1, 3, 5, and 7 and 17 can go
20 to no further action.

1 And we would like to work with the regulatory
2 agency to put that site to closure, so at least we can
3 focus our attention to the other site.

4 For Site 8, 9, 10 and 11, I am not going to
5 discuss Site 12, 21 or up to 29. We are doing some
6 additional investigation to respond to the agency's
7 comments back when they did review the draft final
8 report.

9 We are also, we would like also to do some
10 interim removal action for some of those sites. We
11 would like to work with the agency for that one, so at
12 least we can get that site closed.

13 The offshore IR sites, I believe right now they
14 are in draft. They have completed the draft final
15 report for that one. Our consultant and the Navy are
16 looking at some data gaps for that. And so we would
17 update some of what we had based on whatever we find in
18 the data gaps.

19 For the petroleum sites and the pipelines, we
20 had done an additional sampling for these sites in here

1 (indicating), and we are revising the draft, we are
2 revising the Corrective Action Plan right now.

3 We also have done some study, a pilot study for
4 Site 6.

5 Right now, our consultant, we are waiting. The
6 other sites, we would like to find out whether the
7 technologies that we have for Site 6 is also applicable
8 to those sites.

9 For the lead-based paint and asbestos, we are
10 going to do lead-based paint abatement for Building 240.
11 And we are also going to do some soil removal for 111
12 and 66.

13 I would like the BCT to look at Building 66
14 very carefully so at least we don't waste our money in
15 there. I believe we have done some removal actions
16 about two years ago, a year and a half ago.

17 We left some of the soils underneath the
18 walkway in there, which is really in the sloped area.
19 So maybe the BCT can look at that.

20 And we can put that, use that, utilize that

1 money rather than going to the soil removal in that
2 area.

3 The asbestos, we have not, I don't know what is
4 going on in the asbestos program right now, because the
5 workload that we have come from EFA West. We don't know
6 what was already done.

7 So right now we are researching the data and
8 other information that we can find. We are looking at
9 some older buildings -- like Buildings 6 through 7?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are looking at, I mean,
11 I was involved in the asbestos program.

12 MR. TACTAY: And here is the guy (indicating).

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we largely completed the
14 asbestos program at all of the buildings throughout
15 Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

16 There are a number of, a couple of vacant
17 offices and warehouse type buildings on Treasure Island
18 here where we may have to do some additional work.

19 And then there is also some crawl spaces and
20 some vacant housing units on Yerba Buena Island that may

1 also require some additional work.

2 But the program is largely complete, and we are
3 going to make sure that we've completed the work this
4 year so that we can close out the program.

5 MR. TACTAY: For the environmental baseline
6 survey, we will update that for fiscal year 01.

7 We have over 30 million or less dollars for
8 this fiscal year.

9 What I would like to request from the agency is
10 to, in order for us to accomplish this task and
11 complete, I mean, to move the program much more faster,
12 we would like agency help in the review process.

13 I don't know what we have right now, whether we
14 are thinking about 60 days time frame or 45 days?

15 MR. RIST: We cut the time frames down.

16 MR. TACTAY: It's cut down already.

17 MS. WALTERS: They have been modified.

18 MR. TACTAY: I know that David has had the
19 question of the length of time.

20 MR. RIST: We have already substantially

1 reduced the amount of time for review.

2 MS. WALTERS: Actually, DTSC has been very
3 responsive in terms of accelerating their reviews, so I
4 don't think that will be an issue here.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

6 Both the agencies and the City of San Francisco
7 have been excellent in working with us to review the
8 documents as quickly as possible.

9 MR. TACTAY: Questions?

10 MS. RAKER: I just have a question on the
11 figure.

12 There is an "ECP." What does that mean? It's
13 in the explanation.

14 MR. RIST: Environmental category.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: ECP is Environmental
16 Condition of Property.

17 MR. RIST: Property.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So what this means in
19 summary for the RAB and for those who work and live on
20 the island, the amount of work we will be doing this

1 year in 2001, you will be seeing a lot more activity
2 around the island.

3 We will be doing some cleanups of petroleum
4 areas in various locations on the island.

5 So the level of activity during 2001 will be
6 higher -- and probably spilling into 2002 -- will be
7 higher than what you might have seen this year or
8 previous years.

9 MS. HARRIS: Is there a plan for how you are
10 going to do that?

11 I'm assuming that, with all of this activity,
12 the residents will be inconvenienced.

13 So is there going to be a pattern to finish
14 this work somewhere else so that we won't constantly be
15 bombarded with all the changes that are going on?

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

17 I mean, and as part, the basic part of any job
18 we do, we prepare a work plan and a health and safety
19 plan.

20 And all of those, you know, those plans are

1 reviewed by the agencies and the city to make sure that
2 the work is being conducted properly, and that the
3 health and safety of both people working on the site, as
4 well as people maybe working or living in the area is
5 accounted for.

6 But you raise a good point, too, in terms of
7 looking at all the projects as a whole, to make sure, I
8 would imagine, we don't do a project one month, and then
9 come back six months later and do another project in the
10 same location. That's a good point.

11 MS. HARRIS: Not to mention the aesthetics of
12 it all.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we do take into
14 account things like the routes that equipment and trucks
15 may have to travel.

16 So we do look at that in terms of how it may
17 potentially impact people who live and work here.

18 Since the housing area, for example, is a
19 fairly confined area, the north end of the base, the
20 other activity, a lot of the activity will be taking

1 place along the east side of the island and parts of the
2 south side of the island.

3 So you may not see, it may not be as prevalent
4 near the housing areas.

5 Any other questions or comments?

6 (No response.)

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it also means -- I'm
8 sorry -- it also means for the RAB, you will be seeing a
9 lot more documents than you probably see in the last
10 year.

11 So there will be more documents for you to
12 review, more presentations. I think the amount of
13 agenda, or the amount of agenda items that we will have
14 to go through in the RAB over the next year will be
15 higher than in the past year, which has been a little
16 slower.

17 I think for both this year, 2001 and 2002, we
18 will have a pretty busy year, and that really should be
19 the peak of the program.

20 After 2002, we should be largely completed, and

1 so the program will start to taper off and eventually
2 end.

3 Well, with that, that brings us to the break.
4 And so we can take a brief break, and then we will be
5 back for the organizational and business part of the
6 program.

7 (Short break.)

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I think we will go
9 ahead and get started.

10 That brings us to organizational business.

11 I will turn it over to Nathan Brennan, our
12 community co-chair.

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, in the break, all four
14 of us members, who are now back there, were talking
15 about the meeting. And we were looking, as we have been
16 talking about in the last few meetings since we did the
17 member survey, we are looking at a better way to try to,
18 one, have these meetings and have more participation and
19 still make good use of all the time.

20 One thing we've looked at and generally agree

1 on, the general meetings like this would move to every
2 other month. And so we would skip November and have one
3 in December and then go February, et cetera.

4 And then we would have an interim meeting every
5 month. So the interim meeting would become the monthly
6 meeting. That would be more for reviewing the
7 documents, which, as Jim said, will increase in volume
8 over the next year.

9 We will still have to finalize this probably in
10 the interim meeting in November.

11 Although it's listed as being on the 13th, I
12 would like to discuss if everybody is available on
13 that -- I may not be -- and look for a good date for
14 that meeting.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I just penciled that
16 in on the agenda.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. And try to have a good
18 meeting in November to finalize the schedule.

19 MS. RYAN: I have a question.

20 The purpose of the RAB, really, is document

1 review. And so I'm a little confused. If the interim
2 meeting is going to be document review, then what is the
3 other meeting?

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, the technical
5 subcommittee actually gets the documents.

6 The general members normally take the review
7 and these handouts. The technical subcommittee then
8 takes it.

9 MS. RYAN: Who is that?

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Pat Nelson, Dale, myself,
11 Lew Schalit and Ted Connelly are on it now, and anybody
12 who wants to be, who is a RAB member, that wants to be.

13 Most people, once they start receiving those
14 documents, go (indicating).

15 I don't know if we need to discuss the purpose
16 of the RAB.

17 My understanding, the RAB supplies public
18 comments to the Navy in order for the Navy to do the
19 cleanup with public comment along the way, and not just
20 wait for the 60-day window.

1 MS. RYAN: Right.

2 Three or four months ago, I was at a RAB
3 meeting, and we were talking about the RAB meeting
4 getting more people involved.

5 And I had asked that that be an agenda item and
6 discussed at the following RAB meeting.

7 It wasn't, but then other issues came up, like
8 the removal action that preempted that.

9 But I think it's important to revisit that to
10 try to actually rebuild the RAB instead of diminish it,
11 and increase the public involvement in it.

12 By reducing the meetings, I don't know if you
13 would achieve that.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, I think a lot of
15 people, when they come home, say: I'm busy tonight.
16 I'm not going to do that.

17 But if we focus it down and say, "We would like
18 you to come every other month," and say, "Rather than
19 two presentations, have four on the petroleum and all
20 the things in one meeting," have them come and make a

1 commitment to that.

2 I personally was thinking about shining this on
3 after awhile, because it is hard to make even two minor
4 meetings a month. You have to make that decision and
5 then follow up on it.

6 We have had people who have been here all
7 along, and then we had some new members come in. But
8 other new members who put applications in never came
9 back.

10 MS. SMITH: And there is a lot of turnover in
11 the people in the Bay Area.

12 So we had some really good people who are very
13 good at reviewing documents who do not work anywhere
14 near us any more. It's just not feasible for them.
15 Lucia, excellent at reviewing documents, but she got a
16 job elsewhere.

17 MS. RYAN: Right. That's what I was
18 suggesting.

19 With all the new population that we have here,
20 with as many units that have filled in the last year, it

1 would be worthwhile to get out and try to recruit some
2 new members among the population right here on the
3 island.

4 MS. SMITH: Well, we tried to do that.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: We had eight people apply,
6 and we accepted all of them.

7 MR. LUNT: Was this recently?

8 MS. SMITH: We've had an open house. We put
9 out newsletters.

10 MS. RYAN: Since I have been coming, I know it
11 was four or five months ago when I suggested that they
12 come up with a plan for recruitment, and I know nothing.
13 I haven't heard of anything.

14 MS. SMITH: Well, you came to the open house
15 after that.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The last -- I can't
17 recall the dates right now -- but we did bring in, I
18 think, about six or seven, or maybe as many as eight
19 total new members, I think, over last winter. There was
20 about four or five of them who were Treasure Island

1 residents.

2 But it's only been a few, like Scott, who
3 have -- in fact, some have never, people that we would
4 send letters to saying, you know, congratulations on
5 being a member, and they never showed up at any
6 meetings.

7 MS. RYAN: That's what I'm saying.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Every time there has been a
9 mailing out to the residents, or I think in most of
10 these, a number of the mailings out to the residents, we
11 have included a plug for the Restoration Advisory Board.

12 MS. RYAN: Well, that's probably true, but like
13 you said, that was last winter. A lot of things have
14 changed since then, especially in the local population
15 with a lot of new people that moved in.

16 That would be worth examining some recruitment
17 effort.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

19 Maybe we could look at, I would be happy to get
20 suggestions and maybe we could look at other outreach

1 options we haven't tried before.

2 MS. RYAN: Yes.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, there are two things
4 that we were working on.

5 One, Dale wrote an article to put in the John
6 Stewart newsletter.

7 MS. RYAN: Yes. I never saw that, the draft.
8 I was supposed to see the draft, and I never saw the
9 draft or the article.

10 MS. SMITH: John Stewart never ran it. That's
11 why you didn't see the article.

12 MS. RYAN: Well, and that's what I'm saying.

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Gina has that.

14 MS. SMITH: Well, I'm going to update it and
15 revisit it. It's a little too technical.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It was a wee bit too
17 technical.

18 MS. SMITH: Well, somebody got ahold of it and
19 added a whole bunch more we bit too technical, Nathan.

20 So I have to clean some of that out and

1 simplify it to some extent, because I don't want to
2 scare people off, and also, to make it smaller.

3 And Gina is no longer with us. She is being
4 replaced by somebody else, who, I hope, can stay on top
5 of John Stewart better, so that I have more than three
6 days. She typically gave me a three-day notice that we
7 had an article due.

8 MS. RYAN: Well, I don't think it's fair to
9 rely on John Stewart to really get the word out,
10 although they have been very accommodating and helpful.

11 I think one thing, we were going to put
12 together a memo to the Navy on how they might perhaps
13 increase their outreach efforts, by updating a community
14 relations plan, which is what we do at most of the sites
15 anyway.

16 It's due to be done here by also looking into
17 the mailing list and really expanding it and making sure
18 it's effective and it's up-to-date. It's something that
19 we can have kept somewhere and managed. In other words,
20 have a contractor, whomever, the Navy decides to

1 delegate to that task. It has to be a living document,
2 encompassing John Stewart's list, and a lot of the
3 people from the school that have children in the school
4 here that might not live on the island, et cetera. We
5 talked about this. And we knew it was something that we
6 needed to look into.

7 So, anyhow, we will be forwarding a memo
8 probably to suggest some of these things, as well as a
9 monthly newsletter to compile to give to the residents;
10 so, again, we don't have to depend on John Stewart to
11 put an article in theirs.

12 MS. SMITH: So this would be the regulators
13 doing this newsletter?

14 MS. RYAN: No.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. It will be produced by
16 the Navy.

17 MS. RYAN: We don't do those independently. We
18 would recommend to the Navy.

19 MS. SMITH: Because we let the Navy do what
20 they want. But we are the RAB. We are the community.

1 We can do what we want without input from them, except
2 as far as making sure that we are not completely out of
3 line.

4 But I don't see the purpose of having
5 regulators or the Navy interfere with our newsletter or
6 our article.

7 MS. RYAN: Well, I haven't seen any, but that's
8 not what it would be.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it's not something in
10 place. It's supplementing.

11 MS. SMITH: Yes. You're doing something
12 completely different than what we are doing.

13 MS. RYAN: Yes.

14 John Stewart, we are not suggesting they do
15 anything to change theirs. I don't know if the RAB has
16 done one. I haven't seen one.

17 MS. SMITH: We never got that off the ground.

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think that the Mare Island
19 RAB did a couple of newsletters, and I think it takes an
20 incredible amount of work for people who are not paid,

1 and after awhile, there is not that much response from
2 the community.

3 MS. RYAN: This is just a suggestion for the
4 Navy to do, to keep the residents up-to-date.

5 MS. GERMANY: Actually, GPI does newsletters --
6 I do -- for Alameda Point and Point Melotti, and we get
7 the information from the Navy, as well as community
8 members, who write articles for those newsletters.

9 The mailing list which we maintain is -- what
10 am I trying to say? -- is indicative of the community,
11 as well as Navy personnel and all types of people. That
12 is just a mailing list that the RAB compiles.

13 The way they usually work, we usually have
14 content meetings. And with the content meetings, they
15 are a subcommittee of the RAB with community members and
16 Navy people that plan each newsletter that comes out
17 together.

18 So that's something that, that's a service GPI
19 can provide for you, if you would like something like
20 that.

1 And I can also provide you with copies, past
2 copies of some of the things that we have done, if you
3 would like to see those.

4 MR. HANSEN: Yes. I would like to comment.

5 We have been around this discussion, what, six
6 or eight times, almost every year we do it.

7 But I brought with me a copy of the Hunter's
8 Point Shipyard newsletter. You're probably familiar
9 with that (indicating).

10 MS. GERMANY: Yes.

11 MR. HANSEN: But it's excellent, and it's
12 certainly far better than anything the TI people could
13 hope to put out, realistically.

14 But in response to Patricia, this RAB is
15 different than all others, because there really has not
16 been a community here. While there are what, maybe 200
17 residents on Treasure Island?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, now there are about
19 600 plus units.

20 MR. HANSEN: But even that is quite small as

1 compared to the constituents in the City of Alameda or
2 the constituents of the Presidio, because there is a lot
3 of people that live in that neighborhood.

4 And I think that the present RAB, which is not
5 really paid very well, to get through those technical
6 reports is about all we could ever hope to do, and if
7 the Navy or the agencies can come forth and prepare
8 newsletters, I think that that would be fine.

9 MS. GERMANY: It would be our pleasure.

10 MR. HANSEN: Newsletters having to do with the
11 overall cleanup process.

12 And then if Dale or others wanted to contribute
13 articles, that would be fine.

14 MS. GERMANY: Right.

15 MR. HANSEN: But to expect the existing RAB to
16 serve as the agency that recruits more members, I don't
17 think that's very realistic, Nathan.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

19 It's within the mission of the Navy to
20 facilitate, support the RAB, and provide the community

1 information through newsletters and fact sheets and
2 other forums.

3 That is definitely our mission. And we
4 certainly want to get any input from the RAB members,
5 but we certainly don't expect you to do it.

6 MR. HANSEN: My response to that is, God speed.

7 But I am reluctant, I am disappointed that the
8 John Stewart Company has not made it perfectly clear to
9 all members of the community that this group exists.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, in a number of their
11 mailings, we have included information about the RAB.

12 So I think they have done everything, they have
13 done everything we asked them to do.

14 But I think it looks like there is some other
15 avenues we can look at to foster recruitment.

16 MS. RAKER: One other point, I think, because
17 we are all so busy, and yet we do want to have a good
18 involvement with the RAB.

19 I just want to additionally emphasize, if we
20 had the meetings every other month, or even at Travis,

1 on a quarterly basis, it focuses people's attention so
2 that you don't have to donate one or two nights a month.
3 You are definitely making the commitment to every other
4 month, or every three months. It's a little bit easier
5 for people to get on board when there is a lot less time
6 involved.

7 And, then, also, Jim, these presentations, I
8 think, are excellent overviews of what is going on. And
9 as the documents come in, those three hours will be even
10 more focused because there will be more to talk about
11 and more to cover if we make them every other month.

12 So it's going to put the burden on us to be
13 more communicative, but I think it would be, you would
14 get greater participation from the community if there
15 was less time commitment.

16 MS. SMITH: Although, I think there would be
17 more.

18 We used to not get out of here until 10:00,
19 10:30. I wouldn't get home before 11:00. I would never
20 get to the evening news. I would just go to bed when we

1 had technical documents to review.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We had large RI documents.
3 It took a large amount of time.

4 Well, it sounds like something on the table
5 that needs to be further --

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

7 I think, well, I mean there was only four RAB
8 members here tonight. And I think the consensus was
9 that it's kind of a waste of all the efforts to be
10 outnumbered by four or five to one by the contractors
11 and the regulators and the Navy, when we could try to
12 focus that and, hopefully, get a higher percent from the
13 public.

14 And we were still going to have, essentially, a
15 monthly meeting which would be the technical, and
16 anybody can come to that.

17 Again, it comes down to what commitment are you
18 willing to make? And, again, the Navy is willing to
19 send anybody the documents. Again, what commitment do
20 you want to make?

1 And you know, again, Treasure Island doesn't
2 have, it's not adjunct to any community. It's not part
3 of Hunter's Point. It's not part of the Presidio. It's
4 not part of Alameda. All the other RABs have an easier
5 draw because they are right up against the community
6 they are a part of. This one is a little more remote
7 and a little more difficult. It is not as glorious.

8 MR. RIST: Well, we have a community now.

9 And to follow up on recruitment, I think what I
10 heard the first time tonight is the idea of a monthly
11 newsletter.

12 If that started going out sometime soon, then
13 that might generate a lot of interest in the community
14 here on the island.

15 MS. RYAN: Maybe quarterly then.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I was going to say, I
17 used to have a newsletter every two weeks at work on
18 payday. It's not an easy thing to do. Monthly is a
19 pretty high goal.

20 MR. RIST: What is the Hunter's Point RAB

1 newsletter, Richard?

2 MR. HANSEN: I think it's probably four times a
3 year.

4 MS. GERMANY: Point Melotti and Alameda Point
5 do it quarterly as well.

6 It would generate interest, definitely,
7 absolutely.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think it would be good to
9 start with one where it kind of introduces, and, again,
10 invites people to come out to the RAB.

11 The other thing, I talked to Scott and he
12 looked up the local web page for the island residents.
13 We talked about trying to put together a summary between
14 the two of us on a monthly basis. This meeting covered
15 these items. If you're interested, come to the next
16 meeting which would be, whenever.

17 And, again, that's another way to try to see if
18 people are interested.

19 MS. RYAN: Well, the Navy has a web site, too,
20 that's pretty much hosted and managed by Lee Saunders.

1 And he puts a lot of information on all the RABs. I
2 look at it all the time to remind me what's going on,
3 where the meetings are.

4 I know that some of the facilities post their
5 minutes and things like that on the web site, too. So
6 that is a good tool for them. I don't know if Lou does
7 that.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, he would post
9 whatever.

10 And we are just starting to bring the Northern
11 California RABs into that system, too.

12 MS. RYAN: Yes. I can't remember the web site
13 off the top of my head.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It's about this long
15 (indicating).

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, we put it in the
17 minutes from the August meeting.

18 MS. RYAN: Okay. Yes, bookmark it. It is a
19 good resource.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

1 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It's a millispec, I'm sure.

2 MS. GERMANY: Anyway, it would be very great if
3 there was something physically that came to people's
4 homes, like a newsletter, that they would be able to put
5 their hands on and look at on their own time.

6 MR. LUNT: I have a question.

7 If part of the effort is to recruit more RAB
8 members, why is it that people have to fill out and
9 apply for it rather than just send in their name and
10 just show up?

11 Is there some sort of maybe medium level member
12 that we could get to come out rather than just a
13 community member?

14 MS. SMITH: What do you mean, a medium level
15 member?

16 MR. LUNT: Well, like when I first received the
17 mailing, there were several questions that looked
18 relatively technical.

19 I could have easily said: Oh, that would be
20 cool; but, yeah, they want all this information and I

1 probably wouldn't get accepted, so it's not for me.

2 I'm sure that most of the people who saw that
3 probably thought the same thing.

4 However, if it said: Would you like to be a
5 member of the RAB meeting? Send in your name and show
6 up to this meeting, then you will be a member; rather
7 than having to actually have the stipulation that you
8 will be accepted into it and fill out forms.

9 MS. SMITH: That's part of our bylaws,
10 unfortunately.

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, there is some cap
12 where you could work with.

13 Originally, that was around 25. Originally,
14 there was 70 applicants, whatever.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We did originally get three
16 times as many applicants as we could reasonably put on.

17 MS. SMITH: We just don't get the response any
18 more.

19 MS. RYAN: That's quite typical with a lot of
20 facilities now that the program has been underway for a

1 while. I think they are mostly experiencing that
2 diminished response.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, I think also a lot of
4 the public comes out because I think they are going to
5 see what the future development is.

6 A lot of people find out that this is about
7 environmental cleanup and not about future development.
8 That's a separate group.

9 MS. SMITH: That's the C.A.C.

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: C.A.C.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But Scott raises a good
12 point. Maybe we should look at the application and make
13 sure that maybe we are not turning people off by the
14 application.

15 MS. RYAN: Maybe that could be revised?

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Join now before we close the
17 ranks.

18 MR. LUNT: Plus, I haven't seen anything else
19 since I first moved in, which was almost a year ago.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And you also admitted,

1 though, you get stuff from John Stewart.

2 MR. LUNT: I don't any more, though, and I
3 haven't in the last six months or more.

4 MS. SMITH: Well, like I said, it's been very
5 difficult to connect with them.

6 And whoever replaces Gina, I would hope would
7 be able to stay on top of them a little better in terms
8 of when they plan their next newsletter, because I have
9 enough stuff to do that I'm not, and I didn't know that
10 they had certain restrictions until three days before
11 the newsletter the article was due.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes?

13 MS. HARRIS: I haven't seen that article at
14 all. I always read through all my stuff. I know about
15 the best pizza here, and you have to have leashes on
16 dogs. But I haven't heard about this, this group until
17 the meeting that we had in our neighborhood and was
18 invited here.

19 But I do have a question: If you guys go to
20 every other month, will there be maybe an introduction

1 where people could come in if they want to express
2 something? Do they have to wait two months just to do
3 that? Will there be a period before the meeting starts
4 maybe?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think the way it sounds
6 like we were envisioning it, there would be a meeting
7 every month, but the intervening month, it would be more
8 of a technical meeting, maybe more of a working meeting.

9 But it would still be open to the public. It
10 would still be open to any member who wanted to show up.
11 But it would be more of an optional meeting.

12 But then the other meeting on the second month
13 would be a more regular meeting, like tonight's meeting,
14 so we would be kind of expecting people to show up, at
15 least every two months; but if they were able to, they
16 could show up every month.

17 We find that amongst the members that we have,
18 people will not always attend 12 meetings out of the
19 year, but they might very well attend six meetings out
20 of the year.

1 MS. HARRIS: If I could make an observation,
2 only because I have been involved in a lot of different
3 organizations throughout, just everywhere.

4 And I've always found, that if we have a
5 meeting, it's always difficult to attend, whether it's
6 every month, every week. I find that going to church
7 every Sunday, I think, does it have to be every Sunday?
8 Why can't it be just one Sunday a month?

9 And you find that people who want to be there
10 will be there, if the meeting is once a month or every
11 other month.

12 I don't think extending it will reach the
13 desired goal of getting more people there. I think that
14 would be efficient if you were trying to read over
15 documents every other month, or something, rather than
16 every month, but I don't think for the purposes of
17 getting people there is going to help by extending more
18 time, because, inevitably, when that second month comes,
19 you're going to sit there and it's almost 7:00, and
20 there will be a million other things you could be doing.

1 So I don't think that will necessarily get
2 people there.

3 MS. RYAN: Well, I understand what Nathan said,
4 the people that have been involved for a long time. I
5 just asked David. Right now, they have a technical
6 meeting every month and a RAB meeting. So these folks
7 who devote so much of their time, I can really
8 understand they get burned out on it.

9 MS. SMITH: We're two times a month.

10 MS. RYAN: So have a RAB meeting, and the next
11 month have a technical meeting, which would be open to
12 the public, too. So it would be sort of a quasi-RAB
13 meeting in a way, come to talk.

14 MS. SMITH: Well, it is a RAB meeting.

15 MS. RYAN: So it is a good idea in that
16 respect. I didn't realize that at first. I think
17 that's a good idea.

18 But if we make an effort to get the recruitment
19 for the RAB and get the word out, perhaps by doing the
20 newsletter, and focusing in on all the people who have

1 come into the community in the last six to eight months,
2 and make them aware, like you said, you didn't know
3 about it until you were contacted for this other issue.

4 And so letting the community know about the
5 meetings and their purpose through the newsletter.

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think at this point,
7 the newsletter falls to the Navy, if GPI does it or
8 whoever. And I think we can still work on some articles
9 for the newsletter, whether it's John Stewart or GPI.

10 MS. SMITH: Yes, absolutely.

11 And if you do the newsletter, you have to let
12 us know a little more quickly than three days.

13 MS. GERMANY: Absolutely.

14 The way we typically do it, we supply the RAB
15 with the production schedule, so you will know at each
16 step what is going to happen and when you need to have
17 your article ready.

18 MS. SMITH: John Stewart apparently doesn't do
19 that. They just kind of get together and put it out.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, just to be able to

1 move on, then we will have a technical meeting next
2 month and a general meeting in December.

3 The technical meeting, though, people will have
4 to be called to find out where and when. I think people
5 are likely to show up if there is only a few left.

6 I wanted to talk briefly. We have three TAPP
7 grants in.

8 Jim, do you know where they are?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I know exactly where they
10 are.

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, for those of you
13 who may not know, Marcello Pasqua, who was our
14 environmental liaison, he left work for the Navy. He
15 was our TAPP person. So he left me all the stuff on his
16 desk.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So Jim has personal
18 knowledge.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So I have personal
20 knowledge of the TAPP grant. We will pick that up and

1 try to get it moving forward again.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Again, the TAPP grants will
3 give us some access to professional help to review the
4 documents. And then the comments from that will be
5 presented to the RAB.

6 The one other item was the C.A.C., which Martha
7 talked about a little bit. Again, the C.A.C. is
8 actually supposed to work with the Development Authority
9 as a common body to TIDHA. That meeting will be October
10 25th.

11 I did get selected for that. Like I had told
12 the other RAB members, I was thinking about getting out
13 of this business, but now I guess I'm trapped for
14 another year.

15 MS. SMITH: And now you get to go to three
16 meetings.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, another meeting.

18 But I think it is important that the RAB
19 comments are carried over to C.A.C., so I hope I can do
20 that for the C.A.C.

1 I think that's all.

2 And like I said, I will be calling around to
3 try to set when we do the interim meeting.

4 And then I will work with you, Scott, to get
5 something in the next two weeks.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Thank you.

7 General updates. I will be quick on that. I
8 wanted to take the opportunity, we have some new members
9 of our Navy team here.

10 You met Tony Tactay, who is one of our project
11 engineers.

12 We also, since Marcello Pasqua left the Navy,
13 we have a new environmental liaison, Mr. Steve Edde, who
14 is the environmental liaison for Alameda. He is now
15 also our environmental liaison for Treasure Island.

16 Welcome to Steve.

17 MR. EDDE: Thank you.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we also have a new
19 Tetrattech project manager, Virginia Demetrios, who is
20 taking over for Anju Wicke. I don't know whether some

1 of you know, Anju is expecting, and so she is taking a
2 temporary leave from Tetrattech. So Virginia is now the
3 project lead for Treasure Island.

4 And then, also, we have new members of our GPI
5 team. Gutierrez Palmenberg, Inc., GPI, is our
6 contractor supporting us on the RAB. We have several
7 new members of the GPI staff here. And, hopefully, I
8 won't mess anybody's name up: We have Vila-Sheree
9 Germany and Sonny Sonia.

10 We welcome them.

11 And, of course, Michael Stone has been here for
12 a number of months.

13 So I think that covers our new people that are
14 here tonight.

15 We have draft August meeting minutes. I don't
16 know if anyone has had a chance to look at those from
17 the meeting packet.

18 MS. SMITH: I think that there was an awful lot
19 of typos and funny grammar, too many just to read into
20 the record at this point.

1 I don't know what you want to do about it, but
2 it didn't get proofed, I don't think. It didn't look
3 like it got proofed.

4 MR. RIST: I have the same comment.

5 MS. SMITH: It was really pretty bad this time.
6 There will be one or two things, and then somebody's
7 name gets misspelled.

8 There were whole sections that could have been
9 rewritten. Somebody didn't proof.

10 MR. RIST: I have that same comment, but I also
11 had a couple of specific points, if you want to go to
12 those.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm wondering whether we
14 want to take another look at it.

15 MS. SMITH: Why not take the specific ones?

16 MR. RIST: Yes.

17 I have two at this point, if you want to
18 incorporate those when you make your review.

19 On page 4 of 12 under, "Former Storage Yard
20 Removal Update," on page 4, paragraph 4, it looks like

1 four sentences. It begins with, "All of the
2 environmental concerns have been eliminated," and this
3 is John Bauer from IT Corporation talking about the
4 former storage yard.

5 I think that statement needs to be qualified.
6 I don't know that all of the environmental concerns have
7 been eliminated. There is still outstanding issues that
8 DTSC has raised some questions about, that will need
9 further discussion and possible resolution before it can
10 make any kind of a conclusionary statement about
11 environmental concerns that we are addressing.

12 And page 5 of 12, the very last paragraph on
13 that page, the last sentence states that -- again, this
14 is talking about the former storage yard: It was after
15 the removal that the former storage yard was deemed safe
16 by all the agencies.

17 I believe that that is a misrepresentation of
18 DTSC's position with regards to the status of the former
19 storage yard, and that we have not deemed the former
20 storage yard safe, whatever that means, in any way.

1 So I would move to have that statement at least
2 modified to not include DTSC.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry, which paragraph?

4 MR. RIST: The very last paragraph on page 5.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

6 MR. RIST: Those are the only two comments that
7 I have at this time.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe we will go ahead and
9 take another look at it, and, really, defer approval and
10 take another look at the minutes.

11 Okay. October, well, BCT meeting. Also, we,
12 as we noted, we didn't have a regular September RAB
13 meeting. We didn't have a regular September BCT meeting
14 also. So the only meeting, we have had since the BCT
15 regular meeting we have had since the last August RAB
16 meeting has been the October meeting, which was on
17 October 3rd.

18 We talked about soil gas sampling in Site 12.
19 We are going to be conducting additional sampling for
20 soil gas that may be the result of buried debris and

1 rubbish.

2 So we had a work plan for that, and I think the
3 technical subcommittee members would have gotten copies
4 of that.

5 And then we had an update on the former storage
6 yard, the removal action that we had worked on this
7 summer.

8 We also looked at TI base wide schedules. We
9 have had working meetings on the TI schedules. The RAB
10 hasn't seen those yet. We have another working meeting
11 on that, I think, on the 3rd of November. And so I
12 think we will be in a position to make a presentation to
13 the RAB at the November RAB meeting on the schedules.

14 And then we talked about the RAB meeting.

15 And I think those were our major items for the
16 October BCT meeting. So you should be seeing minutes on
17 those in the next couple of weeks.

18 Also, I would like to just briefly put out and
19 just for thought, I don't want to make any decision
20 without consulting with the community members, but we

1 have been thinking about, the RAB members have been
2 attending the BCT meetings. Apparently, that's not
3 consistent among all the other bases in the Bay Area and
4 elsewhere.

5 And we wanted to at least consider whether or
6 not that's something that we should continue or not.
7 Because the BCT meetings are really the working meetings
8 of the Navy and the agencies.

9 We provide what comes out of those meetings.
10 It's eventually built into the RAB monthly meetings.
11 And so we wanted to consider as to whether or not we
12 should still have a RAB representative at the BCT
13 meetings or not.

14 But we haven't made a decision on that. I just
15 did want to put that out for you.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: With the accelerated
17 schedule for documents, I mean, wasn't there talk about
18 having more interaction between the BCT and the RAB,
19 because documents would no longer, we would no longer
20 have the time to review documents?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think there would be
2 working meetings. I think that was the thought that
3 there would be more working meetings.

4 But the regular monthly BCT meeting is our one
5 regular meeting of the month amongst the Navy and the
6 agencies.

7 MS. SMITH: We worked so hard to get that
8 there, too.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we are not going to
10 make any decisions without getting further input on
11 that.

12 MS. SMITH: I think we should talk to Chris
13 Shirley, or at least just raise it.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I mean, is ARC Ecology
15 going to be banned also there?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think it's not a
17 question of banning, but a working meeting between the
18 Navy and the agencies versus a community forum like
19 this.

20 MS. SMITH: What brought about this change in

1 approach? What brought about this concern? I didn't
2 hear it at all in the times that a RAB member did attend
3 that there were any problems with that.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think it's a matter of
5 being able to have a meeting amongst the government, I
6 mean, the governmental agencies; that we feel that we
7 can have kind of a free flow of discussion.

8 And out of that, we can bring that into the RAB
9 meetings.

10 But having a RAB member present essentially
11 kind of makes the BCT meeting like another part of the
12 RAB meeting.

13 But I don't mean to have a big discussion on
14 this now, but I did want to put that out as a thought
15 that we had.

16 And you made a point of talking to Chris. That
17 sounds like a good idea to me, as something we can
18 further discuss at the interim meeting. I wanted to at
19 least put it out for you.

20 MR. RIST: Can we set a process for making a

1 decision in a time frame to do so?

2 If it's going to be something the Navy is
3 interested in resolving, let's put some dates and
4 structure to it.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think if we can get
6 enough representation at the next interim meeting.

7 MS. SMITH: But if it's the Navy's decision,
8 what part do we play in that?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, your input,
10 obviously. Your thoughts and input are a valuable part
11 of whatever decision we would make.

12 MR. RIST: So let's say by the next regular
13 monthly meeting you could make a decision.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that if we can get
15 enough input at the next RAB interim meeting.

16 There is not a large number of community
17 members here tonight, but people like Chris, who are
18 also involved with other RABs.

19 MS. HARRIS: I'm sorry. It's me again.

20 So, basically, we don't want RAB members or

1 community members involved because they sort of break up
2 or just interfere with your style, so to speak, they
3 somehow hinder you from doing your job?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I wouldn't put it that way
5 at all.

6 I think it's just a matter of having, you know,
7 we have a RAB meeting here, which is a community
8 meeting.

9 And then we have working meetings amongst the
10 agencies involved in the project.

11 And so right now, we have kind of a crossover
12 between those two.

13 MR. LUNT: Having RAB members is somehow
14 counterproductive to those meetings?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In my opinion, this is my
16 opinion.

17 You need to have some meetings in which you can
18 have kind of a free flow exchange of discussion and
19 information that leads to something.

20 I mean, there is a lot of submeetings that go

1 on, a lot of free flow discussion that eventually leads
2 to conclusions. But the process to get to those
3 conclusions can be very open.

4 MS. HARRIS: So, then, you don't think the RAB
5 member would be able to distinguish between the free
6 flow of ideas in coming here and sharing the conclusions
7 with the rest of the group?

8 MS. SMITH: That actually was part of our
9 concern.

10 We got the thing handed to us and said, this is
11 what we worked out with the regulators. We were not
12 happy with some of those decisions.

13 And we asked to be present so at least we had a
14 head's up. They were making significant decisions, like
15 at Site 12, without any input, just being presented to
16 us and we can comment on it.

17 But our comments aren't even legitimate
18 comments. They only go into the administrative record.
19 Nobody will ever see those comments if they give them an
20 official document, because we are not part of that

1 process. So that's why we wanted to be there.

2 And Richard, unfortunately, is not here. He
3 was also very concerned about it.

4 MS. RYAN: Typically, it's not the role of the
5 RAB, though, to be necessarily part of that decision
6 making process between the regulatory agencies and the
7 Navy.

8 If they have a meeting, it's not the function
9 of a RAB to monitor those meetings that are held.
10 That's just not what the RABs were designed for.

11 They are designed for document review and for
12 discussions on any decisions that are made, but they
13 don't necessarily have to be present while those
14 decisions are being made.

15 MS. SMITH: I'm just explaining to you what our
16 problem was with the process.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I understand what Dale is
18 saying.

19 If it's a matter of, and I agree with you, we
20 don't intend for BCT meetings or any other meetings we

1 have outside of a regular RAB meeting to make decisions
2 and simply come into the RAB and say, "Here's the
3 decision."

4 You're right. The purpose of the RAB is for us
5 to come to the RAB and discuss with the community
6 members before we make decisions.

7 And, no, I agree with, I understand where
8 you're coming from with that concern. And that was
9 probably one of the reasons for having RAB members,
10 community RAB members as part of the BCT meetings.

11 Steve?

12 MR. EDDE: Well, I just want to say, your
13 current policy is you allow RAB members to come to BCT
14 meetings?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have for a number of
16 years, yes.

17 MR. EDDE: Yes. We do the same at Alameda. I
18 was at Alameda for four years, and I still go to -- in
19 fact, we had one today. We allow RAB members to come,
20 not all.

1 Typically, it's one representative from the RAB
2 who comes to the meeting, and there was one there today.
3 They can report back then to the RAB at the next RAB
4 meeting.

5 It's worked out very well at Alameda. We
6 haven't had any problems. Nobody has been disruptive or
7 anything like that. They take notes and listen and
8 occasionally make a comment or ask a question. It's
9 been very useful.

10 MS. SMITH: That's been my understanding. We
11 never heard anything negative.

12 MR. EDDE: So that's my input from Alameda:
13 It's worked well.

14 MS. RYAN: I think that's very important.

15 I've heard the flip side, though, where one
16 facility I worked on, there were quite a number of
17 people from the RAB who used that as an opportunity to
18 advance their own agenda at the BCT meeting, which
19 really disrupted the BCT meeting.

20 MS. SMITH: Some of those RABs are extremely

1 dysfunctional.

2 I went to a whole bunch of them, and finally
3 gave up almost in disgust. They were completely
4 dysfunctional from everybody's side.

5 MS. RYAN: Right.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: At any rate, I didn't want
7 to create a big controversy.

8 But in the spirit of openness, I wanted to tell
9 you what I was thinking and seek a little input.

10 And if we can further discuss that at the
11 interim meeting, and as Dave pointed out, bring it to a
12 conclusion.

13 Right now, we don't have any specific agenda
14 items for next RAB meeting except for probably the
15 schedule.

16 So if we have a working meeting to discuss the
17 cleanup schedule in a couple of weeks, and so if we get
18 through that meeting, we should be in a position to
19 present things to the RAB at the November meeting.

20 So that's our one tentative agenda item.

1 Are there any other potential agenda items that
2 anyone would like to see on the November meeting?

3 MS. SMITH: Are we sure we are having a
4 meeting?

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: We are having a December
6 meeting.

7 MR. RIST: Yes, not November. We are having an
8 interim meeting in November and a regular meeting in
9 December.

10 By December, it sounds like we should probably
11 have some pretty set schedules on when we're going to
12 address these additional areas on Site 12, for example,
13 and that might be an agenda item to provide.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess that blew by me
15 that we actually decided that. I mean, it's fine.

16 MS. RAKER: Another thing I would like to see
17 is consideration of a recruitment effort. I had
18 mentioned that several meetings ago, I think it was in
19 July, perhaps, how the Navy could come back with some
20 concrete ideas on how to connect with the community.

1 And I would be glad to work with you on that, but to
2 bring back some sort of report on what we have done to
3 enhance the recruitment efforts through the newsletter
4 or any other method.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, that is something that
6 should be in the BCT meeting.

7 MS. SMITH: Yes. That doesn't sound like it
8 should take up our time.

9 MS. RYAN: All right.

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: You make me feel guilty
11 about it, but it's really beyond us.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think we will work
13 it out and then present what we are planning.

14 MS. RYAN: Right, present the RAB with an
15 overview.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Not to ask you to work
17 through it with us, but we do the homework and present
18 what we propose, seek your comments and then move ahead
19 with it.

20 MS. RAKER: A guilt-free RAB meeting.

1 MS. RYAN: Just to report to the RAB what we
2 have been doing for recruitment.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Excellent.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So did we decide that we
5 weren't going to have a regular November meeting?

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

7 MS. SMITH: Yes, we did.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

9 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Now, the interim meeting in
10 November needs to be arranged by phone, because the
11 people who show up aren't here. The only one left is
12 Dale, and so it's up to you and me.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I thought you were
14 talking about the old interim meeting.

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. The interim meeting.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Will take the place of the
17 regular November meeting.

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Will be the only meeting in
19 November for the RAB.

20 And then we will have a meeting in December.

1 We need to agree on the date. The 13th will
2 not be good for me. We need to look at it and see if we
3 can increase the population at that meeting.

4 MS. SMITH: By doubling it.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

6 MR. RIST: Well, we could move it to the
7 regular meeting night.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I was thinking that
9 might get confusing.

10 We have been publishing the third Tuesday of
11 the month a lot, and if we start jumping it around or
12 moving it to another date, then it may be harder for
13 people to know.

14 MR. LUNT: That's kind of what I assumed would
15 happen, that it would be on the third Tuesday, but one
16 of them would be more emphasized on one subject than the
17 other.

18 MS. RYAN: That's what I thought, too, when you
19 first brought it up.

20 MS. SMITH: I didn't feel we made a decision on

1 that.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That would be fine for me
3 for November's meeting. I could make the 21st.

4 MR. RIST: That's the interim meeting.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That would be an interim
6 meeting.

7 MR. RIST: Where would the location be?

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: The interim meetings that
9 are in the different months would be on Treasure Island.
10 We need to split the transportation issues.

11 MS. SMITH: Yes. And then the interim meetings
12 that occur on the same months as the regular meetings, I
13 got outvoted, and it would be in the city.

14 MR. RIST: So we will still continue with the
15 interim meeting.

16 MS. SMITH: Oh, absolutely.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. There would be an
18 interim meeting every month.

19 MR. RIST: Okay.

20 MS. RYAN: That defeats the purpose, doesn't

1 it?

2 MS. SMITH: No.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: As somebody who has been to
4 every meeting this year, no it doesn't. It throws away
5 six meetings a year.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe calling them both
7 interim meetings is confusing.

8 Basically, whatever we choose to call it, it's
9 a technical meeting in November, the third Tuesday of
10 the month, and then a regular meeting, a general meeting
11 in December.

12 MS. SMITH: Yes. We used to call it the
13 Technical Subcommittee way back when we met at Pat's
14 place. So we could go back to calling it that.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we will have a
16 technical meeting the third Tuesday of the month in
17 November and a general meeting in December, also on the
18 third Tuesday of the month.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think that's far
20 enough away from the holiday.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And, I guess, if there
2 needs to be any small working meetings for planning
3 purposes or for, you know, at other times, those can be
4 done on other dates.

5 MS. DEMETRIOS: Jim, I heard one suggestion to
6 have the technical subgroup meet in the city, but that
7 kind of defeats the purpose of having the local
8 community attend.

9 MS. SMITH: Well, half of them will be here.

10 MS. DEMETRIOS: Well, if I understand
11 correctly, there will be a technical subgroup every
12 month, and then a RAB group every other month, and then
13 every other month, one will be in the city and one will
14 be on Treasure Island?

15 MS. SMITH: Right.

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So we will be meeting every
17 month on Treasure Island.

18 MS. SMITH: But people do not go to the
19 technical subcommittee. Trust me. Trust me. Sometimes
20 there is only three of us.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the bottom line would be
2 that the meetings that are on the third Tuesday of the
3 month, regardless of whether they are a technical
4 meeting or a general meeting, would all still be here on
5 Treasure Island.

6 MS. DEMETRIOS: Well, if we have a lot of
7 participation in the subcommittee, then we might want to
8 change the location for a future date.

9 MS. SMITH: If that's possible.

10 The reason why we have had them in the city is
11 because the Navy has not been willing to sponsor them
12 here.

13 MS. DEMETRIOS: No, I understand.

14 MS. SMITH: We used to have them at ARC Ecology
15 and also at Pat's place, because you weren't certain
16 that you had a location.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, I think Pat
18 volunteered and Art volunteered. Jim always volunteered
19 but not all of us wanted to come out here, so you had to
20 travel farther.

1 So I think it was a compromise between the
2 travel arrangements. I think we could still try to do
3 that, give people the option.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So then moving to
5 the back page, to the close, so we will have a meeting
6 on Tuesday, the 21st of November.

7 I guess we will have to send out, we will
8 generate a flier that explains why it's more of a
9 technical meeting than a general meeting.

10 And then we will have a general meeting on the
11 19th of December, both here on Treasure Island, at the
12 Casa de la Vista.

13 And then if we need to have any planning type
14 meetings, the interim type or planning type meetings, I
15 guess whatever community members would like, I will
16 publish them for that.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So you don't want to have
19 any type of an other meeting in November?

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: No.

1 MS. SMITH: No.

2 Can we start at 7:00 just this time instead of
3 6:30 like we used to do?

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, coming out here with
5 traffic and all.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So two meetings, the
7 meeting we have on the 21st of December and 19th of
8 December will both be at 7:00 p.m.

9 MS. SMITH: Yes, because at the moment, I don't
10 know that we have enough documentation, and it's really
11 going to take that much. But we will have to adjust
12 these numbers once we get into the coming home and
13 finding the Fed Ex packages.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. So the very
15 next meeting we will have will be on the 21st of
16 November, right?

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Right.

18 MS. SMITH: Right.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And that's when we will talk
20 about RAB participation and BCT, we'll talk about RAB

1 meetings in general, and we will talk about the TAPP
2 proposals. By then, you will know where we are going
3 with those.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then technical
5 subjects, any documents out for review.

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Ted had some questions about
7 the, what is it, whatever is in the clay pigeons and
8 what is being done with that. He sent me an e-mail.
9 And I said I would bring that up.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I will forward that e-mail.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, with that, is
13 there anything else before we close?

14 Okay. Well, thank you very much, and we will
15 see some of you on the 21st at the technical meeting,
16 and, hopefully, all of you and more at the general
17 meeting on the 19th of December.

18 Thank you very much.

19 (The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.)

20 ---o0o---

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